**<http://www.investors.com/politics/editorials/yes-there-is-a-cure-for-poverty-its-called-freedom/>**

The creation of factories, the steam engine and other mechanical productivity multipliers, the explosion in new goods and services, and the expansion of trade helped create a new middle class in the developed world, pulling millions out of poverty. Despite wars, revolutions, civil wars, coups, and the advent of communist regimes, capitalism’s powerful expansion continued pulling ever-greater numbers of people out of poverty.  But the pace really picked up substantially after the Berlin Wall fell. During the 1990s, economic freedom — the engine of economic growth and prosperity — soared.   Freedom lets us all use our talents and abilities to our best advantage, while encouraging the wise use of scarce resources. Yet, sadly, in recent years socialism has once again reared its ugly head. Venezuela, Argentina, Cuba and Brazil have all made the socialist mistake — and paid for it. Large swaths of Africa and Asia, too. And much of the Mideast has no real freedom at all.

[**http://townhall.com/columnists/walterewilliams/2016/06/08/elitist-arrogance-part-ii-n2174232?utm\_source=thdaily&utm\_medium=email&utm\_campaign=nl&newsletterad**](http://townhall.com/columnists/walterewilliams/2016/06/08/elitist-arrogance-part-ii-n2174232?utm_source=thdaily&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=nl&newsletterad)=

***A basic economic premise holds that when the price of something rises, people seek to economize on its use. They seek substitutes for that which has risen in price.*** Recent years have seen proposals for an increase in the federal minimum wage to $15 an hour.  One substitute that has emerged for cashiers is automated kiosks where, instead of having a person take your order, you select your meal and pay for it using a machine.  ***There is little evidence that people are insensitive to price changes, whether they be changes in taxes, gas prices, food prices, labor prices or any other price.***

[**http://townhall.com/columnists/congressmancharlesboustany/2016/05/26/promoting-employment-for-welfare-recipients-is-true-compassion-n2169390?utm\_source=thdaily&utm\_medium=email&utm\_campaign=nl&newsletterad**](http://townhall.com/columnists/congressmancharlesboustany/2016/05/26/promoting-employment-for-welfare-recipients-is-true-compassion-n2169390?utm_source=thdaily&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=nl&newsletterad)=

Promoting Employment for Welfare Recipients Is True Compassion:  Recipients must be empowered to lift themselves out of poverty by giving them the tools to be successful in work and increase their income over time.  Current welfare programs are structured so poorly, they provide incentives for recipients to avoid work and stay dependent on permanent handouts.

[**http://townhall.com/columnists/arthurschaper/2016/08/01/for-donald-trump-victims-lives-matter-n2200358?utm\_source=thdaily&utm\_medium=email&utm\_campaign=nl&newsletterad**](http://townhall.com/columnists/arthurschaper/2016/08/01/for-donald-trump-victims-lives-matter-n2200358?utm_source=thdaily&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=nl&newsletterad)=

corporate cronyism has tilted the marketplace away from the hard-working, honest business owner to the well-financed industrial behemoths with the right Washington contacts.  Citizens are despised, illegals are protected, and the feds want to take our guns away.  Trump’s message on immigration, trade, and security courted those voters effectively. WaThis embittering lawlessness hits the hardest on ***the families*** [***of The Remembrance Project***](http://www.theremembranceproject.org/)***. Founded in 2009, this group commemorates the lives of Americans, young and old, who have been killed by illegal aliens in their own country.*** Washington’s aloof inattention, coupled with the robust pandering of Big Business and Big Labor, has done enough damage.

[**http://townhall.com/columnists/dennisprager/2016/06/28/why-the-left-hates-referendums-n2184036?utm\_source=thdaily&utm\_medium=email&utm\_campaign=nl&newsletterad**](http://townhall.com/columnists/dennisprager/2016/06/28/why-the-left-hates-referendums-n2184036?utm_source=thdaily&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=nl&newsletterad)=

First, the left (Democraps) cares about "the people" as much as the Soviet Communist Party cared about the workers. For the left, real people are either political fodder or, when they support the left, useful idiots. ***The left loves power, not people.***

[**http://eaglerising.com/32701/house-republicans-introduce-resolution-to-investigate-obama-for-high-crimes-and-misdemeanors/**](http://eaglerising.com/32701/house-republicans-introduce-resolution-to-investigate-obama-for-high-crimes-and-misdemeanors/)

Barack Hussein Obama Soetoro Sobarkah has less than a year left in office and the Republican-led House, which has been led by Republicans since their victory in 2010, is finally getting around to a resolution to establish a Select Committee on [***High Crimes and Misdemeanors***](http://freedomoutpost.com/1180-documented-examples-of-barack-obamas-lying-lawbreaking-corruption-cronyism-hypocrisy-waste-etc/) ***within the Executive Branch and the Obama Administration***.  [**HRes693 IH**](http://thomas.loc.gov/cgi-bin/query/z?c114:H.RES.693:) was introduced into the House of Representatives by Rep. Ted Yoho

[**http://www.investors.com/politics/editorials/the-death-of-american-coal-under-obama/**](http://www.investors.com/politics/editorials/the-death-of-american-coal-under-obama/)

Obama has succeeded in decimating whole towns across America — from Wyoming to Virginia to Pennsylvania — dependent on coal. An estimated 31,000 coal miners, truckers, engineers, construction workers and others have lost their jobs since 2009 as a result of this global warming jihad.  What is maddening about these developments is that coal is much, much cleaner than ever before. EPA statistics show that emissions of sulfur, lead, carbon monoxide, and smog  from coal plants have been reduced by more than 50% in the last 40 years.  America is the Saudi Arabia of coal. We have an estimated 500 years supply of that energy source.  ***Perhaps the millennials will wake up to the dangers of an unreliable electric grid system when they won’t be able to power up their Play Station 4s, their I phones, and their lap tops.*** Every poll shows Americans care most about jobs and the economy — and almost not at all about climate change.  Republicans should campaign on American energy and reviving the fossil fuel industry as a way to restoring 4 percent growth in America.

[**http://www.investors.com/politics/editorials/father-of-global-warming-admits-it-used-to-be-hotter-than-it-is-now/**](http://www.investors.com/politics/editorials/father-of-global-warming-admits-it-used-to-be-hotter-than-it-is-now/)

James Hansen, the famed NASA scientist who stirred the climate scare…Hansen has even admitted this.  “The last interglacial period, 120,000 years ago, that’s the last time it was warmer than today, sea level was 6 to 9 meters higher,” he said in an interview with online magazine [**Yale Environment 360**](http://e360.yale.edu/feature/james_hansen_science_demands_action/2981/).  ***So it has been warmer, and sea levels have been higher. And those conditions were entirely natural.***

[**http://www.wnd.com/2016/04/revealed-feds-demands-to-manipulate-global-warming-data/**](http://www.wnd.com/2016/04/revealed-feds-demands-to-manipulate-global-warming-data/)

NASA temperature data doesn’t even agree with NASA temperature data from 15 years ago,” notes the article “[**Global temperature record is a smoking gun of collusion and fraud**](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/2016/04/08/global-temperature-record-is-a-smoking-gun-of-collusion-and-fraud/).”   They all use basically the same GHCN data set from NOAA (which has lost more than 80 percent of their stations over the past few decades) and E-mails show that they discussed with each other ways to alter the data to make it agree with their theory.”   Marc Morano is executive editor and chief correspondent for [**ClimateDepot**](http://www.climatedepot.com/), as well as host and producer of the upcoming film “[**Climate Hustle**](http://www.wnd.com/2016/04/revealed-feds-demands-to-manipulate-global-warming-data/www.ClimateHustle.com).”

[**http://townhall.com/columnists/walterewilliams/2016/04/20/rights-versus-wishes-n2150280?utm\_source=thdaily&utm\_medium=email&utm\_campaign=nl&newsletterad**](http://townhall.com/columnists/walterewilliams/2016/04/20/rights-versus-wishes-n2150280?utm_source=thdaily&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=nl&newsletterad)=

In the standard historical usage of the term, a "right" is something that exists simultaneously among people. ***As such, a right imposes no obligation on another.*** For example, the right to free speech is something we all possess. My right to free speech imposes no obligation upon another except that of noninterference. Similarly, I have a right to travel freely. Again, that right imposes no obligation upon another except that of noninterference.  Contrast those rights to free speech and travel with the supposed rights to medical care and decent housing. Those supposed rights do impose obligations upon others. ***If one does not have money to pay for a medical service or decent housing and the government provides it, where do you think the government gets the money?  If you agree that there is no Santa Claus or tooth fairy and that Congress does not have any resources of its very own, the only way for Congress to give one American something is to first take it from some other American.*** In other words, if one person has a right to something he did not earn, it requires another person's not having a right to something he did earn.  Let's apply this bogus concept of rights to my right to speak and travel freely. Doing so, in the case of my right to free speech, it might impose obligations on others to supply me with an auditorium, microphone and audience. My right to travel freely might require that others provide me with resources to purchase airplane tickets and hotel accommodations.  As human beings, we all have certain natural rights. Of the rights we possess, we have a right to delegate them to government. For example, we all have a natural right to defend ourselves against predators. Because we possess that right, we can delegate it to government. By contrast, I do not have a right to take one person's earnings to give to another. Because I have no such right, I cannot delegate it to government. ***If I did take your earnings to provide medical services for another, it would rightfully be described and condemned as an act of theft. When government does the same, it's still theft, albeit legalized theft.***

[**http://townhall.com/columnists/walterewilliams/2016/04/27/a-superior-vision-n2153268?utm\_source=thdaily&utm\_medium=email&utm\_campaign=nl&newsletterad**](http://townhall.com/columnists/walterewilliams/2016/04/27/a-superior-vision-n2153268?utm_source=thdaily&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=nl&newsletterad)=

At least two-thirds of that spending can be described as government's taking the property of one American and giving it to another. ***That's our moral tragedy: We've become a nation of people endeavoring to live at the expense of others -- in a word, a nation of thieves.***  I am my private property, and you are your private property. If you agree with that premise, then certain human actions are moral and others immoral. The reason murder is immoral is that it violates private property. Similarly, rape and theft are immoral, for they, too, violate private property. Most Americans will agree that murder and rape violate people's property rights and are hence immoral. But there may not be so much agreement about theft. Let's look at it.  Theft is when a person's property is taken from him -- through stealth, force, intimidation, threats or coercion -- and given to another to whom it does not belong. If a person took your property -- even to help another person who is in need -- it would be called theft.

[***http://townhall.com/columnists/victordavishanson/2016/05/12/draft-n2161483?utm\_source=thdaily&utm\_medium=email&utm\_campaign=nl&newsletterad***](http://townhall.com/columnists/victordavishanson/2016/05/12/draft-n2161483?utm_source=thdaily&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=nl&newsletterad)***=***

***Moreover, the additional social expense associated with millions of undocumented workers -- in rising health care, legal, education and law-enforcement costs -- is usually picked up by the public taxpayer, not by employers.   The professional class likes having low-wage "help" to clean the house, cook meals, help take care of kids and elders, and tend the lawn. Such outsourcing usually is not affordable for the middle and lower classes.  Elites have ways of navigating around the downsides of illegal immigration. They can avoid crowded schools and low-income neighborhoods, and they can easily pay the higher taxes that can result from illegal immigration.  Support for lax immigration policies also offers psychological penance for essentially living a life of apartheid. An elite can avoid living in integrated neighborhoods or sending his children to diverse schools, but he can square that circle by voicing theoretical support for immigrant amnesty and sanctuary cities.***

[**http://www.investors.com/politics/on-the-left/robert-j-samuelson-whats-the-real-gender-pay-gap/**](http://www.investors.com/politics/on-the-left/robert-j-samuelson-whats-the-real-gender-pay-gap/)

A more accurate ratio, after adjusting for differences in gender employment patterns, is closer to 92%. Even the remaining gap of eight percentage points may not stem fully from discrimination.  They demand “equal pay for equal work.” But that’s not what the pay gap shows. It’s ***simply the ratio of women’s average hourly pay to men’s average hourly pay. The jobs in the comparison are not the same***, and when these differences are taken into account, the ratio of women’s pay to men’s rises to almost 92% from 79%, say Blau and Kahn.  Specifically, they identify two major differences between women’s and men’s employment patterns. **First, despite advances, women remain more concentrated than men in lower-paying industries and occupations. They work disproportionately as health care aides, receptionists, cashiers and food servers. This drags down women’s average wages.  The second big difference is that women still have slightly less on-the-job experience than men. This, too, lowers their average wages.**  But the persisting gap could have other causes. There’s ***“the motherhood wage penalty”***: Women bear the greatest responsibilities for child-rearing. Careers are interrupted; even when employers allow greater job flexibility, incomes and advancement prospects suffer.  ***On the other hand, the pleasures and duties of being a parent often dwarf on-the-job rewards.***

[**http://townhall.com/columnists/pauldriessen/2016/04/28/climate-hustle-demolishes-climate-alarmism-n2154518?utm\_source=thdaily&utm\_medium=email&utm\_campaign=nl&newsletterad**](http://townhall.com/columnists/pauldriessen/2016/04/28/climate-hustle-demolishes-climate-alarmism-n2154518?utm_source=thdaily&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=nl&newsletterad)=

*Climate Hustle* is the perfect antidote to the destructive, demoralizing climate alarmism that dominates political decisions and obsesses the Obama White House and EPA. You owe it to yourself to see it. I saw *Climate Hustle* April 14, at its U.S. premiere on Capitol Hill in Washington. The film is informative and entertaining, pointed and humorous. As meteorologist [**Anthony Watts**](https://wattsupwiththat.com/2016/04/25/my-review-skeptic-film-climate-hustle-to-appear-in-theaters-nationwide-one-week-from-tonight/) says, it is wickedly effective in its using slapstick humor and the words and deeds of climate alarmists to make you laugh at them.  See this amazing film on May 2, and find out for yourself. To learn where it’s showing near you, and to buy tickets, visit [**www.ClimateHustle.com**](http://www.climatehustle.com/)   You’ll be glad you did.

[**https://www.ssa.gov/history/court.html**](https://www.ssa.gov/history/court.html)

In the spring of 1935 Justice Roberts joined with the conservatives to invalidate the Railroad Retirement Act. In May, the Court threw out a centerpiece of the New Deal, the National Industrial Recovery Act. In January 1936 a passionately split Court ruled the Agricultural Adjustment Act unconstitutional. In another case from 1936 the Court ruled New York state's minimum wage law unconstitutional. The upshot was that major social and political reforms, including social insurance programs, appeared headed for defeat. President Roosevelt's response to all of this was stunning and unexpected. On February 5, 1937 he sent a special message to Congress proposing legislation granting the President new powers to add additional judges to all federal courts whenever there were sitting judges age 70 or older who refused to retire.  The President would be decisively rebuffed, his reputation in history tarnished for all time. But the Court, it seemed, got the message and suddenly shifted its course.  Three Social Security cases made their way to the Supreme Court during its October 1936 term. One challenged the old-age insurance program (Helvering vs. Davis) and two challenged the unemployment compensation program of the Social Security Act. The Court would issue rulings on all three on the same day.  In March 1937, in a pivotal case, Justice Roberts unexpectedly changed his allegiance from the conservatives to the liberals, shifting the balance on the Court from 5-4 against to ***5-4*** in favor of most New Deal legislation.  The Social Security Board could ill afford to wait until a definitive Supreme Court ruling was issued before starting to work. Issuance of social security numbers (SSNs), collection of payroll taxes, and payment of the first lump-sum benefits all had to start by January 1937. And the Board would have to hire staff, acquire facilities, set up record keeping procedures, and a million other things before then.

[***http://dailysignal.com/2016/04/25/debunking-the-wage-gap-we-are-not-victims/?utm\_source=TDS\_Email&utm\_medium=email&utm\_campaign=MorningBell&mkt\_tok=eyJpIjoiWkdKa05qVTNZVGxsTldSaiIsInQiOiI1K0RWVG1WbWRsR0lyZndsOVc4NGF6dW15azA4VjM0MlpIZzlTOXNWVlVFZ0t1bXdrc3dkeG9vZjdXbG5ObFNxUVdFXC9hK05lQW1VT0txMmU2XC9tVDhIdUVIMzFDOUZoUG1scmpmVnU1bFBrPSJ9***](http://dailysignal.com/2016/04/25/debunking-the-wage-gap-we-are-not-victims/?utm_source=TDS_Email&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=MorningBell&mkt_tok=eyJpIjoiWkdKa05qVTNZVGxsTldSaiIsInQiOiI1K0RWVG1WbWRsR0lyZndsOVc4NGF6dW15azA4VjM0MlpIZzlTOXNWVlVFZ0t1bXdrc3dkeG9vZjdXbG5ObFNxUVdFXC9hK05lQW1VT0txMmU2XC9tVDhIdUVIMzFDOUZoUG1scmpmVnU1bFBrPSJ9)

***In reality, in our 20s women are paid better than men—by 8 cents on the dollar. And overall, 72 percent of women say they have about the same opportunities to advance to top executive and professional positions in their companies as men.  Now, it is true that on average men earn more than women, and they also hold a greater number of executive positions. Yet this wage gap is usually not the product of workplace discrimination but rather is the product of the choices and needs of both women and men. Here’s a radical thought: Women are different than men, and our priorities, demands, and career paths differ in most cases because of our own choosing.  Rather than pitting men and women against each other and using simplistic numbers to suggest that women are victims, we ought to acknowledge these differences and embrace the choices we make.  When we take into account things like education, hours worked, industry, experience, and career choice, the wage gap disappears.  For instance, most women today prefer not to work full time while their children are growing up. This decision naturally slows our workplace trajectory and can decrease our wages when we do return, particularly when you take into account that only 40 percent of women who take time off for children re-enter full-time work.***

[**http://townhall.com/columnists/larryelder/2016/06/02/on-inequality-n2172075?utm\_source=thdaily&utm\_medium=email&utm\_campaign=nl&newsletterad**](http://townhall.com/columnists/larryelder/2016/06/02/on-inequality-n2172075?utm_source=thdaily&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=nl&newsletterad)=

Later in life, I started playing tennis, and I became quite passionate about it. But most of the people I played against had started playing years earlier, and most had taken lessons for years. I got better, but given my competitors' head start, the gap remained.  
Financial planners advise clients to start early and stick to some sort of game plan. Is there any wonder that those who do so will have more net worth than those who started later, or who lacked the discipline to follow and stick to a plan? How is government supposed to address these "unequal" outcomes?  Most entrepreneurs experience failure before hitting on an idea, concept or business that makes money. Even then, it takes 20 to 30 years of long hours and sacrifice, along with occasional self-doubt and a dollop of luck, to become a multimillionaire.  ***In the real world, two individuals, living next door to each other, make different choices about education, careers, spouses, where to live, and if and how to invest. Even if they make exactly the same income, one might live below his or her means, prudently saving money, while the other might choose to regularly buy new cars and fancy clothes and go on expensive vacations.*** Is there any question that the first person will end up with a higher net worth than the latter? Is their "inequality" something that government should address?  ***Communism, collectivism and socialism*** rest on the same premise -- that government possesses the kindness, aptitude, judgment and ability to take from some and give to others to achieve "equality." **Karl Marx** wrote, "From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs." And that's the problem. The statement implicitly acknowledges that ***some have more aptitude, drive, energy and ability than others***. ***To take from some and give to others reduces the initiative of both the giver and the givee.***  This is the fundamental flaw with income redistribution, the very foundation of communism, socialism and collectivism.

[**http://townhall.com/columnists/laurahollis/2016/06/02/compulsion-isnt-compassion-n2172091?utm\_source=thdaily&utm\_medium=email&utm\_campaign=nl&newsletterad**](http://townhall.com/columnists/laurahollis/2016/06/02/compulsion-isnt-compassion-n2172091?utm_source=thdaily&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=nl&newsletterad)=

***Obama's love of the federal government bludgeon changes people's focus from the ability to be kind to their neighbors to having to defend their own rights. It pits Americans against one another.***  It's much the same with immigration. Remember those buses filled with illegal immigrants that irate townspeople refused to let stop in Murrieta, California two years ago? It wasn't really the immigrants that citizens were infuriated with; it was a government that refuses to listen, disregards our laws, our rights and our safety, and then accuses its citizens of being "uncompassionate" when they express legitimate concerns about illness, healthcare and welfare expenditures or crime.

[**http://constitution.com/transparent-presidency-hid-censoring-400-groups-irs-targeted-2012-election/**](http://constitution.com/transparent-presidency-hid-censoring-400-groups-irs-targeted-2012-election/)

In 2013, the IRS claimed it targeted less than 300 conservative groups prior to the 2012 Election. In actuality, the IRA targeted 426 organizations.  In a *Washington Times* [**article**](http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2016/jun/5/irs-reveals-list-of-tea-party-groups-targeted-for-/), “IRS finally reveals list of tea party groups targeted for extra scrutiny,” it turns out that it took three years for the IRS to finally admit that it targeted tea party and conservative groups for “intrusive scrutiny. *The Times* reports that the IRS released a “near-complete list of the organizations it snagged in a political dragnet.”

Last month, the IRS was forced to comply with federal rulings to file its list last month.  The media is not reporting this. The “most transparent presidency” has stonewalled federal judges for three years to not provide information about a list of hundreds of people against which a taxpayer-funded agency was targeting, penalizing, and censoring.  Would this have happened under a Republican president? Would the media be reporting on this scandal if it was not Obama?

[**http://dailysignal.com/2016/05/31/these-7-short-videos-clear-up-myths-about-air-pollution/?utm\_source=TDS\_Email&utm\_medium=email&utm\_campaign=CapitolBell&mkt\_tok=eyJpIjoiTkdRNU9EY3pNV1EzTXpFeiIsInQiOiJwdmwyMFVQSWp3XC9GRGFcL21CNTJRYnlsQ2pKOXhwV0NWNlFhY3puYnhvbTFyUDN6djU5cEE3NnRXYXRsRDJOSWl2ZUlsd0craVd4S3Y0YmdlMDFhdnJ3cFpldVhENlVqSUpxd3E4VUhrOVFZPSJ9**](http://dailysignal.com/2016/05/31/these-7-short-videos-clear-up-myths-about-air-pollution/?utm_source=TDS_Email&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=CapitolBell&mkt_tok=eyJpIjoiTkdRNU9EY3pNV1EzTXpFeiIsInQiOiJwdmwyMFVQSWp3XC9GRGFcL21CNTJRYnlsQ2pKOXhwV0NWNlFhY3puYnhvbTFyUDN6djU5cEE3NnRXYXRsRDJOSWl2ZUlsd0craVd4S3Y0YmdlMDFhdnJ3cFpldVhENlVqSUpxd3E4VUhrOVFZPSJ9)

**These 7 Short Videos Clear Up Myths About Air Pollution** “Our series of short videos about the EPA’s Clean Power Plan, air pollution, and climate change educate younger Americans about the tremendous progress we’ve made in cleaning our air of toxic emissions while pointing out that ***carbon dioxide—a gas we all exhale—is non-toxic plant fertilizer***,” Chuck DeVore, vice president of national initiatives for the Texas Public Policy Foundation, said.  [**http://www.texaspolicy.com/centers/detail/energy-environment**](http://www.texaspolicy.com/centers/detail/energy-environment)

[**http://www.investors.com/politics/commentary/the-truth-warming-alarmists-dont-want-you-to-know-about-the-climate-models/**](http://www.investors.com/politics/commentary/the-truth-warming-alarmists-dont-want-you-to-know-about-the-climate-models/)

(follow the $$$$) Trusting the models too much is not the only gaping hole in the climate alarmists’ claims. Their bigger problem is that they rely on [**models that have been consistently wrong**](http://www.investors.com/politics/commentary/global-warming-models-are-wrong/). The heat that the models have predicted for decades has simply not arrived.  And, as the Daily Caller pointed out last week, the federal government has spent billions — [**close to $100 billion**](https://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/omb/assets/legislative_reports/fcce-report-to-congress.pdf), actually, since just fiscal 2012 — on “science” that is undergirded by failed models.  Climate scientists are spending more energy and resources trying to upgrade their flawed models than they are trying to understand the climate itself. And it’s a good bet that what most climate scientists will consider improved modeling will be programs that predict even greater warmth.  As we noted above, modeling has its place in science, but modeling itself isn’t science. In science, questions are asked and a hypothesis is developed, then tested through experimentation. The models, however, simply spit out the outcomes that the researchers who developed them programmed them to. Quite clearly, the science isn’t settled. In fact, to some extent, it isn’t even science.

[**http://culturaloffering.com/2008/10/27/wealth-redistribution--the-grades-example.aspx**](http://culturaloffering.com/2008/10/27/wealth-redistribution--the-grades-example.aspx)           imagine your teacher or professor announcing that those students getting A's will have two grade points deducted so that the students getting F's and D's can have their grades lifted to a C.  The individuals getting B's will have one grade point deducted and used for the same purpose.  After all, isn't it FAIR that those students getting A's and B's should help out students who aren't as fortunate?  Make sense?" I asked.

            "No.  The reason we get A's and B's is that we are working harder or maybe we are smarter.  It isn't our fault that some kids are getting D's and F's," he answered.  "Well, you'll still do okay.  Getting a C is still passing, and you will have helped out the other students," I argued.

             "If you do that, there is no reason for me to study hard," he reasoned.  "I'll take it easy."  "But if you take it easy, where will we get the grade points to help those D and F students?" I asked.  "We have to get the points somewhere."  "I don't know," he said.  He now understands the economic effect of redistribution through taxation.

            (The College Republicans at [**the University**](http://dailycaller.com/2011/04/20/students-not-eager-to-redistribute-gpa-scores/) of California-Merced ask fellow students, who support raising taxes on the rich, if they would be willing to redistribute their GPAs. They don’t think it’s a good idea because they *earned* their grades.) Read more: [**http://dailycaller.com/2011/04/20/students-not-eager-to-redistribute-gpa-scores/#ixzz1KAckeFqh**](http://dailycaller.com/2011/04/20/students-not-eager-to-redistribute-gpa-scores/#ixzz1KAckeFqh)

An economics professor at a local college made a statement that he had never failed a single student before, but had recently failed an entire class.  That class had insisted that Obama's socialism worked and that no one would be poor and no one would be rich, a great equalizer.   
          The professor then said, "OK, we will have an experiment in this class on Obama's plan"..   
All grades would be averaged and everyone would receive the same grade so no one would fail and no one would receive an A....   
          After the first test, the grades were averaged and everyone got a B.  The students who studied hard were upset and the students who studied little were happy.  As the second test rolled around, the students who studied little had studied even less and the ones who studied hard decided they wanted a free ride too so they studied little.   
          The second test average was a D!  No one was happy.  When the 3rd test rolled around, the average was an F.  As the tests proceeded, the scores never increased as bickering, blame and name-calling all resulted in hard feelings and no one would study for the benefit of anyone else.   
          All failed, to their great surprise, and the professor told them that socialism would also ultimately fail because ***when the reward is great, the effort to succeed is great, but when government takes all the reward away, no one will try or want to succeed.***Could not be any simpler than that. (Please pass this on)                 **Remember, there is a test coming up.  The elections.**

[**http://www.lazymaths.com/more-math/the-us-tax-system-explained%e2%80%93with-beer/#more-3454**](http://www.lazymaths.com/more-math/the-us-tax-system-explained%e2%80%93with-beer/#more-3454)In this taxing times, take a sip of beer and read through this brilliant explanation of the US tax system using actual percentages, the impact of a tax cut, and the public reaction that ***even Obama should be able to understand.*** *The wealthy or the rich are productive, talented, ambitious, job creators, business owners and investors who fund businesses that create jobs.*

Suppose that every day, ten men go out for beer and the bill for all ten comes to $100. If they paid their bill the way we pay our taxes, it would go something like this (Federal, state, real estate, payroll, estate taxes etc.):

Drinkers 1-4 (the poorest) pay - $0 or 0% of the tab   
Drinker #5 pays - $1 or 1% of the tab   
Drinker #6 pays - $3 or 3% of the tab   
Drinker #7 pays - $7 or 7% of the tab   
Drinker #8 pays - $12 or 12% of the tab   
Drinker #9 pays - $18 or 18% of the tab   
Drinker #10 (the richest) pays - $59 or 59% of the tab

So, that’s what they decided to do. The ten men drank in the bar every day and seemed quite happy with the arrangement, until one day, the owner threw them a curve. “Since you are all such good customers,” he said, “I’m going to reduce the cost of your daily beer by $20. “Drinks for the ten now cost just $80.

            The group still wanted to pay their bill the way we pay our taxes, so the first four men were unaffected. They would still drink for free. But what about the other six men – the paying customers? How could they divide the $20 windfall so that everyone would get his ‘fair share?’

            They realized that $20 divided by six is $3.33. But if they subtracted that from everybody’s share, then the fifth man and the sixth man would each end up being paid to drink his beer. So, the bar owner suggested that it would be fair to reduce each man’s bill by roughly the same amount, and he proceeded to work out the amounts each should pay.

If the drinkers would have stuck to their original plan, as they devised for *apportioning* the bill, the split would have been easy with a 20% reduction across the boards:   
  
Drinkers 1-4 paid $0 get $0 back final amount paid = $00.00   
Drinker #5 paid $1 gets $0.20 back, final amount paid = $00.80   
Drinker #6 paid $3 gets $0.60 back, final amount paid = $2.40   
Drinker #7 paid $7 gets $1.40 back, final amount paid = $5.60   
Drinker #8 paid $12 gets $2.40 back, final amount paid = $9.60   
Drinker #9 paid $18 gets $3.60 back, final amount paid = $14.40   
Drinker #10 paid $59 gets $11.80 back, final amount paid = $47.20  (Look at how much the rich pay)  
Original Tab $100 minus $20--20% rebate = final tab $80.00

            Each of the six was better off than before. And the first four continued to drink for free. But once outside the restaurant, the men began to compare their savings.  “I only got 60 cents out of the $20,”declared the sixth man. He pointed to the tenth man,” but he got $11.80!”  “Yeah, that’s right,” exclaimed the fifth man. “I only saved 20 cents. It’s unfair that he got 11.80!”  “That’s true!!” shouted the seventh man. “Why should he get $11.80 back when I got only 1.40? The wealthy get all the breaks!”  “Wait a minute,” yelled the first four men in unison. “We didn’t get anything at all. The system exploits the poor!”  
            *The nine men surrounded the tenth and beat him up.* *The next night the tenth man didn’t show up for drinks*, so the nine sat down and had beers without him. But when it came time to pay the bill, they discovered something important. They didn’t have enough money between all of them for even half of the bill!

            And that, boys and girls, journalists and college professors, is how our tax system works. The  people who pay the highest taxes get the most benefit from a tax reduction. ***Tax them too much, attack them for being wealthy, and they just may not show up anymore. In fact, they might start drinking overseas where the atmosphere is somewhat friendlier.***  Readers, Visitors, Math Enthusiasts…, if you have a better way to explain the Tax system, share it with us and our readers, and even if you don’t go ahead and share this with your friends and family…If government run itself efficiently, effectively and productively like a business such as this bar, then people could keep more of their money and do other things with that money, providing for family, investing, charity etc.

I guess there are people who still don’t get it as here are some typical responses to this and if this doesn’t help you can’t fix stupid:

The rich men have become rich in part because they have talent, but also because they had access to the poor men’s labor and the middle class’ purchasing power.

*{ Go get a job from a poor man then.  Don’t buy the product or service then.  The product or       service provider/businessperson takes the risk in using their time, talent and treasure to make a      profit from their product or service.  You take that risk.}*

The rich men, by definition, make more use of public resources. Their activities require more land, more energy, more natural resources, more public infrastructure. They monopolize more government workers, require more military resources, and generate more environmental damages and so forth.

*{So they pay more for the real estate & taxes that are used to pay for these services, permits,     water and sewer bills etc.  Where does the government get the money it has?  From   businesspeople who generate income, sales, jobs who employ others that generate income etc.            Think about it a little more!}*

The poor men don’t pay taxes because they are dirt poor. All of their disposable income go towards getting a roof and feeding their family and dealing with the stress of being poor. Were they to pay more taxes they would become a burden for society which would be good for no one.

*{ look at your social security and job income history, do you stay at minimum wage or as you     work hard, learn skills and become more valuable, you get paid more?  This is the typical cycle              for everyone starting at the bottom of the ladder/totem pole and working their way up and with              new crops of teenagers every year the gap will remain, but usually not the same people remain       at the bottom.  You want to have the opportunity to work your way up the ladder, so you don’t                 remain poor.  Learn more needed skills, keep learning, get an education, work hard, take on         another job or two to increase your income, don’t have premarital sex, if you find love-get          married, spend less, live below your means,  and you will be better off.}*

[**http://www.ftportfolios.com/Commentary/EconomicResearch/2011/9/6/want-jobs-have-faith**](http://www.ftportfolios.com/Commentary/EconomicResearch/2011/9/6/want-jobs-have-faith)

 favorite parable about economic growth. We borrow it from Paul Zane Pilzer.

Imagine 10 people live on an island. Each person catches two fish every day, which is subsistence living. There are no savings. Children, or immigrants who do not know how to fish, would be hard to absorb. The people would be desperate to increase production.

But then, a miracle happens. Two of these people figure out how to make a boat and a net. They fish 200 yards offshore. The two of them catch 20 fish each day with this new technology, which replicates the daily GDP created by all 10 using the old technology.

At this point, eight people no longer need to fish and the island has a choice. The eight could grow corn, pick coconuts, fix the boat and the net, or trade some other good or service to their more productive neighbors. Living standards would rise. Abundance and plenty would be created. Children and immigrants could be absorbed.

Or…the eight without a boat could become envious and complain that a 10 fish-to-2 fish income ratio is unfair and that the rich fishermen should pay taxes. So, the island votes to institute an 80% tax on anyone that uses a net.

Let’s assume that the fishermen with a boat continue to catch 20 fish a day. If so, the other eight would stop fishing and divide up the 16-fish tax between them. Everyone would still get two fish a day. Living standards would not rise. Kids and immigrants who did not know how to fish would be a burden. The benefits of the new technology would go to waste.

This is the problem with attempts by the government to be fair and socially just. This is also the problem with trying to spend our way out of economic pain. It doesn’t work.

And even if we decide not to tax the fishermen, but instead borrow the fish and give them away, the same thing happens. Borrowing the fish, and then consuming them, does not create new wealth. It only puts a burden on the less productive that they will never be able to repay. This is what has happened in Greece and many other European countries. Government spending, whether paid for with debt or with taxes, undermines job growth and wealth creation.

Excluding defense, the US federal government is spending more today as a share of GDP than it ever has in history. It is also re-distributing more income than it ever has in history. We understand the impetus for this…we care about people too.

But, the desire to help people does not always mean that what we are doing is really helping. In fact, the massive increase in government spending the US has instituted in the past few years (under Obama and the Democrats) is backfiring.

[**http://townhall.com/columnists/thomassowell/2016/05/31/socialism-for-the-uninformed-n2171042?utm\_source=thdaily&utm\_medium=email&utm\_campaign=nl&newsletterad**](http://townhall.com/columnists/thomassowell/2016/05/31/socialism-for-the-uninformed-n2171042?utm_source=thdaily&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=nl&newsletterad)=

While throngs of young people are cheering loudly for avowed socialist Bernie Sanders, ***socialism has turned oil-rich Venezuela into a place where there are shortages of everything*** from toilet paper to beer, where electricity keeps shutting down, and where there are long lines of people hoping to get food, people complaining that they cannot feed their families.  With national income going down, and prices going up under triple-digit inflation in Venezuela, these complaints are by no means frivolous. But it is doubtful if the young people cheering for Bernie Sanders have even heard of such things, whether in Venezuela or in other countries around the world that have turned their economies over to politicians and bureaucrats to run.  But people who attribute income inequality to capitalists exploiting workers, as Karl Marx claimed, never seem to get around to testing that belief against facts -- such as the fact that none of the Marxist regimes around the world has ever had as high a standard of living for working people as there is in many capitalist countries.  ***The great promise of socialism is something for nothing. It is one of the signs of today's dumbed-down education*** that so many college students seem to think that the cost of their education should -- and will -- be paid by raising taxes on "the rich."

[**http://townhall.com/tipsheet/mattvespa/2016/05/30/nyt-venezuelan-socialism-has-pretty-much-shut-down-all-aspects-of-socioeconomic-life-n2171010?utm\_source=thdaily&utm\_medium=email&utm\_campaign=nl&newsletterad**](http://townhall.com/tipsheet/mattvespa/2016/05/30/nyt-venezuelan-socialism-has-pretty-much-shut-down-all-aspects-of-socioeconomic-life-n2171010?utm_source=thdaily&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=nl&newsletterad)=

Venezuela’s tryst with ***socialism*** continues to make its citizens suffer under lack of electricity, food, and medical supplies.   ***corruption is a byproduct of authoritarian leftism***. Not just in Bolivia, but other governments that aspire to the planned economy model.  Viva La Revolución!

[**http://www.wnd.com/2016/06/cops-catch-islamic-refugee-at-u-s-border-with-gas-pipeline-plans/**](http://www.wnd.com/2016/06/cops-catch-islamic-refugee-at-u-s-border-with-gas-pipeline-plans/)

In an eerie development on concerns about Islamic terrorism, New Mexico police have apprehended an illegal Middle Eastern woman in possession of the region’s gas pipeline plans.  According to [**Judicial Watch**](http://www.judicialwatch.org/blog/2016/06/islamic-refugee-gas-pipeline-plans-arrested-new-mexico-border-county/), authorities in Luna County – which borders Mexico – pulled the woman over during a traffic stop. The woman was described as an “Islamic refugee.” After the plans were found, county authorities alerted the U.S. Border Patrol and the Federal Bureau of Investigation’s Joint Terrorism Task Forces, or JTTF, which has been deployed to the area to investigate.  The pipeline plans include the Deming region, situated about 35 miles north of the Mexican border and with a population of about 15,000. Deming is considered one of the “[**10 worst places**](https://www.roadsnacks.net/worst-places-to-live-in-new-mexico/)” to live in New Mexico due to drug cartels, gangs, unemployment, poverty and crime.  The constant smuggling across the porous southern border extends beyond drugs. Organizations such as Judicial Watch have documented how Mexican drug traffickers also smuggle Islamic terrorists into the U.S. via remote farm roads or rural airfields.

[**http://www.wnd.com/2012/04/i-work-hard-obama-defends-vacations/**](http://www.wnd.com/2012/04/i-work-hard-obama-defends-vacations/)

“No one is questioning his need to travel on Air Force One or have security. ***The questions being raised are the first family taking so many vacations, when and where, at taxpayer expense.”***  That issue again made headlines temporary just days ago when one of Obama’s daughters took a trip to Mexico, accompanied by dozens of security officers. The White House reportedly asked news outlets not to report on the trip.

Before that, [**according to the Washington Examiner,**](http://washingtonexaminer.com/politics/washington-secrets/2012/02/michelles-ski-trip-marks-16-obama-vacations/294051) the Obamas had taken 16 vacations at taxpayer expense.  They include a President’s Day 2012 ski trip to Colorado, an extended stay in Hawaii at Christmas 2011, a Martha’s Vineyard, Mass., vacation during summer of 2011, a trip to Africa and Botswana in June 2011, another Colorado ski vacation on President’s Day 2011, Christmas 2011 for an extended trip to Hawaii.  Before that it was Florida, Chicago, Spain, Martha’s Vineyard again, Mount Desert Island, Maine, Chicago, New York City, Hawaii, Yellowstone National Park, Grand Canyon and Martha’s Vineyard again.

The report defended the Obama trips, citing 30 visits President Bush made to ***his*** own personal Texas ranch (over how many years?).  “But Obama’s have become more controversial because of the costs associated with moving the first family to a public vacation spot, unlike the Bushes to their own remote ranch in Crawford, Texas. For example, the Hawaii Reporter said the first family’s 2011 Christmas vacation in Hawaii would exceed $1.5 million.”  The report continued, “Critics and even some in his own party say the vacations present a bad image at a time when many Americans are struggling to get by during the recession.”

**How many vacations have you taken in the last 4 years?  Did you pay for them out of your own pocket?  How about the golf outings and parties at the White House etc.?**

  I have a better idea for Mr. Buffett. Take the extra tax money you want to pay and set up a venture capital institute. People who have new business ideas or products that need investment capital would present their ideas to a board of experienced entrepreneurs who would evaluate the business plans. If accepted, the business would be capitalized. Existing business enterprises that needed additional capital for expansion could also participate. Four billion would go a long way.

            Another Buffett-funded enterprise could be a school for entrepreneurs where students could learn how to run a business and pick up the basis in accounting, marketing, and advertising.

            Buffett and other high income earners will be able to assuage their guilt for being rich, raise up a generation of new business leaders, increase employment, curtail rising economic dependency, and even expand the tax base all without raising anybody’s taxes. So Warren, don’t dump your money down a rat hole. Do something productive and lasting with it. Invest in Americans, not in the federal government. Read more: [**Hey, Warren, No One’s Stopping You from Paying More Taxes | Godfather Politics**](http://godfatherpolitics.com/529/hey-warren-no-ones-stopping-you-from-paying-more-taxes/#ixzz1VOlHRRql) [**http://godfatherpolitics.com/529/hey-warren-no-ones-stopping-you-from-paying-more-taxes/#ixzz1VOlHRRql**](http://godfatherpolitics.com/529/hey-warren-no-ones-stopping-you-from-paying-more-taxes/#ixzz1VOlHRRql)

[**http://politicaloutcast.com/2012/07/top-12-reasons-to-vote-for-a-democrat/**](http://politicaloutcast.com/2012/07/top-12-reasons-to-vote-for-a-democrat/)

* I voted for a Democrat because I believe oil companies’ profits of 4% on a gallon of gas are obscene, but the government taxing the same gallon of gas at 15% isn’t.
* I voted for a Democrat because I believe the government will do a better job of spending the money I earn than I would.
* I voted for a Democrat because I’m way too irresponsible to own a gun, and I know that my local police are all I need to protect me from murderers, rapists, thugs, and thieves.
* I voted for a Democrat because I’m not concerned about millions of babies being aborted so long as we keep all death row inmates alive.
* I voted for a Democrat because I think illegal aliens have a right to free health care, education, and Social Security benefits.
* I voted for a Democrat because I believe that business should not be allowed to make profits for themselves. They need to break even and give the rest away to the government for redistribution as the Democrats see fit.
* I voted for a Democrat because I think that it’s better to pay billions to people who hate us for their oil, but not drill for our own because it might upset some useless endangered beetle, gopher, or fish.
* I voted for a Democrat because I believe liberal judges need to rewrite the Constitution regularly to suit some fringe folks who would never get their agendas past the voters.

[**http://www.wnd.com/2016/08/devastating-bombshells-in-new-hillary-emails/**](http://www.wnd.com/2016/08/devastating-bombshells-in-new-hillary-emails/)

In another case, Band “directs” Abedin and Mills to put “Lebanese-Nigerian billionaire and Clinton Foundation donor Gilbert Chagoury in touch with the State Department’s ‘substance person’ on Lebanon.’  “Band notes that Chagoury is ‘key guy there [Lebanon] and to us,’ and insists that Abedin call Amb. Jeffrey Feltman to connect him to Chagoury.”  Judicial Watch explained Chagoury is a friend of Bill Clinton and top donor to the family foundation.  Band began writing in the exchange: “We need to speak to the substance person re Lebanon. As you know, he’s [Chagoury] key guy there and to us and is loved in lebanon.”

“Its jeff feltman,” Abedin wrote back, referring to America’s former ambassador to Lebanon who went on to become assistant secretary of state for Near Eastern affairs in August 2009.  “I’m sure he knows him. Ill talk to jeff,” said Abedin.  Less than 20 minutes later, Band replied: “Better if you call him. Now preferable. This is very important. He’s awake I’m sure.”  Judicial Watch said: “He has appeared near the top of the foundation’s donor list as a $1 million to $5 million contributor, according to foundation documents. He also pledged $1 billion to the Clinton Global Initiative. ***According to a 2010 investigation by PBS Frontline, Chagoury was convicted in 2000 in Switzerland for laundering money from Nigeria, but agreed to a plea deal and repaid $66 million to the Nigerian government.”***  But the watchdog organization pointed out that the interaction – and even favors that seem to be evident – “seem in violation of the ethics agreements that Hillary Clinton agreed to in order to be appointed and confirmed as secretary of state.” [***The New York Post bluntly described Clinton’s actions***](http://nypost.com/2016/08/09/emails-reveal-hillarys-shocking-pay-for-play-scheme/) ***as putting “the State Department up for sale, with top aides pulling strings and doing favors for fat-cat donors to the Clinton Foundation – including a shady billionaire.”***

[**http://www.wnd.com/2016/07/bestselling-author-clintons-run-money-laundering-ring/**](http://www.wnd.com/2016/07/bestselling-author-clintons-run-money-laundering-ring/)

Investigative reporter: ***Clintons run money-laundering ring:  'This is the type of thing drug cartels or terrorists do,' not presidents, candidates***

[**http://www.newsmax.com/Headline/US-Campaign-2016/2016/06/22/id/735073/?ns\_mail\_uid=35536539&ns\_mail\_job=1674865\_06222016&s=al&dkt\_nbr=hz8svygz**](http://www.newsmax.com/Headline/US-Campaign-2016/2016/06/22/id/735073/?ns_mail_uid=35536539&ns_mail_job=1674865_06222016&s=al&dkt_nbr=hz8svygz)

Trump picked apart Clinton's candidacy one issue at a time:  Clinton has "perfected the politics of personal profit and even theft."  "Her leadership style volcanic impulsive, disdainful and disdainful of the rules."  Clinton needs to go to "prison to pay for the crimes that she's already committed against our country."  Clinton "gets rich making you poor."  Clinton's decisions as Secretary of State "spread death, destruction and terrorism everywhere she touched."   But in perhaps his strongest assertion, Trump ripped Clinton for failing to disclose 1,000 foreign donations.   ***"Hillary Clinton may be the most corrupt person ever to seek the presidency of the United States," Trump said to a near two-minute standing ovation.  "Hillary Clinton's tryout for the presidency has produced one deadly foreign policy disaster after another," Trump said.*** "She's virtually done nothing good. It all started with her bad judgment in supporting the war in Iraq in the first place."  Trump excoriated Clinton's handling of Benghazi, the event that cost the lives of four Americans, including Ambassador Chris Stevens.   She started the war that put them in Libya, denied him the security he asked for then left him there to die."  Trump wasn't through with Clinton's tenure at the State Department.  ***"The Hillary Clinton foreign policy cost America thousands of lives and trillions and trillions of dollars and unleashed ISIS across the world,"*** Trump said. "No secretary of state has been more wrong, more often and in more places than Hillary Clinton. ***Her decisions spread death, destruction and terrorism everywhere she touched."***   Trump detailed how Clinton's immigration policy has and would cause more destruction.

[**http://townhall.com/video/trump-clinton-may-be-the-most-corrupt-person-ever-to-seek-the-presidency-n2182617?utm\_source=thdaily&utm\_medium=email&utm\_campaign=nl&newsletterad**](http://townhall.com/video/trump-clinton-may-be-the-most-corrupt-person-ever-to-seek-the-presidency-n2182617?utm_source=thdaily&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=nl&newsletterad)=

[**http://townhall.com/columnists/larryelder/2016/08/04/where-is-the-hillary-lied-people-died-crowd-n2201604?utm\_source=thdaily&utm\_medium=email&utm\_campaign=nl&newsletterad**](http://townhall.com/columnists/larryelder/2016/08/04/where-is-the-hillary-lied-people-died-crowd-n2201604?utm_source=thdaily&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=nl&newsletterad)=

The same clueless nitwits who, with no evidence, cried "Bush lied, people died!" are now ignoring overwhelming evidence of Hillary Clinton's violation of the Espionage Act and how that behavior imperiled national security. In George W. Bush's case, there is zero evidence of a "lie." In Clinton's case, as to a violation of the Espionage Act, her violation is clear-cut.  **The bipartisan Robb-Silberman Commission, set up in 2004 to examine the weapons of mass destruction intel on which the Iraq War was based, found -- after more than a year of investigation -- that *no one lied*.** President Bill Clinton's top Persian Gulf adviser, the CIA's Kenneth Pollack, disagreed with Bush's decision to invade Iraq. But as to the intel, Pollack said the opinion was unanimous -- among all 16 of the nation's intelligence commissions -- that Saddam Hussein possessed stockpiles of WMD.  "Other nations' intelligence services were similarly aligned with U.S. views. ... In sum, *no one* doubted that Iraq had weapons of mass destruction."

[**http://townhall.com/columnists/frmarcelguarnizo/2016/07/07/hillary-clinton-paves-the-way-for-easy-treason-against-america-n2189489?utm\_source=thdaily&utm\_medium=email&utm\_campaign=nl&newsletterad**](http://townhall.com/columnists/frmarcelguarnizo/2016/07/07/hillary-clinton-paves-the-way-for-easy-treason-against-america-n2189489?utm_source=thdaily&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=nl&newsletterad)=

***The Clinton National Security Scandal***

***Hillary Clinton Paves the Way For Easy Treason Against America***To remove Top Secret information and hundreds of other classified documents from the government’s care, she had to risk jail and even get others to collude in this process.  Clinton the Perfect Subject for Black Mail from Our Enemies

[**http://netrightdaily.com/2016/07/hillary-non-indictment-guts-freedom-information-act/**](http://netrightdaily.com/2016/07/hillary-non-indictment-guts-freedom-information-act/)

***(Lying, Cheating, Corrupt, Crooked Democraps)***

When FBI director James Comey announced this week that that Hillary Clinton’s actions regarding her official email were not worthy of prosecution, his decision had ramifications far beyond the national security context and how officials handle classified material. Essentially he has signed off on the practice of high-level executive branch officials using private email and other records systems in an effort to keep the federal records they create out of the public eye and away from requestors who use the federal Freedom of Information Act (FOIA).  This is a long way from the transparency that we were promised by President Obama. In his first week in office President Obama instructed federal employees as follows:  “The Government should not keep information confidential merely because public officials might be embarrassed by disclosure, because errors and failures might be revealed, or because of speculative or abstract fears. Nondisclosure should never be based on an effort to protect the personal interests of Government officials at the expense of those they are supposed to serve. In responding to requests under the FOIA, executive branch agencies (agencies) should act promptly and in a spirit of cooperation, recognizing that such agencies are servants of the public.”  As the whole Clinton email situation so aptly demonstrates, there is a wide gulf between the words that were proclaimed and what actually occurs in real life. Clinton, having been part of the Washington, D.C. establishment for decades clearly knows how FOIA works.

[**http://netrightdaily.com/2016/07/millennials-expected-hillary-to-skate/**](http://netrightdaily.com/2016/07/millennials-expected-hillary-to-skate/)

(Millennials-- ***DO NOT VOTE for CROOKED, CORRUPT, LYING, GREEDY HILLARY***)  when someone has money and power they are immune to prosecution.  One college junior, who requested to remain anonymous, stated the lack of an indictment “sets a great ***precedent that lying to the American people is perfectly ok, and that being careless with American secrets is perfectly ok.”***  The most shocking thing my conversations uncovered though, was the viewpoint of some Bernie Sanders supporters and undecided voters.  ***Clinton has not only proved that she is a crook, but that she has the political power and authority to control any system.*** [**http://www.newsmax.com/Newsfront/hillary-clinton-fbi-email-scandal-donald-turmp/2016/07/05/id/737181/?ns\_mail\_uid=35536539&ns\_mail\_job=1676689\_07062016&s=al&dkt\_nbr=6uis94bs**](http://www.newsmax.com/Newsfront/hillary-clinton-fbi-email-scandal-donald-turmp/2016/07/05/id/737181/?ns_mail_uid=35536539&ns_mail_job=1676689_07062016&s=al&dkt_nbr=6uis94bs)

The FBI director laid out today a detailed case of how Hillary Clinton compromised the safety of the American people by storing highly classified information on a private email server with no security," the presumptive Republican nominee [**said in a statement**](https://www.donaldjtrump.com/press-releases/donald-j.-trump-statement-on-hillary-clintons-bad-judgment-and-the-rigged-s).  "It has also been revealed that Hillary Clinton lied when she said that she did not send classified information," he added. "The FBI director confirmed that over 100 emails were deemed classified at the time they were sent, including emails classified as top secret.  ***"On top of it all, Hillary Clinton's lawyers wiped the servers clean to delete another 30,000 emails, hiding her corrupt dealings from investigators. She used the State Department for her personal gain, trading favors for cash, and tried to conceal the records.  "Also, she didn't want people to know the details about her botched decisions in Libya, Syria, Iraq and Egypt that destabilized the Middle East," Trump said.  He added that "because of our rigged system that holds the American people to one standard and people like Hillary Clinton to another, it does not look like she will be facing the criminal charges that she deserves.***  "Bill Clinton didn't accidentally run into the attorney general on the airport tarmac last week in Phoenix," Trump continued, referring to the [**June 27 meeting with Loretta Lynch**](http://www.newsmax.com/Newsfront/loretta-lynch-met-bill-clinton-release/2016/06/29/id/736368/) aboard her private plane at Sky Harbor International Airport.  "Hillary Clinton didn't accidentally sneak into the FBI during one of the country's biggest holiday weekends to testify on her illegal activities, something that wouldn't be afforded to others under investigation (and on a Saturday, of all days)."  Clinton was [**grilled by the FBI on Saturday**](http://www.newsmax.com/Newsfront/Hillary-Clinton/2016/07/02/id/736787/) for three and a half hours at the agency's headquarters in Washington. "Folks — the system is rigged," the developer said. "The normal punishment, in this case, would include losing authority to handle classified information — and that too disqualifies Hillary Clinton from being president.  ***"The final jury will be the American people," Trump concluded, "and they will issue the verdict on her corruption, incompetence, and bad judgment on Nov. 8."***

[**http://constitution.com/project-x-clintons-first-email-scandal/**](http://constitution.com/project-x-clintons-first-email-scandal/)

During Bill Clinton’s tenure in the White House a “glitch” (or person) turned off the automatic email archiving system causing the [**loss of of roughly one million emails.**](http://www.investors.com/politics/editorials/clintons-repeated-email-malfunctions-go-back-to-1990s/) The emails just “happened” to disappear while special prosecutor Kenneth Starr was subpoenaing emails for the Monica Lewinsky scandal and congress was asking for emails because it was investigating the “Filegate” scandal. The lost emails just “happened” to be Bill Clinton’s and others being investigated in the above scandals; and the people who discovered the missing emails were threatened with jail if they spoke about them.  Not all of the White House emails were lost– just the ones on the Mail2 server. The officials served by Mail2 included Doris Matsui, Marsha Scott, Sidney Blumenthal, Cheryl Mills, Bruce Lindsey, Erskine Bowles, Rahm Emanuel, Nancy Hernreich, John Podesta, Ira Magaziner, Ann Lewis, Charles Ruff, Lanny Breuer, Paul Begala, and President Clinton.  If some of those names sound familiar, they should.

[**http://www.investors.com/politics/editorials/clinton-email-scandal-three-problems-hillary-cant-escape/**](http://www.investors.com/politics/editorials/clinton-email-scandal-three-problems-hillary-cant-escape/)

on Memorial Day, [**USA Today’s editorial board**](http://www.usatoday.com/story/opinion/2016/05/30/hillary-clinton-email-server-inspector-general-editorials-debates/85159948/) said that “Clinton broke the rules.” Clinton’s “bad decision,” said the board, has “turned into something far worse: a threat to national security, one that she repeatedly ignored despite multiple warnings.”

[**http://www.investors.com/politics/editorials/clinton-e-mail-scandal-5-more-lies-uncovered-by-inspector-general-report/**](http://www.investors.com/politics/editorials/clinton-e-mail-scandal-5-more-lies-uncovered-by-inspector-general-report/)

Clinton E-mail Scandal:  5 More Lies Uncovered By Inspector General Report.  Some 2,000 e-mails were deemed classified, some of them Top Secret, others “born classified” because of the nature of the information. Clinton sent more than 100 classified e-mails herself.  What does it say about Hillary Clinton that she was so determined to shield herself from public disclosure laws that she was willing to break every rule in the book, and then with a straight face tell the public that she did nothing wrong?

[**http://townhall.com/columnists/larrykudlow/2016/06/01/are-the-clintons-the-real-housingcrash-villains-n2171595?utm\_source=thdaily&utm\_medium=email&utm\_campaign=nl&newsletterad**](http://townhall.com/columnists/larrykudlow/2016/06/01/are-the-clintons-the-real-housingcrash-villains-n2171595?utm_source=thdaily&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=nl&newsletterad)=

Before Clinton is able to rewrite this history, let's look at the many ways the Clintons and cronies contributed to the Great Recession.  The seeds of the mortgage meltdown were planted during Bill Clinton's presidency.  Under Andrew Cuomo, Clinton's secretary of Housing and Urban Development, Community Reinvestment Act regulators gave banks higher ratings for home loans made in credit-deprived areas. Banks were effectively rewarded for throwing out sound underwriting standards and writing loans to those who were at high risk of defaulting. If banks didn't comply with these rules, regulators reined in their ability to expand lending and deposits.  These new HUD rules lowered down payments from the traditional 20 percent to 3 percent by 1995 and zero down payments by 2000. What's more, in the Clinton push to issue home loans to lower-income borrowers, Fannie and Freddie made it a common practice to virtually end credit documentation, low credit scores were disregarded and income and job history was also thrown aside. The phrase "subprime" became commonplace. What an understatement.

Next the Clinton administration's rules ordered the taxpayer-backed Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac to expand their quotas of risky loans from 30 percent of portfolio to 50 percent, as part of a big push to expand home ownership. Fannie and Freddie were securitizing these home loans and offering 100 percent taxpayer guarantees of repayment. So now taxpayers were on the hook for these risky, low down payment loans.   Tragically, when prices fell, lower income folks who really could not afford these mortgages under normal credit standards suffered massive foreclosures and personal bankruptcies. Many will never get credit again. It's a perfect example of liberals using government allegedly to help the poor, with the ultimate consequences being disastrous to them.  Additionally, ultra-easy money from the Federal Reserve also played a key role.  Fannie and Freddie, by the way, cost the taxpayers $187 billion.  Just to make this story worse, Sen. Hillary Clinton and Sen. Barack Obama voted to filibuster a Republican effort to roll back Fannie and Freddie. But on top of all this, while Clinton was propping up Fannie and Freddie, she was taking contributions from their foundations, as a Washington Times report concluded.  "Freddie Mac and Fannie Mae's political action committee and individuals linked to the companies donated $75,500 to Mrs. Clinton's senatorial campaign," according to the Washington Times. "Freddie Mac also gave the Clinton Foundation a $50,000 to $100,000 donation."  To be clear, there was plenty of blame to go around among both political parties and the horde of housing lobbyists who helped set up this real estate house of cards.

[**http://townhall.com/columnists/thomassowell/2016/06/07/is-personal-responsibility-obsolete-part-ii-n2174320?utm\_source=thdaily&utm\_medium=email&utm\_campaign=nl&newsletterad**](http://townhall.com/columnists/thomassowell/2016/06/07/is-personal-responsibility-obsolete-part-ii-n2174320?utm_source=thdaily&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=nl&newsletterad)=

Everyone recognizes that there are some people unable to provide for their own survival -- infants and the severely disabled, among others. But providing for such people is wholly different from a blanket guarantee for everybody that they need not lift a finger to feed, clothe or shelter themselves.  In Saudi Arabia today, the great windfall gain is its vast petroleum reserve. This has spawned both a fabulously wealthy ruling elite and a heavily subsidized general population in which many have become disdainful of work. The net result has been a work force in which foreigners literally outnumber Saudis.  ***The welfare state removes challenges -- and has produced many social retrogressions.***

[**http://townhall.com/columnists/dennisprager/2016/06/07/creators-oped-n2174531?utm\_source=thdaily&utm\_medium=email&utm\_campaign=nl&newsletterad**](http://townhall.com/columnists/dennisprager/2016/06/07/creators-oped-n2174531?utm_source=thdaily&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=nl&newsletterad)=

What, for example, do socialist ***Karl Marx***, Soviet politician ***Leon Trotsky***, linguist and political activist ***Noam Chomsky*** and billionaire ***George Soros*** have in common? They were/are all radicals who were born to Jewish parents, had/have no Jewish identity and did/do harm to Jews and non-Jews.  Marx was the grandson of two Orthodox rabbis (his father converted to Christianity), yet he wrote one of the most significant anti-Semitic essays of the 19th century, "On the Jewish Question" in 1844.

Trotsky, born Lev Bronstein, was the intellectual father of Russian, and later Soviet, communism. He, along with Joseph Stalin and three others (two of whom were also non-Jewish Jews), fought to succeed Vladimir Lenin as leader of the Communist Party.

When Trotsky was head of the Red Army, Moscow's chief rabbi, Jacob Mazeh, asked Trotsky to use the army to protect the Jews from pogrom attacks. Trotsky reportedly responded, "Why do you come to me? I am not a Jew," to which Mazeh answered: "That's the tragedy. It's the Trotskys who make revolutions, and it's the Bronsteins who pay the price."  Soros is another man who was born Jewish and later became a radical world citizen, a man who was alienated from America and his Jewish origins and damages both.  ***Non-Jewish Jews like Sanders*** are alienated from Jews who strongly identify as Jewish and Christians who strongly identify as Christians. And ***non-American Americans like Sanders*** and others who identify as "world citizens" more than they identify as American citizens, are alienated from Americans who strongly identify as Americans.  The radical non-Jewish Jew and the radical non-American American love humanity, but they hurt real humans, especially Jews and Americans.

[**http://www.wnd.com/2016/05/the-big-list-of-bathroom-attacks/**](http://www.wnd.com/2016/05/the-big-list-of-bathroom-attacks/)

(Wait until this becomes “legal”)  While it’s too soon to know the impact of the recent changes, **the organization has** [**posted a list of 50 instances**](http://www.lc.org/transgender) **in which a man assaulted, attacked, endangered or harassed a girl or a woman in a women’s restroom or locker room.**   See [**Liberty Counsel’s long website list**](http://www.lc.org/transgender) of men attacking women or children in restrooms and locker rooms.   For example, only last month, James Thomas Shoemaker, 19, was accused in Pennsylvania of using a phone “to look at 10-year-old girls in Sheetz restroom.”  “The girl told her mother, who was waiting for her outside the bathroom, that a man was in the adjoining stall using his cell phone camera to record her has she used the facilities. Employees called the police, who found ***the man still in the bathroom an hour later, using his phone to access pornography, while in the stall, as well as using the camera on the phone to look under other stalls in order to view women next to him.”*** Man dressed as woman suspected of filming multiple women, including a woman and her 5-year-old daughter, in mall restrooms. The suspect in multiple incidents, a 30-year-old man used a bag to conceal a camera to film women as they used the restroom facilities.”  Other cases come from Fort Myers, Florida; England; Palmdale, California; Bakersfield, California; Dalls: and Everett, Washington, where a man admitted he took a shower in the women’s locker room “for purposes of sexual gratification.”  A man undressed in front of children in a Walmart restroom, another man wore a women’s swim suit and exposed himself to children and another unidentified male was being sought for indecent exposure to children ages 5-10.  Said Liberty Counsel: “Laws and policies allowing men open access to private spaces designed for women puts women at risk of attack. ***Increasing publicity will make women and girls targets for rapists, pedophiles and voyeurs.”***

[**http://townhall.com/columnists/starparker/2016/05/18/time-to-shut-down-the-department-of-education-n2164610?utm\_source=thdailypm&utm\_medium=email&utm\_campaign=nl\_pm&newsletterad**](http://townhall.com/columnists/starparker/2016/05/18/time-to-shut-down-the-department-of-education-n2164610?utm_source=thdailypm&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=nl_pm&newsletterad)=

The Department of Education was created under President Carter in 1979 (students went to school and graduated before 1979, we went to the Moon etc) under the same misguided pretense that has driven much of the growth of our massively bloated federal government -- that if there is something we really care about, we should give more money and power to Washington bureaucrats.  ***The Education department should be shut down and these funds should either be returned to taxpayers and or sent to parents with children in public schools to be used toward vouchers to allow them to choose where to send their children to school.***

[**http://www.wnd.com/2016/05/next-u-s-president-to-be-decided-in-bathroom/**](http://www.wnd.com/2016/05/next-u-s-president-to-be-decided-in-bathroom/)

“Forcing girls to share restrooms and locker rooms with biological males across the nation is an egregious invasion of privacy. Not only are the Obama administration’s guidelines a direct violation of their privacy rights, they also infringe on their parents’ rights. My clients don’t want Obama’s radical policies in their bathrooms – and there is no federal authority or legal justification for these guidelines,” stated Floyd.  She was referencing a pending lawsuit over the issue in Illinois. Several other lawsuits already have been filed.  The Family Research Council noted that for years, conservatives have wanted to ***eliminate the Department of Education, one of two agencies that issued Obama’s orders***.  “The agency’s outrageous order that public schools ignore the basic biology of their students in the use of ***bathrooms, locker rooms, and showers may have finally awakened a sleeping giant.*** Parents, governors, House and Senate leaders, religious groups and superintendents are incensed that the White House would threaten to pull funding for children’s education over something as ridiculous and unpopular as gender-free restrooms,” the group said.   “Education is not among the enumerated powers of the federal government, and therefore schooling is properly within the jurisdiction of states or local communities. That includes bathroom policies.  “Secondly, this latest federal intrusion is typical of what has been imposed on schools across America from Washington, D.C., for generations. Rather than focusing on real education, the federally controlled schools have become indoctrination factories waging war on truth, common sense, morality and even reality.”

**President Kennedy wanted to put a man on the moon, *while Obama wants to put a man in a women's restroom..***

[**http://townhall.com/columnists/monacharen/2016/06/10/what-the-stanford-rape-case-reveals-n2176251?utm\_source=thdaily&utm\_medium=email&utm\_campaign=nl&newsletterad**](http://townhall.com/columnists/monacharen/2016/06/10/what-the-stanford-rape-case-reveals-n2176251?utm_source=thdaily&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=nl&newsletterad)=

Here is the truth that the left will never acknowledge ***-- the hookup culture they celebrate and defend is the greatest petri dish for enabling rape and sexual assault imaginable.*** It does women no favors to tell them that the way they drink is irrelevant. It may not be a crime to get blind drunk at a bar or party -- but it's reckless.

[**http://www.wnd.com/2016/08/2012-pentagon-report-warned-obama-was-creating-isis/**](http://www.wnd.com/2016/08/2012-pentagon-report-warned-obama-was-creating-isis/)

***(ISIS hope & change brought to you by Owebama/HiLIARy) a Defense Intelligence Agency document declassified last year shows the Obama administration was warned in 2012 that if it continued its policies, a radical Islamic regime could form in Eastern Syria.***  [**Writing in Chronicles magazine**](https://www.chroniclesmagazine.org/blogs/jim-jatras/trump-claims-obama-and-hillary-are-founder-and-co-founder-of-isis/), Jim Jatras, a former U.S. diplomat and foreign policy adviser to the Senate GOP leadership, cited a [**DIA report in August 2012 that was declassified and released last year under a Freedom of Information Act request from Judicial Watch**](http://www.judicialwatch.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/05/Pg.-291-Pgs.-287-293-JW-v-DOD-and-State-14-812-DOD-Release-2015-04-10-final-version11.pdf).  Hillary Clinton was secretary of state at the time under President Obama.

[**http://constitution.com/blockbuster-report-shows-pentagon-warning-2012-obama-policies-lead-rise-isis/**](http://constitution.com/blockbuster-report-shows-pentagon-warning-2012-obama-policies-lead-rise-isis/)

The Defense Intelligence Agency report comes after GOP presidential candidate Donald Trump claimed that Barack Hussein Obama Soetoro Sobarkah and Hillary Clinton were the “founder” and “cofounder” of the Islamic State.  Aside from the cautionary example of the chaos Libya was thrown into by “regime change” in 2011, not to mention the appearance of al-Qaeda in the first place as a precipitate from the Afghan war against the Soviets, they had every reason to heed what amounted to a forewarning from DIA.

[**http://constitution.com/hillary-hypocrite-clinton-estate-surrounded-massive-10-foot-wall/**](http://constitution.com/hillary-hypocrite-clinton-estate-surrounded-massive-10-foot-wall/)

But those same people who mock the idea of a border wall are often the ones with the highest fences on their own property. It’s like politicians who rail against guns, but have no problem surrounding themselves with lots of security personnel who carry *guns.* They want to make sure that *they’re*protected, but not anyone else.  As it turns out, one of Hillary Clinton’s lavish properties has a huge fence – or border wall – around it. And it’s not just for looks. It must be at least ten feet high. Take a look at some of these.

[**http://townhall.com/tipsheet/mattvespa/2016/08/08/benghazi-victims-families-sue-clinton-n2203105?utm\_source=thdaily&utm\_medium=email&utm\_campaign=nl&newsletterad**](http://townhall.com/tipsheet/mattvespa/2016/08/08/benghazi-victims-families-sue-clinton-n2203105?utm_source=thdaily&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=nl&newsletterad)=

***Benghazi Victims' Families Allege Negligence And Intentional Emotional Harm In Lawsuit Against Clinton :***

the suit faults Clinton for negligence and “intentional infliction of emotional distress. You can read the lawsuit [**here**](http://www.freedomwatchusa.org/pdf/160808-Final%20Complaint%20.pdf):

Immediately after the attack, Defendant Clinton, in an effort to save the re-election chances of President Barack Obama, and in turn, her own chances at the 2016 Presidency, lied to Plaintiffs and the public at large that the Benghazi Attacks were caused by Islamic reaction over an anti-Muslim YouTube video that had been posted on the internet. These lies were perpetrated despite the fact that she knew immediately that this video was actually not the cause of the attack—information that she shared with the Prime Minister of Egypt and her own daughter, Chelsea Clinton, but hid from Plaintiffs and the public at large. Defendant Clinton even promised Plaintiffs that the person responsible for the video would be arrested.

[**http://www.wnd.com/2016/08/raped-at-12-victim-lashes-out-at-hillary-for-defending-attacker/**](http://www.wnd.com/2016/08/raped-at-12-victim-lashes-out-at-hillary-for-defending-attacker/)

***Raped at age 12, a woman now is lashing out at Hillary Clinton for defending her attacker, who got off with only a short jail term thanks to the young lawyer*** in Arkansas in 1975.  The victim, Kathy Shelton, now is saying she wants to speak out so that people know the truth about the Democratic candidate for president.  Shelton’s comments about the assault she endured at the hands of a 41-year-old attacker and the subsequent ordeal because of the attacker’s lawyer, Clinton, came in [**an exclusive interview with the London Daily Mail.**](http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-3729466/Child-rape-victim-comes-forward-time-40-years-call-Hillary-Clinton-liar-defended-rapist-smearing-blocking-evidence-callously-laughing-knew-guilty.html)  Shelton said she was agreeing to be identified “because ***she is furious that her rapist’s defense attorney – Hillary Clinton – has been portraying herself as a lifelong advocate of women and girls*** on the campaign trail,” the report said.  Shelton, now 54, was interviewed in Springdale, Arkansas, by Alana Goodman.   It was Clinton, then Hillary Rodham, who in 1975 defended Thomas Alfred Taylor, a factory worker accused of first-degree rape for luring Shelton to his car.

Taylor eventually pleaded to “unlawful fondling of a minor” after, according to the report, “Clinton was able to block the admission of forensic evidence that linked her client to the crime.”  Shelton told the Mail Clinton lied when she accused the then-12-year-old of “seeking out older men” and demanding she undergo a grueling psychiatric examination to determine whether she was “mentally unstable.”  Shelton told the Mail that she’s wanted nothing to do with men, and she is a lesbian.

[**http://www.wnd.com/2016/06/orlando-mosque-tied-to-case-hillarys-state-dept-scrubbed/**](http://www.wnd.com/2016/06/orlando-mosque-tied-to-case-hillarys-state-dept-scrubbed/)

When Syed Farook and Tashfeen Malik massacred 14 people in San Bernardino, California, last December, newly retired Department of Homeland Security agent Philip Haney discovered that a case he developed ***might have prevented the attack if it had not been shut down by his agency and Hillary Clinton’s State Department.***  Now, Haney tells WND that the mosque where Orlando killer Omar Mir Siddique Mateen worshiped several times a week also has a tie to that case.  He noted that the FBI twice had Mateen on its radar, but closed down the investigations both times.    In the immediate aftermath of the Orlando massacre, Haney has found that the Islamic Center of Fort Pierce, Florida, is part of a network in the United States that originated in the Indian subcontinent.  [**The Fort Pierce mosque’s website features a link that demonstrates its relationship to the Shariah Board of America**](http://www.fortpierceislamiccenter.com/links.php), a division of the [**Rahmat-e-Alam Foundation**](http://www.rahmatealam.net/darul-uloom.aspx), which operates the [**Darul Uloom Chicago**](http://www.darululoomonline.org/) madrassa.  The madrassa is closely affiliated with the Institute of Islamic Education, which was a major component of Haney’s Tablighi Jamaat case.  Along with ***the State Department’s and Department of Homeland Security’s quashing of the case*** in June 2012, the administration subsequently ordered the deletion of an additional 67 records related to a report on the Institute of Islamic Education.  Haney explained that this kind of information comprises the “dots” that counter-terrorism analysts connect to form cases that are used to identify potential terrorist threats.

[**http://www.wnd.com/2016/06/trump-calls-on-obama-hillary-to-quit-after-shooting/**](http://www.wnd.com/2016/06/trump-calls-on-obama-hillary-to-quit-after-shooting/)

***Trump calls on Obama, Hillary to quit after shooting***  If we do not get tough and smart real fast, we are not going to have a country anymore. Because our leaders are weak, I said this was going to happen – and it is only going to get worse. I am trying to save lives and prevent the next terrorist attack. We can’t afford to be politically correct anymore.   Radical Islam advocates hate for women, gays, Jews, Christians and all Americans. I am going to I am going to be a President for all Americans, and I am going to protect and defend all Americans. ***We are going to make America safe again and great again for everyone.***

[**http://townhall.com/columnists/markdavis/2016/06/17/a-time-for-choosing-n2179778?utm\_source=thdaily&utm\_medium=email&utm\_campaign=nl&newsletterad**](http://townhall.com/columnists/markdavis/2016/06/17/a-time-for-choosing-n2179778?utm_source=thdaily&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=nl&newsletterad)=

***Failure to back the Republican nominee (Trump) will lead to a Hillary Clinton presidency, which should be unacceptable to any conservative.***  Conservatives must choose whether to stop a Hillary presidency or to be a willing accessory to it.  From the Supreme Court to job creation to fighting jihad to defending the Second Amendment, there is no logic in the universe that suggests she is the better choice.

[**http://www.wnd.com/2016/08/communist-party-unites-behind-hillary/**](http://www.wnd.com/2016/08/communist-party-unites-behind-hillary/)

The Communists, who for decades ran their own candidates for president and vice president but supported Barack Obama in 2008 and 2012, don’t just like Hillary and Bernie. The party also gave a big thumbs-up to Clinton’s running mate, Tim Kaine.  “If that sounds hyperbolic to you, just stop reading right now and pull up the [**CPUSA’s website,”**](http://www.cpusa.org/) he added. “Spend some time reading and digesting it. Try to discern any major differences between the Communist Party’s concerns, sensibilities and solutions – on issues from ‘gay’ rights, to unfettered immigration, to renewable energy, to wealth redistribution, to condemning cops as racist, to universal health care – and those of today’s Democratic Party.”

[**http://pjmedia.com/zombie/2012/07/18/the-ultimate-takedown-of-obamas-you-didnt-build-that-speech/?singlepage=true**](http://pjmedia.com/zombie/2012/07/18/the-ultimate-takedown-of-obamas-you-didnt-build-that-speech/?singlepage=true)                               Here’s the shocking truth: President Obama and Elizabeth Warren are correct — we all benefit from certain taxpayer-funded collectivist government infrastructure projects and programs. And here’s the other shocking truth: ***Therefore, we should limit government expenditures to just those programs.*** Why? Because most of the *other* government programs either • hinder, constrict or penalize entrepreneurial activity; or • benefit some people to the detriment of others; or • waste money on bureaucracy, overhead or ill-considered expenditures that end up indebting the nation and by extension all Americans.

So what Obama and Warren are really stating is this:

**Only one-fourth of your federal tax dollars go to projects and programs that benefit the general public and entrepreneurs; the other three-fourths are essentially a complete waste, or are at best optional if we could afford them.** Which of course is exactly what fiscal conservatives have been arguing all along.  ***So yeah, I agree with Obama: Let’s slash the federal budget by 75%, and only fund services and programs that directly serve the public good.***

Obama and Warren have ***intentionally conflated local taxes with federal taxes.*** ***In most localities across the country, public education, police and firefighters, and street repair are primarily paid for by property taxes, local sales taxes, and state taxes. Federal grants can supplement local funds***, but rarely is a school district or a police department propped up entirely with federal money.  So if we revisit Obama’s and Warren’s speeches, they’re actually making an argument for increased *local* taxes. And yet they and their audiences somehow imagine that the arguments given are a legitimate rationale for increased *federal* taxes.  ***As I said at the beginning of this essay, Obama has just unintentionally proved the conservatives’ case for limited government, and for decentralization and local control.***

[**http://news.investors.com/article/614855/201206141820/obama-wrong-about-both-private-and-public-sectors.htm?Ntt=president-brags-of-an-economy-treading-water&p=full**](http://news.investors.com/article/614855/201206141820/obama-wrong-about-both-private-and-public-sectors.htm?Ntt=president-brags-of-an-economy-treading-water&p=full)

Economist John Lott points out: "Thirty-six months into the recovery and the private sector hasn't even made up half the jobs lost during the recession, let alone make up for the fact that there are about 7.6 million more working age people than when the recession started.

"What about the 4.2 million that were lost between when Obama became president and February 2010? The 'growth' just replaces what was lost during the first part of his administration. Let alone the 8.8 million private-sector jobs that were lost between when the recession started."

Do the math.  ***It takes 150,000 new jobs per month just to keep pace with population growth, those coming into the market from high school and college. Obama's 4.3 million jobs divided by 27 months comes to an average of about 159,000 jobs over that stretch. That is treading water, not even close to the number it takes to make a dent in the 8.2% unemployment. (which does not include the hopeless people who stopped looking for work which would make unemployment much higher adjusting for the participation rate.)***

What about the supposedly suffering public sector?  According to Investors.com:  "Private-sector jobs are still down by 4.6 million, or 4%, from January 2008, when overall employment peaked. Meanwhile, government jobs are down just 407,000, or 1.8%. Federal employment actually is 225,000 jobs above its January 2008 level, an 11.4% increase. That's right, up 11.4%. ..."The recession was boom time for federal employment, especially after Obama took office.

[**http://www.investors.com/politics/editorials/fair-share-45-of-americans-pay-zero-income-taxes/**](http://www.investors.com/politics/editorials/fair-share-45-of-americans-pay-zero-income-taxes/)

Fair Share? 45% Of Americans Pay Zero Income Taxes:  The nonpartisan Tax Policy Center has some eye-opening statistics on its site that should silence the “tax fairness” debate, if the numbers were widely known.  For example, did you know that the richest 20% of households pay 88% of federal income taxes?  Or that this is up from 64.7% the year before Reagan took office?

Did you know that [**45% of all households pay zero taxes**](http://www.taxpolicycenter.org/model-estimates/tax-units-zero-or-negative-income-tax/tax-units-zero-or-negative-income-tax)? Or that most of these people actually get money back? Tax Policy Center data show that he poorest 20% of households have an effective tax rate of *negative* 7.5%, while the next poorest 20% face a rate of *negative* 1.3%.  Ah, the argument goes, but the rich have gotten all the income gains over the past 35 years, so of course their share of income taxes has gone up. The problem is that the share of income accounted by the top 20% has climbed just [**7 percentage points**](http://www.statista.com/statistics/203247/shares-of-household-income-of-quintiles-in-the-us/) since 1980, while their share of income taxes went up by more than 23 points.  The argument continues that these numbers don’t account for payroll and other taxes the poor pay. Yet even when you combine all of these, the average effective tax rate for the poorest among us is a mere 1.9%, while the rate for the wealthiest climbs to 23.4%, Tax Policy Center data show.  Nevertheless, ***Both Sanders and Hillary Clinton are determined to raise taxes sharply on the “rich” to pay for their massive increases in spending.*** ***But as is always the case with such tax hikes, it’s not just the rich who would end up paying more under their plans.***  Sanders’ [**$15.3 trillion tax hike**](blob:http://www.taxpolicycenter.org/bf31a4fb-dedd-4a55-b871-22747bfdf1dc), for example, would boost taxes at *every* income level.

[***http://edsitement.neh.gov/lesson-plan/anti-federalist-arguments-against-complete-consolidation***](http://edsitement.neh.gov/lesson-plan/anti-federalist-arguments-against-complete-consolidation)***Anti-federalist Brutus summarized the issue thus: “The first question is…whether the thirteen United States should be reduced to one great republic…or whether they should continue thirteen confederated republics, under the direction and controul of a supreme federal head for certain defined national purposes only?”  The result, Anti-federalists believed, would be a powerful tyranny, in which the national government exercised its virtually unlimited powers to oppress the people and deprive them of their liberty.***

[***http://www.mediaite.com/online/obama-advisor-openly-brags-about-lying-to-public-media-yawns/***](http://www.mediaite.com/online/obama-advisor-openly-brags-about-lying-to-public-media-yawns/)

***(Treason)  Remember that time the White House deceived those gullible Americans about the Iran deal? Haha, good times!  That was the undeniable tone of*** [***a recent New York Times profile***](http://mobile.nytimes.com/2016/05/08/magazine/the-aspiring-novelist-who-became-obamas-foreign-policy-guru.html) ***of President Barack Obama‘s national security advisor Ben Rhodes.   The way in which most Americans have heard the story of the Iran deal presented — that the Obama administration began seriously engaging with Iranian officials in 2013 in order to take advantage of a new political reality in Iran, which came about because of elections that brought moderates to power in that country — was largely manufactured for the purpose for selling the deal. Even where the particulars of that story are true, the implications that readers and viewers are encouraged to take away from those particulars are often misleading or false.  By eliminating the fuss about Iran’s nuclear program, the administration hoped to eliminate a source of structural tension between the two countries, which would create the space for America to disentangle itself from its established system of alliances with countries like Saudi Arabia, Egypt, Israel and Turkey. With one bold move, the administration would effectively begin the process of a large-scale disengagement from the Middle East.   Rhodes didn’t admit the administration lied to us, he admitted that they’re actively lying to us.  Rhodes told the Times all about how the administration propped up hundreds of foreign policy “experts” for reporters to rely on, all of whom actually just parroted the administration’s talking points.  (just like Man Madeup Climate Change) Conservative outlets like The Weekly Standard and the Washington Free Beacon have covered the story, but not a single major outlet has touched it. Again, it’s hard to imagine a Bush administration official could have given an interview where they even implied they actively misled the public without it dominating cable and print news alike.***

[***http://dailysignal.com/2016/05/09/the-cynical-spinmeister-who-helped-sell-obamas-iran-nuclear-deal/?utm\_source=TDS\_Email&utm\_medium=email&utm\_campaign=MorningBell&mkt\_tok=eyJpIjoiWkRsalpETmtNakExTWpBMSIsInQiOiIzeWtHb0hJWFVxR2pjc2tyNHRldkJqU2lEenI5bW9UWWt0VE5NVkZiRVFoaHpuaW8xU3U4eEc0QUM1RlVmS0YzZ2tZQ2NRU3N1M0VXdUpEbXVEYTY0Y0ZVQkg0SnBEdnE3aWtUNXNwVjJnVT0ifQ==***](http://dailysignal.com/2016/05/09/the-cynical-spinmeister-who-helped-sell-obamas-iran-nuclear-deal/?utm_source=TDS_Email&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=MorningBell&mkt_tok=eyJpIjoiWkRsalpETmtNakExTWpBMSIsInQiOiIzeWtHb0hJWFVxR2pjc2tyNHRldkJqU2lEenI5bW9UWWt0VE5NVkZiRVFoaHpuaW8xU3U4eEc0QUM1RlVmS0YzZ2tZQ2NRU3N1M0VXdUpEbXVEYTY0Y0ZVQkg0SnBEdnE3aWtUNXNwVjJnVT0ifQ==)

***David Samuels, who interviewed Rhodes for the article, noted: “His lack of conventional real-world experience of the kind that normally precedes responsibility for the fate of nations—like military or diplomatic service, or even a master’s degree in international relations, rather than creative writing—is still startling.”***

[***http://www.marklevinshow.com/2016/05/10/may-10-2016/***](http://www.marklevinshow.com/2016/05/10/may-10-2016/)

***The Iran Nuclear deal is the most devastating treaty in modern times. The survivability of the West is at stake with this deal, but the Obama administration doesn’t care. They continue to deceive the American people and their lying is amounting to a scandal worse than Watergate.***

[***http://www.investors.com/politics/on-the-right/betsy-mccaughey-obamas-killer-economy/***](http://www.investors.com/politics/on-the-right/betsy-mccaughey-obamas-killer-economy/)

***People in need of work are twice as likely to take their own lives as employed people, and people fired in their forties and fifties find it hardest to get hired again.  That makes boosting economic growth a life and death issue. But you wouldn’t know it listening to Barack Obama and Hillary Clinton. Stagnating wages are linked to suicide in every state.   Economic distress is so widespread that for the first time ever, life expectancy of white women in the U.S. actually dropped. Despite progress against cancer and heart disease, lives are being cut short by hopelessness.  It’s a national health emergency. Suicide kills more middle-agers than flu, pneumonia and diabetes combined. They often occur after dashed expectations, abandonment by a spouse and loss of self-worth. They take their life when they can see no way to get a job, support their family and regain self-worth.  The Congressional Budget Office predicts that with current policies in effect, growth will lumber along at less than 3% — too little to stop the suicides.  Every candidate should be putting forward policies to jumpstart the economy — including lowering corporate tax rates, deregulating, improving international trade deals, and wooing companies and capital back into the U.S.  Job-killing policies are people-killers, too. Suicide spiked during the Depression in 1933, rose and fell with economic growth thereafter, and hit an all time low with the tech boom in 2000. Now, 10 years of economic stagnation are producing another wave of human tragedy, as laid off workers see no way out except death.***

[***http://www.investors.com/politics/editorials/repeal-dodd-frank/***](http://www.investors.com/politics/editorials/repeal-dodd-frank/)

***A group of respected think tanks — the Heritage Foundation, the American Enterprise Institute, the Cato Institute and the Mercatus Center — has issued a 208-page book titled “The Case Against Dodd-Frank: How The ‘Consumer Protection’ Law Endangers Americans.” It’s a devastating indictment of the law.  The book crushes the conventional media and liberal political narrative that deregulation was at the heart of the crisis.   Wallison shows with convincing detail that, in his words, the crisis “was principally the result of the U.S. government’s housing policies.” Not deregulation.***

***To fix the damage, the study suggests three reforms:  1) Close Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac. The “toxic twins” spent hundreds of billions in taxpayer backed dollars to subsidize mortgages for uncreditworthy buyers. That was the real cause of the financial crisis.  2) Stop Fed bailouts. That’s especially true of the bank behemoths deemed “too big too fail.”  3) Kill the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau. A massive new regulator of the entire economy, CFPB has helped choke off credit to average Americans and small businesses.  In large part due to Dodd-Frank, the U.S. economy has fallen from 3% growth before Obama, to a pathetic 2% growth now. The first step to restoring our lost economic mojo is to kill Dodd-Frank once and for all.***

[**http://patriotupdate.com/26608/runaway-slave-is-obamas-worst-nightmare**](http://patriotupdate.com/26608/runaway-slave-is-obamas-worst-nightmare)                    A one-time NAACP local chapter president, Reverend Bryant became a conservative activist after his realization that the ***entitlement mindset of the “progressive”*** black community is the equivalent of trading one form of tyranny for another. In the documentary, Reverend Bryant makes the argument that it’s time for a new ***“Underground Railroad” movement to help liberate all Americans from the contemporary form of a government-run plantation: entitlements***.  For more information on the Runaway Slave documentary, please visit [**www.runawayslavemovie.com**](http://www.runawayslavemovie.com/).   Citing statistics that demonstrate increasingly high rates of abortion, crime, unemployment and single parent households in the black community, the film features interviews with politicians and everyday Americans including economist Thomas Sowell, Dr. Alveda King, U.S. Representative Allen West, GOP Presidential Candidate Herman Cain, activist Star Parker and many others.

[**http://townhall.com/columnists/ilanamercer/2016/08/05/europeans-abolished-slavery-africansmuslims-still-practice-it-n2201991?utm\_source=thdaily&utm\_medium=email&utm\_campaign=nl&newsletterad**](http://townhall.com/columnists/ilanamercer/2016/08/05/europeans-abolished-slavery-africansmuslims-still-practice-it-n2201991?utm_source=thdaily&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=nl&newsletterad)=

**First he exposed the History Channel’s miniseries** [**“Roots”**](http://www.frontpagemag.com/fpm/263131/history-channels-unhistorical-roots-jack-kerwick)**as root-and-brunch fiction. Now, the courageous epistolary warrior** [**Kunta (Jack) Kerwick**](http://townhall.com/columnists/jackkerwick/) **has turned his attention to** [**correcting lies**](http://townhall.com/columnists/jackkerwick/2016/07/21/racially-incorrect-facts-regarding-race-and-slavery-n2195701) **about slavery, promulgated in media and scholarly circles.**

A point forcefully made by Kerwick is that although a vibrant, indigenous slave trade was conducted well into the nineteenth century in the interior of West Africa, slavery has become the White Man’s cross to bear. Also omitted, in the course of the “honest” conversation about race directed by our political masters, is that credit for the demise of the slave trade in Africa belongs to Europeans. In his compact study, ***The Slave Trade* (London, 2006), British historian Jeremy Black highlights the “leading role Britain played in the abolition of slavery** [as]… an example of an ethical foreign policy.” Britain agonized over this repugnant institution, failed to reconcile it with the Christian faith, and consequently abolished it.  Professor Black condemns the exclusive focus on the Atlantic—or transatlantic—slave trade to the exclusion of the robust slave trade conducted by Arabs across the Sahara Desert. Or, across the Indian Ocean and the Red Sea to markets in the Middle East. **This exclusive focus on westerners as slave owners and traders, notes Black, “fits with the [political] narrative of Western exploitation” of undeveloped countries and their people.**  Arab affinity for slavery, ethnic prejudice and purges lives on today in the treatment, for example, of blacks in Darfur and Yazidis in Kurdistan, Iraq.  At its most savage, child slavery still thrives in Haiti in the form of the “**[Restavec system](https://www.mtholyoke.edu/~bolto20k/classweb/worldpol/Intervention.html)**.” Children are kept in grinding poverty and worked to the bone.  **What other people would agonize over events they had no part in, personally, for damages they did not inflict?  Grievance is leveled at a collective, all whites, for infractions it did not commit: Africans who were not enslaved are seen as having an ineffable claim against Europeans who did not enslave them.**

[**http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/History\_of\_Facebook**](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/History_of_Facebook)

**Learning example of how a company, employers, JOBS and wealth are created AND  How capitalism works.**  Facebook received its first investment of US$500,000 in June 2004 from [**PayPal**](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/PayPal) co-founder [**Peter Thiel**](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Peter_Thiel), in exchange for 7% of the company.[**[44]**](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/History_of_Facebook#cite_note-beware-46) This was followed a year later by $12.7 million in [**venture capital**](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Venture_capital) from [**Accel Partners**](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Accel_Partners), and then $27.5 million more from [**Greylock Partners**](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Greylock_Partners).[**[44]**](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/History_of_Facebook#cite_note-beware-46)[**[45]**](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/History_of_Facebook#cite_note-25mil-47) On October 24, 2007, Microsoft announced that it had purchased a 1.6% share of Facebook for $240 million, giving Facebook a total implied value of around $15 billion.[**[56]**](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/History_of_Facebook#cite_note-MSPR1-58) However, Microsoft bought [**preferred stock**](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Preferred_stock) that carried special rights, such as "liquidation preferences" that meant Microsoft would get paid before common stockholders if the company were sold. Microsoft's purchase also included the right to place international ads on Facebook.[**[57]**](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/History_of_Facebook#cite_note-BW-6Aug08-59) In November 2007, Hong Kong billionaire [**Li Ka-shing**](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Li_Ka-shing) invested $60 million in Facebook.[**[58]**](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/History_of_Facebook#cite_note-60)In August 2008, [***BusinessWeek***](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/BusinessWeek) reported that private sales by employees, as well as purchases by venture capital firms, were being done at share prices that put the company's total valuation at between $3.75 billion and $5 billion.[**[57]**](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/History_of_Facebook#cite_note-BW-6Aug08-59)   Facebook filed for an [**initial public offering**](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Initial_public_offering) on February 1, 2012.[**[70]**](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/History_of_Facebook#cite_note-72) The preliminary prospectus stated that the company was seeking to raise $5 billion. The document announced that the company had 845 million active monthly users and its website featured 2.7 billion daily likes and comments.[**[71]**](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/History_of_Facebook#cite_note-73) After the IPO, Zuckerberg will retain a 22% ownership share in Facebook and will own 57% of the voting shares.[**[72]**](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/History_of_Facebook#cite_note-fortune-74)[**Underwriters**](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Underwriter) valued the shares at $38 each, pricing the company at $104 billion, the largest valuation to date for a newly public company.[**[73]**](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/History_of_Facebook#cite_note-75) On May 16, one day before the IPO, Facebook announced that it would sell 25% more shares than originally planned due to high demand.[**[74]**](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/History_of_Facebook#cite_note-76) The IPO raised $16 billion, making it the third largest in U.S. history (just ahead of [**AT&T Wireless**](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/AT%26T_Wireless) and behind only [**General Motors**](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/General_Motors) and [**Visa Inc.**](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Visa_Inc.)).[**[75]**](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/History_of_Facebook#cite_note-NYT517-77)[**[76]**](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/History_of_Facebook#cite_note-USN517-78) The stock price left the company with a higher [**market capitalization**](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Market_capitalization) than all but a few U.S. corporations – surpassing heavyweights such as [**Amazon.com**](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Amazon.com), [**McDonald's**](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/McDonald%27s), [**Disney**](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Disney), and [**Kraft Foods**](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Kraft_Foods) – and made Zuckerberg's stock worth $19 billion.[**[75]**](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/History_of_Facebook#cite_note-NYT517-77)[**[76**](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/History_of_Facebook#cite_note-USN517-78)  **Did you see the Government do anything here?  Why should the Government be so greedy and expect to get a cut from the ideas, risk, hard work, all ready taxed money & capital of *Investors and  venture capital* etc. in business??**  **Econ for Dummies 101…Hey Obama what classes did you take & what you’re your grades and GPA?**

[**http://news.investors.com/article/613655/201206041914/obama-economic-recovery-worst-since-great-depression.htm?Ntt=obamanomics-the-lowlights**](http://news.investors.com/article/613655/201206041914/obama-economic-recovery-worst-since-great-depression.htm?Ntt=obamanomics-the-lowlights)      This is what Obamanomics has wrought. Fiscal promiscuity. Trickle-down big government poverty. Shared misery.  Too much to list here, follow the link…

[**http://conservativebyte.com/2011/10/bet-founder-to-obama-you-dont-get-people-to-like-you-by-attacking-them-or-demeaning-their-success/**](http://conservativebyte.com/2011/10/bet-founder-to-obama-you-dont-get-people-to-like-you-by-attacking-them-or-demeaning-their-success/)    Obama wants jobs, but spreads the anti business rhetoric & policies on Job Creators??  I thought Obama was supposed to be so smart??  How smart can he possibly be, unless he wants us to have Greek style high unemployment, Greek style crushing debt and to have Greek style riots, hopelessness and discontent?

            Robert Johnson, who founded the Black Entertainment Television network in 1980, said President Barack Obama needs to adjust his message to one that’s not “attacking” the wealthy for their success.  Johnson said. “You don’t get people to like you by attacking them or demeaning their success. I grew up in a family of 10 kids, first one to go to college, and I’ve earned my success. I’ve earned my right to fly private if I choose to do so. And by attacking me, is not going to convince me that I should take a bigger hit because I happen to be wealthy.”

[**http://dailysignal.com/2016/08/01/these-states-added-work-requirements-for-food-stamp-recipients-heres-how-its-working-out/?utm\_source=TDS\_Email&utm\_medium=email&utm\_campaign=MorningBell&mkt\_tok=eyJpIjoiWldKa1l6ZzVNMkV5WkRWbCIsInQiOiJDNEZ6cXdLdFlFMzZaQ3JxWnNueE0wY0UwNnRuM0dLVGFxSmpLK2pKQ3hhd25zVTNCSnBYNlluUm93d0FPMjRZTmU3S1E4OExibzBpcmdlSm03c09cL0V6YmlhMXhaV1BcL2dndFJ6clllU05FPSJ9**](http://dailysignal.com/2016/08/01/these-states-added-work-requirements-for-food-stamp-recipients-heres-how-its-working-out/?utm_source=TDS_Email&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=MorningBell&mkt_tok=eyJpIjoiWldKa1l6ZzVNMkV5WkRWbCIsInQiOiJDNEZ6cXdLdFlFMzZaQ3JxWnNueE0wY0UwNnRuM0dLVGFxSmpLK2pKQ3hhd25zVTNCSnBYNlluUm93d0FPMjRZTmU3S1E4OExibzBpcmdlSm03c09cL0V6YmlhMXhaV1BcL2dndFJ6clllU05FPSJ9)

A few states that have incorporated work requirements have seen encouraging outcomes that should provide a blueprint for greater welfare reform efforts nationwide.  Between March and April of this year, the number of food stamp recipients [**decreased by 773,134**](http://www.fns.usda.gov/sites/default/files/pd/29SNAPcurrPP.pdf). This brings food stamp enrollment down to 2011 levels and represents the biggest drop in participation since 2005.

However, food stamp participation is still far higher than it was prior to the recession, as the recently released [**Index of Culture and Opportunity**](https://medium.com/2016-index-of-culture-and-opportunity/how-intentional-design-increased-dependence-on-food-stamps-and-undermined-work-1fc2bb6338fb#.nso5nx26n) shows. Participation is [**expected to remain higher**](https://www.cbo.gov/sites/default/files/51312-2016-03-SNAP1.pdf) than [**pre-recession levels**](http://www.fns.usda.gov/sites/default/files/pd/SNAPsummary.pdf) for the next several years, and so is food stamp [**spending**](https://www.cbo.gov/sites/default/files/51312-2016-03-SNAP1.pdf).  Although food stamp participation grew rapidly during the recession, it was on an upward climb before then. Policies were put into place that made it easier for people to get on the program and stay there. Then, during the recession, the food stamp [**work requirement for able-bodied adults without dependents**](http://www.fns.usda.gov/sites/default/files/Guide_to_Serving_ABAWDs_Subject_to_Time_Limit.pdf) was [**suspended**](http://www.fns.usda.gov/sites/default/files/022509.pdf) as part of President Barack Obama’s 2009 stimulus package. (The [**work requirement**](http://www.fns.usda.gov/sites/default/files/Guide_to_Serving_ABAWDs_Subject_to_Time_Limit.pdf) limits able-bodied adults without dependents to three months of food stamp benefits in a 36-month period unless they work at least part time, participate in a work program, or do community service.)

The decline in food stamp rolls between March and April of this year [**follows**](http://www.cbpp.org/bigger-snap-declines-in-states-newly-imposing-time-limits) the re-establishment of work requirements in a number of states. ***On Jan. 1,*** [***22 states***](http://www.pewtrusts.org/en/research-and-analysis/blogs/stateline/2016/01/19/new-work-requirements-put-food-stamps-at-risk)***had to reinstate the federal work requirement for areas of the state or the entire state because their waivers expired.* The Foundation for Government Accountability** [**identified**](http://thefga.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/02/PowerOfWork-KansasWelfareReform.pdf) **that nearly 60 percent of Kansans who left the food stamp rolls following the establishment of food stamp work requirements found employment within 12 months and, “their incomes rose by an average of 127 percent per year.”  Indiana has experienced similar outcomes.**

[**http://conservativebyte.com/2011/10/obama-travels-to-st-louis-for-money-laundering-operation/**](http://conservativebyte.com/2011/10/obama-travels-to-st-louis-for-money-laundering-operation/)    Tom Carnahan received millions of dollars in loan guarantees from Obama for a fake solar energy company. Think Solyndra. I don’t think it’s as much money, but this is the money laundering operation. Tom Carnahan gets money from Obama for a fake solar company and then hosts a fundraiser for Obama? So that’s taxpayer money that Tom Carnahan got — that’s your and my money that Obama’s giving away in loan guarantees — to a fake solar firm, then he heads into St. Louis for a $25,000-a-plate fundraiser. He’s getting the money back. So what Obama has done, and numerous times, is generate campaign contributions that are taxpayer dollars.

[**http://urbanlegends.about.com/od/barackobama/a/Lou-Pritchett-Letter-To-Obama.htm**](http://urbanlegends.about.com/od/barackobama/a/Lou-Pritchett-Letter-To-Obama.htm)      Lou Pritchett is one of corporate America's true living legends - an acclaimed author, dynamic teacher and one of the world's highest rated speakers. Successful corporate executives everywhere recognize him as the foremost leader in change management.

AN OPEN LETTER TO PRESIDENT OBAMA  
  
Dear President Obama:  
  
You are the thirteenth President under whom I have lived and unlike any of the others, you truly scare me. ***You scare me because:***

you did not spend the formative years of youth growing up in America and culturally you are not an American.

you have never run a company or met a payroll.

you have never had military experience, thus don't understand it at its core.

you lack humility and 'class', always blaming others.

for over half your life you have aligned yourself with radical extremists who hate America and you refuse to publicly denounce these radicals who wish to see America fail.

you are a cheerleader for the 'blame America' crowd and deliver this message abroad.

you want to change America to a European style country where the government sector dominates instead of the private sector.

you want to replace our health care system with a government controlled one.

you prefer 'wind mills' vs. responsibly capitalizing on our own vast oil, coal and shale reserves.

you want to kill the American capitalist goose that lays the golden egg which provides the highest standard of living in the world.

you have begun to use 'extortion' tactics against certain banks and corporations.

your own political party shrinks from challenging you on your wild and irresponsible spending proposals.

you will not openly listen to or even consider opposing points of view from intelligent people.

[**http://www.wnd.com/2012/04/democrat-comic-obamas-a-f-ing-a-hole/**](http://www.wnd.com/2012/04/democrat-comic-obamas-a-f-ing-a-hole/)

The podcast, titled “The ABC’s of SNL,” was co-hosted by filmmaker Kevin Smith, and billed as being recorded “live from the Jon Lovitz Podcast Theatre.”

Lovitz said: “This whole thing with Obama saying the rich don’t pay their taxes is f—ing bullsh–. And I voted for the guy, and I’m a Democrat. What a f—ing a–hole. The rich don’t pay their taxes? Let me tell you something, right. First they say to you, you’re dead broke, ‘the United States of America, you can do anything you want, go for it.’ So then you go for it and then you make it, and everyone’s like ‘f— you.’”

He continued, “If I make a dollar and out of every dollar I’m taxed at 50, half, at 50 cents, I have to give, isn’t that like enough? It’s half. HALF!”  Lovitz’s co-host clowned that the government would be offended, and therefore shut down his podcast theatre.

“We heard that [in] the fourth f—kin’ episode, you won’t leave Obama alone,” said Smith. “This is an election year! They’re gonna come in and make an example of you, man. The government can come in and take your sh– away. Even your good memories.”

Lovitz isn’t the only comic from “SNL” who has problems with the president.

His fellow cast member, Victoria Jackson, who’s now a [**WND columnist**](http://www.wnd.com/author/vjackson/), made national [**headlines in March 2010 when she released a song on YouTube titled, “There’s a Communist in the White House,”**](http://www.wnd.com/2010/03/126910/) which has collected more than a half-million views.

[**http://www.wnd.com/2016/06/michelle-os-inexplicable-vile-bitterness/**](http://www.wnd.com/2016/06/michelle-os-inexplicable-vile-bitterness/)

Yes, slaves from Virginia and Maryland, two solidly Democratic states at the time (Maryland remains so), I might add, were used to complete the building of the White House, when paid laborers were in short supply.  America was short on labor in 1792. There was an effort to import European laborers to complete the project, but that effort fell short. So slaves were used.

***I might note there was no Republican Party at the time.  Abraham Lincoln was the first Republican president some 68 years later. He ran on an anti-slavery platform and won. It was Republicans who freed the slaves.***  ***For another 100 years, however, it was the Democratic Party – Barack and Michelle Obama’s party – that fought integration and civil-rights legislation.*** The Republican Party championed it.  ***The Ku Klux Klan was the armed militia of the Democratic Party*** – lynching almost as many white Republicans as they did innocent blacks after the War Between the States, in which more Americans died than any other war in which Americans (white and black) have fought.  Do we really need another slavery lecture from Michelle Obama – a woman raised in privilege from birth and who has lived like a queen for the last eight years at the expense of white and black Americans?

***RECIPE FOR SUCCESS:***  [**http://www.nomblog.com/25192/**](http://www.nomblog.com/25192/)          A study by the Brookings Institution has shown that for those that 1. graduate from high school, 2. who get a full-time job, and 3. wait until 21 before they marry and 4. then have their first child, the probability of becoming poor is 2 percent. And if those factors are absent, the probability of being poor is 76%," said Gov. Romney  **<http://www.ncpa.org/pub/ba428>**

[**http://townhall.com/columnists/thomassowell/2016/08/16/does-black-success-matter-n2205360?utm\_source=thdaily&utm\_medium=email&utm\_campaign=nl&newsletterad**](http://townhall.com/columnists/thomassowell/2016/08/16/does-black-success-matter-n2205360?utm_source=thdaily&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=nl&newsletterad)=

There are in fact whole chains of charter schools where black and Hispanic youngsters score well above the national average on tests. ***There are the KIPP (Knowledge IS Power Program) schools and the Success Academy schools, for example.*** Only 39 percent of all students in New York state schools who were tested recently scored at the "proficient" level in math, but 100 percent of the students at the ***Crown Heights Success Academy school*** scored at that level in math. Blacks and Hispanics are 90 percent of the students in the Crown Heights Success Academy.  The Success Academy schools in general ranked in the top 2 percent in English and in the top 1 percent in math. Hispanic students in these schools reached the "proficient" level in math nearly twice as often as Hispanic students in the regular public schools. Black students in these Success Academy schools reached the "proficient" level more than twice as often as black students in the regular public schools.  What makes this all the more amazing is that these charter schools are typically located in the same ghettos or barrios where other blacks or Hispanics are failing miserably on the same tests. More than that, successful charter schools are often physically housed in the very same buildings as the unsuccessful public schools.  In other words, minority kids from the same neighborhood, going to school in classes across the hall from each other, or on different floors, are scoring far above average and far below average on the same tests.  ***If black success was considered half as newsworthy as black failures, such facts would be headline news -- and people who have the real interests of black and other minority students at heart would be asking, "Wow! How can we get more kids into these charter schools?"***  ***Black success is a threat to political empires and to a whole social vision behind those empires.*** That social vision has politicians like Bill de Blasio and Hillary Clinton cast in the role of rescuers and protectors of blacks from enemies threatening on all sides. If politicians can promote paranoia, that means bigger voter turnout, which is what really matters to them.

[**http://www.rushlimbaugh.com/daily/2016/05/27/did\_obama\_apologize\_in\_hiroshima**](http://www.rushlimbaugh.com/daily/2016/05/27/did_obama_apologize_in_hiroshima)

August 6, 1945, aboard the USS Augusta in the mid-Atlantic, ***President Harry Truman announcing the US dropped an atomic bomb on Hiroshima, Japan.***  TRUMAN: A short time ago, an American airplane dropped one bomb on Hiroshima and destroyed its usefulness to the enemy. That bomb has more power than 20,000 tons of TNT. ***The Japanese began the war from the air in Pearl Harbor. They have been repaid many fold.*** It is an atomic bomb. It is a harnessing of the basic power of the universe. The force from which the sun draws its power, has been loosed against those who brought war to the Far East.  Here's more from Harry Truman, again, same situation, August 6, 1944, on board the USS Augusta in the mid-Atlantic.  TRUMAN: We are now prepared to destroy more rapidly and completely every productive enterprise the Japanese have in any city. We shall destroy their docks, their factories, and their communications. Let there be no mistake. We shall completely destroy Japan's power to make war. ***It was to spare the Japanese people from utter destruction that the ultimatum of July the 26 was issued at Potsdam. Their leaders promptly rejected that ultimatum.*** If they do not now accept our terms, they may expect a rain of ruin from the air the like of which has never been seen on this earth.  TRUMAN: We have spent more than $2 billion on the greatest scientific gamble in history, and we have won. But the greatest marvel is not the size of the enterprise, its secrecy, or its cost, but the achievement of scientific brains in making it work. What has been done is the greatest achievement of organized science in history.  RUSH: He's talking about the nuclear weapon there.  RUSH: ***Hiroshima was a military target, by the way, not just civilian. The Japanese 5th Division, 2nd Army headquarters were there. But it was Nagasaki the second bomb that made them surrender,*** and it was only because the emperor overruled his military. They didn't want to surrender even after the second bomb, the military of Japan.  ***Hiroshima was a military target. It was the home of the Japanese 2nd Army, which commanded the defense of all of Southern Japan, which is where we were going to invade. It was also, Hiroshima was, a major communications center, major storage area, and the assembly point for troops disembarking. So it was a very high value military target as well.***  And we were prepared to invade. And it was well known -- well, it was forecast by American military people that such an invasion by air, by sea would result in an unspeakable number of American deaths, and it was not assured that we would emerge victorious from it. That's when Truman said to hell with that. And he really did talk that way, to hell with that, and made the decision to drop the two bombs.  ***So, it was as much as anything to destroy military targets, storage areas, staging areas, command centers, command-and-control centers. It was also to protect the lives of American military personnel.*** We only had two bombs. After the first bomb at Hiroshima, the Japanese did not surrender. Nagasaki came a short time later, precisely because the Japanese did not surrender after Hiroshima. If Nagasaki had not convinced them, we would have had to invade, and, as it was, the Japanese military did not want to surrender.

[**http://www.investors.com/politics/commentary/californias-overpriced-bullet-train-could-be-obsolete-before-its-ever-built/**](http://www.investors.com/politics/commentary/californias-overpriced-bullet-train-could-be-obsolete-before-its-ever-built/)

Musk’s idea with hyperloop was to send floating transportation pods through depressurized tubes at speeds of up to 760 mph. At that speed, a trip from San Diego to San Francisco would take a little more than 30 minutes.  Development on Musk’s idea is now moving at hyper speed. [**Hyperloop One’s test**](http://www.usatoday.com/story/tech/news/2016/05/11/hyperloop-one-debuts-future-tech-nevada-desert/84236120/), for example, came just 16 months after that company was founded. Company executives say they will be able to ship goods on its system in three years, and carry passengers by 2021.  But since enthusiastic private investors are staking their own money on the outcome, it’s far less likely to become a massive boondoggle than a taxpayer-funded railroad. Plus, if hyperloop doesn’t pan out, taxpayers won’t be left holding the bill.  ***The private sector can always get things done better, faster, with more innovation and flexibility, and at lower costs than bureaucrats and politicians.***

[**http://netrightdaily.com/2012/07/barack-obama-socialist-or-nouveau-fascist/**](http://netrightdaily.com/2012/07/barack-obama-socialist-or-nouveau-fascist/)

Obama has never advocated doctrinaire socialism (which is based on government ownership of private property and the means of production). Certainly he has made good on his promise to “spread the wealth around” via unprecedented government intervention in the free market, but he cannot be called a socialist in the mold of Vladimir Lenin, Mao Zedong, Fidel Castro or Kim Jong-Il.

“What President Obama has been pushing for, and moving toward, is more insidious: government control of the economy, while leaving ownership in private hands,” columnist Thomas Sowell [**wrote**](http://www.thenewamerican.com/opinion/thomas-sowell/item/11704-barack-obama-socialist-or-fascist) recently. ***“That way, politicians get to call the shots but, when their bright ideas lead to disaster, they can always blame those who own businesses in the private sector.”***

***Sound familiar?*** This is precisely what happened during the recent recession. For example, ***government-mandated loans aimed at boosting homeownership were clearly among the root causes of the economic downturn*** – but when the sub-prime bubble burst blame was placed exclusively on “corporate greed.” Of course at the same time politicians were absolving themselves of any responsibility, they were forcing taxpayers to subsidize massive bailouts of these “greedy” financial institutions.

So if Obama isn’t a socialist, what is he? Economically speaking it’s far more accurate to say that he is a fascist — a supporter of *dirigisme*, in which government manages the economy through central planning, not collective ownership. Fascism did not seek to stamp out the innovative, wealth-creating potential of profit-seeking investment and entrepreneurship – instead it sought to channel those innovations (and funnel that wealth) to the good of the state.

“In fascist Italy the state pays for the blunders of private enterprise,” Italian social critic Gaetano Salvemini [**wrote**](http://www.banned-books.com/truth-seeker/1994archive/121_3/ts213l.html) in the mid-1930s.  When business was good, “profit remained to private initiative.” However when downturns came (as they inevitably do), “the government added the loss to the taxpayer’s burden.”  “Profit is private and individual,” Salvemini wrote. “Loss is public and social.”

This is the basis of fascism’s “third way” between laissez-faire capitalism and Marxism. It’s also precisely the economic system we see at work in America today, a centralized bureaucratic oligarchy in which ***farm subsidies, investments in “green jobs,” Wall Street bailouts, Export-Import Bank subsidies and numerous other taxpayer-funded incentives manipulate the market to serve specific political purposes.***

Also consider this: ***Is any property really “private” if the government can take it based on little more than a whim? And is any sector of the economy really “private” as long as government can swoop in and set its prices and production quotas? And finally, is any market truly “free” if government can compel citizens to make specific purchases?  Of course not — all of which makes Obama’s ideology dangerous no matter what label we slap on it.***

[**http://www.moneynews.com/StreetTalk/Bianco-Fed-Policy-Counterfeiting/2012/02/21/id/430005?s=al&promo\_code=E383-1**](http://www.moneynews.com/StreetTalk/Bianco-Fed-Policy-Counterfeiting/2012/02/21/id/430005?s=al&promo_code=E383-1)

Under such policy, known as quantitative easing, the Fed goes in and buys assets like Treasury instruments or mortgage-backed securities from the banks, crediting those banks' reserve accounts with the funds, in what critics says is basically money printing.  "The ability of the Fed to increase the amount of money in banks' reserve accounts; that's what most people mean when they talk about money printing and that's under the direction of the Fed," says Jim Bianco, president of Bianco Research, according to The Daily Ticker, a Yahoo! news venue.

***"If you or I did that it would be fraud, it would be counterfeiting and we'd go to jail***," Bianco adds.   "But when the Fed does it, it's sophisticated monetary policy."  The Fed says quantitative easing was necessary to steer the country away from crippling deflation while doing the best it can to maximize the jobs situation.  
              Critics say it will ***fuel inflationary pressures down the road, has cheapened the dollar*** and really hasn't done that much for price stability and jobs recovery anyway.

As the dollar cheapens, it buys less in commodities and commodities priced in dollars go up.  Now you know why gas, food and other store products cost so much and will continue to cost more.

Will you vote for the brilliant wizard Obama and his Democrats so we can have costs necessarily skyrocket???                            Read more: [**Jim Bianco: Fed Policy Is Really Just Counterfeiting**](http://www.moneynews.com/StreetTalk/Bianco-Fed-Policy-Counterfeiting/2012/02/21/id/430005?s=al&promo_code=E383-1#ixzz1sQcXPBxq)

[**http://news.investors.com/article/607263/201204101812/us-debt-not-eu-is-real-problem.htm?Ntt=the-real-problem-us-debt&p=full**](http://news.investors.com/article/607263/201204101812/us-debt-not-eu-is-real-problem.htm?Ntt=the-real-problem-us-debt&p=full)

What saved the greenback after Nixon removed the U.S. dollar from the gold standard in 1971 — ending the post-war Bretton Woods international financial order — was the status of U.S. dollar as the reserve currency of the world.  This began with Saudi Arabia agreeing in 1973 to accept only U.S. dollars as payment for oil in exchange for U.S. protection of the Saudi monarchy and its oilfields. By 1975, the reserve currency status of the U.S. dollar was firmly established, with OPEC members agreeing to trade only in dollars. Trading of other commodities came to be priced in dollars, which reinforced the reserve currency status of the dollar.

Central banks around the world have maintained disproportionately large reserves of dollars to facilitate trade, which enabled the U.S. to print excessive amounts of its currency with seemingly little inflationary consequences.  The reserve currency status of the dollar has also allowed Americans to import more than they exported, to consume more than they produced and to spend more than they earned.  But all that is about to change. The U.S. dollar is already being abandoned by a number of countries in favor of the Chinese yuan.

In December 2011, Japan and China agreed to dump the dollar and trade in yen and yuan. China's trade with Vietnam, Thailand and Russia is now settled in yuan instead of dollars.  In January, the 10 nations of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) strengthened the linking of their economies with those of China, Hong Kong, Japan and South Korea with a $240 billion equivalent non-dollar credit agreement, thus moving further away from the dollar.

Elsewhere, while Iran's nuclear energy development program gets scrutinized, few realize that Iran is circumventing dollar-based trade sanctions. As of March 20, Iran started trading oil in currencies other than the dollar. India has agreed to settle 45% of payments for Iranian oil in rupees, with gold as an additional payment option.

On March 29, the China Development Bank agreed with its BRICS' counterparts to eschew dollar lending and extend credit to each other in their own respective currencies.

***The erosion and loss of the use of the U.S. dollar as the reserve currency means less demand and more dollar selling by central banks around the world, which in turn causes inflation as the dollar weakens against other currencies.***

Worse, the demise of the dollar's reserve currency status at the same time that federal debt compounds to new heights creates a perfect storm, ***making a collapse of the dollar closer than most Americans realize.*** Let's hope the anticipation of new leadership coming in November buys time for an orderly transition.

[**http://news.investors.com/article/607465/201204111853/obama-stretches-truth-in-fairness-debate.htm?Ntt=the-presidents-fairness-fiction**](http://news.investors.com/article/607465/201204111853/obama-stretches-truth-in-fairness-debate.htm?Ntt=the-presidents-fairness-fiction)

President Obama has struggled to make a case for his big-government, high-tax vision for the economy. But his comments reveal just how bankrupt his vision is.

***Bush, like Obama, entered office during a recession***. Not only did he take over after the biggest stock market crash since the Depression, but the Fed had more than doubled interest rates, killing growth.  Worse, within eight months of entering office, the U.S. was hit with the 9/11 terrorist attacks — the first on the American homeland since World War II. Within the space of just 90 days, a million jobs were lost.  Obama's right. ***President Bush did cut tax rates. What was the result?*** We had 52 straight months of job growth, with 8 million new jobs over six years.  For Bush's entire presidency, the unemployment rate averaged 5.3%. Under Obama, it's not been below 8%. Real after-tax income per person rose more than 11% under Bush, while real GDP from 2000 to 2007 grew $2.1 trillion, or 17%. In 2007, the deficit fell to $162 billion — roughly 1% of GDP.

***Does Obama really want to compare himself to that?*** Since he's entered office, we've lost 1.7 million jobs, and unemployment has averaged over 8%.  His deficits have averaged $1.4 trillion — about 8% of GDP, a record. On his watch, debt has soared from $10.7 trillion to $16 trillion. America now has more debt than the entire euro zone and Great Britain — combined.  Under Obama spending has surged. The federal government now accounts for 25% of the economy, vs. the long-term average of 20%. ***Through his big-government policies, Obama took a bad recession and made sure our recovery would be the worst ever — and then blamed it on everyone but himself. Our economy, in short, will never regain its old vitality until a new president is elected, and Obama's top-down, government-centered policies are laid to rest.***

[**http://news.investors.com/article/612950/201205291845/consumer-confidence-flatlines-under-obama.htm?Ntt=public-vote-of-no-confidence**](http://news.investors.com/article/612950/201205291845/consumer-confidence-flatlines-under-obama.htm?Ntt=public-vote-of-no-confidence)                        The current reading is worse when you realize that **under President Bush — you know, the guy who Obama passes the buck onto for ruining the economy — confidence averaged 88.**  That's despite two recessions, a terrorist massacre and two long wars.

**Throughout Obama's "recovery," the index has averaged 57.**  What reason do people have to feel confident today?  Almost three years into the recovery, unemployment is still above 8%, household incomes are down more than 5%, gasoline prices remain at historic highs, and the economy can only eke out meager gains.  On top of this, we learned this week that housing prices are back at their mid-2002 levels. So, naturally, Obama's again making excuses and shifting blame.

Indeed, the only reason the economy continues to struggle for breath is because Obama continues to choke off its air supply. Even now, he has no clue how his policy prescriptions of vast new federal spending, gargantuan debt, massive regulation, a government health care takeover, and endless bashing of businessmen, profits and the "rich" are killing the “recovery”, jobs & hampering growth.  Still, we are confident of one thing. The economy will come roaring back to life once all that stops.

[**http://www.aei.org/article/politics-and-public-opinion/forget-bain-obamas-public-equity-record-is-the-real-scandal/**](http://www.aei.org/article/politics-and-public-opinion/forget-bain-obamas-public-equity-record-is-the-real-scandal/)

Raser Technologies, ECOtality, Nevada Geothermal Power (NGP), First Solar, Abound Solar, Inc., Beacon Power, SunPower, Brightsource, Solyndra, Amazingly, Obama has declared that all the projects received funding “based solely on their merits.” But as Hoover Institution scholar Peter Schweizer reported in his book, “Throw Them All Out,” ***fully 71 percent of the Obama Energy Department’s grants and loans went to “individuals who were bundlers, members of Obama’s National Finance Committee, or large donors to the Democratic Party.***” Collectively, these Obama cronies raised $457,834 for his campaign, and they were in turn approved for grants or loans of nearly $11.35 billion. **Obama** said this week it’s not the president’s job “to make a lot of money for investors.” Well, he sure seems to have made a lot of (taxpayer) money for investors in his political machine.  All that cronyism and corruption is catching up with the administration. According to Politico, ***“The Energy Department’s inspector general has launched more than 100 criminal investigations” related to the department’s green-energy programs.***

[**http://news.investors.com/article/614548/201206121726/size-of-us-debt-threatens-the-economy.htm?Ntt=william-dunkelberg&p=full**](http://news.investors.com/article/614548/201206121726/size-of-us-debt-threatens-the-economy.htm?Ntt=william-dunkelberg&p=full)                         ***Ask anyone who owns a business what happens if you borrow and spend more than you take in as revenue.  After your listener has a good chuckle, she will undoubtedly tell you that you won't have that business for very long.***  Then ask her what happens if the government behaves that way — borrowing and spending, constantly, for years, without any plan to stop and continually spending more than it receives in revenue. We used debt to help live beyond our means. The governments that represent us did the same, making generous promises without provisions to pay for them.

At some point, probably sooner rather than later (and as is now the case in Europe), lenders will refuse to finance our political insanity at interest rates we can afford, if at all.

But it is the president who must take responsibility for our fiscal trajectory, provide leadership and offer a credible program that will immediately start to balance spending and tax revenues without discouraging the needed vitality of the private sector.

The European experience bears witness to what will happen if the U.S. continues to raise the debt limit, if our government is permitted to borrow more money without implementing a credible program of fiscal discipline that lenders can believe in.  Record high unemployment in eurozone countries has left many nations finding that borrowing costs are too high to allow government debt to be serviced without imposing crushing taxes and broken promises on the populous.

Raising the debt limit with no accompanying credible fiscal plan may keep the government open this month, this year or next, but will punch a politically irreversible hole in the hull of our sinking sovereign ship of state.  Fearing a repetition of events in Europe, small-business owners are not likely to hire and expand and invest in a future that is so uncertain.  And without a thriving small-business sector, our economy may never fully recover.  • Dunkelberg is chief economist for the National Federation of Independent Business.

<http://news.investors.com/Article/592963/201111281800/occupy-wall-street-free-lunch-far-too-costly.htm?Ntt=what-ows-doesnt>            There ain't no such thing as a free lunch. Everything demanded by the Occupy Wall Streeters — whether "free" health care ( greedy doctors and nurses) , a "world-class education" ( greedy teachers and professors) or a "guaranteed living-wage income regardless of employment" status — costs money.  Government possesses no money of its own. It raises money by taxing, borrowing or printing.  The bigger the government, the smaller the private sector.

Individuals can spend their money more wisely, efficiently and more humanely than can government.  People value and spend their money more wisely when they acquire it by their own efforts — also known as work. There are real-world, direct consequences on you for squandering your own money, as opposed to when government squanders the money of its people.

Government employees enjoy job security unknown in the private sector and are often paid more than their private-sector counterparts. Greed?

People spend their money more humanely because they won't waste as much of it.

*Consider that to deal with "the poor," the federal government has a vast array of agencies, programs and policies. But only about 30 cents of each dollar designated for the poor actually gets in the hands of the recipient. Contrast this with the United Way, Salvation Army and other private charities where 90 cents of each dollar donated gets to a beneficiary.*

Americans agree that some people — whether faultless or irresponsible — need assistance, if only occasionally. The only issue is how they will be helped.

The U.S. Constitution isn't just any ordinary document. It is the contract between the government and its people, the ones who empower government and who — once upon a time — expected the Constitution to restrain government, not empower it.

*When you rob Peter to pay Paul, you can always count on the support of Paul. But at some point Peter begins to feel taken advantage of.*

<http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article/474218/200904161809/Tea-Party-System.aspx>                   "Don't Spread My Wealth. Spread My Work Ethic," "Who'll Bail Me Out?" "Atlas Will Shrug," "Tea Today. No Kool-Aid," and "Acorn Didn't Have To Bus Us Here," referring to the left-wing activist group that specializes in voter registration drives benefiting liberal Democrats.

During 12 years of dominance in Congress and eight years in the White House, the GOP failed to kick its addiction to pork and make tough decisions on controlling entitlement spending. It found it too politically risky to secure the U.S. borders — even in the post-9/11 years when homeland security trumped all other concerns.

            The tea party movement proves that even in the left-leaning Northeast, a huge natural constituency exists for these bread-and-butter American issues — lower taxes, less government, a strong military that's allowed to win, tough measures to end illegal immigration, term limits and family values

[**http://news.investors.com/article/610553/201205071832/president-loki-demands-glory-and-world-free-from-freedom.htm?Ntt=president-loki-demands-glory&p=full**](http://news.investors.com/article/610553/201205071832/president-loki-demands-glory-and-world-free-from-freedom.htm?Ntt=president-loki-demands-glory&p=full)

In "The Hunger Games," the young heroes of the film were literally trying to survive the big-government, nanny-state-ordered "death panel" competition created to thin out the freedom-seeking herd of human sheep who foolishly thought their destiny should be in their hands and not that of the government.

At one point as they televise the games into a huge theatre of wealthy and protected government supporters, it's impossible not to see the vacuous and superficial faces as a collection of every single demographic group that blindly supports Barack Obama.  While comical, it's also more than frightening in its reality.

***As bad as "The Hunger Games" is for Obama's "I'm better than you, so I will think for you" big-government image, "The Avengers" is worse. Much worse.***

The basic plot of "The Avengers" is that the freedom-defending superheroes have united to try to stop the totalitarian, big-government-loving Loki from subjugating all of humankind.  Like Obama, the despot-wannabe Loki is fond of giving speeches. Also like President Obama, he picks Germany to wax Marxist.  After terrifying and then herding hundreds of theater-goers into a public square, Loki demands that they kneel before him. When they do, he proceeds to give what will become the most quoted political speech of 2012 — precisely because it ***so eerily echoes the words and theology of President Obama and his mentor Saul Alinsky.***  Says Loki to the cowering crowd now kneeling before him:

***"I come with glad tidings of a world made free — from freedom. Freedom is life's great lie.*** The bright lure of freedom diminishes your life's joy in a mad scramble for power, for identity. Is this not simpler? Is this not your natural state?  ***"It is the unspoken truth of humanity: that you crave subjugation. The bright lure of freedom diminishes your life's joy in a mad scramble for power. For identity. You were made to be ruled. In the end ... you will always kneel."***

Bingo. *The Obama-Alinsky philosophy in one liberty-destroying sound bite.*

During the course of the movie, it is made clear that Loki — like Barack Obama — was handed his position and power in life and did not really earn it. As such, this truth and his obvious insecurities drive him in his maniacal quest for power.  If you need further proof that President Loki ... sorry, I mean ***Obama ... wants the government to do all of your thinking, look no further than the virtual woman he and his campaign have just created.  Her name is "Julia,"*** and in the world of Barack Obama, from birth to a future "death panel" end, the nanny-state dictates her decisions.  Aside from being a truly weird and creepy creation, "Julia" is an insult to all women as the president and the Obama campaign tell them, "Don't worry, we, your government, will do the thinking for you."

[**http://news.investors.com/article/610276/201205031911/obama-life-of-julia-campaign-for-government-dependence.htm?Ntt=julias-bad-life**](http://news.investors.com/article/610276/201205031911/obama-life-of-julia-campaign-for-government-dependence.htm?Ntt=julias-bad-life)

What it really shows is Obama's vision of cradle-to-grave government dependency.

That's Obama's vision, anyway. ***Here's what Julia's life will really be like under his policies:***

She'll start life by personally inheriting $1.5 million in federal debt, a third of which is due to ***Obama's reckless spending policies.***

If she's like most kids, her public school education will have been hampered by Obama's union pals. And her college costs will likely be out of reach because of Obama-favored federal aid programs that have fueled tuition inflation.  If she graduates, she'll find she has a 50% chance of not getting a job, thanks to Obama's lousy economic recovery. And she'll be forced to buy insurance, whether she wants it or not, thanks to ObamaCare's mandate.

Should Julia be dumb enough to try to start a business, she'll likely be dragged down by an avalanche of government red tape.  If she still manages to be successful, Obama will tax most of her earnings away, making it less likely that she'll be able to hire the next Julia in line.

Then, when Julia makes it to retirement, she'll find Medicare and Social Security broke, since Obama refuses to offer any meaningful entitlement improvements.  So, good luck, Julia.  You'll definitely need it if Obama is re-elected.

[**http://news.investors.com/article/617687/201207101851/obama-hometown-chicago-murder-capital.htm?p=full**](http://news.investors.com/article/617687/201207101851/obama-hometown-chicago-murder-capital.htm?p=full)                   In Obama's Chicago, A Trayvon Martin Every Day

"I got a letter from a viewer the other day who asked us why we were spending so much time at 'The Evening News' covering Afghanistan when more people were dying in Chicago," Pelley said. "Why is the murder rate up 30%?"  Pelley put the number of murders in Chicago at 275 so far this year.

Mayor Emanuel announced Monday that he's devoting another $4 million to tear down vacant buildings where gang members live and store guns and drugs. Structurally sound buildings will be boarded up. But why are they vacant and boarded up? Why did 200,000 people flee Chicago in the past decade?

***Chicago, like Illinois, is overtaxed and overregulated, a climate that attracts neither businesses nor people.*** It was the ideological incubator for a community organizer who would become president and blame all of America's problems on those who worked hard and succeeded.

Decades of progressive liberalism that started with LBJ's Great Society did much to destroy the black family in America.  ***Progressive liberalism does not teach the values of hard work and reaping the fruits of one's labor. It gives men fish instead of teaching them how to fish. It demeans the value of marriage***

[**http://www.wnd.com/2012/04/michael-savage-book-sales-portend-obama-win/**](http://www.wnd.com/2012/04/michael-savage-book-sales-portend-obama-win/)

Listen to Conservative Talk Shows Right From Your Browser - For Free! [**www.ConservativeTalkNow.com**](http://www.googleadservices.com/pagead/aclk?sa=L&ai=BIZ67DSOPT-KEA4P2nQSc3-yCDcv4o5MDq7Di3xvAjbcB8JswEAEYASDxk-wXOABQt86V7P3_____AWDJttqJlKSYE6AB7eyt3gOyAQt3d3cud25kLmNvbboBCjMwMHgyNTBfanPIAQHaAUdodHRwOi8vd3d3LnduZC5jb20vMjAxMi8wNC9taWNoYWVsLXNhdmFnZS1ib29rLXNhbGVzLXBvcnRlbmQtb2JhbWEtd2luL4ACAcgCs-DZK6gDAegDjAPoA9cB6AMW9QMAAABE9QMgAAAQiAYB&num=1&cid=5Ggv6rymdm-wh0HmUVDgft4k&sig=AOD64_10QiJra5QkB_aJHrpTt7zs5Myj4A&client=ca-pub-4362624082965872&adurl=http://www.conservativetalknow.com/index.jhtml%3Fspu=true%26partner=YTxdm003)

The upcoming New York Times non-fiction bestseller list could foretell the outcome of the November presidential election by indicating how enthusiastic conservatives are to vote and participate in the campaign, according to talk radio host and author [**Michael Savage**](http://www.michaelsavage.wnd.com/).

Savage told his audience today that the No. 1 position on the April 22 hard-cover non-fiction list of MSNBC host Rachel Maddow’s new book compared to the No. 3 position of his book, “[**Trickle Down Tyranny: Crushing Obama’s Dream Of The Socialist States Of America,”**](http://superstore.wnd.com/books/Trickle-Down-Tyranny-Crushing-Obamas-Dreams-of-a-Socialist-America-Hardcover) leads him to predict a narrow Obama victory.

“Trickle Down Tyranny” is Savage’s seventh New York Times bestseller. He made his fiction debut last fall with [**Abuse of Power,”**](http://superstore.wnd.com/books/Fiction/Abuse-of-Power-Hardcover) which began at No. 4 on the Times list and became Amazon.com’s No. 1 bestselling hard-cover book.  Savage agreed with a caller today who said “liberals are way more motivated to change the country than conservatives.”

“They want to drag the country into a Marxist state,” Savage said. “Whether it’s Marxism light or Marxism heavy, we don’t know yet. But they are doing a very good job of destroying the way of life, and the conservatives are a big bunch of losers.”  His third-ranked national talk show, with more than 10 million listeners, airs live Monday through Friday from 6 p.m. to 9 p.m. Eastern. It can be [**heard online through stations such as KSTE in Sacramento.**](http://www.iheart.com/#/live/229/?autoplay=true)

[**http://news.investors.com/Article.aspx?id=603591&p=1&ibdbot=1**](http://news.investors.com/Article.aspx?id=603591&p=1&ibdbot=1)              Last year, 41% of all babies born in the U.S. (including 53% of babies born to women under 30) were illegitimate, growing up without their own fathers. It is obvious that when the mother of these children has no husband to support her and her babies, she calls on big brother government. You and I then pay the bills for what is labeled welfare.

It's not poverty that causes broken families; it's the absence of marriage that causes poverty and puts kids below the designated poverty line. ***Social issues cause fiscal expenses.***

I grew up during the Great Depression of the 1930s, and the American family — white and black — was not broken. It stayed together to face life's reversals. The massive national problem of having babies without marriage started with Lyndon Johnson's War on Poverty in the 1960s. LBJ welfare channeled all the money and benefits to the woman, thereby making the husband and father unnecessary.

I'm not saying anything new; ***Charles Murray laid this all out more than 20 years ago***. He said, ***"Illegitimacy is the single most important social problem of our time ... because it drives everything else," imposing gigantic costs on the taxpayers.***

A conscious political strategy; it promotes dependence on government and more votes for the Democrats.

Most Americans are unaware that nearly $900 billion a year of federal taxpayers' money is handed out to non-taxpayers allegedly below a designated poverty line. Americans' lack of knowledge of the enormity of these handouts is why we sometimes hear reference to the "hidden" welfare state.

So why do we use tax dollars to discourage marriage and subsidize illegitimacy?  Welfare spending is a major cause of our unbalanced budgets and colossal debt. This hidden welfare state is the fastest growing part of government spending. And this doesn't include Social Security or Medicare payments.

Nor do the Heritage Foundation figures count the social and fiscal costs of the expensive problems that come mostly from female-headed households. These include drug addiction, sex, suicides, school dropouts, runaways and crime.

Welfare spending is a failure; it doesn't advance us toward any constructive goal, such as helping recipients to get on their feet economically. It merely increases dependence on government handouts and increases votes for big-spending politicians.

[**http://www.ssa.gov/OACT/TRSUM/index.html**](http://www.ssa.gov/OACT/TRSUM/index.html)       After 2014, cash deficits are expected to grow rapidly as the number of beneficiaries continues to grow at a substantially faster rate than the number of covered workers. Through 2022, the annual cash deficits will be made up ***by redeeming trust fund assets from the General Fund of the Treasury***.   [**http://www.cbo.gov/ftpdocs/120xx/doc12039/HistoricalTables[1].pdf**](http://www.cbo.gov/ftpdocs/120xx/doc12039/HistoricalTables%5b1%5d.pdf)

[**http://www.forbes.com/sites/merrillmatthews/2011/07/13/what-happened-to-the-2-6-trillion-social-security-trust-fund/**](http://www.forbes.com/sites/merrillmatthews/2011/07/13/what-happened-to-the-2-6-trillion-social-security-trust-fund/)

Because these redemptions will be less than interest earnings, trust fund balances will continue to grow. After 2022, trust fund assets will be redeemed in amounts that exceed interest earnings until trust fund reserves are exhausted in 2036, one year earlier than was projected last year. Thereafter, tax income would be sufficient to pay only about three-quarters of scheduled benefits through 2085.

**Medicare**

Relative to the combined Social Security Trust Funds, the Medicare HI Trust Fund faces a more immediate funding shortfall, though its longer term financial outlook is better under the assumptions employed in this report.

**Conclusion**

Projected long-run program costs for both Medicare and Social Security are **not sustainable** under currently scheduled financing, and will require legislative corrections if disruptive consequences for beneficiaries and taxpayers are to be avoided.

The financial challenges facing Social Security and Medicare should be addressed soon. If action is taken sooner rather than later, more options and more time will be available to phase in changes so that those affected can adequately prepare. Even in advance of these deliberations, we believe that the essential message conveyed by these reports is clear and will not change, absent legislation: that the vital Social Security and Medicare programs face real and substantial challenges, and that ***elected officials will best serve the interests of the public if financial corrections are enacted at the earliest practicable time.***

[**http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2011/05/social-security-2011-trustees-report-shows-permanent-deficits**](http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2011/05/social-security-2011-trustees-report-shows-permanent-deficits)

[**http://www.usatoday.com/news/opinion/2005-03-15-benefits-reform-galveston\_x.htm**](http://www.usatoday.com/news/opinion/2005-03-15-benefits-reform-galveston_x.htm)       Our plan, put together by financial experts, was a "banking model" rather than an "investment model." To eliminate the risks of the up-and-down stock market, workers' contributions were put into conservative fixed-rate guaranteed annuities, rather than fluctuating stocks, bonds or mutual funds. Our results have been impressive: We've averaged about 6.5% annual rate of return over 24 years. And we've provided substantially better benefits in all three Social Security categories: retirement, survivorship, disability.

[**http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article/572492/201105171845/Reform-That-Works.aspx**](http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article/572492/201105171845/Reform-That-Works.aspx)          Social Security, according to a just-released Trustee report, is now "permanently cash negative." But for any who  think saving citizens' retirements is impossible, take a look at what's been done in Galveston, Texas.

Thirty years ago, tiny Galveston opted out of the entire Social Security system for its county employees and introduced private accounts.  It was the brainchild of a county judge, Ray Holbrook, and a few other officials, who took a good look at the parlous state of Social Security in the late 1970s and came up with an "Alternate Plan" of privately managed personal accounts they believed would outperform the public model. An opt-out clause in the original 1935 law (since shut) let them try something different.

How did they do? Three decades later, Galveston County employees take home pensions with nearly a 7% average annual return compounded over 30 years.  By contrast, Social Security recipients get a 1% to 2% return and newer workers will get even less. So Galveston's retirement checks are about four times the size of Social Security and come with life insurance, too.

It was good old American common sense, using a conservatively managed fund that couldn't be raided by politicians — which is why today the Social Security trust fund is loaded with nonrecourse IOUs, not real assets.

Like Chile's more sophisticated private system, which offered more worker choices and managed transition costs, Galveston's system shows that private systems outperform public ones, and workers willingly choose private systems when placed to a vote — 66% of Galveston's employees voted "yes."

Now that the Social Security Trustees report shows the Trust Fund will go broke by 2036 — a year earlier than last year's report — and holds a 75-year unfunded liability of $6.5 trillion, some, like Sen. Orrin Hatch, R-Utah, ranking member on the Senate Finance Committee, say Social Security as we know it must end.

Yet even with the successes of Galveston and two other Texas counties — Matagorda and Brazoria — it's no longer possible to opt out of Social Security.  In 1983, Rep. Jack Brooks, D-Texas, saw the threat the Galveston system posed to politicians' use of the Social Security trust fund as their slush fund after 50 Texas counties lined up to join Galveston.

"It was more a political issue than an economic issue," said Judge Holbrook last year on Fox News.  With the bad news just getting worse, it's time to recognize that private social security can indeed work and ought to be available for everyone who wants it.

[**http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article.aspx?id=573038&p=1**](http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article.aspx?id=573038&p=1)            Most Americans living below the official poverty line own a car or truck — and government entitlement programs seldom provide cars and trucks. Most people living below the official poverty line also have air conditioning, color television and a microwave oven — and these too are not usually handed out by government entitlement programs.

Cell phones and other electronic devices are by no means unheard of in low-income neighborhoods, where children would supposedly go hungry if there were no school lunch programs. In reality, low-income people are overweight even more often than other Americans

As for the elderly, 80% are homeowners whose monthly housing costs are less than $400, including property taxes, utilities and maintenance.

The desperately poor elderly conjured up in political and media rhetoric are — in the world of reality — the wealthiest segment of the American population. The average wealth of older households is nearly three times the wealth of households headed by people in the 35- to 44-year-old bracket, and more than 15 times the wealth of households headed by someone under 35 years of age.  If the wealthiest segment of the population cannot pay their own medical bills, who can?

As for the rest of the poor, Professor Walter Williams of George Mason University long ago showed that you could give the poor enough money to lift them all above the official poverty line for a fraction of what it costs to support a massive welfare state bureaucracy.

We don't need to send the country into bankruptcy, in the name of the poor, by spending trillions of dollars on people who are not poor, and who could take care of themselves. The poor have been used as human shields behind which the expanding welfare state can advance.

The goal is not to keep the poor from starving but to create dependency, because dependency translates into votes for politicians who play Santa Claus.

We have all heard the old saying about how giving a man a fish feeds him for a day, while teaching him to fish feeds him for a lifetime. Independence makes for a healthier society, but dependency is what gets votes for politicians.  For politicians, giving a man a fish every day of his life is the way to keep getting his vote. "Entitlement" is just a fancy word for dependency

[**http://www.forbes.com/sites/merrillmatthews/2011/05/12/how-three-texas-counties-created-personal-social-security-accounts-and-prospered/**](http://www.forbes.com/sites/merrillmatthews/2011/05/12/how-three-texas-counties-created-personal-social-security-accounts-and-prospered/)

The 2011 annual report by the program's Board of Trustees noted the following: in 2010, 54 million people were receiving Social Security benefits, while 157 million people were paying into the fund; of those receiving benefits, 44 million were receiving retirement benefits and 10 million disability benefits. In 2011, there will be 56 million beneficiaries and 158 million workers paying in. In 2010, total income was $781.1 billion and expenditures were $712.5 billion, which meant a total net increase in assets of $68.6 billion. Assets in 2010 were $2.6 trillion, an amount that is expected to be adequate to cover the next 10 years. In 2023, total income and interest earned on assets are projected to no longer cover expenditures for Social Security, as demographic shifts burden the system. By 2035, the ratio of potential retirees to working age persons will be 37 percent — there will be less than three potential income earners for every retiree in the population. The trust fund would then be exhausted by 2036 without legislative action.[**[9]**](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Social_Security_%28United_States%29#cite_note-8)

A **Ponzi scheme** is a [**fraudulent**](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Fraud) [**investment**](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Investment) operation ( vs. Social security which is forced and sanctioned by government)  that pays returns to separate investors, not from any actual profit earned by the organization, but from their own money or money paid by subsequent investors. The Ponzi scheme usually entices new investors by offering returns other investments cannot guarantee, in the form of short-term returns that are either abnormally high or unusually consistent. The perpetuation of the returns that a Ponzi scheme advertises and pays requires an ever-increasing flow of money from investors to keep the scheme going.

<http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article/558016/201012281843/Fresno-Zimbabwe.aspx>      Local newspapers and Fresno County officials are trying to rally Facebook users to vote for Fresno in a corporate contest sponsored by Wal-Mart for $1 million in charity food donations for the hungry. Fresno, a city of 505,000, has taken the national lead because 24.1% of Fresno's families are going hungry.

Civic spirit is good, but something big is wrong here. Fresno is the agricultural capital of America. More food per acre in more variety can be grown in the fertile Central Valley surrounding this community than on any other land in America — perhaps in the world.

Yet far from being a paradise, Fresno is starting to resemble Zimbabwe or 1930s Ukraine, a victim of a famine machine that is entirely man-made, not by red communists this time, but by greens.

State and federal officials, driven by the agenda of environmental extremists, have made it extremely difficult for the valley's farms  It's high time the greens who did this to the richest farmland in the country be held accountable.

<http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article/534728/201005201852/Water-Sanity-For-Central-California.aspx>                       Based on a judicial ruling, some of the most prized and productive agricultural land in the country was turned into a wasteland after its water was shut off.

The ruling was derived from an 800-page "biological opinion" put out by regulators enforcing the National Environmental Policy Act, ostensibly to protect a finger-sized fish called the delta smelt and some other wildlife. Regulators complained that smelt were getting ground up in pumping stations that brought river water from California's north to its south, so the water had to stop.

Even the judge was appalled at being forced into the ruling but had no choice, given the law, and tried to cushion the impact.  Tuesday, that same judge, District Judge Oliver Wanger declared to federal regulators that they must consider the impact of their "draconian" actions on human communities, something they've never done up until now.  "Federal defendants completely abdicated their responsibility to consider alternative remedies," Wanger wrote.

He also ripped into the environmental regulators for their junk science "guesstimates," stating that their shut-off "lacked factual and scientific justification, while effectively ignoring the irreparable harm (their regulations) have inflicted on humans and the human environment," according to the San Francisco Chronicle.  It's a landmark ruling that makes a superb use of checks and balances on power, given that up until now, these bureaucrats have never been held accountable for their actions.

Adding insult to injury, water has increasingly been turned into a bargaining chit, with Washington using access to it as political leverage to force local congressmen to vote for unpopular bills like health care reform.

[**http://news.investors.com/article/618146/201207131919/call-public-employees-what-they-are-and8212-economy-destroyers.htm?Ntt=douglas-mackinnon&p=full**](http://news.investors.com/article/618146/201207131919/call-public-employees-what-they-are-and8212-economy-destroyers.htm?Ntt=douglas-mackinnon&p=full)                          The next time you see a city, county, state or federal public employee — be they teachers, postal workers, librarians, in the mayor's office, or even police or firefighters — don't view them as neighbors, friends or friendly civil servants, but rather as the destroyers of your economic future.  To be sure, the vast majority of these people are incredibly decent human beings — and no doubt see themselves that way. Just as the vast majority of them are very intelligent and know right from wrong.

***Every honest American knows that if one of these public service jobs was offered tomorrow with zero pension — jobs that pay from $20,000 to well over $100,000 per year — thousands of the unemployed would line up immediately and consider themselves blessed with good fortune if they landed one.***  In large part because of the unchecked ***greed*** of the public employee unions and workers, ***San Bernardino this week became the third California city to seek bankruptcy protection.***  Of course, if you were looking for that honest explanation from Democrats and ***pro-public employee union media outlets such as the Los Angeles Times or Reuters***, good luck.

As non-public employees continue to raid more of their precious life saving to pay for these unfunded gold-plated public employee pensions and health care plans, the obvious question has to be asked: Do these public employees deserve a pension at all? The answer of course is "no."

***In the United States of America, other than liberty, we are entitled to nothing.***

As the something for nothing, ***big-government proponents cripple the economies of Greece, Italy, Spain, California, Illinois, New York, Maryland and numerous other countries and municipalities***, when do the Americans not participating in this threat to their welfare and the welfare of their children scream, "Enough is enough!"

[**http://news.investors.com/article/609190/201204251909/democrats-fear-mongering-election-strategy.htm?Ntt=democrats-have-nothing-to-offer&p=full**](http://news.investors.com/article/609190/201204251909/democrats-fear-mongering-election-strategy.htm?Ntt=democrats-have-nothing-to-offer&p=full)      Democrats have said, including President Obama, who called Rep. Paul Ryan's budget "thinly veiled social Darwinism".  ***So what do Democrats have to offer instead? Nothing.*** The Senate hasn't produced a budget since 2009 and refuses to this year, which means that once again the red-ink hemorrhaging federal government will be operating without any spending guidelines. Obama's budget plan was so ludicrous that not one House Democrat would vote for it.  The Democrats' refusal to govern hardly ends here.

***The country faces monumental problems — a national debt crisis, an entitlement crisis, an energy crisis, to say nothing of the lingering economic crisis.***

But on issue after issue, Democrats have absolutely nothing constructive to offer — no entitlement-reform ideas, no budget-reform proposals, no debt-reduction plans, no credible energy policies.  Then again, what choice do Democrats have other than fear-mongering? ***They certainly can't run on their record. For two years, they enjoyed huge majorities in the House and Senate along with a willing partner in the White House, and got everything they wanted.***

***We've seen the results:*** The worst economic recovery since the Great Depression, a national debt that's now bigger than the GDP, a massively wasteful stimulus program, skyrocketing oil and gas prices, high unemployment, stagnating incomes, and falling home prices.

So their only option is to try to distract voters with scary campfire tales about evil Republicans. The real horror story, however, would be if voters rewarded the Democrats' empty fear campaign this November.

[**http://news.investors.com/article/610858/201205091826/use-tax-reform-to-release-a-2-trillion-stimulus.htm?Ntt=defusing-our-debt-bomb&p=full**](http://news.investors.com/article/610858/201205091826/use-tax-reform-to-release-a-2-trillion-stimulus.htm?Ntt=defusing-our-debt-bomb&p=full)

Fortunately, Federal Reserve Chairman Ben Bernanke has been honest about the math. As he explained to Congress last year, ***"By definition, the unsustainable trajectories of deficits and debt that the (Congressional Budget Office) outlines cannot actually happen, because creditors would never be willing to lend to a government whose debt, relative to national income, is rising without limit."***

Bernanke added, quoting a famous line from economist Herbert Stein, "If something can't go on forever, it will stop."

If current patterns hold, Washington will continue to behave as if there is no entitlement and debt crisis. We'll hear increasingly dire warnings and earnest promises to do something at the next crisis moment (i.e. the coming "fiscal cliff"), but no one will act decisively until we experience more economic pain.

For instance, "Medicare as we know it" ends in five years when Medicare Part A — the hospital insurance trust fund — runs out of money. Politicians who say we can continue Medicare without structural reforms are lying and are using seniors as rhetorical human shields to stay in power.

Economists Carmen Reinhart and Kenneth Rogoff have shown that when debt reaches 90% of GDP (we're now at 101%) we lose 1 point of GDP growth, which slows the economy by 25% to 33% and prevents the creation of 1 million jobs annually. Reinhart and Rogoff's theory is being tested in real time and has been shown to be correct.

The key question, though, is this: Why would we borrow another $800 billion and create a drag on the economy when we could create confidence and certainty through entitlement and tax reform — lowering rates and broadening the base — and release $2 trillion into the economy? A long-term debt solution would give us much more bang for the buck than another bloated stimulus.

Finally, many on the left are wrongly arguing that "cuts" means austerity and slower growth. Yet, eliminating stupid and gratuitously wasteful and duplicative federal spending is not necessarily austerity. It is common sense and, in fact, stimulative. Not all dollars are spent or wasted equally. A dollar spent in the private sector does far more to stimulate growth than a dollar spent by GSA in Las Vegas.

Sweden of all places, which had the fastest growth in Europe last year, has just shown the world that smart tax cuts and spending cuts are the best stimulus.

Billionaire and great American Donald Trump says of the new blockbuster book [**"Amateur: Barack Obama in the White House"**](http://news.newsmax.com/?S64vYWdmFBAa9YqIiYdREG07kQszxJv1S&http://shop.newsmax.com/shop/index.cfm?page=products&productid=831&s=al&promo_code=EF97-1) that it's the "best book" he's read on Obama.   Here's what Trump said: “The Amateur is the best book I’ve read on how Barack Obama is wrecking our country. I urge everyone who cares about America to read Edward Klein’s eye-opening book.” The just-released book is skyrocketing on the best-seller lists, already hitting Amazon's top 10.

[**http://superstore.wnd.com/video/I-Want-Your-Money-DVD**](http://superstore.wnd.com/video/I-Want-Your-Money-DVD)

Two versions of the American dream now stand in sharp contrast. Which do you choose: Big government or personal responsibility?

As we look around us, we cannot help but see the malignancy creeping through our towns, cities and states - the entire nation being brought to its knees.  The cancer is government expansion through ever-increasing taxation and spending.  Citizen outcry has reached such a decibel level that the problem no longer can be kicked down the road.

In the documentary *I Want Your Money,* filmmaker Ray Griggs illustrates America's current plight and offers sound direction in our journey back to the America intended by its founders.

Griggs offers us a much-needed alternative to Michael Moore and the dismal image of our nation he has been spewing around the world. Griggs' film was released in theaters in October of 2010; while it was not well received by theater owners, cheering crowds filled the theaters that dared to show it on 500 screens across the U.S., helping stir the tide of Tea Party victories in the last elections.

*I Want Your Money* is about two diametrically opposed concepts of governance. One views the money you earned as yours and best allocated by you. It champions the traditional American dream, which has played out millions of times through generations of Americans, of improving one’s lot in life and the entrepreneurial spirit of daring to dream and to build big. The other believes that the federal government, using taxpayers’ money, should play a major role in leveling out the nation’s wealth to guarantee outcomes to all, regardless of effort.

[**http://news.investors.com/article/600680/201202091828/liberals-donand8217t-like-wealth-earned-honestly.htm?Ntt=congress-real-plutocrats**](http://news.investors.com/article/600680/201202091828/liberals-donand8217t-like-wealth-earned-honestly.htm?Ntt=congress-real-plutocrats)                   Liberals are disgusted by people who made their own money, as Romney did at Bain Capital. But they admire ill-gotten gains, which is how John Kerry, John Edwards, Jon Corzine, John F. Kennedy, Franklin D. Roosevelt and innumerable other spokesmen for the downtrodden amassed their fortunes.  Democrats are very proud of the rich, patrician FDR — who inherited all of his money and then launched a series of federal entitlements designed to bankrupt America 60 years later. JFK also inherited his wealth, from a father who made his money as a bootlegger and stock manipulator. (In their defense, both went on to create jobs for bartenders and prostitutes.)  Kerry is in a special category of the gigolo. He acquired his fortune by marrying someone, who married someone, who inherited the money — leading Kerry's children to refer to Teresa Heinz Kerry as their "step-money." In what can only be described as luck, Kerry's first wife was also an heiress.

Even when Kerry refused to release his wife's tax returns in order to avoid the humiliation of revealing his allowance, the press was demurely silent. John Edwards made well over $50 million by shaking down hardworking doctors with junk science lawsuits — as the New York Times has since admitted. The highlight of his sideshows was when he channeled unborn children in front of illiterate jurors.

(In the Democrats' moral universe, the unborn have no right to life, but they're perfectly acceptable as witnesses for the plaintiff in a malpractice suit.)

The six wealthiest senators are all Democrats, half of whom married or inherited their money. Some other multimillionaire Democrats are:

• Jay Rockefeller of West Virginia, the second-richest senator after Kerry, who inherited his money.

• Dianne Feinstein of California, the sixth-richest senator, who married her money.

• Maria Cantwell of Washington, a bogus dot-com multimillionaire who cashed out before the stock crashed.

• Claire McCaskill of Missouri, the ninth-richest senator, who failed to pay taxes on her private plane until she was caught last year, and who married her money.

Meanwhile, with few exceptions, Republicans either made money on their own or they don't have it. It's no accident Democrats oppose a tax on wealth, of which they have boatloads, but strongly support taxes on income, which they typically do not have.

Democrats don't hate the rich; they are the rich, luxuriating in fortunes acquired by inheritance or marriage, fleecing the taxpayer, trial lawyer hucksterism or disreputable money manipulation. Their contempt is reserved for those who engage in honest work for a living, whom they accuse of "greed" for wanting to pay the government a little less.

[**http://news.investors.com/article/600854/201202101833/democrats-refusal-to-pass-budget-is-illegal.htm?Ntt=when-leaders-turn-lawless**](http://news.investors.com/article/600854/201202101833/democrats-refusal-to-pass-budget-is-illegal.htm?Ntt=when-leaders-turn-lawless)     "the fact is," Congress is required under the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 to pass a spending plan and then have it scored by the Congressional Budget Office and signed by the president. That none of this happens suggests a level of disrespect for the law and the people found only among criminals.  It has everything to do with ***Democrats' refusal*** to admit that their unparalleled spending binge and exploding debt will soon lead to a tidal wave of tax hikes on average Americans.

[**http://news.investors.com/article/601602/201202171814/obama-uses-birth-control-misdirection.htm?Ntt=brokest-nation-in-history**](http://news.investors.com/article/601602/201202171814/obama-uses-birth-control-misdirection.htm?Ntt=brokest-nation-in-history)              Have you seen the official White House version of what the New York Times headline writers call "A Responsible Budget"?  My favorite bit is ***Chart 5-1 on Page 58 of their 500-page appendix on "Analytical Perspectives." This is entitled "Publicly Held Debt Under 2013 Budget Policy Projections."*** As shown above, it's a straight line going straight up before disappearing off the top right-hand corner of the graph in the year 2084

the ***Obama condoms-for-clunkers giveaway*** and a debt-to-GDP ratio of 900% by 2075 — are not unconnected. In Greece, 100 grandparents have 42 grandchildren — i.e., an upside-down family tree. As I wrote in this space a few weeks ago, "If 100 geezers run up a bazillion dollars' worth of debt, is it likely that 42 youngsters will ever be able to pay it off?" Most analysts know the answer to that question: Greece is demographically insolvent. So it's looking to Germany to continue bankrolling its First World lifestyle. A nation that did without having kids of its own is in no mood to maintain Greece as the ingrate slacker who never moves out of the house.

Testifying before Congress, Timmy Geithner referred only to "demographic challenges" — an oblique allusion to the fact that the U.S. economy is about to be terminally clobbered by 100 trillion dollars of entitlement obligations it can never meet. And, as ***Chart 5-1 on page 58 of the official Obama budget "Analytical Perspectives***" makes plain, your feckless, decadent rulers have no plans to do anything about it.

Instead, the Democrats shriek, ooh, Republican prudes who can't get any action want to shut down your sex life! According to CBO projections, by midcentury mere interest payments on the debt will exceed federal revenues.

For purposes of comparison, by 1788 Louis XVI's government in France was spending a mere 60% of revenues on debt service, and we know how that worked out for His Majesty shortly thereafter.

Not to worry, says Barry Antoinette. ***Let them eat condoms.*** This is a very curious priority for a dying republic. "Birth control" is accessible, indeed ubiquitous, and, by comparison with anything from a gallon of gas to basic cable, one of the cheapest expenses in the average budget. But where is the compelling societal interest in the state prioritizing and subsidizing it? Especially when you're already the Brokest Nation in History.   But in America an oblivious political class, led by a president who characterizes young motherhood as a "punishment," prefers to offer solutions to problems that don't exist rather than the ones that are all too real.

***I think this is what they call handing out condoms on the Titanic.*** Glenn Reynolds, the Instapundit, distills the current hysteria thus: "It's as if we passed a law requiring mosques to sell bacon and then, when people objected, responded by saying 'What's wrong with bacon? You're trying to ban bacon!!!!'"  Americans foolish enough to fall for the Democrats' crude bit of misdirection can hardly complain about their rendezvous with the sharp end of that page 58 budget graph.  People are free to buy bacon, and free to buy condoms. But the state has no compelling interest to force either down your throat.

[**http://www.downsizinggovernment.org/overpaid-federal-workers**](http://www.downsizinggovernment.org/overpaid-federal-workers)

An analysis by *USA Today* [**http://www.usatoday.com/news/washington/2009-12-10-federal-pay-salaries\_N.htm**](http://www.usatoday.com/news/washington/2009-12-10-federal-pay-salaries_N.htm)      revealed particularly fast wage growth at the top end of the federal workforce in recent years.**[6](http://www.downsizinggovernment.org/overpaid-federal-workers" \l "_edn6)** By 2009, there were 383,000 federal civilian workers with salaries of more than $100,000, 66,000 with salaries of more than $150,000, and 22,000 with salaries of more than $170,000. Between late 2007 and mid-2009, the number of federal workers earning more than $150,000 more than doubled, even as the economy fell into a deep recession during that period.  Federal pay should be reasonable, and we certainly need competent workers in federal jobs, assuming that they are jobs that are really required. But the government industry shouldn't be one of the highest-paid industries in the nation. Indeed, an advantage of reducing federal pay would be to encourage more turnover in the currently very static federal workforce. That would get more young and energetic people in government, which would be a good thing.

Another way to help solve the federal pay problem would be to privatize federal jobs where possible. For example, a study found that the average annual compensation of federal air traffic controllers was $166,000 in 2005.**[21](http://www.downsizinggovernment.org/overpaid-federal-workers" \l "_edn21)** Is that too much? Let's find out by privatizing air traffic control—as Canada has done—and let the market decide. Does the government pay postal workers too much? Let's privatize postal services—as Germany has done—and let the market decide.

With regard to immediate policy reforms, Congress should freeze or cut federal wages and then start overhauling federal benefits to reduce costs. It should, for example, phase-out defined-benefit pension plans, as most private-sector employers have. To deal with today's large budget deficits, we need to restrain all areas of spending, and so it is reasonable to cut federal pay packages and better align them with private-sector practices.

[**http://www.cbo.gov/ftpdocs/78xx/doc7874/03-15-Federal\_Personnel.pdf**](http://www.cbo.gov/ftpdocs/78xx/doc7874/03-15-Federal_Personnel.pdf) Total Number of Federal Civilian Employees, Selected Years, 1990 to 2005

[**http://news.investors.com/article/601606/201202171832/prudence-is-key-for-gop-in-battling-obama.htm?Ntt=prudence-is-key**](http://news.investors.com/article/601606/201202171832/prudence-is-key-for-gop-in-battling-obama.htm?Ntt=prudence-is-key)                Tocqueville, after describing in "Democracy in America" how Americans avoided the perils of equality by forming voluntary associations, engaging in local government and believing in religions that disciplined their pursuit of self-interest into a pursuit of virtue, painted the picture of a darker future. Above a democratic populace, he writes, "an immense tutelary power is elevated, which alone takes charge of assuring their enjoyments and watching over their fate. It is absolute, detailed, rigid, far-seeing and mild. It would resemble paternal power if, like that, it had for its object to prepare men for manhood; but on the contrary, it seeks only to keep them fixed irrevocably in childhood; it likes citizens to enjoy themselves. It willingly works for their happiness; but it wants to be the unique agent and sole arbiter of that."

Thus Tocqueville, writing in the 1830s, foresees ObamaCare and the crony capitalism that produces a Super Bowl commercial from a government- and union-controlled company that seeks Obama's re-election.

"Thus, taking each individual by turns in its powerful hands and kneading him as it likes, the sovereign extends its arms over society as a whole; it covers its surface with a network of small, complicated, painstaking, uniform rules through which the most original minds and the most vigorous souls cannot clear a way to surpass the crowd; it does not break wills, but it softens them, bends them and directs them; it rarely forces one to act, but it constantly opposes itself to one's acting; it does not destroy, it prevents things from being born; it does not tyrannize, it hinders, compromises, enervates, extinguishes, dazes and finally reduces each nation to being nothing more than a herd of timid and industrial animals of which the government is the shepherd."  That is what House Republicans are fighting to reverse.

<http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article/479613/200906151917/VPs-Guess-Services.aspx>               On Feb. 18, we said: "The (stimulus) bill Congress hurried to pass late last week without anyone having read the entire 1,434 pages will in fact not stimulate much of anything."

We further noted that the $787 billion package would not be an economic stimulus but a spending bill filled with "pork and outright waste."

We were not alone. Some 330 economists signed a statement last winter saying that President Obama's claim — that "there is no disagreement that we need action by our government, a recovery plan that will help to jump-start the economy" — simply "is not true."

This statement, in an ad paid for by the Cato Institute, appeared on full pages in 24 major newspapers across the country, including the New York Times and Washington Post.

The economists were not crackpots but respected scholars, including Nobelists James Buchanan, Vernon Smith and Edward Prescott, as well as Reagan Office and Management of Budget Director James Miller, Walter Williams and John Lott.  Also opposed to the stimulus are the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office and a core of mainly Republican U.S. representatives and senators, too small unfortunately to change the outcome, who saw through the smoke and weren't fooled by the mirrors.

<http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article/457117/200901081829/Can-Social-Security-Get-A-New-Deal-.aspx>                
Obama's party lashes out when even partial privatization is brought up.

But taking retirement out of government's hands works. It has worked in Chile. It has worked in Britain.  It's worked, as well, in Texas, where in 1981, Galveston County employees voted 78% to 22% to opt out of the Social Security system and put their trust in a private retirement plan. Brazoria and Matagorda counties followed Galveston out of Social Security before Congress outlawed in 1983 the option of leaving Social Security.  Now more than 5,000 Texas participants are in a private plan where the rate of return far exceeds that of Social Security's average of 1.25%.

The Institute of Policy Innovation, a Texas think tank, reports that a low-income worker making $17,124 a year and retiring at 65 will get $782 per month from Social Security while someone with an identical salary retiring at the same age would receive $1,285 a month from the plan the Texas county workers invest in. A retiree who earned roughly $51,000 a year will get $1,540 monthly from Social Security, $3,846 from the Texas plan.

In September, Obama referred to President Bush's "failed privatization scheme" for Social Security, indicating that his administration would never consider private plans.  If overhauling entitlements is truly "a central part" of his administration's attempts to tame federal spending, he must be open to ideas beyond cutting benefits, raising taxes and shifty budgeting.  Better to be known as the president who saved the nation from an entitlement disaster and economic doom than the President who had the chance and failed because of inexperience and incompetence.  Voting “Present “ won’t work.

<http://townhall.com/columnists/phyllisschlafly/2009/12/15/who_has_the_solution_for_unemployment/page/full/>                            Young people voted for Obama for President by 66 percent to 32 percent, but they made a bad bargain because 3 million of them now have no jobs. According to the Center for Labor Market Studies at Northeastern University in Boston, the percentage of young men actually working is the lowest in the 61 years of recordkeeping.

A more biting criticism was leveled at Obama by the left-wing journal Rolling Stone in its Dec. 10 issue, which lambasts the president in an eight-page attack article called "Obama's Big Sellout." Rolling Stone is in shock at discovering that Obama's socialism means payoffs to his rich friends and Wall Street contributors while spreading the poverty around (instead of the wealth).

The health care bill is another direct attack on the young people who voted for Obama. The Democrats' plan will force young people to buy insurance they don't want in order to subsidize expensive care of seniors. Of course, young people will be stuck with a staggering debt hanging over them for the rest of their lives.

To understand and reverse Obama's attack on American jobs, which is dashing hopes and opportunities for the young, all congressional candidates should *read Jerome Corsi's newest book, "America for Sale."   Corsi also explains Obama's policies that are destroying the dollar and wiping out the middle class* by exporting blue-collar and white-collar jobs while importing an underclass. Economic hard times are ahead unless the voters call a halt in the 2010 congressional elections.

<http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article/512767/200911171927/Perspective-Of-A-Russian-Immigrant-No-3.aspx>                        "Sacrifice for the collective good" is one of the founding principles of socialism, where the collective, not the individual, is the basis of society.

Revolutionaries in Russia did not go around boasting about destruction; they made inspiring speeches about fairness, equality, justice and the greater good. After securing power and their own access to material goods, government officials decided what to give and take from the masses, according to their definition of what is good.

When party leaders talk about the "collective good," what they are really talking about is their right to determine what is good for the collective. Government bureaucrats decide what level of sacrifice is needed and who needs to sacrifice. They replace voluntary charity with the forceful redistribution of other people's private property.

Why do people born into a free society accept a failed 100-year-old ideology? It seems Americans are simply unaware of modern history. They don't know the theory behind slogans such as "fairness and equality" and "sacrifice for the collective good," much less how it works when implemented. They buy into old utopian slogans masquerading as new progressive ideals for "Hope and Change."

Americans are not different from people in Russia, Germany, China, Korea or anywhere else. It is human nature to seek power and control, just as it is human nature to seek profit. Deny profit and you destroy any incentive for people to produce and innovate. Give up enough of your liberty to any centralized power and the result is entirely predictable.

Compare North Korea to South Korea, East Germany to West Germany before the fall of the wall — these are examples of the same people living under two different systems: socialism vs. capitalism.

Laws are necessary in a civil society, and this includes laws that regulate the free market. But a government takeover of the economy will result in the transformation of the land of opportunity into a land of apathy and stagnation, a land in which individuals become cogs moving and turning according to government regulations.  In the USSR, they taught us in school that socialism is good and capitalism is bad. That they now teach the same in American schools I find strange.

<http://townhall.com/columnists/larryelder/2010/02/11/krugman_bushs_deficit_bad,_obamas_deficit_good/page/full/>   Left-wing economist, Nobel laureate and New York Times columnist Paul Krugman hates deficits in tough economic times -- when the president of the United States is named George W. Bush.

Krugman, in a November 2004 interview, criticized the "enormous" Bush deficit. "We have a world-class budget deficit," he said, "not just as in absolute terms, of course -- it's the biggest budget deficit in the history of the world -- but it's a budget deficit that, as a share of GDP, is right up there."

The numbers? The deficit in fiscal year 2004 -- $413 billion, 3.5 percent of the gross domestic product.   In October 2004, unemployment was 5.5 percent and continued to slowly decline. At the time, Krugman described the economy as "weak," with "job creation ... essentially nonexistent."  Fast-forward to 2010.

The numbers: projected deficit for fiscal year 2010 -- over $1.5 trillion, more than 10 percent of GDP.  This sets a post-WWII record in both absolute numbers and as a percentage of GDP. And if the Obama administration's optimistic projections of the economic growth fall short, things will get much worse. So what does Krugman say now? We must guard against "deficit hysteria." In "Fiscal Scare Tactics," his recent column, Krugman writes.

Let's review. In 2004, an unhappy Krugman criticized Bush's "weak" economy and "miserable" job creation. Running an "enormous" deficit was a bad thing. Times were awful -- "by a large margin" the worst job crash and performance since Herbert Hoover. Today the deficit is four times as large in an even weaker economy with much higher unemployment. Times are awful. Now, though, the deficit is a good thing and should be even bigger.           Krugman's flip-flop on the deficit demonstrates a modern economic equation. Hatred of Bush + love for Obama = intellectual dishonesty.

<http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article/534274/201005171833/Left-Begrudges-To-The-Death-Others-Wealth.aspx>                 Off the teleprompter for a few seconds while stumping recently for a financial overhaul, President Obama had this to say about money and success:

"Now, what we're doing, I want to be clear, we're not trying to push financial reform because we begrudge success that's fairly earned. I mean, I do think at a certain point you've made enough money."

No begrudging of success? That's what the left does — begrudge and resent, robotically. It's what makes them leftists — and bitter.

Steeler quarterback Ben Roethlisberger got a $25 million signing bonus while the median salary last year for physicians practicing family medicine was $160,000? So 156 family doctors worked all year and their combined paychecks were slightly lower than Ben's bonus. Is the White House OK with that? Should the central committee of White House czars decide how much of Ben's $25 million was due to the lucky inheritance of a good throwing arm and how much was "fairly earned" due to hard work?

And what'll they do about Lady Gaga earning more than General Motors?  So who decides when we've "made enough money"? Should we tell Julia Roberts not to make another movie, tell her she's "made enough"? How about Oprah?  And what about the stage hands and popcorn sellers who lose their jobs as a result?

Should the czars tell Tiger Woods that he's way past that "certain point" when he's earned "enough," unless he wants to play for free or donate 100% of the winnings to the needs of the collective?

Should the government have told the owners of Pittsburgh-based 84 Lumber to stop at 83? At last count, the company had about 4,000 employees in 289 stores in 34 states.

Rather than worrying about who has too much, Obama should be thinking about what made America the most successful nation in human history, in terms of economic prosperity and individual freedom.

Instead of giving greater power to the central government, the power to decree what we should drive, what we should eat, what we'll be permitted to hear and see, what income has been "fairly earned" and when at "a certain point" we've "made enough money," the founding philosophy of the U.S. called for a society based on an exactly opposite set of principles.

"Were we directed from Washington when to sow and when to reap, we should soon want bread," warned Thomas Jefferson. It was a lesson learned firsthand by millions of starving farmers in China and the Soviet Union.

[***http://constitution.com/lynchs-climate-gestapo-closely-mirrors-1920-1940-reich-protections-video/***](http://constitution.com/lynchs-climate-gestapo-closely-mirrors-1920-1940-reich-protections-video/)

***In the 1920’s, the German Communist Party and the National Socialist German Worker’s (Nazi) Party were two sides of the same coin. To gain power, the Nazi party had to convince the German people the Communists where evil and extremists. The man to do it was Adolf Hitler. He used anger, hatred, and disinformation to turn the Germans against Communism while at the same time hiding the atrocities of Nazism.  Under the guise of “protecting the people,” disinformation involved first labeling and targeting opponents.  In January 1933, Hitler was appointed chancellor where he immediately began labeling Communists as terrorists. (This is quite rich coming from the man that would execute six million Jews within the next decade.) Hitler was able to appoint Hermann Goering as the Nazi President of the Reichstag, or*** [***German National Parliament.***](http://www.biography.com/people/hermann-g%C3%B6ring-37281#nazi-party-and-world-war-i) ***Goering was already in command of Hitler’s Nazi SA force, or “Storm Troopers,” throughout Prussia. After receiving the title of Interior Minister of Prussia, Goering used his position to assemble a massive police force.  On February 22, 1933, Goering appointed fifty thousand of SA officials as secret state police, known as the “Gestapo.” Two days later Goering raided the Communist headquarters. Putting his own propaganda in motion, Goering falsely accused the communists of inciting a revolution.  Nazi propaganda fueled by this incident, allowed Hitler and his party to quickly lie, deceive, and scare their way into power. And the existing court system wasn’t enough, so Hitler created a new court to obtain the “justice” he wanted.  Hitler quickly instituted the “People’s Court” on May 2, 1934.***

<http://news.investors.com/Article/593098/201111291733/income-inequality-harry-potter-rowling-wal-mart-99-percenters-lebron-james.htm?Ntt=blame-the-99>      Joanne Rowling was a welfare mother in Edinburgh, Scotland. All that has changed. As the writer of the "Harry Potter" novels, having a net worth of $1 billion, she is the world's wealthiest author. More importantly, she's one of those dastardly 1-percenters condemned by the Occupy Wall Streeters and other leftists.

How did Rowling become so wealthy and unequal to the rest of us? The entire blame for this social injustice lies at the feet of the world's children and their enabling parents. Rowling's wealth is a direct result of more than 500 million "Harry Potter" book sales and movie receipts grossing more than $5 billion.

In other words, the millions of "99-percenters" who individually plunk down $8 or $9 to attend a "Harry Potter" movie, $15 to buy a "Harry Potter" novel or $30 to buy a "Harry Potter" Blu-ray Disc are directly responsible for contributing to income inequality and wealth concentration that economist and Nobel laureate Paul Krugman says "is incompatible with real democracy."

*In other words, Rowling is not responsible for income inequality; it's the people who purchase her works.*

Basketball great LeBron James plays forward for the Miami Heat and earns $43 million for doing so. That puts him with those 1-percenters denounced by Wall Street occupiers. But who made LeBron a 1-percenter?

In other words, I'd like Krugman to tell us what should be done to stop the millions of children who make Joanne Rowling rich, the millions who fork over their money to the benefit of LeBron James and the hundreds of millions of people who shop at Wal-Mart.

<http://news.investors.com/Article/590606/201111041732/A-Closer-Look-At-Fat-Cat-Few-Who-Did-Us-In.htm?Ntt=a-closer-look-at>  First lady Michelle Obama the other day railed at *"the few at the top," who do all sorts of bad things.* A few months ago, we began hearing of the "1%" who are responsible for the current economic mess.  "They" apparently make all their money at the expense of the other 99%. Are they the same as last year's villains, who had not paid "their fair share" in making over $200,000 in annual income?

Do they include the greedy doctors, who, the president once asserted, recklessly lop off limbs and yank tonsils for profits? Is my urologist a dreaded one-percenter? He found out what was causing my kidney stones but probably makes good money.

Was a nearby farmer one, too? I bet he makes over $200,000 but, like many other growers in this area, has found a way to produce beef and cotton more cheaply and efficiently than farmers in almost any other part of the world, thereby enriching his county, state and nation.

So I wonder, was the late Apple CEO Steve Jobs a suspect billionaire? Should I be mad or grateful that he made billions by permanently replacing my old scissors, paste and bottle of liquid paper of the 1970s?

Did Johnny Depp really have to earn $50 million last year alone — or Leonardo DiCaprio $77 million? Couldn't they have settled for $2 million in salary in 2010, and thereby passed on a little bit of the savings to their ticket-buying fans?  What kind of system would allow Oprah Winfrey or the late Michael Jackson each to accumulate nearly $1 billion? Is left-wing filmmaker Michael Moore — reportedly worth $50 million — a one-percenter? Why does such an enemy of capitalism need so much capitalist largesse?  Are liberals like Sens. John Kerry or Dianne Feinstein — among the richest in the U.S. Senate — in that elite group?  How about Warren Buffett and Bill Gates, together worth over $100 billion? They are certainly philanthropists. But their charities are predicated on two assumptions:  They both apparently trust the private sector more than government to administer their vast estates, and neither sees much of a problem in avoiding billions in inheritance taxes that would one day be due to a now-broke federal treasury.  Is George Soros a "corporate jet owner"? He nearly broke the Bank of England by shorting the British pound and was convicted in France of insider training. Rather than comply with new federal financial-disclosure regulations, he told some of his outside investors just to keep their money.  Is Obama's former director of the budget, Peter Orszag, a "fat-cat banker"? He left the administration to enter the "revolving door" of Wall Street, where he is now a rich banker for Citigroup.

*Those most likely to fly corporate jets are precisely the elite who show up at the president's mega-fundraisers and play golf with him on the world's most exclusive courses — or visit Martha's Vineyard and Vail, where the first family sometimes vacations.* How about the actors, rappers and filmmakers in jeans and baseball caps.  And if we really want more tax revenue, there is far more to be had from the nearly 50% of American households that pay no federal income tax than from the 1% that now pays 37% of all the collected revenue.  In short, a confident, successful society neither idolizes nor demonizes its rich, but instead believes that wealth can be created rather than taken from others. And it *simply judges the better-off by the content of their characters, not the size of their wallets.*

<http://news.investors.com/Article/589975/201110311848/Education-Vs-Bureaucracy.htm?Ntt=education-vs-bureaucracy>                 Waste: How can a 375% education spending increase over four decades result in flat-lined reading, math and science scores? Because all that largesse feeds a bureaucratic monster sheltered from competition.

McCluskey made no bones about federal education spending being bad for kids and bad for the economy — *a big reason being that much of the spending goes not to real teachers or principals but to those holding an array of bureaucratic "support" positions.*

Overall, per-pupil spending has risen from $5,671 in 1970, according to McCluskey, to $12,922 in 2007-08 — a 128% rise — and public school employment has been 10 times the rate of student enrollment. Meanwhile, school district administrative staff per pupil has doubled.

What has all that presumably well-intentioned government education spending and "hiring of teachers" bought the American taxpayer? Stagnant reading, math and science scores for 17-year-olds over the last 40 years, as irrefutably shown in statistics from the National Assessment of Educational Progress, which McCluskey concedes is "a very incomplete measure, but is also Washington's own measuring stick."

<http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article/522949/201003041514/Both-Parties-Bear-Part-Of-Deficit-But-Dems-Is-Quadruple-The-GOPs.aspx>             As Alexander Hamilton wrote, Congress "commands the purse." And both Democrats and Republicans have controlled Congress in recent years, during which time our national debt has skyrocketed.

During the most recent seven years that the Democrats have controlled Congress, their deficits have averaged $619 billion a year, or 5.3% of the gross domestic product (GDP). During the most recent seven years that the Republicans have controlled Congress, their deficits have averaged $93 billion a year, or 0.6% of GDP. Over their entire seven-year spans, the Democrats' deficit spending has totaled $4.3 trillion, the Republicans' $651 billion.

And none of this counts the 2011 budget. If the Democratic Congress passes a budget similar to what President Obama has proposed, it will increase deficits by another $1.3 trillion, or 8.3% of GDP (even with growth in GDP projected at a healthy 4.6%). That's 14 times the average deficit under Republican control of Congress.

The simple truth is this: If you take all of the deficits accumulated over the last seven years in which the Democrats and Republicans, respectively, have controlled Congress (14 years in total), $8.70 out of every $10 in deficit spending has been racked up by a Democratic Congress, $1.30 by a Republican Congress.

President Obama, who according to White House figures will post more deficit spending in his first two years than any other president in U.S. history has posted in eight, said last week that "my administration is doing what families and businesses all across the country are doing during these difficult times — we're tightening our belts."

evidence of belt-tightening in Washington has proven to be quite elusive — especially when the Democratic Party has been in control of the purse strings.

<http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article/568737/201104111831/Tax-The-Rich-Good-Luck-With-That.aspx>                      This year, Congress will spend $3.7 trillion dollars. That turns out to be about $10 billion per day. Can we prey upon the rich to cough up the money?  According to IRS statistics, roughly 2% of U.S. households have an income of $250,000 and above.  All told, households earning $250,000 and above account for 25%, or $1.97 trillion, of the nearly $8 trillion of total household income. If Congress imposed a 100% tax, taking all earnings above $250,000 per year, it would yield the princely sum of $1.4 trillion. That would keep the government running for 141 days, but there's a problem because there are 224 more days left in the year. How about corporate profits to fill the gap? Fortune 500 companies earn nearly $400 billion in profits. Since leftists think profits are little less than theft and greed, Congress might confiscate these ill-gotten gains so that they can be returned to their rightful owners.  Taking corporate profits would keep the government running for another 40 days, but that along with confiscating all income above $250,000 would only get us to the end of June. Congress must search elsewhere.  According to the Forbes 400, America has 400 billionaires with a combined net worth of $1.3 trillion. Congress could confiscate their stocks and bonds, and force them to sell their businesses, yachts, airplanes, mansions and jewelry. The problem is that after fleecing the rich of their income and net worth, and the Fortune 500 corporations of their profits, it would only get us to mid-August.  The fact of the matter is there are not enough rich people to come anywhere close to satisfying Congress' voracious spending appetite. They're going to have to go after the non-rich.

[**http://econfaculty.gmu.edu/wew/articles/10/PoliticiansExploitEconomicIgnorance**](http://econfaculty.gmu.edu/wew/articles/10/PoliticiansExploitEconomicIgnorance)                  Suppose your local politician tells you, as a homeowner, "I'm not going to raise taxes on you! I'm going to raise taxes on your land." You'd probably tell him that he's an idiot because land does not pay taxes; only people pay taxes. That means a tax on your land is a tax on you. You say, "Williams, that's pretty elementary, isn't it?" Not quite.   
            What about the politician who tells us that he's not going to raise taxes on the middle class; instead, he's going to raise corporate income taxes as means to get rich corporations to pay their rightful share of government?            If a tax is levied on a corporation, and if it is to survive, it will have one of three responses, or some combination thereof. One response is to raise the price of its product, so who bears the burden? Another response is to lower dividends; again, who bears the burden? Yet another response is to lay off workers. In each case, it is people, not some legal fiction called a corporation, who bear the burden of the tax.   
    We raise taxes on things we want to discourage, like cigarettes, and we lower taxes on things we want to encourage, like education.  The problem is Obama treats job creators like cigarettes.

<http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article/569126/201104141826/Tax-Days-Forgotten-Lesson.aspx>               the 16th Amendment passed on July 2, 1909, and ratified by the states on Feb. 3, 1913, the original targets of this amendment were the corporations and trusts of the day that had gained too much power at the expense of consumers and workers.  But once ratified, it was immediately utilized to tax individual income. The initial tax rate was 2%. Doesn't that sound quaint compared to today's top rate of 35%?  Like most creations of government, once initiated, the income tax had a strong propensity to grow.  Small businesses are the engine of our economy and drive job growth. They create 64% of all net new jobs and produce 13 times as many patents as larger businesses per worker. Over half of private sector employees work for small businesses, and everyone benefits from their ingenuity and high-quality service.  Small businesses and their workers are especially hard-hit by high taxes. Every dollar of additional tax that a business pays is a dollar that cannot be spent on increased wages, health insurance, retirement savings, investment in equipment and the hiring of new workers.  That's a lot of income that is NOT available for business expansion and job creation.  politicians and governments don't create jobs — businesses do. Government can only maintain an environment that encourages entrepreneurs to invest and hire.  Instead, the Obama Democrat government is producing more spending, more regulation, more taxes, bigger deficits and higher levels of debt. For the working people who run small businesses, Obama, Pelosi, Reid and the Democrat’s policies do not inspire confidence. Its definition of wealthy targets small businesses. Included in this category are 750,000 small businesses that employ 25% of American workers. These are firms that organize as sub-chapter "S" corporations and LLC's and report income and pay taxes at the individual rate.  You don't help the people riding the wagon by punishing the people pulling it. But Obama does.

[**http://townhall.com/columnists/thomassowell/2011/08/16/social\_degeneration/page/full/**](http://townhall.com/columnists/thomassowell/2011/08/16/social_degeneration/page/full/)            Philadelphia's black mayor, Michael A. Nutter, ordered a police crackdown and lashed out at the whole lifestyle of those who did such things.  "Pull up your pants and buy a belt 'cause no one wants to see your underwear or the crack of your butt," he said. "If you walk into somebody's office with your hair uncombed and a pick in the back, and your shoes untied, and your pants half down, tattoos up and down your arms and on your neck, and you wonder why somebody won't hire you? They don't hire you 'cause you look like you're crazy," the mayor said. He added: "You have damaged your own race."

While this might seem like it is just plain common sense, what Mayor Nutter said undermines a whole vision of the world that has brought fame, fortune and power to race hustlers in politics, the media and academia. Any racial disparities in hiring can only be due to racism and discrimination, according to the prevailing vision, which reaches from street corner demagogues to the august chambers of the Supreme Court of the United States.

The prevailing social dogma is that disparities in outcomes between races can only be due to disparities in how these races are treated. In other words, there cannot possibly be any differences in behavior.

The Chinese minority in Malaysia has long been more successful and more prosperous than the Malay majority, just as the Indians in Fiji have long been more successful and more prosperous than the indigenous Fijians. At various places and times throughout history, the same could be said of the Armenians in Turkey, the Lebanese in Sierra Leone, the Parsees in India, the Japanese in Brazil, and numerous others. There are similar disparities within particular racial or ethnic groups. Even this late in history, I have had northern Italians explain to me why they are not like southern Italians. In Australia, Jewish leaders in both Sydney and Melbourne went to great lengths to tell me why and how the Jews are different in these two cities.

In the United States, despite the higher poverty level among blacks than among whites, the poverty rate among black married couples has been in single digits since 1994. The disparities within the black community are huge, both in behavior and in outcomes. Behavior like effort, working smart, working hard, putting time in to learn & study, graduate from high school, graduate from tech school or college, get married then have children can make a big difference.

[**http://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/why-are-we-in-this-debt-fix-its-the-elderly-stupid/2011/07/28/gIQA08LtfI\_story.html**](http://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/why-are-we-in-this-debt-fix-its-the-elderly-stupid/2011/07/28/gIQA08LtfI_story.html)                        In 1960, **national defense** was the government’s main job; it constituted [**52 percent of federal outlays**](http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/omb/budget/fy2012/assets/hist.pdf). In 2011 — even with two wars — it is **20 percent and falling**. Meanwhile, Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid and other retiree programs [**constitute roughly half**](http://www.cbo.gov/ftpdocs/120xx/doc12039/01-26_FY2011Outlook.pdf) of non-interest federal spending.   By now, it’s obvious that we need to rewrite the social contract that, over the past half-century, has **transformed the federal government’s main task into transferring income from workers to retirees.**

This tidal wave of spending means one or all of the following: (a) much higher taxes; (b) the gutting of other government services, from the Weather Service to medical research; (c) a partial and dangerous disarmament; (d) large and unstable deficits.

Obama poses as one brave guy for even broaching “entitlement reform” with fellow Democrats. What he hasn’t done is to ask — in language that is clear and comprehensible to ordinary people — ***whether many healthy, reasonably well-off seniors deserve all the subsidies they receive??***  That would be leadership. Obama is having none of it.  **a mythology holding that, once people hit 65, most become poor.**  We need to ask how much today’s programs constitute a genuine “safety net” to protect the vulnerable (which is good) and how much they simply subsidize retirees’ private pleasures.

Our politicians make perfunctory bows to entitlement reform and consider that they’ve discharged their duty, even if nothing changes. We need to recognize that federal retiree programs often represent middle-class welfare. **Past taxes were never “saved” to pay future benefits.** We need to ask the hard questions: ***Who deserves help and who doesn’t?***

[**http://townhall.com/columnists/thomassowell/2011/08/03/misleading\_words\_part\_ii/page/full/**](http://townhall.com/columnists/thomassowell/2011/08/03/misleading_words_part_ii/page/full/)       Why should the average taxpayer be subsidizing people who have much more wealth than they do?

If we are concerned about those particular elderly people who are in fact poor -- as we are about other people who are genuinely poor, whatever their age might be -- then we can **simply confine our help to those who are poor by some reasonable means test.** It would cost a fraction of what it costs to subsidize everybody who reaches a certain age.  But the political left hates means tests. If government programs were confined to people who were genuinely poor in some meaningful sense, that would shrink the welfare state to a fraction of its current size. The left would lose their human shields.

It is certainly true that the elderly are more likely to have more medical problems and larger medical expenses. But old age is not some unforeseeable misfortune. It is not only foreseeable but inevitable for those who do not die young. It is one thing to keep people from suffering from unforeseeable things beyond their control. **But it is something else to simply subsidize their necessities so that they can spend their money on other things and leave a larger estate to be passed on to their heirs.** People who say they want a government program because "***I don't want to be a burden to my children" apparently think it is all right to be a burden to other people's children.*** Among the runaway spending behind our current national debt problems is the extravagant luxury of buying political rhetoric.

[**http://news.investors.com/Article/568928/201104121859/Its-Date-Night-For-Capitalists-Atlas-Shrugged-Opens-Friday.htm?Ntt=its-date-night**](http://news.investors.com/Article/568928/201104121859/Its-Date-Night-For-Capitalists-Atlas-Shrugged-Opens-Friday.htm?Ntt=its-date-night)           "Atlas Shrugged," Ayn Rand's legendary novel, was published in 1957. Instead of focusing on the old tale of victimized workers and greedy owners, the story turns the tables and shows what happens to the world when the innovators and producers go on strike, when the capitalists and owners turn out the lights and disappear.

The question has been asked on billboards, T-shirts and bumper stickers for half a century: "Who is John Galt?" In "Atlas Shrugged," he's the man who initiates and leads the strike of the producers.

The shrugging comes when men of achievement refuse to accept their unearned guilt, refuse to have their strengths and accomplishments turned into weaknesses and sins.

"All your life, you have heard yourself denounced, not for your faults, but for your greatest virtues," Francisco d'Anconia says to successful industrialist Hank Rearden in the novel. "You have been hated, not for your mistakes, but for your achievements.

[**http://news.investors.com/Article/597353/201201101843/startups-bull-bear-job-growth.htm?Ntt=govt-endangers**](http://news.investors.com/Article/597353/201201101843/startups-bull-bear-job-growth.htm?Ntt=govt-endangers)     a lesser-known animal metaphor economists like to use is "gazelle" — referring to a small business that, like the animal, is known for being lean and swift.  Most small businesses stay small, but not the gazelles; they run fast. Unfortunately, America's gazelles are now under attack, and the hunter is the U.S. government.

Horribly overreaching legislation such as the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002 and the Dodd-Frank Act of 2010 have had the unintended but incredibly ignorant consequence of cutting small businesses, and consequently the gazelles, off from markets and making it increasingly difficult for them to access capital. ***Capital is the gas of business, and a Ferrari without gas is nothing more than an expensive coffee table.***

***There are generally three ways a small business can obtain the capital it needs to grow. First, it can launch itself on the stock market, through an IPO (initial public offering). Second, it can pursue conventional commercial bank lending. And third, it can seek private equity.***

So if you want to kill the gazelles, then the perfect plan would be to make all three of these options overly difficult. **Sarbanes-Oxley**, which was passed after the Enron and WorldCom scandals, has made it incredibly tough for small businesses to go public. **Dodd-Frank**, intended to regulate large banks "too big to fail," acting in tandem with a risk-averse OCC, have made Main Street banks wary of lending to the gazelles. Finally, **the tax code** is pretty harsh on deducting private investment losses, and recent years have seen private investment in the gazelles retreat.

***President Obama's own Council on Jobs and Competitiveness recently wrote the following in its interim report to him:  "Well-intentioned regulations aimed at protecting the public from the misrepresentations of a small number of large companies have unintentionally placed significant burdens on the large number of small companies. As a result, fewer high-growth entrepreneurial companies are going public."***

As the Economist reveals, companies with a valuation of less than $50 million have gone from comprising 80% of IPOs in the 1990s to just 20% today. The federal government's own IPO Task Force October report noted the ***average cost of achieving initial regulatory compliance is $2.5 million, followed by an ongoing average annual compliance cost of $1.5 million.*** That's serious coin.

***Now couple these dismal statistics with the fact that 90% of the jobs in newly public gazelles are created after the IPO, and you get a lot fewer jobs.***

And recently, in a poll by Pepperdine University, 61% of bankers said they had not made a loan they wanted to because of the fear of being second-guessed, and punished, by the feds. Now add Dodd-Frank regulations and you really have Bonnie and Clyde — hitting the Main Street banks that lend to small businesses much harder than the behemoths on Wall Street.

[**http://news.investors.com/Article/590863/201111071901/Its-Very-Easy-To-Tell-Big-Lies-With-Statistics.htm?Ntt=its-very-easy-to-tell-big-lies**](http://news.investors.com/Article/590863/201111071901/Its-Very-Easy-To-Tell-Big-Lies-With-Statistics.htm?Ntt=its-very-easy-to-tell-big-lies)                    ***The relationship between age and income is not hard to understand. It usually takes years to acquire the skills and experience that high-paying jobs require, or to build up a clientele for those in business or the professions.***

But those in the media and in politics who are currently up in arms, denouncing income inequalities, seldom mention age as a factor in those inequalities.  The shrill rhetoric about differences in income proceeds as if they are talking about income inequalities between different classes of people.

***It would be hard to get the public all worked up over the fact that young people just starting out in their careers are not making nearly as much money as their parents or grandparents make.*** Differences in wealth between the young and the old are even greater than differences in income.  Differences in age are just one of the reasons why the insinuations about income and wealth that are thrown around in the media and in politics are often remote from reality.

While the rhetoric is about people, the statistics are almost invariably about abstract income brackets.  It is easier and cheaper to collect statistics about income brackets than it is to follow actual flesh-and-blood people as they move massively from one income bracket to another over the years.

A University of Michigan study showed that most of the working people who were in the bottom 20% of income earners in 1975 were also in the top 40% at some point by 1991.

Only 5% of those in the bottom quintile in 1975 were still there in 1991, while 29% of them were now in the top quintile. People in the media and in politics choose statistics that seem to prove what they want to prove. But ***the rest of us should become aware of what games are being played with numbers.***

[**http://news.investors.com/Article/595412/201112201853/anti-chinese-made-china-economy-jobs-unemployment.htm?Ntt=china-economy-isnt-the-threat**](http://news.investors.com/Article/595412/201112201853/anti-chinese-made-china-economy-jobs-unemployment.htm?Ntt=china-economy-isnt-the-threat)        Let's look at the magnitude of our trade with China. An excellent place to start is a recent publication (8/8/2011) by Galina Hale and Bart Hobijn, two economists at the Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco, titled **"The U.S. Content of 'Made in China.'"**

One of the several questions they ask is: What is the fraction of U.S. consumer spending for goods made in China? Their data sources are the U.S. Census Bureau, the Bureau of Labor Statistics and the Commerce Department's Bureau of Economic Analysis.  Hale and Hobijn find that the vast majority of goods and services sold in the United States are produced here.  In 2010, total imports were about 16 percent of U.S. gross domestic product, and of that, 2.5% came from China.

A total of 88.5% of U.S. consumer spending is on items made in the United States, the bulk of which are domestically produced services — such as medical care, housing, transportation, etc. — which make up about two-thirds of spending.  Chinese goods account for 2.7% of U.S. personal consumption expenditures, about one-quarter of the 11.5% foreign share.

They point out that most of that price goes for transportation in the U.S., rent for the store where they are sold, profits for shareholders of the U.S. retailer, and marketing costs, which include the salaries, wages and benefits paid to the U.S. workers and managers responsible for getting sneakers to consumers.  On average, 55 cents of every dollar spent on goods made in China goes for marketing services produced in the U.S.

Going hand in hand with today's trade demagoguery is talk about decline in U.S. manufacturing.

For the year 2008, the Federal Reserve estimated that the value of U.S. manufacturing output was about $3.7 trillion. If the U.S. manufacturing sector were a separate economy — with its own GDP — it would be tied with Germany as the world's fourth-richest economy.

Today's manufacturing worker is so productive that the value of his average output is $234,220, three times higher than it was in 1980 and twice as high as it was in 1990.  That means more can be produced with fewer workers, resulting in a precipitous fall in manufacturing jobs, from 19.5 million jobs in 1979 to a little more than 10 million today.

The bottom line is that we Americans are allowing ourselves to be suckered into believing that China is the source of our unemployment problems when the true culprit is Congress and the White House with its taxes, regulations, super spending and big government statists mainly Democrats in nature.

<http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article/570140/201104251858/China-As-No-1-Give-Us-A-Break.aspx>                          One has to wonder, too, about a politically motivated IMF "report" that predicts U.S. decline. Our troubles are many, but we've heard all this before.

The fact is, China itself faces formidable hurdles that will make it tough to keep growing at current rates.

But real wealth and productivity are measured on a per-person basis. And based on that, China won't catch the U.S. anytime soon. In fact, it may never catch us.

As the chart shows, China is way behind the U.S. in per-person income. Per-capita GDP in the U.S. is $42,517 in 2005 dollars. In China, it's about $2,802. Even by 2030, China doesn't get close to U.S. per-person output, not even at current growth rates.  This is important, because per-capita GDP is a rough proxy for productivity.

But, as we've noted before, due to its notorious "one-child" policy, China is aging fast. By 2040, its elderly population will exceed the total population of Germany, France, Britain, Italy and Japan today.

Today, things aren't so bad: China has six workers for every elderly retiree, a manageable ratio. But in 2040, that will drop to two workers per retiree. Meanwhile, as of last year just 12% of China's population was over 60, but that will surge to 24% by 2040.

<http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article/516039/200912221838/Escaping-Recession.aspx>                     The study, by economists Alberto Alesina and Silvia Ardagna, is based on the experiences of the 21 most wealthy countries from 1970 to 2007. As such, it represents the most complete and relevant fiscal policy review to date. Its findings are unambiguous:  "Fiscal stimuli based upon tax cuts are more likely to increase growth than those based upon spending increases. ... The current stimulus package in the U.S. is too much tilted in the direction of spending rather than tax cuts." Cutting spending seems to enhance growth.  Government spending doesn't end recessions, but tax and spending cuts do.

<http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article/547207/201009141849/Polarizer-In-Chief.aspx>                        Obama applies two of the late Chicago socialist Saul Alinsky's "Rules for Radicals:" "Pick the target, freeze it, personalize it and polarize it," and "Ridicule the opposition."  Alinsky, who despised American capitalism, also advised community organizers like Obama to co-opt the middle class in their revolution to bring about "economic justice." If they could get the middle class, along with the poor, to envy the rich, they could control the largest voting bloc and seize all the power they'd need.

<http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article/550274/201010131830/A-Plan-To-End-Failed-Federal-Programs.aspx>                   How can failing programs be identified? Congress and presidents of both parties have tried.  The Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) passed during the Clinton administration directed federal agencies to produce strategic plans, annual performance reports and outcome-based measures of performance.  President Bush implemented the Performance Assessment Rating Tool (PART) to rate all federal programs on their effectiveness at delivering results to the public.  These efforts have been worthwhile. GPRA enabled the public to find information about federal agency performance on each agency's Web site. And this information has gotten better over time.  Congress rarely uses the publicly-available information about federal program performance when allocating taxpayer funds.

<http://townhall.com/columnists/thomassowell/2009/01/27/what_are_they_buying>               “Stimulus Plan???”  Using long, drawn-out processes to put money into circulation to meet an emergency is like mailing a letter to the fire department to tell them that your house is on fire.

If you cut taxes tomorrow, we the people would have more money in their next paycheck, and it would probably be spent by the time they got that paycheck, through increased credit card purchases beforehand.  We the people would decide how to spend the money, not our careless, wasteful, hurry up and wait government.  If this is about spending, who should do it--Taxpayers or our wasteful government?

 Whether Buffett recognizes it or not, rich Americans' investments are needed to push the economy ahead. Taking more from them deprives the private sector of the fuel it needs to expand. Government cannot boost growth by increasing taxes.

Nor does giving more money to the government create jobs. All it does is cause the government to spend more. Economists Richard Vedder and Lowell Gallaway found in a well-known study that for each dollar in new taxes raked into the Treasury, Washington increases spending by $1.58.

An updated study by Vedder and Stephen Moore, an economist who writes for the Wall Street Journal's editorial pages, found that for every dollar in new taxes, the government spends $1.17.  Either way, increases in tax revenues won't close the deficit. They will only widen it.

Economist Arnold Kling, in a working paper for George Mason University's Mercatus Center, confirms that higher tax rates won't eliminate the deficit because taxpayers, especially those at the top end, will alter their behavior by shifting income into forms that are taxed at lower rates.

When income tax rates have been cut, the economy has responded with growth. This well-documented phenomenon happened in the 1920s under Calvin Coolidge, the 1960s when Congress passed tax cuts that John Kennedy had asked for, the 1980s when Ronald Reagan promoted supply-side economics and, most recently, during the George W. Bush administration.

The data also show that tax cuts, by creating greater prosperity, increase tax revenues over time. While that may help close the budget deficit, we don't see it as a compelling argument for lower rates. Feeding the federal beast more is not our goal. If you want the deficit cut, spending should be reduced dramatically.

<http://news.investors.com/Article/595681/201112221818/occupy-congress.htm?Ntt=the-000017>

Too much economic power is in too few hands.  It's unfortunate indeed that the Occupiers have so far ignored the country's most egregious concentration of economic power.

In 2010, a tiny cabal of 535 individuals — just 0.00017% of the population — spent $3.5 trillion, or about 23% of the $14.5 trillion U.S. economy. That leaves 77% for the other 99.99983% of us.

The group is the U.S. Congress — whose members have enormous powers to tax and spend. And they've used them to grab economic power well beyond anything found in the private sector.

If we look at the richest 535 private citizens, measured by the Forbes 400 list combined with estimates for the nation's next 135 wealthiest people, we estimate these rich people probably have about $166 billion in spendable income each year. Internal Revenue Service data from the 535 highest tax returns give a somewhat lower figure of $135 billion.

Thus, the members of Congress wield 20 to 25 times more economic power than the same number of richest private citizens in the country. The lawmakers even put the richest 1% to shame. The Occupiers' bogeymen earn a combined $1.3 trillion a year in income, or less than 40% of what Congress spends each year.

If rich people invest in producing products no one wants, they lose money and find themselves replaced in the economic pecking order by people who made wiser choices.  In the past year alone, 18 new members climbed into the Forbes 400, nearly all of them self-made entrepreneurs.

In contrast, Congress takes its money from taxpayers by force and meets regularly to conspire on how to spend these immense sums of money.  Yet there is little guarantee that they will create value with their spending. If their politically motivated "investments" fail, as with Solyndra or the various "bridges to nowhere," taxpayers lose but politicians suffer no consequences. Members of Congress keep their jobs and move on to spend trillions more. But it gets even worse. In addition to commanding vast sums of money, members of Congress also claim the power to regulate everything — our light bulbs, our showerheads, the price we pay for sugar, our health care choices, and on and on and on.

Rich people can't force anybody to stop buying 100-watt incandescent light bulbs as an example, but Congress sure can.  If concentrated income and power in the hands of a few elites is really a problem, we should direct our ire toward the U.S. Capitol, not Wall Street.

[**http://www.usatoday.com/news/opinion/editorials/story/2011-08-30/Editorial-How-Australia-got-its-triple-A-credit-rating-back/50196816/1**](http://www.usatoday.com/news/opinion/editorials/story/2011-08-30/Editorial-How-Australia-got-its-triple-A-credit-rating-back/50196816/1)           [**Its unemployment rate**](http://www.abs.gov.au/ausstats/abs@.nsf/mf/6202.0) is just 5.1%, compared with 9.1% here. But a good bit of Australia's success derives from its commitment to budgetary discipline.

What is most immediately pertinent about Australia is that [**it lost its AAA credit rating**](http://www.theaustralian.com.au/business/news/once-the-aaa-is-lost-its-hard-to-get-back-costello/story-e6frg906-1226110455132) in 1986, suffered a further downgrade in 1989 — and then got back to triple-A in 2003. ([**Canada, Denmark, Finland and Sweden**](http://www.usatoday.com/MONEY/usaedition/2011-08-08-SampP-interview_ST_U.htm) have also lost and regained AAA status.)

The story of how Australia got its fiscal groove back explains why it has fared so much better in recent years than other major industrialized nations. In 1986, it had been running deficits for decades. Many of its industries were heavily regulated.  The government immediately began offering much more austere budgets, notwithstanding the fact that it was controlled by the left-of-center [**Australian Labor Party**](http://content.usatoday.com/topics/topic/Australian+Labor+Party).

Australia has shifted most current workers out of a state-run pension plan like [**Social Security**](http://content.usatoday.com/topics/topic/Legislation+and+Acts/U.S.+Government/Social+Security) and into a compulsory 401(k)-type savings plan. It also, quite fortuitously, steered clear of the types of housing policies prevalent in the USA, where the federal government subsidizes mortgage debt with generous tax breaks and exposes taxpayers to risk through [**Fannie Mae**](http://content.usatoday.com/topics/topic/Organizations/Companies/Banking,+Financial,+Insurance,+Law/Fannie+Mae) and [**Freddie Mac**](http://content.usatoday.com/topics/topic/Organizations/Companies/Banking,+Financial,+Insurance,+Law/Freddie+Mac).  Its liberals do not engage in a denial of the facts, as many Democrats do when they insist that unsustainable spending on entitlement programs must go on unchanged. And its conservatives do not box themselves in with rigid positions and pledges that make it impossible to raise new revenue, the way Republicans here do.

[**http://townhall.com/columnists/walterewilliams/2016/06/15/money-going-to-washington-n2177357?utm\_source=thdaily&utm\_medium=email&utm\_campaign=nl&newsletterad**](http://townhall.com/columnists/walterewilliams/2016/06/15/money-going-to-washington-n2177357?utm_source=thdaily&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=nl&newsletterad)=

(buying favors, bribes) According to a New York Post article (May 22, 2016), in just two years, Hillary Clinton -- former first lady, senator from New York and secretary of state -- collected over $21 million in speaking fees. These fees were paid by Goldman Sachs, Morgan Stanley, Deutsche Bank, Fidelity Investments, UBS, Bank of America and several hedge fund companies.

[**http://townhall.com/columnists/emmetttyrrell/2016/05/19/a-movie-for-clintonites-n2165195?utm\_source=thdaily&utm\_medium=email&utm\_campaign=nl&newsletterad**](http://townhall.com/columnists/emmetttyrrell/2016/05/19/a-movie-for-clintonites-n2165195?utm_source=thdaily&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=nl&newsletterad)=

"***Clinton Cash" is based on Peter Schweizer's book "Clinton Cash***: The Untold Story of How and Why Foreign Governments and Businesses Helped Make Bill and Hillary Rich," which was reviewed in this column a year ago. When seen on the big screen, "Clinton Cash" is even more chilling than the book, for it deals with the astounding amounts of money that were directed to the Clintons while Clinton was secretary of state and Bill was on the speaking circuit. Since leaving their offices at the White House, the Clintons have amassed a fortune last calculated at over $135 million.  The Clinton Foundation now is now worth an astounding $2 billion.  The documentary was about the Clintons' worldwide corruption.

[**http://www.breitbart.com/2016-presidential-race/2016/06/02/hillary-university-bill-clinton-bagged-16-46-million-from-for-profit-college-as-state-dept-funneled-55-million-back/**](http://www.breitbart.com/2016-presidential-race/2016/06/02/hillary-university-bill-clinton-bagged-16-46-million-from-for-profit-college-as-state-dept-funneled-55-million-back/)

In April 2015, Bill Clinton was forced to abruptly resign from his lucrative perch as honorary chancellor of Laureate Education, a for-profit college company. The reason for Clinton’s immediate departure: [***Clinton Cash* revealed**](http://www.breitbart.com/big-government/2015/08/05/bill-clinton-bagged-16-million-from-company-that-received-millions-from-hillarys-state-dept/), and [**Bloomberg confirmed**](http://www.bloomberg.com/politics/articles/2015-07-31/hillary-and-bill-clinton-paid-43-million-in-federal-taxes), that Laureate funneled Bill Clinton $16.46 million over five years while Hillary Clinton’s State Dept. pumped at least $55 million to a group run by Laureate’s founder and chairman, Douglas Becker, a man with [**strong ties**](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Brrz1Tqzhp8) to the Clinton Global Initiative. Laureate has donated between $1 million and $5 million (donations are reported in ranges, not exact amounts) to [**the Clinton Foundation**](http://www.wsj.com/articles/hillarys-for-profit-education-1442273388). Progressive billionaire [**George Soros**](https://www.washingtonpost.com/business/laureate-a-for-profit-education-firm-finds-international-success-with-a-clintons-help/2014/01/16/13f8adde-7ca6-11e3-9556-4a4bf7bcbd84_story.html) is also a Laureate financial backer.  Throughout ten Democratic Party debates, Establishment Media have not asked Hillary Clinton a single question about she and her husband’s for-profit education scam.

[**http://www.wnd.com/2016/06/clinton-for-profit-education-scandal-dwarfs-trump-u/**](http://www.wnd.com/2016/06/clinton-for-profit-education-scandal-dwarfs-trump-u/)

Bill and Hillary Clinton’s attack on Donald Trump over Trump University could invite increased scrutiny of the Clintons’ involvement in a for-profit education scandal in which a company that runs shell colleges paid Bill Clinton $16.5 million to be its pitchman.  While the Clintons were collecting millions, Hillary Clinton’s State Department funneled at least $55 million to a group run by the college company, Laureate Education Inc., according to [**Peter Schweizer’s book “Clinton Cash”**](http://superstore.wnd.com/Clinton-Cash-The-Untold-Story-of-How-and-Why-Foreign-Governments-and-Businesses) as [**Breitbart reported**](http://www.breitbart.com/big-government/2015/08/05/bill-clinton-bagged-16-million-from-company-that-received-millions-from-hillarys-state-dept/).

Clinton abruptly resigned from his post as “honorary chancellor” in April 2015 when the disclosure was publicized.  Documents uncovered by Washington-based watchdog Judicial Watch show Laureate Education paid the former president through a “shell corporation” pass-through account that evidently passed State Department scrutiny while Hillary was secretary of state.  The firm is being sued by several online graduate students for allegedly dishonest practices, and a 2012 U.S Senate report found that more than half of Laureate’s online Walden University revenue went to marketing and profit,” the Miami Herald noted.

[**http://www.marklevinshow.com/2016/06/02/june-2-2016/**](http://www.marklevinshow.com/2016/06/02/june-2-2016/)

why all the focus on Trump University? It would be better to focus on the liberal indoctrination mills like our public schools. Are you happy with quality of education in public schools?

[**http://libertyalliance.com/hillarys-47-friends-ended-dead-mysteriously/**](http://libertyalliance.com/hillarys-47-friends-ended-dead-mysteriously/)

**Funny things always happen to Bill and Hillary Clinton, friends have this nasty habit of turning up dead.**

[**http://www.ncpa.org/pub/the-disappearing-gender-pay-gap**](http://www.ncpa.org/pub/the-disappearing-gender-pay-gap)

***What Is the Wage Gap?*** The “77 cents to the dollar” statistic comes from the U.S. Census Bureau’s 2010 Current Population Survey. As of 2014, the ratio was bumped up to 79.5 percent. The Bureau of Labor Statistics, which calculates things a bit differently, puts the number for 2014 median weekly earnings closer to 83 percent. What these statistics reveal is not what people are being paid for the same work, but **what the average full-time working woman makes against the average full-time working man. It ignores differences in occupation. The average surgeon makes more than the average librarian, so if more men choose to be surgeons and more women choose to be librarians (which they do), this will be reflected in their average wage. This difference is due to their professional choices. It is, in fact, unequal pay for unequal work.** Continue Reading - See more at: http://www.ncpa.org/pub/the-disappearing-gender-pay-gap#sthash.ZwP5jBrH.dpuf

[**http://www.wnd.com/2016/07/study-no-racial-differences-in-cop-shootings/**](http://www.wnd.com/2016/07/study-no-racial-differences-in-cop-shootings/)

Study: 'No racial differences' in cop shootings; 'Black Lives Matter should seek solutions within their own communities'

[**http://townhall.com/columnists/thomassowell/2016/07/12/the-war-on-cops-n2191290?utm\_source=thdaily&utm\_medium=email&utm\_campaign=nl&newsletterad**](http://townhall.com/columnists/thomassowell/2016/07/12/the-war-on-cops-n2191290?utm_source=thdaily&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=nl&newsletterad)=

Chief among those who generate this poisonous atmosphere are career race hustlers like Al Sharpton and racist institutions like the "Black Lives Matter" movement.  The same is true of the more upscale, genteel and sophisticated race panderers, including the President of the United States.  But, to the race hustlers, black lives don't really matter nearly as much as their chance to get publicity, power, money, votes or whatever else serves their own interests.  The mainstream media play a large, and largely irresponsible, role in the creation and maintenance of a poisonous racial atmosphere that has claimed the lives of policemen around the country.  Mob rule is not democracy. It threatens democracy, as it threatens lives -- black or white -- and all lives should matter.

[**http://townhall.com/columnists/dennisprager/2016/07/12/the-new-york-times-and-the-left-have-blood-on-their-hands-n2191460?utm\_source=thdaily&utm\_medium=email&utm\_campaign=nl&newsletterad**](http://townhall.com/columnists/dennisprager/2016/07/12/the-new-york-times-and-the-left-have-blood-on-their-hands-n2191460?utm_source=thdaily&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=nl&newsletterad)=

The New York Times has been in the forefront of the left's hysterical, hate-filled attacks on police officers and whites.

Also appropriately, on the day of the Dallas murders, the Times published two white-hating, police-hating pieces.  And not once does Professor Dyson mention that the Minnesota police officer was Latino.  The New York Times -- as the flagship publication of the left -- and the rest of the left have the blood of police on their hands. And not just cops' blood -- the blood of the blacks murdered because of police reticence to vigorously patrol black areas. What is known as the "Ferguson effect" was created entirely by the left.

[**http://townhall.com/columnists/jackkerwick/2016/07/13/black-lives-matter-or-black-lies-matter-n2192014?utm\_source=thdaily&utm\_medium=email&utm\_campaign=nl&newsletterad**](http://townhall.com/columnists/jackkerwick/2016/07/13/black-lives-matter-or-black-lies-matter-n2192014?utm_source=thdaily&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=nl&newsletterad)=

I believe that the black sheriff of Milwaukee County, David Clarke, had it right when he renamed Black *Lives* Matter “[**Black *Lies* Matter**](http://www.gopusa.com/sheriff-david-clarke-black-lies-matter/).”  Clarke also called on Americans of all races, but particularly white Americans who have been intimidated by threats of “racism” for far too long, to [**“stand up”**](http://www.foxnews.com/opinion/2016/07/11/sheriff-david-clarke-its-time-to-stand-up-to-black-lives-matter.html) to these racial arsonists.  The [**Department of Justice**](https://www.fbi.gov/about-us/cjis/ucr/crime-in-the-u.s/2013/crime-in-the-u.s.-2013/tables/table-43)—*Barack Obama’s* DOJ—recently released numbers on race and crime that may come as a quite unpleasant surprise to those invested in promoting the notion that blacks are perpetual victims of  “white racism.”   In 2013, blacks were *six times* more likely to commit murder than non-blacks (whites, Hispanics, Asians) and *twelve times* more likely to murder someone of *another* race.  For nearly every category of crime, blacks were found to be perpetrators at a higher rate than that of any other racial group.   ***a police officer is more than 18 times more likely to be shot by a black male than an unarmed black male is to be shot by an officer.***

[**http://townhall.com/tipsheet/joepappalardo/2016/07/14/5-facts-black-lives-matter-gets-right-n2192784?utm\_source=thdaily&utm\_medium=email&utm\_campaign=nl&newsletterad**](http://townhall.com/tipsheet/joepappalardo/2016/07/14/5-facts-black-lives-matter-gets-right-n2192784?utm_source=thdaily&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=nl&newsletterad)=

**Black citizens are more likely to be stopped by officers**

Officers in New York City are much more likely to stop black citizens, because more crimes are committed by blacks and as a result police are often given descriptions of black suspects. This leads to more innocent, non-white men being stopped on the street by police. In a [**speech**](https://imprimis.hillsdale.edu/wp-content/uploads/2016/05/Imprimis_April16.pdf)to Hillsdale College students, writer Heather Mac Donald said:  Officers hope against hope that they will receive descriptions of white shooting suspects, but it almost never happens. ***This incidence of crime means that innocent black men have a much higher chance than innocent white men of being stopped by the police because they match the description of a suspect. This is not something the police choose. It is a reality forced on them by the facts of crime.***

She noted that while only 23 percent of New York City's population is black, 75 percent of shootings, 70 percent of robberies, and 66 percent of all violent crimes are committed by blacks.

                Mac Donald calls this the "***Ferguson Effect***." Because of the anti-police rhetoric of Black Lives Matter, police are reluctant to do their jobs when they could be blasted by the public and the media.  In a [**study**](http://www.nber.org/papers/w22399)of Houston, Texas police officers, economist Roland G. Fryer, Jr. discovered that police were 23.8 percent less likely to shoot at black suspects than white suspects. In situations where lethal force may have been justified, blacks had less chance of being shot than whites.

**5. White and black deaths in police shootings are unequal** In this ongoing [**study**](https://www.washingtonpost.com/graphics/national/police-shootings-2016/)by the Washington Post, this year, **46 percent of the 522 people killed by police shootings were white. 25 percent were black.** Hispanic suspects made up 15 percent.

[**http://dailysignal.com/2016/06/02/documents-reveal-operation-fast-and-furious-firearms-used-extensively-by-mexican-drug-cartels/?utm\_source=TDS\_Email&utm\_medium=email&utm\_campaign=CapitolBell&mkt\_tok=eyJpIjoiWlRKaU1XWXpZVGd3TldReiIsInQiOiJzaEVlTTlKMk1VVEpaQ1R6T1BqTGhnbG9HTG55SldmODRpRUZISitLS3QzdE5Yekhvd25rbE15UEdOTHVCNmY4ZUNMNDI4Y2JFejNWSWZaM2VlN3hyYXhCMnN6NEY4WmdNNzZlRkZWOU1MRT0ifQ==**](http://dailysignal.com/2016/06/02/documents-reveal-operation-fast-and-furious-firearms-used-extensively-by-mexican-drug-cartels/?utm_source=TDS_Email&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=CapitolBell&mkt_tok=eyJpIjoiWlRKaU1XWXpZVGd3TldReiIsInQiOiJzaEVlTTlKMk1VVEpaQ1R6T1BqTGhnbG9HTG55SldmODRpRUZISitLS3QzdE5Yekhvd25rbE15UEdOTHVCNmY4ZUNMNDI4Y2JFejNWSWZaM2VlN3hyYXhCMnN6NEY4WmdNNzZlRkZWOU1MRT0ifQ==)

(Obama/Holder lied, people died)  According to Justice Department documents [**obtained**](http://www.judicialwatch.org/press-room/press-releases/judicial-watch-justice-department-documents-reveal-widespread-use-fast-furious-weapons-major-mexican-drug-cartels-linked-least-69-killings/) by conservative watchdog Judicial Watch, ***Fast and Furious*** weapons have seen wide use in Mexican drug cartels, with reports suggesting the ***guns are tied to at least 69 killings***.  Originally conceived by the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives in 2009, Operation Fast and Furious was created to deliberately sell guns to illegal buyers near the Mexican border, which the ATF hoped to trace back to Mexican cartels. The operation passed ***approximately 2,000 guns into the hands of illegal buyers*** while achieving minimal law enforcement ends.  The Justice Department documents recorded only 94 Fast and Furious firearms recovered in Mexico between December 2012 and March 2016. “As the production of documents from the ATF continues,” he said, “we expect to see even further confirmation of ***Obama’s disgraced former Attorney General Eric Holder’s prediction that Fast and Furious guns will be used in crimes for years to come.***”  The Department of Justice did not respond to The Daily Signal’s request for comment.

[**http://www.wnd.com/2016/05/refugees-sending-suitcases-of-welfare-cash-home-to-somalia/**](http://www.wnd.com/2016/05/refugees-sending-suitcases-of-welfare-cash-home-to-somalia/)

Those hauling the cash-laden cases were Somali-Americans who’d come to this country as refugees. They routinely send money back to Somalia. And many of the greenbacks headed to the jihadist-infested East African country come from welfare checks the refugees receive from the U.S. government, compliments of American taxpayers.  Kerns said the first cash shipment rolled through Sea-Tac early last year. A man carrying $750,000 in cash told Customs officials he was transporting the money overseas. Over the next few months couriers carrying as much as $2 million boarded commercial flights at Sea-Tac.

One Seattle hawala sent out $20 million last year, said Kerns.

(Democraps create a crisis and don’t let it go to waste, Fast & Furious III)  Appearing on the popular Fox News program "Hannity" Tuesday evening, former Department of Homeland Security officer Philip Haney said he was directed to delete hundreds of records he had compiled on various Muslim individuals and organizations with ties to terrorist groups.  While on assignment at the National Targeting Center, Haney had obtained valuable information on members of a worldwide Islamic group known as Tablighi Jamaat. However***, in 2012, the (pro Marxist-muslim) Obama State Department effectively shut down the NTC's Tablighi Jamaat Initiative***, demanding intelligence based on religious affiliation be disregarded out of concern for Muslims' civil liberties. In his eye-opening new book [**"See Something, Say Nothing,"**](http://wec.wnd.com/t/218721/2914200/162461/4/) Haney writes that Syed Farook, one of the shooters in the San Bernardino massacre last December, fit the profile of the Tablighi Jamaat members Haney interviewed at the Atlanta airport. He told Hannity that if his Tablighi Jamaat information hadn't been deleted, the DHS may have been able to prevent the San Bernardino attack from happening.   "I believe I have a plausible premise that we could have stopped it by two major ways – either Syed Farook would have been put on the no-fly list and not allowed to travel, or his pending fiance [fellow San Bernardino shooter Tashfeen Malik] would have been denied a visa because of his affiliation with an organization with plausible ties to terrorism," Haney explained to Hannity. What's more, he said last weekend's Orlando nightclub shooting could have been prevented as well if only law enforcement officers had realized the connections between the Islamic Center of Fort Pierce, where Omar Mateen attended, and the San Bernardino mosque where Farook attended.   "There's an entire network of those kinds of mosques across the United States, and I found out a couple days ago that the mosque in Fort Pierce is also related to the same network," Haney revealed.   Sean Hannity could only express horror at what the Obama administration did to hamstring DHS officers like Haney from protecting the country.

[**http://www.wnd.com/2016/06/obama-deliberately-dismantling-americas-defenses/**](http://www.wnd.com/2016/06/obama-deliberately-dismantling-americas-defenses/)

Haney, author of the smash bestseller [**“See Something, Say Nothing,”**](http://superstore.wnd.com/See-Something-Say-Nothing-Hardcover?promocode=MSTORY) once spearheaded investigations at the National Targeting Center, which provides information in real time to Customs and Border Protection agents making decisions about who to let into the country.  He specialized in finding the connections between different groups and individuals before they could strike. However, ***an investigation into a global network known as Tablighi Jamaat was shut down by Hillary Clinton’s State Department and the DHS*** because of fears that it violated the civil rights and civil liberties of Muslims.   Haney pointed to the connections that have been exposed in Orlando as a graphic illustration of how the networks behind each terrorist attack are not difficult to find if you know what you are looking for.  “The father of the shooter was [**the vice-president of the mosque,**](http://www.breitbart.com/national-security/2016/06/14/counterjihad-orlando-terrorists-father-helped-run-radical-mosque-regularly-attended-son/) the Fort Pierce mosque.   Haney also pointed to the problem of Muslims not assimilating into American culture.

“We hear about assimilation as if it’s Americans’ fault that Muslims can’t assimilate or won’t,” he said. “But it’s not our fault. They have to make the choice to assimilate. But ***they are taught it’s an abrogation or violation of Shariah law to assimilate to a non-Islamic culture. They’re not here to assimilate.***  “They came here with an understanding that if they come here and settle in a country and implement Islam and Shariah law that they will receive the same reward in heaven as the men with the gun.

[**http://townhall.com/columnists/calthomas/2016/06/21/logicfree-zone-n2181249?utm\_source=thdaily&utm\_medium=email&utm\_campaign=nl&newsletterad**](http://townhall.com/columnists/calthomas/2016/06/21/logicfree-zone-n2181249?utm_source=thdaily&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=nl&newsletterad)=

(Barack Hussein Obama) Rep. Stephen Lynch (D-MA) recently disclosed that a congressional investigation has found at least 72 employees of the Department of Homeland Security listed on the U.S. terrorist watch list.  ***Name one law that deters someone intent on breaking the law. Murder has been prohibited since the beginning of civilization, but people still murder.  The Orlando shooter, Omar Mateen, reportedly visited Pulse nightclub several times before breaking its gun-free zone policy.*** Why do so many of us find it hard to accept that Islamists want to kill us as part of a strategy to create a worldwide caliphate?  James Kallstrom, a former FBI assistant director, recently spoke with Megyn Kelly on her Fox News show. Kallstrom told Kelly that **orders have come down from the White House that the bureau cannot investigate 'anything to do with Muslims' and agents are "petrified" of losing their jobs if they do.**  ***Islamists could not have a better friend in the White House had they put one of their own there.***

[**http://townhall.com/columnists/monacharen/2016/07/15/factchecking-a-memorial-service-n2192932?utm\_source=thdaily&utm\_medium=email&utm\_campaign=nl&newsletterad**](http://townhall.com/columnists/monacharen/2016/07/15/factchecking-a-memorial-service-n2192932?utm_source=thdaily&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=nl&newsletterad)=

Rates of intermarriage also reveal the decline of racial animus. Stephan Thernstrom, co-author with Abigail Thernstrom of "America in Black and White," notes that rates of intermarriage have risen from 0.7 percent of all black marriages in 1963 to 15.5 percent in 2008.  Too many black children are growing up in chaotic homes and attending miserable schools. Too many fall into crime.

[**http://www.frc.org/get.cfm?i=WA16F38&f=WU16F13**](http://www.frc.org/get.cfm?i=WA16F38&f=WU16F13)

[**With Liberty and Prophylactics for All...**](http://www.frc.org/updatearticle/20160624/liberty-prophylactics)

Twenty-five years into the "if-it-feels-good-do-it-with-a-condom" approach, researchers are finding that "safe" sex is anything but. In fact, the approach championed by everyone from Planned Parenthood to President Obama actually made the situation *worse*. In one of the most important studies in a generation, Notre Dame experts have just finished what they call "The Incidental Fertility Effects of School Condom Distribution Programs" -- a sweeping look at the condom-pushing school programs of the 1990s.  ***In schools that showered kids with free condoms, the teen pregnancy and sexually transmitted disease rates climbed. Turns out, pushing contraception on high schoolers may have advertised sex, but it certainly didn't make it safe.*** Despite what liberals would have you believe, surveys have shown that parents *on both sides of the political spectrum* ([**76 percent of Democrats and 87 percent of Republicans**](http://www.frc.org/admin/washington_updates/washingtonupdate/add/downloads.frc.org/EF/EF16F83.pdf)) ***overwhelmingly prefer lessons on risk avoidance over risk reduction.  Our young people have nothing to gain from this race to intimacy but shorter marriages, deadly infections, premature parenthood, negative self-esteem, and difficulties at school.*** Americans may disagree about condoms, but every study says the same thing about abstinence: the ***kids who practice it don't get diseases and don't get pregnant***

[***http://townhall.com/columnists/johnhawkins/2016/05/03/20-quotes-from-ancient-greek-philosophers-that-liberals-still-dont-understand-n2157165?utm\_source=thdaily&utm\_medium=email&utm\_campaign=nl&newsletterad***](http://townhall.com/columnists/johnhawkins/2016/05/03/20-quotes-from-ancient-greek-philosophers-that-liberals-still-dont-understand-n2157165?utm_source=thdaily&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=nl&newsletterad)***=***

***1) "The real destroyer of the liberties of the people is he who spreads among them bounties, donations and benefits." – Plutarch***

***3) "The worst form of inequality is to try to make unequal things equal." -- Aristotle***

***4) "Justice means minding one's own business and not meddling with other men's concerns." -- Plato***

***5) "Toil is no source of shame; idleness is shame." -- Hesiod***

***6) "Good people do not need laws to tell them to act responsibly, while bad people will find a way around the laws." -- Plato***

***7) "We hang the petty thieves and appoint the great ones to public office." -- Aesop***

***9) "When there is an income tax, the just man will pay more and the unjust less on the same amount of income." -- Plato***

***12) "This and no other is the root from which a tyrant springs; when he first appears he is a protector." -- Plato***

***15) "We regard wealth as something to be properly used, rather than as something to boast about. As for poverty, no one need be ashamed to admit it: the real shame is in not taking practical measures to escape from it." -- Pericles***

***16) "Republics decline into democracies and democracies degenerate into despotisms." -- Aristotle***

***19) "Society is well governed when its people obey the magistrates, and the magistrates obey the law." -- Solon***

***20) "A system of morality which is based on relative emotional values is a mere illusion, a thoroughly vulgar conception which has nothing sound in it and nothing true." -- Socrates***

[***http://dailysignal.com/2016/05/12/what-does-we-the-people-really-mean-a-constitutional-scholar-explains/?utm\_source=TDS\_Email&utm\_medium=email&utm\_campaign=MorningBell&mkt\_tok=eyJpIjoiWlRjME5XVTRNVEZoTW1JMSIsInQiOiJUNHhuVUg4TlFKN0RtM0Z6bFYxNnJCSEYrMlFGK0pDWEhiQkZsVjJGdGtYYzU0MnBZaDBOaE4ySXV2UzRoMktoWnBxamZuRGVuOVhUOWt4UUtkTGpjaERCdFMrNE1nSUk5UHBmNnZLakxJST0ifQ==***](http://dailysignal.com/2016/05/12/what-does-we-the-people-really-mean-a-constitutional-scholar-explains/?utm_source=TDS_Email&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=MorningBell&mkt_tok=eyJpIjoiWlRjME5XVTRNVEZoTW1JMSIsInQiOiJUNHhuVUg4TlFKN0RtM0Z6bFYxNnJCSEYrMlFGK0pDWEhiQkZsVjJGdGtYYzU0MnBZaDBOaE4ySXV2UzRoMktoWnBxamZuRGVuOVhUOWt4UUtkTGpjaERCdFMrNE1nSUk5UHBmNnZLakxJST0ifQ==)

***Do you know the difference between a democracy and a constitutional republic? Georgetown University law professor Randy Barnett wants to clear up any confusion.***

<http://townhall.com/columnists/walterewilliams/2011/02/16/self-inflicted_poverty/page/full/>                      Why is it that Egyptians do well in the U.S. but not Egypt? Let's look at Egypt. According to various reports, about 40 percent of Egypt's 80 million people live on or below the $2 per-day poverty line set by the World Bank. Unemployment is estimated to be twice the official rate pegged at 10 percent.

Much of Egypt's economic problems are directly related to government interference and control that have resulted in weak institutions vital to prosperity.   More than 90 percent of Egyptians hold their property without legal title.

De Soto says, "Without clear legal title to their assets and real estate, in short, these entrepreneurs own what I have called 'dead capital' -- property that cannot be leveraged as collateral for loans, to obtain investment capital, or as security for long-term contractual deals. And so the majority of these Egyptian enterprises remain small and relatively poor."

"To open a small bakery, our investigators found, would take more than 500 days. To get legal title to a vacant piece of land would take more than 10 years of dealing with red tape. To do business in Egypt, an aspiring poor entrepreneur would have to deal with 56 government agencies and repetitive government inspections."

Those countries with greater economic liberty and private property rights tend also to have stronger protections of human rights. And as an important side benefit of that greater economic liberty and human rights protections, their people are wealthier. We need to persuade our fellow man around the globe that liberty is a necessary ingredient for prosperity.

<http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article/522587/201003011837/Chile-Vs-Haiti.aspx>                             Yet unlike Haiti, which lost upwards of 250,000 people in its 7.0 quake Jan. 12, Chile's death toll as of Monday was 725, fewer than even the 1,800 who died in New Orleans' 2005 Katrina.

Unlike poverty-stricken Haiti, Chile has embraced capitalism. Because of this profound reshaping of Chile's economy, a foundation was laid for the creation of wealth in the private sector. Private savings, investment and incomes have all skyrocketed, leading to a larger tax base for government.

That tax base made it possible for government to build infrastructure like highways, high-tech communications and schools. It also helped them afford better earthquake preparation in building codes and disaster education for the public. All of this is possible because of the invisible architecture of the free market — and because Chile's government is honest, accountable and transparent.

Haiti had none of those advantages. Its property rights and legal system in particular rank as the worst in the hemisphere. According to the 2010 Index of Economic Freedom, Haiti ties with Cuba for last place on property rights and ranks below it on corruption.

Chile, meanwhile, ranks among the global top 10.  With no exaggeration, Saturday's earthquake shows that Chile's choice to unabashedly embrace capitalism, made decades ago, has saved thousands of lives.

We hope Haiti's rebuilding will now encourage that country to do the same — however tough it may be.

<http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article/517564/201001081913/How-Data-On-Income-Distribution-Are-Misunderstood-And-Misapplied.aspx>          In terms of statistical categories, it is indeed true that both the amount of income and the proportion of all income received by those in the top 20% bracket have risen over the years, widening the gap between the top and bottom quintiles.

But Internal Revenue Service data following specific individuals over time show that, in terms of people, the incomes of those particular taxpayers who were in the bottom 20% in income in 1996 rose 91% by 2005, while the incomes of those particular taxpayers who were in the top 20% in 1996 rose by only 10% by 2005 — and those in the top 5% and top 1% actually declined.

While it might seem as if both these radically different sets of statistics cannot be true at the same time, what makes them mutually compatible is that flesh-and-blood human beings move from one statistical category to another over time.

When those taxpayers who were initially in the lowest income bracket had their incomes nearly double in a decade, that moved many of them up and out of the bottom quintile — and when those in the top 1% had their incomes cut by about one-fourth, that may well have dropped them out of the top 1%.

Internal Revenue Service data can follow particular individuals over time from their tax returns, which have individual Social Security numbers as identification, while data from the Census Bureau and most other sources follow what happens to statistical categories over time, even though it is not the same individuals in the same categories over the years.   (look at your social security statement and see if your income has changed over the years with your education, hard work and experience)

*Next: How intellectuals misuse data to mislead the public about the gap between "the rich" and "the poor."*

<http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article/540392/201007141854/Jobbing-America.aspx>       This is a key part of the Keynesian idea of a government "multiplier," whereby one dollar given to the government to spend magically turns into $2.50 in the private economy. This simply isn't believable — either in concept or reality.  Referencing the best study done on the multiplier effect so far — by economists Robert Barro and Charles Redlick of Harvard University — de Rugy notes that history not only shows no positive multiplier effect, but a negative one.  That is, a dollar given to the government actually reduces GDP, due to the waste, inefficiency and dead-weight tax loss of removing money from productive uses in the private sector.

<http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/PhotoPopup.aspx?path=ISSjob0715_4100714.png&docId=540392&xmpSource=&width=831&height=545&caption>=              chart of unemployment over the last 10 recessions that shows the miserable failure of Obama, the Democrats and Obamanomics.  We need people who know what they are doing.

<http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article/468522/200902112104/Taxing-The-Truth.aspx>        As history shows, lower taxes, not more government, work best:

The 1920s: When the income tax was established in 1913, the rate was 7%. But it quickly soared, especially for the rich, and by 1918 the top rate was 77%. Unfortunately, coming out of the war the economy was a mess, with prices falling, unemployment soaring and nominal GDP dropping by more than 15% in just one year.

From 1921 to 1925, under Presidents Harding and Coolidge, tax rates were slashed to 25%, and GDP rose at an annual rate of 3.4% in the four years after the tax cuts vs. 2% before. All told, GDP swelled more than 50% during the 1920s.

All this was undone, however, on a bipartisan basis — first by President Hoover, a Republican, then by the Democrat FDR. Hoover boosted the top income tax rate to 63%. Then, FDR took it to 79%, while also doubling the corporate tax to 24%, imposing a Social Security tax of 2% and raising taxes on stocks and dividends, estates, and "excess" profits. Is it any wonder the economy went nowhere in the 1930s?

The 1960s: President Kennedy, a Democrat, believed strongly that lower taxes meant higher growth, and he was soon proven right. Before he was assassinated, JFK proposed cutting top tax rates from a punitive 91% to 70%. In 1965, his cuts were enacted under President Johnson by a Democratic Congress.

Once again, growth took off, along with private investment. Real GNP, which averaged just 2.4% from 1952 to 1960, expanded at 4.5% during the '60s. The expansion that began in 1961 and ended in 1970 was, at the time, the longest ever.

The 1980s: President Reagan took over an economy with a 21% prime interest rate, double-digit unemployment and inflation, slowing productivity and flagging economic growth.  But he too was a big tax cutter. His 25% across-the-board rate cuts snapped the economy out of its funk, creating the longest peacetime expansion ever at the time. During Reagan's two terms real GDP growth averaged 3.2% compared with 2.8% in the preceding eight years.  After stagnating through most of the 1970s, real median family income grew $4,000 under Reagan. Investment boomed, as did the stock market, business creation and innovation. Some 20 million new jobs were created, due to the increased incentives to work, save and invest resulting from lower tax rates.

We all want our new president to succeed. But to do so, he needs to drop the class-warfare rhetoric on taxes and cut them instead. Like Coolidge. Like Kennedy. Like Reagan.

<http://townhall.com/columnists/thomassowell/2010/10/26/brass_oldies>      One of these brass oldies is a phrase that has been a perennial favorite of the left, "tax cuts for the rich." How long ago was this refuted? More than 80 years ago, the "tax cuts for the rich" argument was refuted, both in theory and in practice, by Andrew Mellon, who was Secretary of the Treasury in the 1920s. When Mellon took office, there was a large national debt, the economy was stagnating, and tax rates were high, though the tax revenues were still not enough to cover government expenditures. What was Mellon's prescription for getting out of this mess? A series of major cuts in the tax rates!  more revenue may often be obtained by lower rates."  How can that be? Because taxpayers change their behavior according to what the tax rates are. When tax rates are reduced, investors have incentives to take their money out of tax shelters and put it into the private economy, creating higher returns for themselves and more production in the economy. Andrew Mellon understood this then, even though many in politics and the media seem not to understand it now.Between 1921 and 1929, tax rates in the top brackets were cut from 73 percent to 24 percent. In other words, these were what the left likes to call "tax cuts for the rich."

What happened to federal revenues from income taxes over this same span of time? Income tax revenues rose by more than 30 percent. What happened to the economy? Jobs increased, output rose, the unemployment rate fell and incomes rose. Because economic activity increased, the government received more income tax revenues. In short, these were tax cuts for the economy, even if the left likes to call them "tax cuts for the rich."

John Maynard Keynes pointed out in 1933 that lowering the tax rates can increase tax revenues, if the tax rates are so high as to discourage economic activity.

President John F. Kennedy made the same argument in the 1960s -- and tax revenues increased after the tax rates were cut during his administration. The same thing happened under Ronald Reagan during the 1980s. And it happened again under George W. Bush, whose tax rate cuts are scheduled to expire next January.

The rich actually paid more total taxes, and a higher percentage of all taxes, after the Bush tax rate cuts, because their incomes were rising with the rising economy.

Do the people who keep repeating the catch phrase, "tax cuts for the rich" not know this? Or are they depending on your not knowing it?

<http://townhall.com/columnists/thomassowell/2010/10/27/brass_oldies_part_ii>      Some people point to the history of the Great Depression of the 1930s, when unemployment peaked at 25 percent, as proof that the government cannot simply stand by and do nothing when so many millions of people are out of work.

If we are going to look back at history, we need to make sure the history we look at is accurate. First of all, unemployment never hit 25 percent *until after-- repeat, AFTER--* the federal government intervened in the economy.

What was unemployment like when the federal government first intervened in the economy after the stock market crash of 1929? It was 6.3 percent when that first intervention took place in June 1930-- down from a peak of 9 percent in December 1929, two months after the stock market crash.

Unemployment never hit double digits in any of the 12 months following the stock market crash of 1929. But it hit double digits within 6 months after government intervention-- and unemployment stayed in double digits for the entire remainder of the decade, as the government went in for one intervention after another.  The idea behind these higher tariffs was that reducing our imports of foreign goods would create more jobs for American workers. It sounds plausible, but more than a thousand economists took out newspaper ads, warning that these tariffs would be counterproductive.

That was because other countries would retaliate with their own import restrictions, reducing American exports, thereby destroying American jobs. That is exactly what happened. But there are still people today who repeat the brass oldie that restricting imports will save American jobs.

 A statistical analysis by economists, published in 2004, concluded that federal interventions had prolonged the Great Depression of the 1930s by several years. How long will future research show that current government interventions prolonged the economic crisis we are living through now?

<http://townhall.com/columnists/walterewilliams/2010/12/08/moral_or_immoral_government/page/full/>                        Where does Congress get handout money? One thing for sure, it's not from the Tooth Fairy or Santa Claus nor is it congressmen reaching into their own pockets. The only way for Congress to give one American one dollar is to first, through the tax code, take that dollar from some other American. It must forcibly use one American to serve another American. Forcibly using one person to serve another is one way to describe slavery.

But my question to you is: When congressmen and presidents take their oaths of office, is that oath to uphold and defend good ideas or the U.S. Constitution?

 In 1794, when Congress appropriated $15,000 to assist some French refugees, James Madison, the father of our Constitution, stood on the floor of the House to object, saying, "I cannot undertake to lay my finger on that article of the Constitution which granted a right to Congress of expending, on objects of benevolence, the money of their constituents." Did James Madison miss something in the Constitution?

You might answer, "He forgot the general welfare clause." No, he had that covered, saying, "If Congress can do whatever in their discretion can be done by money, and will promote the General Welfare, the Government is no longer a limited one, possessing enumerated powers, but an indefinite one."

<http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article/504749/200908281827/Government-Isnt-The-Only-Answer-To-Helping-Needy-Get-Health-Care.aspx>                 The Founding Fathers vigorously debated the role of the federal government and defined it in Article I, Section 8 — spelling out the specific duties and obligations of the federal government.

Most notably, these included providing a military for national security, coining money, establishing rules for immigration and citizenship, establishing rules for bankruptcy, setting up a postal system, establishing trademark and copyright rules, and setting up a legal system to resolve disputes.

Charity is not there.

Congress began ignoring its lack of authority for charity before the ink dried on the Constitution. When Congress appropriated $15,000 to assist French refugees in 1792, James Madison — a Founding Father and principal author of the Constitution — wrote:  "I cannot undertake to lay my finger on that article of the Constitution, which granted a right to Congress of expending, on objects of benevolence, the money of their constituents."

What about the Constitution's general welfare clause?

Madison said: "With respect to the words general welfare, I have always regarded them as qualified by the detail of powers (enumerated in the Constitution) connected with them. To take them in a literal and unlimited sense would be a metamorphosis of the Constitution into a character which there is a host of proofs was not contemplated by its creators."

And consider government welfare's effect on people's willingness to give. During the Great Depression — before the social programs that today we accept as givens (Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid) — charitable giving increased dramatically.  After FDR began signing social programs into law, charitable giving continued, but not at the same rate. People felt that they had given at the office and/or that government was handling it.

Government "charity" is simply less efficient than private charity. Every dollar extracted from taxpayers, sent to Washington and then routed to the beneficiary loses about 70 cents in transfer costs — salaries, rent and other expenses.

The Salvation Army, by contrast, spends 2 cents in operating costs, with the remainder going to fundraising and the beneficiary. It achieves this, among other ways, by relying on volunteers to do much of the work.

Three in four families donate to charity, averaging more than 3% of their income, with two-thirds going to secular charities. In total, Americans give more than $300 billion a year — more than the gross domestic product of Finland or Ireland. More than half of families also donate their time.

Absent (unconstitutional) government programs, individuals and charitable organizations can, will and — in many cases — already do provide services to the needy. A limited government — one that taxes only to fulfill its permissible duties — would allow even more disposable time and money.

People-to-people charity is more efficient, less costly, more humane and compassionate, and more likely to inspire change and self-sufficiency in the beneficiary.

[**http://www.forbes.com/sites/robenderle/2011/10/21/steve-jobs-most-mortem-advice-for-google-microsoft-and-president-obama/**](http://www.forbes.com/sites/robenderle/2011/10/21/steve-jobs-most-mortem-advice-for-google-microsoft-and-president-obama/)

[**Jobs actually told Obama he was headed for a one term presidency**](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2011/10/20/steve-jobs-biography-obama_n_1022786.html) recognizing this problem.

Jobs was characteristically blunt. He seemed to have transformed from a liberal into a conservative.

"You're headed for a one-term presidency," ***he told Obama at the start of their meeting, insisting that the administration needed to be more business-friendly. As an example, Jobs described the ease with which companies can build factories in China compared to the United States, where "regulations and unnecessary costs" make it difficult for them.***

***Jobs also criticized America's education system, saying it was "crippled by union work rules," noted Isaacson.*** "Until the teachers' unions were broken, there was almost no hope for education reform." Jobs proposed allowing principals to hire and fire teachers based on merit, that schools stay open until 6 p.m. and that they be open 11 months a year.

[**http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article/474081/200904151806/How-To-Judge-Elected-Representatives.aspx**](http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article/474081/200904151806/How-To-Judge-Elected-Representatives.aspx)**in 1817, South Carolina's John C. Calhoun proposed to use $1.5 million to improve the nation's fledgling system of roads and canals.  But then Calhoun got a real shock.**

**President James Madison drew him aside at a reception at the president's temporary quarters — the Executive Mansion was still being re-constructed from its torching by the British—and told Calhoun point blank that he could not sign the bill on constitutional grounds.  Architect of the Constitution and strict constructionist that he was, Madison felt that such an appropriation for internal improvements was not within the enumerated powers granted Congress.  He also feared that it would dangerously disrupt the partition of powers and the intended focus between the state and federal governments. Madison vetoed the bill one day before his term ended.  Thereafter, federal funding of internal improvements became a hotly debated issue, with Henry Clay's emerging Whig Party being generally in favor and Andrew Jackson's Democrats opposed to such appropriations.**

**In 1846, Jackson's handpicked political heir, James K. Polk, vetoed a then-staggering appropriation of $1,378,450 (the entire national debt was only about $17 million) for forty separate improvement projects to rivers and harbors on the Great Lakes.**

**"Should this bill become law," President Polk prophetically told Congress, "the principle which it establishes will inevitably lead to large and annually increasing appropriations and drains upon the Treasury, for it is not to be doubted that numerous other localities ... will demand, through their representatives in Congress, to be placed on an equal footing with them."  Polk stopped the pork in 1846, but Congress has let the pig loose again and again.**

**A new report from Stanford University economists John Cogan and John Taylor says, "There was little if any net stimulus," resulting from President Obama's $862 billion package. Worse, say the authors, the White House should have known it would not work.  "The irony," they write, "is that basic economic theory and practical experience predicted this would happen."But why the stimulus didn't work is a little more complex.  The authors break down the three kinds of Keynesian stimulus packages.·         In one, government gives money to consumers and hopes they spend it. ·         In another, the federal government directly buys goods and services, ranging from computers to building infrastructure. ·         In the third, government hands money to state and local governments to spend. The $862 billion stimulus package passed by Congress and signed into law by the president tried to do all three things.  Unfortunately, none of them worked, says Investor's Business Daily.·         In the case of money handed over to consumers, "It went to pay down some debt or was simply saved rather than spent on consumption." ·         At the federal level, the stimulus generated just $20 billion in added government purchases, about 3 present of the total spent;of that amount, only $4 billion was spent on infrastructure. ·         Then there were the grants to state and local governments, which were expected to get local economies revving again, but were unsuccessful, according to Cogan and Taylor. Source: "The Economic Stimulus That Wasn't," Investor's Business Daily, January 25, 2011.** [**http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article.aspx?id=560910&p=1**](http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article.aspx?id=560910&p=1)

[**http://townhall.com/columnists/anncoulter/2011/11/23/ill\_gladly\_pay\_you\_tuesday\_for\_a\_tax\_increase\_today/page/full/**](http://townhall.com/columnists/anncoulter/2011/11/23/ill_gladly_pay_you_tuesday_for_a_tax_increase_today/page/full/)            Blitzer cited Ronald Reagan's statement in his autobiography, "An American Life," that he would happily compromise with Democrats if he could get 75 or 80 percent of what he wanted -- implying that today's Republicans were nuttier than Reagan if they'd refuse a dollar in tax hikes for $10 in spending cuts.  Wolf should have kept reading. As Reagan explains a little farther in his autobiography: He did accept tax hikes "in return for (the Democrats') agreement to cut spending by $280 billion," but, Reagan continues, "the Democrats reneged on their pledge and we never got those cuts."

Maybe that's why Republicans won't agree to raise taxes in exchange for Democratic promises to cut spending.  So in 1982, Reagan struck a deal with the Democrats to raise some business and excise taxes -- though not income taxes -- in exchange for $280 billion in spending cuts over the next six years. As Reagan wrote in his diary at the time: "The tax increase is the price we have to pay to get the budget cuts."

But, of course, the Democrats were lying. Instead of cutting $280 billion, they spent an additional $450 billion -- only $140 billion of which went to the Reagan defense buildup that ended the Evil Empire.

Meanwhile, Reagan's tax cuts brought in an extra $375 billion in government revenue in the next six years -- as that amiable, simple-minded dunce Reagan always said they would. His tax cuts funded the entire $140 billion defense buildup, with $235 billion left over.

Even the gusher of revenue brought in by Reagan's tax cuts couldn't pay for all the additional spending piled up by double-crossing Democrats -- more than twice as much as Reagan's spending on defense.  Apparently, Republicans can read the Democrats' record, too. They know that Democrats will promise to cut spending in exchange for tax increases and then screw Republicans on the spending cuts.

[**http://news.investors.com/Article/598978/201201251842/state-of-the-union-left-out-spending-debt.htm?Ntt=a-reasonable-rebuttal**](http://news.investors.com/Article/598978/201201251842/state-of-the-union-left-out-spending-debt.htm?Ntt=a-reasonable-rebuttal)            The nation is in bad shape, Daniels said, and he cited two reasons upfront: persistent unemployment and "an unprecedented explosion of spending, with borrowed money."  Then he made an important connection: "The president's grand experiment in ***trickle-down government*** has held back rather than sped economic recovery."

That is, the lavish public spending that purports to put people back to work costs more jobs than it creates.  ***Such is the path to stagnation and bankruptcy.*** Greece has gone down it already. Italy and some other European countries may soon follow.

[**http://news.investors.com/Article/591171/201111091859/Who-Pays-For-Corporate-Taxes-.htm?Ntt=who-pays-for-corporate-taxes**](http://news.investors.com/Article/591171/201111091859/Who-Pays-For-Corporate-Taxes-.htm?Ntt=who-pays-for-corporate-taxes)    Virginia has a car tax. Does the car pay the tax? In most political jurisdictions, there's a property tax. Does property pay the tax? You say: "Williams, that's lunacy. Neither a car nor property pays taxes. Only flesh-and-blood people pay taxes!"  If a tax is levied on a corporation and if it is to survive, it will have one of several responses or some combination thereof.

One response is to raise the price of its product, so **customers** share part of the burden. Another response is to lower dividends, so **shareholders** share a part of the burden. And a considerable portion of reduced dividend burden falls on ordinary non-rich people.

According to the Tax Foundation, 19% of federal tax returns report dividend income, but 42% of taxpayers older than 65 report dividend income. Therefore, it is people, not some legal fiction called a corporation, who bear the burden of the tax.  Because corporations have these responses to the imposition of a tax, they are merely government tax collectors.

***The largest burden of corporate taxes is borne by workers***. We discover that by asking a simple question, such as: Which workers on a road construction project earn the higher pay — those employed moving dirt with shovels and wheelbarrows or those doing the same atop giant earthmovers?  You'd guess the guys operating the earthmovers, but why? It's not because they're unionized or because construction contractors have a fondness for earthmover operators. It's because those workers have more capital (tools) to work with and are thereby more productive. Higher productivity translates into higher wages.

Tax policies that raise the cost of capital formation — such as capital gains taxes, low depreciation allowances and corporate taxes — reduce capital formation. As a result, workers have less capital, lower productivity and lower wage growth.  In 1980, Joseph Stiglitz, now a Nobel laureate, said that workers share the highest corporate tax burden in the form of lower wages. A number of economic studies, including that of the Congressional Budget Office, show that workers bear anywhere from 45% to 75% of the corporate tax burden.

Adding to the burden is the fact that capital has the kind of mobility that labor doesn't. ***Corporate capital can flee to other countries easily, but workers cannot.***

[**http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article/540548/201007151900/The-White-House-Against-The-World.aspx**](http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article/540548/201007151900/The-White-House-Against-The-World.aspx)                     indeed, the changes have been epic, whether it's the nationalization of health care, the $700 billion in bailouts, the $862 billion in failed stimulus, the takeover of the car industry or attempts to control Wall Street.

What's surprising is that so many others also now find themselves in sharp disagreement and near open revolt with Obama & Co., from businesses to average voters to foreign countries that once revered our new president as some kind of global savior.

Meanwhile, with average Americans angry about the economy, illegal immigration and the incompetence in handling the BP oil spill, among other things, the Tea Party movement has surged.

Despite attempts to tar the Tea Partyers as racists, rednecks and shills for the GOP, Obama's poll readings across all groups have never been weaker. A shock poll by Gallup showed he now trails virtually all would-be contenders in 2012 in head-to-head contests. For many voters, it's already Anybody-But-Obama time.  In recent weeks, business groups that weren't unfriendly to Obama have sounded alarm bells about the damage being done by the administration and its allies in Congress.

The Business Roundtable, a CEO group of major U.S. companies with more than $6 trillion in sales; the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, and the small-business oriented National Federation of Independent Business have all warned that current policies — taxes, regulations, bailouts — are killing economic growth and job creation.

Even among the states, President Obama faces a growing revolt. Some 39 are fighting ObamaCare in court, calling it a violation of their rights. And after the Obama Justice Department tried to politically isolate Arizona over its new immigration law, nine states immediately stepped up to support it.

Foreign nations were among Obama's most ardent supporters following the two terms of George W. Bush, who was mercilessly caricatured overseas as an unlettered cowboy. But this week, EU President Jose Manuel Barroso warned: "The transatlantic relationship is not living up to its potential."

Even Britain, once the staunchest of allies, now talks of an end to the "special relationship." Leaders in Russia, Iran, North Korea, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, the West Bank and Gaza, Venezuela and other countries now routinely snub or reject Obama's policy overtures, and deride him behind his back for being weak.

[**http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article/540126/201007122007/Boot-On-Neck-Policies-Choke-US-Recovery.aspx**](http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article/540126/201007122007/Boot-On-Neck-Policies-Choke-US-Recovery.aspx)                        With the Obama administration being on an anti-business kick, boasting of putting their foot on some business' neck, and the president talking about putting his foot on another part of the anatomy, with Congress coming up with more and more red tape, more mandates and more heavy-handed interventions in businesses, would you risk $26 billion that you might not even be able to get back, much less make any money on the deal?

<http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article/567312/201103281759/Mass-Migration-Of-Americas-Golden-Geese.aspx>                    In short, with blacks, as with other racial or ethnic groups, those with better prospects are leaving the states that are repelling their most productive citizens in general with liberal policies.  Detroit is perhaps the most striking example of a once-thriving city ruined by years of liberal social policies.  Before the ghetto riot of 1967, Detroit's black population had the highest rate of homeownership of any black urban population in the country, and their unemployment rate was just 3.4%. It was not despair that fueled the riot. It was the riot that marked the beginning of the decline of Detroit to its current state of despair.  Detroit's population today is only half of what it once was, and its most productive people have been the ones who fled.

<http://townhall.com/columnists/thomassowell/2009/03/31/a_rookie_president/page/full/>                        He has never had any position of major executive responsibility in any kind of organization where he was personally responsible for the outcome.

Other first-term Presidents have been governors, generals, cabinet members or others in positions of personal responsibility. A few have been senators, like Barack Obama, but usually for longer than Obama, and had not spent half their few years in the senate running for President. Barack Obama is following a long practice among those on the left of being hard on our allies and soft on our enemies.  We can lose some very big games with this rookie.

<http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article/544983/201008251845/CEOs-Speak-Up.aspx>                          comments of Intel CEO Paul Otellini this week at the Technology Policy Institute's Aspen Forum quite enlightening.  "I can tell you definitively that it costs $1 billion more per factory for me to build, equip and operate a semiconductor manufacturing facility in the U.S.," he said. And 90% of that added cost, he said, is due to taxes and regulations that other countries don't have.  Otellini isn't alone in his frustration.  The anger's been building. In June, Ivan Seidenberg, CEO of Verizon Communications and head of the Business Roundtable, warned of a growing anti-business slant in both Congress and the White House. Tax hikes, regulations and constant policy shifts, he said, "harm our ability ... to grow private-sector jobs in the U.S."  Over the next decade, businesses expect soaring government spending, $13 trillion added to our national debt, more regulations, higher taxes on individuals, investors and businesses, and, oh yes, new laws that impose strict new rules on entire industries — as has already happened to Wall Street, the auto industry and health care.

<http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article/519631/201001291905/-Dow-Dives-53.aspx>              Obama’s cabinet has the least private sector experience…Experience does matter!!  Also, the market seems to be saying: "It's the policies, stupid." Specifically, the socialistic policies that the Obama administration keeps pushing  <http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article/543650/201008121904/The-Cabinet-From-Another-World.aspx>

<http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article/517432/201001071906/Congress-Bernanke-Should-Know-That-Regulators-Arenand8217t-Soothsayers.aspx>                 Requiring homebuyers to make a 10% or 20% down payment to purchase a house, for starters, would have had the same effect as margin requirements do for stocks. Buyers wouldn't have had enough cash in hand to keep up with bubble prices; the result would have been a smaller bubble.  And when that bubble burst, homeowners would have had their own money in the game, reducing their incentive to walk away from their homes and bankrupt their lenders.

If regulators had properly governed derivatives such as credit-default swaps, AIG couldn't have made $500 billion in promises without putting consistent cash down and clearing its trades on exchanges.

AIG could have failed, because its failure wouldn't have endangered the rest of the economy. Investors would have known where the risk lay, and known, too, that there was a set level of cash down to cover some losses. They wouldn't have panicked and pulled their funds indiscriminately from the financial system, necessitating a bailout.

if the Fed wasn't thinking about how things like trillions of dollars in mortgages could affect the entire economy, it should have been.

In 2000, the Fed willingly surrendered its power to regulate credit-default swaps.

market discipline. Millions of investors can monitor the financial system better than Washington can, but only if they operate under the credible threat of failure.  Such discipline is lacking now. Lenders know that big or complex financial companies are "too big to fail,

[**http://www.teaparty.org/report-obama-spent-twice-as-much-time-on-vacationgolf-as-economy-23539/**](http://www.teaparty.org/report-obama-spent-twice-as-much-time-on-vacationgolf-as-economy-23539/)

According to a new report by the nonpartisan Government Accountability Institute (GAI), ***President Barack Obama has spent over twice as many hours on vacation and golf (976 hours) as he has in economic meetings of any kind (474.4 hours).***

The report, “Presidential Calendar: A Time-Based Analysis,” used the official White House calendar, Politico’s comprehensive presidential calendar, and media reports through March 31, 2013 to calculate its results.

[***FAX BLAST SPECIAL: Impeach Obama NOW! For Sedition against the Constitution!***](https://payments.paysimple.com/buyer/checkoutformpay/Lz7kEm6HCnCvtD5h2KOzRst2TEg-)

GAI’s findings may actually understate Obama’s recreational hours.

Last year, Obama told CBS News that playing golf is “the only time that for six hours, I’m outside.” But instead of six hours, GAI counted a round of golf as taking just four hours. Likewise, for presidential vacation hours, researchers attributed just six hours of any day of vacation to leisure activity.  “Like most people, presidents still do work while on vacation,” said GAI President Peter Schweizer. “So we really went out of our way to fairly and accurately reflect how the president spends his time.”

[**http://theblacksphere.net/2013/10/america-needs-white-republican-president/**](http://theblacksphere.net/2013/10/america-needs-white-republican-president/)

Liberal blacks have disagreed with most Republican presidents since Eisenhower, yet these blacks are not considered racists. In fact, when blacks had sanity and disagreed with the policies of racist white Democrat presidents, nobody accused black people of being racists.  Fighting for one’s civil rights was not racist then, nor is it racist now. Blacks (and Republicans) were on the side of righteousness, when they disagreed with the racist policies of Andrew Johnson, and adopted by every Democrat president since.  Never has a black person been called racist, because they didn’t like one of the white presidents’ policies. Blacks were just exercising their First Amendment rights to speak freely. Blacks have disagreed with policy positions of about every Republican president in the modern era, including those who have helped them.

Take Reagan for example. Reagan ushered in a veritable Renaissance for blacks, as Fox News [**showcased**](http://www.foxnews.com/opinion/2011/01/17/michael-reagan-ronald-reagan-friend-blacks-obama/).

And the Reagan record?  African-American columnist Joseph Perkins has studied the effects of Reaganomics on black America. He found that, after the Reagan tax cuts gained traction, African-American unemployment fell from 19.5 percent in 1983 to 11.4 percent in 1989. Black-owned businesses saw income rise from $12.4 billion in 1982 to $18.1 billion in 1987—an annual average growth rate of 7.9 percent. The black middle class expanded by one-third during the Reagan years, from 3.6 million to 4.8 million.

Real Politics [**reports**](http://www.realclearpolitics.com/articles/2013/08/23/is_obama_good_for_black_americans_119685.html#ixzz2hENWiwma) Obama’s statistics as follows:  
Read more at [**http://theblacksphere.net/2013/10/america-needs-white-republican-president/#HyFLQbjv2ffAZ6rk.99**](http://theblacksphere.net/2013/10/america-needs-white-republican-president/#HyFLQbjv2ffAZ6rk.99)

[**http://news.investors.com/ibd-editorials-on-the-right/091013-670512-obama-not-as-smart-as-leftist-supporters-believe-he-is.htm?p=full**](http://news.investors.com/ibd-editorials-on-the-right/091013-670512-obama-not-as-smart-as-leftist-supporters-believe-he-is.htm?p=full)

What if the absolute simple truth of the matter is that President Obama is not very smart, and consequently way over his head?  
I would ask for proof of his brilliance. In every instance they came up empty and as a group would embarrassingly default to "He is articulate and gives a great speech."  ***It is not surprising that Obama supporters are unable to supply proof. It is difficult to do so when Obama himself has ordered all of his academic records sealed.*** Again, even supporters of President Obama who declare him "brilliant" because ***he speaks well with the aid of a teleprompter from words written by others*** may admit he is often factually and grammatically challenged without his rhetorical crutch.  Coupled with the question about the president's actual intelligence is the often-quoted concern — even from Obama supporters — that the president is "disengaged and aloof."  Bush was mocked relentlessly by the media for playing golf and being "disengaged." Does Mr. ***Obama playing over four times as much golf as Bush — including during the Syrian crisis — or cards in the final moments of Osama bin Laden mean he is more "disengaged" than Bush or other presidents?***

[**http://news.investors.com/ibd-editorials-viewpoint/091213-670837-democrats-lead-to-military-disaster-in-syria.htm?p=full**](http://news.investors.com/ibd-editorials-viewpoint/091213-670837-democrats-lead-to-military-disaster-in-syria.htm?p=full)

***Republican President Dwight Eisenhower, the supreme commander of the Allied forces in World War II***, said he could conceive of no greater tragedy than the U.S. getting heavily involved in Vietnam. He sent aid to the anti-communist forces, but no troops.  ***Democratic President John F. Kennedy sent troops***. But in short order he was conniving to assassinate South Vietnamese President Ngo Dinh Diem — also known as "our ally in the middle of the war."  JFK's brother, the Democratic attorney general, actually suggested that Americans donate blood to the North Vietnamese — or "our enemy" — as a gesture of goodwill. (Secretary of State John Kerry's bold threat this week of an "unbelievably small" strike against Syria sounds positively macho by comparison.)  ***Kennedy's successor, Democrat Lyndon B. Johnson***, escalated the war in Vietnam in order to prove that Democrats could be trusted with national defense. Which they cannot.  As journalist David Halberstam reported, LBJ would "talk to his closest political aides about the McCarthy days, of how ***DEMOCRAT Truman lost China*** and then the Congress and the White House, and how, by God, Johnson was not going to be the president who lost Vietnam and the Congress and the White House."  LBJ sacrificed tens of thousands of American lives to try to make the Democrats look manly.  Republican Nixon came in and honorably ended the Democrats' disastrous handling of the Vietnam War by signing the Paris Peace Accords in January 1973. In return for the lousy terms we jammed down South Vietnam's throat, America promised that, if the North attacked, the U.S. would resume bombing missions and military aid.  In 1953, President Eisenhower assisted the Shah of Iran in removing loon Mohammad Mossadegh as prime minister. Mossadegh had been elected in the confusion after the assassination of the previous prime minister, whereupon he promptly nationalized Iran's oil fields, driving out the British companies who knew how to run them, thus wiping out Iran's primary source of wealth.

With British and American help, the shah's choice was installed as prime minister, and a friendly government ruled Iran.

Alas, 20 years later, ***DEMOCRAT Jimmy Carter became president. When Islamic fundamentalists staged a revolution in Iran, Carter refused to come to the aid of the shah, a staunch American ally***.

Liberals praised Ayatollah Khomeini to the skies — Carter's U.N. Ambassador Andrew Young, Princeton's Richard Falk and LBJ Attorney General Ramsey Clark all assured us that life would be peachy under him. What could go wrong?

The ayatollah had barely seized power when Islamic lunatics took 52 Americans hostage in Tehran, where they remained for 444 days, until Carter was safely removed from office.  ***By giving Islamic fanatics their first nation-state, DEMOCRAT Jimmy Carter produced the global Islamofascist movement we're still dealing with today.*** For the next eight years, peace and freedom spread throughout the world as President Ronald Reagan destroyed the Soviet Union and restored America's power.  For no purpose whatsoever — no purpose, that is, other than fulfilling Obama's idiotic campaign talking point about **Afg**hanistan being a "war of necessity," contrasted with Iraq, a petty little "war of convenience." (At least Obama's "credibility" on Afghanistan is still intact!)  ***Then Obama threw away our victory in Iraq. By withdrawing every last troop, Obama has allowed al-Qaida and Iran to overrun this one shining example of an Arab democracy. We have American troops stationed in South Korea, Germany, Japan, Belgium, Africa, Norway , Singapore, Qatar, Diego Garcia, even little Djibouti. But no troops for you, Iraq & soon AFG!*** Obama didn't even have to do anything in Iraq! He only had to not remove all our troops.  Instead, Obama flung America's prestige into removing the pro-Western Hosni Mubarak in Egypt.

[**http://www.breitbart.com/Big-Peace/2013/05/06/Source-Only-President-Could-Have-Made-Stand-Down-Call-During-Benghazi-Attack**](http://www.breitbart.com/Big-Peace/2013/05/06/Source-Only-President-Could-Have-Made-Stand-Down-Call-During-Benghazi-Attack)

According to the source, when the attack on the Consulate occurred, ***a specific chain of command*** to gain verbal permission to move special-forces in must have occurred. SOCAFRICA commander Lieutenant Col. Gibson would have contacted a desk officer at the time, asking for that permission.

That desk officer would have called [**Marine Corps Col. George Bristol**](http://www.stripes.com/news/europe/special-operations-in-africa-task-force-changes-commanders-1.211699), then in command of Joint Special Operations Task Force-Trans Sahara. From there, Bristol would have made contact with [**Rear Admiral Brian Losey**](http://www.navy.mil/navydata/bios/navybio.asp?bioID=532), then Commander of Special Operations Command Africa. Losey would have contacted four-star [**General Carter Ham**](http://www.africom.mil/about-the-command/past-leaders/general-carter-f-ham), commander of U.S. AFRICOM at the time.    “Ham answers directly to the President of the United States,” said the source. It wasn’t a low-level bureaucrat making the call, the source adamantly added.

That call may have been made early in the engagement. Both Secretary of Defense Leon Panetta and Joint Chiefs of Staff Chairman Martin Dempsey testified in January that they had no further communication with President Barack Obama after an initial briefing in the early hours of the Benghazi crisis, which continued through the night.

But what about then-Secretary of State Hillary Clinton?  “I have a hard time thinking it was Hillary alone. Hillary may have tried to circumvent the counterterrorism board and deal with this. I think in order for her to tell General Ham, ‘No, you’re not going to get involved,' she would have had to talk to the president. The president would have had to say, ‘No, take your commands from Hillary.’ He would have had said something, because ***Ham does not work for the Department of State; he works directly for the president,” the source explained.***

The lack of clarity surrounding orders given during the Benghazi attacks is ***a stark contrast*** to the clarity projected after the successful ***Osama bin Laden raid in May 2011, when administration officials were keen to attribute responsibility for the orders to the president.***

[***http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2160715/Obamas-Harvard-law-professor-Roberto-Unger-says-defeated-2012.html***](http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2160715/Obamas-Harvard-law-professor-Roberto-Unger-says-defeated-2012.html)

A former professor of Barack Obama has turned against his one-time student and publicly urged voters ***not to re-elect him***.Roberto Unger posted a video on YouTube detailing the reasons why he believes the ***President does not deserve a second term in the White House***.

Mr Unger, a prominent Brazilian politician and an adviser to Obama in 2008, said: ‘President Obama must be defeated in the coming election. ***Obama has failed*** to advance the progressive cause in the United States.’  The 65-year-old academic was in frequent contact with Mr Obama on his Blackberry throughout the last election campaign but has since decided that he no longer agreed with the President’s decisions.

His list of complaints against the President is a long one in the video entitled ‘***Beyond Obama’***.

The esteemed philosopher is scathing of Mr Obama’s plans to salvage America’s ailing economy, saying that ***his policy solely consists of ‘financial confidence (?) and food stamps’***.

[**http://www.investors.com/politics/columnists/robert-j-samuelson-the-mostly-false-globalization-narrative/**](http://www.investors.com/politics/columnists/robert-j-samuelson-the-mostly-false-globalization-narrative/)

(Farming etc)  We can blame manufacturing's problems and dislocations on foreigners and disloyal American multinational firms. If they behaved better, the American economy would improve. There is some truth to this, but it is hardly the whole truth -- as the case of steel shows.  ***Despite plummeting industry employment, U.S. steel production is roughly where it's been for decades***, between 90 million and 120 million tons a year. Imports generally represent 20% to 25% of domestic consumption. True, dozens of steel plants have closed. ***But dozens of more efficient plants have opened. Productivity (aka, efficiency) has increased dramatically.  The industry's largest change of the past half-century is the rise of so-called "mini-mills."*** There are now two dominant ways of making steel.  The traditional way is to start from scratch: Iron ore, limestone and coal are melted to form pig iron; then the pig iron is boiled in a "basic oxygen furnace" to make molten steel, which is formed into various finished products (sheet for cars, beams for construction and the like).  ***Mini-mills are the second way. Their raw material is scrap steel, which is melted in "electric arc furnaces" to make molten steel. The mini-mills have a big cost advantage over the older "vertically integrated" mills.***  From 1970 to 2015, their share of total U.S. steel production went from 15% to 63%, reports the American Iron and Steel Institute, an industry group.  This has huge implications. In a recent study, economists Allan Collard-Wexler of Duke and Jan De Loecker of Princeton found that ***the spread of mini-mills -- with their greater efficiency -- explained most of the industry's job loss.***  Put differently: If there were no foreign trade in steel, most of those jobs would have vanished anyway. The least efficient vertically integrated plants were forced to close. The decisive competition has been domestic, not foreign.  To be sure, steelmakers face legitimate trade issues. There's a global steel glut, mainly because China sharply expanded its industry on the unrealistic assumption of continued strong economic growth.   ***Better manufacturing methods and technologies mean that fewer workers can produce the same output.  This is a good thing, even if it initially involves fewer jobs, because higher productivity promotes higher living standards.* All dynamic economies experience constant disruptions from changing technologies, shifting consumer tastes and inevitable business cycles.**

At first glance, Nordic countries seem to have everything liberals want to see in America: equal income distribution, good health, low levels of poverty, and thriving economies, all co-existing with big welfare states. By copying Nordic policies, many of the American Left hope to transform America to a similar socialist "utopia."  Released by WND Books today, in [***Debunking Utopia: Exposing the Myth of Nordic Socialism***](http://wec.wnd.com/t/278767/2914200/208478/3/), Swedish author Nima Sanandaji explains why this is all wishful thinking. Certainly, some aspects of Nordic welfare states, such as childcare provision, merit the admiration of liberals. But overall, it is a unique ***culture based on hard work, healthy diets, social cohesion and high levels of trust that have made Nordic countries successful.***

[**http://www.futurescience.com/emp/emp-protection.html**](http://www.futurescience.com/emp/emp-protection.html)

Devices such as the *SolidGround* system made by [**Emprimus**](http://www.emprimus.com/) can be installed by local electric companies on all of their large transformers that are connected to very long lines.  Even apartment dwellers on a very low income can have a level of preparedness that will be of significant help.  ***By buying an extra can of reasonably nutritious canned food every week or so, you can build up a food reserve*** -- before you realize it -- that will last you for at least a two or three weeks, and probably much longer.  The most important thing is to store at least a two-week ***supply of drinking water***.  There are many plastic containers of all sizes that can be stored in a closet that won't take up an excessive amount of space.  One kind of convenient containers for water storage in small spaces are the one gallon polypropylene plastic bottles that are used for Arizona brand teas.  Although these plastic containers are marked with the Resin Identification Code *5* or *7*, the Arizona Beverage Company web site states that (at least, as of November 2013 and earlier) the plastic does not contain any bisphenol-A in the container, so they should be safe for long-term water storage.  These one-gallon plastic containers with screw-on plastic lids should be a convenient method of water storage for many people.  Do not keep the water in storage for a very long time without refreshing your supply with new water occasionally, though.  There are larger containers that are made for long-term water storage for those who have the storage space for a longer-term emergency water supply.

[**http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/PhotoPopup.aspx?path=ISSspag0526\_3110525.png&docId=573386&xmpSource=&width=717&height=489&caption**](http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/PhotoPopup.aspx?path=ISSspag0526_3110525.png&docId=573386&xmpSource=&width=717&height=489&caption)=                        This is the slowest "recovery" since the 1930s, if it can be called that (see chart above), as businesses beset by the highest corporate tax burden in the world, the looming job-killing presence of ObamaCare and cap-and-trade by regulation sit on the sidelines, fearing the future.  
  
 [**http://www.ftportfolios.com/Commentary/EconomicResearch/2011/7/11/jobs-versus-government**](http://www.ftportfolios.com/Commentary/EconomicResearch/2011/7/11/jobs-versus-government)   Liberal economists have argued that recoveries from financial crises are always slow. But this covers up the fact that government always grows in a crisis – no matter which party i

[**http://news.investors.com/Article/599237/201201271850/obama-tax-hikes-would-hit-economy.htm?Ntt=taxing-success**](http://news.investors.com/Article/599237/201201271850/obama-tax-hikes-would-hit-economy.htm?Ntt=taxing-success)           Talk about taxing success. Talk about taxing growth.

The capital gains tax is the single most important economywide tax on wealth, risk taking and investment. It's a tax on seed corn. What a brilliant idea, Mr. President.  I remember the late Jack Kemp always saying you can't have successful capitalism without capital.

***compare Obama's 2.4% with the 4.6% post-WWII average recovery rate after 10 quarters. The average is twice as good as Obama. But Obama is only roughly a third of Reagan. That tells you something.*** Why is it "fair" or "equal" to create a lower tide that pulls down all boats?  Voters, do you want more trickle down government poverty, hopelessness and unemployment of Obamanomics or is it time to shed Obama and the Democrats???

[**http://news.investors.com/Article/599291/201201271850/economy-continues-to-underperform-under-obama.htm?Ntt=obamas-lost-12-trillion**](http://news.investors.com/Article/599291/201201271850/economy-continues-to-underperform-under-obama.htm?Ntt=obamas-lost-12-trillion)

Had Obama's recovery been as powerful as Reagan's, the economic pie would be $1.2 trillion bigger today.  And had job growth under Obama kept pace with job growth during the Reagan recovery, there would be 10 million — yes 10 million — more people with jobs today.

So what explains the difference between these two recoveries? First, the 1981-82 recession was almost as long (16 months vs. 18 months), and as deep (unemployment was actually higher, peaking at 10.8% in that earlier recession). But even that didn't stop a rip-roaring comeback.

Second, a recent Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta report found: "U.S. history provides no support for linking low employment and high unemployment in the current recovery with the financial crisis of 2007-2008." Plus, nobody at the time expected the Reagan recovery to be as fast and as powerful as it was.

***So what's different? The presidents' policies.***

[**http://finance.yahoo.com/news/5-myths-obamas-economic-recovery-164300445.html**](http://finance.yahoo.com/news/5-myths-obamas-economic-recovery-164300445.html)       But while the so-called Great Recession lasted 18 months and sent unemployment to 10.1%, the 1981-82 recession was comparable in length and severity. That one lasted 16 months, and pushed unemployment even higher, to 10.8%.

***The difference is that today under the Obama “recovery” unemployment is still at an historically high 8.6%, and it's only that low because the labor force has declined. Real GDP is a mere 0.04% above its pre-recession peak. At the comparable point in the Reagan recovery, unemployment had plunged to 7.3%, while the economy had grown 12% above its pre-recession peak, and was still climbing fast.  It’s the Policies Stupid!*** an Atlanta Federal Reserve paper in October challenged that claim (Recoveries from financial crises are inherently slower.)  After looking at U.S. recessions before and after the Great Depression, it concluded that "U.S. history provides no support for linking low employment and high unemployment in the current recovery with the financial crisis of 2007-2008.

[**http://www.usatoday.com/money/perfi/taxes/story/2011-09-20/buffett-tax-millionaires/50480226/1**](http://www.usatoday.com/money/perfi/taxes/story/2011-09-20/buffett-tax-millionaires/50480226/1) WASHINGTON – [**President Obama**](http://content.usatoday.com/topics/topic/People/Politicians,+Government+Officials,+Strategists/Executive/Barack+Obama) says he wants to make sure millionaires are taxed at higher rates than their secretaries. The data say they already are.

***On average, the wealthiest people in America pay a lot more taxes than the middle class or the poor, according to private and government data. They pay at a higher rate, and as a group, they contribute a much larger share of the overall taxes collected by the federal government.***

The 10% of households with the highest incomes pay more than half of all federal taxes. They pay more than 70% of federal income taxes, according to the

[**http://news.investors.com/Article/583401/201108311840/Investors-Matter.htm**](http://news.investors.com/Article/583401/201108311840/Investors-Matter.htm)         A Rasmussen survey taken Aug. 20 and 21 found that 64% of the country thinks that the most basic goal of businesses is "to create jobs for the overall economy." Only 25% of the 1,000 respondents got the question right and knew the "primary objective of a business" is "to create value for the shareholders."

Americans need jobs. But businesses are not charities established simply to employ people. Businesses have to create wealth for investors or those businesses will cease to exist.  A company that focuses on hiring without concern for profit would soon go out of business. No one goes into business or runs one simply to employ workers. Everyone goes into business or manages one to make money.

Companies exist for one reason: Someone invested in a promising idea. This investment can be from a group of shareholders providing the company's financial capital. Or it can come from a person or a group that invests their savings and labor.  Either way, those investors have to be paid for what they put into a business. If they're not, they have no reason to invest.

Without the profit motive, mankind would be living today just as it had in the beginning. A man's life would be more poor, nasty, brutish and short than it was in the day when Thomas Hobbes wrote those words in the middle of the 17th century.  It's people who have sought profit who have financially backed and created the innovations that define the luxuries, conveniences and health of modern life.

It's important that Americans understand what the primary objective of businesses is. If they don't, then we are doomed to keep electing politicians whose perverse understanding of business is poison to our economy.

[**http://news.investors.com/Article/589282/201110251850/Why-Marriage-Preserves-More-Perfect-Union.htm**](http://news.investors.com/Article/589282/201110251850/Why-Marriage-Preserves-More-Perfect-Union.htm)

Most Americans are unaware that about $700 billion a year of federal taxpayers' money is handed out to nontaxpayers who are allegedly below the poverty line (in addition to $250 billion a year given out by the states).  The No. 1 reason people are below the poverty line is what a group in St. Louis labels "marriage absence." They have created a new organization called the Center for Marriage Policy [**http://marriagepolicy.org/**](http://marriagepolicy.org/)    to design for Missouri a model to deal with this problem. At a conference this October to launch its proposals, founder David Usher said, "Marriage absence is driving America's greatest problems, including out-of-control spending, much of the home-loan foreclosure crisis, poverty, children who fail in school, lack of health care coverage, and personal bankruptcy."

The temptation to cheat is ever present. The Census Bureau just reported that one-quarter of the single moms receiving generous taxpayer cash and benefits actually have a partner living in the house whom she doesn't marry because marriage would cut off her government handouts.

What is now called the hidden welfare state (because so few Americans know about its enormity) is the fastest-growing component of government spending, and this does **not** include Social Security or Medicare payments. The total of these means-tested handouts is greater than what we are paying for our entire public school system and greater than what we spend on national defense.

[**http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article/519631/201001291905/-Dow-Dives-53.aspx**](http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article/519631/201001291905/-Dow-Dives-53.aspx)**Obama’s cabinet has the LEAST private sector experience…WE pay the price for their Inexperience, stupidity and On The Job Training......Experience does matter!!  Also, the market seems to be saying: "It's the policies, stupid." Specifically, the socialistic policies that the Obama administration keeps pushing  <http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article/543650/201008121904/The-Cabinet-From-Another-World.aspx>**

**The deficit he inherited was created by the Congressional Democrats, including Senator Barack Obama,** who did absolutely nothing to oppose the runaway spending. He was one of the biggest of the big spenders. The last time the federal government had a budget surplus, Bill Clinton was president, so it was called "the Clinton surplus." But Republicans controlled the House of Representatives, where all spending bills originate, for the first time in 40 years. It was also the first budget surplus in more than a quarter of a century. The only direct power that any president has that can affect deficits and surpluses is the power to veto spending bills. President Bush did not veto enough spending bills but Senator Obama and his fellow Democrats in control of Congress were the ones who passed the spending bills.

[**http://www.breitbart.com/Big-Government/2012/07/18/Top-Ten-Things-Obama-Has-Not-Released**](http://www.breitbart.com/Big-Government/2012/07/18/Top-Ten-Things-Obama-Has-Not-Released)

As the Obama campaign and the media continue to press Mitt Romney to release more of his tax returns, and to suggest--without a shred of evidence--that he is a “felon,” it is worth noting how much ***critical information Barack Obama has withheld*** from view--both as a candidate in 2008, and during his term in office. Here is a Breitbart News top ten list of things that ***Obama has refused to release*** (a complete list would fill volumes):

10. **State senate papers**. In the 2008 primary, Obama criticized Hillary Clinton for not releasing papers from her eight years time as First Lady--but [**failed to produce**](http://www.startribune.com/templates/Print_This_Story?sid=11824566) any papers from his eight years in Springfield. “[**They could have been thrown out**](http://blogs.suntimes.com/sweet/2007/11/sweet_web_column_obama_on_his.html),” he said.

9. **Academic transcripts**. His supposed academic brilliance was a major selling point, but Obama (by his own admission) was a mediocre student. His GPA at Occidental was a [**B-plus**](http://www.breitbart.com/Big-Journalism/2012/07/09/Review-Maraniss-Barack-Obama-The-Story-Two-Lies-Do-Not-Equal-Truth) at best, and his entering class at Columbia was [**weak**](http://www.breitbart.com/Big-Government/2012/05/22/Exclusive-The-Vetting-Obama-Wrong-on-Columbia-Admission-Transfer-Class-Had-Low-SAT-Scores-Grades). Can he prove his merit?

8. **Book proposal**. Obama’s literary agent claimed he was “[**born in Kenya**](http://www.breitbart.com/Big-Government/2012/05/17/The-Vetting-Barack-Obama-Literary-Agent-1991-Born-in-Kenya-Raised-Indonesia-Hawaii)”--for [**sixteen years**](http://www.breitbart.com/Big-Government/2012/05/17/Obama-pamphlet-in-use-2007). His original book proposal exists--biographer David Maraniss [**refers**](http://www.breitbart.com/Big-Journalism/2012/07/09/Review-Maraniss-Barack-Obama-The-Story-Two-Lies-Do-Not-Equal-Truth) to it--and seems to have embellished other key details of his life. Yet it has never been released.

7. **Medical records**. In 2000, and again (briefly) in 2008, GOP presidential candidate Sen. John McCain [**released**](http://articles.cnn.com/2008-05-22/health/mccain.records_1_vytorin-republican-nominee-form-of-skin-cancer?_s=PM:HEALTH) thousands of pages of his medical records. Obama, who had abused drugs and continued smoking, merely provided a [**one-page doctor’s note**](http://www.swamppolitics.com/news/politics/blog/2008/05/obama_releases_doctors_letter.html).

6. **Small-dollar donors**. In 2008, the McCain campaign [**released**](http://www.cbsnews.com/2100-18563_162-4550728.html) the names of donors who had contributed less than $200, though it was not required to do so. But the Obama campaign refused, amidst [**accusations**](http://hotlineoncall.nationaljournal.com/archives/2008/10/mccain_camp_urg.php) it had accepted illegal foreign contributions.

5. **The Khalidi tape**. In 2003, Obama attended a party for his good friend, the radical Palestinian academic Rashid Khalidi. The event featured incendiary anti-Israel rhetoric. The *LA Times* [**broke the story**](http://articles.latimes.com/2008/apr/10/nation/na-obamamideast10), but has refused to release the tape--and so has Obama.

4. **The real White House guest list**. Touting its transparency, the Obama White House released its guest logs--but [**kept many visits secret**](http://www.iwatchnews.org/2011/04/13/4115/white-house-visitor-logs-riddled-holes), and moved [**meetings with lobbyists**](http://www.nytimes.com/2010/06/25/us/politics/25caribou.html?pagewanted=all) off-site. It also [**refused to confirm**](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/andrewbreitbart/the-white-house-guess-lis_b_839232.html) the identities of visitors like Bertha Lewis of ACORN.

3. **Countless FOIA requests**. The Obama administration has been described as “[**the worst**](http://dyn.politico.com/printstory.cfm?uuid=F2845408-4ECA-4C58-A39F-64257AD30534)” ever in complying with Freedom of Information Act requests for documents. It has also punished whistleblowers like David Walpin, who [**exposed**](http://michellemalkin.com/2009/06/12/obamas-americorps-scandal-and-the-first-ladys-meddling/) cronyism in Americorps.

2. **Health reform negotiations**. Candidate Obama [**promised**](http://www.mcclatchydc.com/2009/07/09/71584/obama-campaign-vow-of-public-debate.html) that health care reform negotiations would be televised on C-SPAN. Instead, there were back-room deals worth millions with lobbyists and legislators--the details of which are [**only beginning to emerge**](http://deadlinelive.info/2012/06/10/backroom-obamacare-deal-with-big-pharma-probed-by-gop/).

1. **Fast and Furious documents**. After months of stonewalling Congress, Attorney General Eric Holder asked President Obama to use executive privilege to conceal thousands of documents related to the deadly scandal--and [**Obama did just that**](http://dailycaller.com/2012/06/20/holder-asks-obama-to-assert-executive-privilege-over-fast-and-furious-documents/).

In addition to the above, Obama and his campaign have lied about many facts about his past--his [**membership in the New Party**](http://www.breitbart.com/Big-Government/2012/06/07/Obama-Caught-Lying-Again-He-WAS-Member-of-New-Party-Says-Kurtz); his [**extensive**](http://www.nationalreview.com/articles/224610/inside-obamas-acorn/stanley-kurtz) connections with ACORN; and his continued relationship with domestic terrorist [**Bill Ayers**](http://www.breitbart.com/Big-Government/2012/06/04/Exclusive-The-Vetting-Senator-Barack-Obama-Attend-Bill-Ayers-Barbecue-July-4-2005/) and [**Jeremiah Wright**](http://www.breitbart.com/Big-Government/2012/05/13/Obama-Wright-Bribe), among other examples. Obama’s own memoir is filled with fabrications. And now he is lying about his opponent’s honorable record in business. He--and the media--have no shame.

[**http://patriotupdate.com/articles/enough-with-irene-what-about-the-missouri-river-floods**](http://patriotupdate.com/articles/enough-with-irene-what-about-the-missouri-river-floods)    East Coast newspapers and TV shows have saturated the media with stories about Irene, few even know about the Southern states that have been devastated by floods and fires with little to no coverage the past year—and even less help from the Obama administration.

            Texas Governor Rick Perry continually asked Washington for help with their wildfires and Tennessee did the same when many of their Nashville neighborhoods were flooded.  Both states got little to no response—but put a hurricane anywhere near Democrat-populated areas and watch them jump!

Hopefully more attention will be given to our neglected Southern states.

*Did you know the lower Missouri River valley has been flooded for the past 5 months?  They are still flooded, bluff to bluff and thousands of homes have been ruined.  Thousands of acres of farmland, destroyed.  People’s ability to make a living has been destroyed.  Small towns along the Missouri, which depend on agriculture, are going to fail.*

*Small towns along the Missouri, which depend on agriculture, are going to fail.  We have been ignored by the national media, except for the brief blurb about our nuclear power plants. FEMA has denied claims.  The Army Corp of Engineers refuses to accept any responsibility even though their policy has caused most of it.*

*President Obama and Janet Napolitano has been on the big wind/rain storm along the East Coast like flies on cow manure.   And we just sit here and take it.*

*To top it off some rather* ***wealthy people are buying destroyed farmland for pennies on the dollar, taking advantage of our crisis.***

 Unfortunately, you know what they say in DC these days about never letting a crisis go to waste…

[View Enlarged Image](http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/PhotoPopup.aspx?path=ISSb0701_2100630.png&docId=539049&xmpSource=&width=408&height=976&caption=)        Obama's Gulf Oil Disaster Timeline as Obama "votes present" .  More On The Job Training for this inexperienced politician.

Delayed Response

 Posted 06/30/2010 06:59 PM ET

Deepwater Disaster: Washington is finally accepting international help for dealing with the crude spill in the Gulf. It took only 70 days of gushing for the White House to agree to the aid. The delay is inexcusable.

On Day 3 of the Katrina wreckage, the Bush administration waived coastal laws, including the Jones Act, to keep oil production and shipping moving.

The White House, widely condemned for its handling of the hurricane's aftermath, didn't go begging for a waiver, wring its hands or consult with union leaders.

Michael Chertoff simply said "I am exercising my discretion and authority to waive the coastwise laws" because "such waivers are necessary in the interest of national defense."

As director of Homeland Security, Chertoff had the authority — and the backing of an executive office that was hustling to prevent the Katrina problems from spreading.

On Wednesday, after as much as 137 million gallons have flowed from the broken BP well, the plodding Obama White House announced it was accepting help from 12 countries — of the 27 that offered — in cleaning up the mess. What took so long?

This White House has been scolded for refusing to waive the Jones Act, a union-backed protectionist law that says the vessels that carry merchandise between U.S. ports must be built and owned by U.S. citizens, and flagged in this country.

But apparently it didn't even need to formally waive the law, at least if Tuesday's events are any indication. All it needed to do was say "yes" to the many offers of assistance.

Three weeks ago, President Obama told Louisiana residents that he couldn't "suck" up the spilled crude "with a straw." No one ever said he should. But he could have used the services of those who, in effect, are able to do just that. The Dutch, masters at handling maritime crises, offered help a mere three days after the spill. Their ships, which are far more advanced than the American vessels, would clean the water while their experts would build sand dikes to protect the land from whatever crude wasn't sopped up.

Even better: The Dutch wouldn't charge for the use of their ships.

Didn't matter. Neither did BP's wishes to have the Dutch brought in. Geert Visser, consul general in Houston for the Netherlands, told the Financial Post that Washington's response to the offer was "Thanks, but no thanks."

Other offers were similarly rejected. Why? Did the White House believe that accepting foreign help would have forced it to waive the Jones Act and fear that the unions that it owes for its 2008 election would be outraged? <http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article/539049/201006301859/Delayed-Response.aspx>

<http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article/533670/201005111806/Drilling-Oil-Execs-For-Answers.aspx>                      It was the failure of this administration to implement a 1994 plan that made the situation far worse.  The Mobile (Ala.) Press-Register has reported that an "In-Situ Burn" plan produced by federal agencies in 1994 called for responding to a major oil spill in the Gulf with the immediate use of what are called fire booms. The water-cooled booms contain surface oil in the early stages of a spill and burn it at the site far from shore

<http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article/537282/201006141903/The-Last-Straw.aspx>           Has anyone seen the FEMA director in the Gulf or on the side of a milk carton? Where is Energy Secretary Chu? Off polishing a solar panel somewhere perhaps? You'd think the administration could have found out there is a company in Maine able to produce 90,000 feet of containment boom a day. Why was the incident commander, Adm. Thad Allen, unaware of that fact until ABC's Jake Tapper made him aware of it in an interview? lack of leadership. Now we have perhaps hundreds of thousands of feet of containment boom sitting idle in a Maine warehouse. On May 2 — six weeks ago — Louisiana Gov. Bobby Jindal requested that federal authorities and BP provide 3 million feet of absorbent boom, 5 million feet of hard boom and 30 "jack-up" barges. Couldn't someone not attending a fundraiser or party at the White House have used Google to find a supplier? Louisiana authorities also asked the Army Corps of Engineers for an emergency permit for a specific plan to dredge and build new barrier islands to keep the oil from shore and wetlands. How hard are those tasks to perform, Mr. President? Put away the teleprompter and pick up the phone.

<http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article/535719/201005271857/Slick-Real-Slick.aspx>                George W. Bush was blamed for the federal response to Katrina, even though the state of Louisiana and the city of New Orleans, both governed by Democrats at the time, dropped the ball as first and primary responders.  (Look at other states like Florida that deal with hurricanes and see how it's supposed to be handled if local governments are run by people who are competent and responsible)

It wasn't Bush who ordered people into the Superdome instead of out of the city. It wasn't Bush who left school buses to sit empty in a flooded parking lot. But this spill is on Obama's watch.

Unlike Katrina, where disputes and confusion quickly arose between federal, state and local authorities over who should have done what and when, the handling of this accident in federal waters was a clear federal responsibility. It was the failure of this administration to implement contingency plans in place since 1994 to contain and burn the oil that made the situation far worse. It's not Bush's fault.

President Obama has just made his second trip to the Gulf in a nearly 40-day span. Bush made something like seven in the same time span while supervising, among other things, the Coast Guard plucking something like 30,000 people off their rooftops to safety.  While the oil washed up in Louisiana marshes, Obama took time out to raise money for the re-election of Barbara "Call Me Senator" Boxer in California.

As the St. Petersburg Times editorialized on the first Friday of the BP blowout: "President Obama met U2's Bono in the Oval Office on Friday when he should have been headed to the Gulf Coast."  While the Gulf Coast faced an ecological disaster, President Obama yukked it up at the White House Correspondent's Dinner. His following Saturday radio address didn't even mention the oil rig explosion in which 11 workers died.

[**http://cfif.org/v/index.php/commentary/54-state-of-affairs/1110-10-big-lies-from-the-obama-administration**](http://cfif.org/v/index.php/commentary/54-state-of-affairs/1110-10-big-lies-from-the-obama-administration)            Obama has asked to be judged on results. As dutiful citizens, we owe it to him to hold him to that standard. Consider these 10 statements, all of which proved to be untrue:  
   
**1. Claim:** "When there is a bill that ends up on my desk as the president, you the public will have five days to look online and find out what's in it before I sign it." – June 22, 2007

**Reality:** Frequently broken, this pledge was ignored in a particularly egregious fashion with ObamaCare. There, Congress passed a massive, 2,000 plus-page piece of legislation late in the evening on Sunday, March 21, 2010. The bill was signed into law on the morning of Tuesday, March 23, 2010.

**2. Claim:** “Muammar Gaddafi has lost the legitimacy to lead and he must leave; those who perpetrate violence against the Libyan people will be held accountable; and the aspirations of the Libyan people for freedom, democracy and dignity must be met.” – March 3, 2011

**Reality:** Nearly six months later, Gaddafi remains in power in Libya, with no resolution to the standoff – nor hope for the Libyan people – in sight.

**3. Claim:** “Today, I'm pledging to cut the deficit we inherited by half by the end of my first term in office.” – February 23, 2009

**Reality:** Average annual budget deficits during Obama’s first term have been about four times larger than the annual deficits “inherited” from George W. Bush, usually running between 1.2 and 1.4 trillion dollars annually.   
   
**4. Claim:** “We’ve got a philosophical difference, which we’ve debated repeatedly, and that is that Senator Clinton believes the only way to achieve universal health care is to force everybody to purchase it. And my belief is, the reason that people don’t have it is not because they don’t want it but because they can’t afford it.” – February 21, 2008  
   
**Reality:** Obama signed health care reform into law on March 23, 2010. The bill included a provision for an “individual mandate” in health care insurance – in other words, a design to “force everybody to purchase it.”  
   
**5. Claim:** “Yesterday, Jim [Owens], the head of Caterpillar, said that if Congress passes our [stimulus] plan, this company will be able to rehire some of the folks who were just laid off, and that's a story I'm confident will be repeated at companies across the country.” – February 12, 2009  
   
**Reality:** "I think realistically no. The truth is we're going to have more layoffs before we start hiring again" – Jim Owens, later in the day on February 12, 2009  
   
**6. Claim:** "I'm going to have all the [health care] negotiations around a big table. We'll have doctors and nurses and hospital administrators. Insurance companies, drug companies -- they'll get a seat at the table, they just won't be able to buy every chair. But what we will do is, we'll have the negotiations televised on C-SPAN, so that people can see who is making arguments on behalf of their constituents, and who are making arguments on behalf of the drug companies or the insurance companies. And so, that approach, I think is what is going to allow people to stay involved in this process." – August 21, 2008  
   
**Reality:** Not only did the health care horse-trading never make it to C-SPAN, the entire process was notable for its lack of transparency, a criticism that almost sank the health care bill’s prospects for passage when sweetheart deals like the so-called “Cornhusker Kickback” and “Louisiana Purchase” were revealed.  
   
**7. Claim:** [On illegal immigration] – “They wanted a fence. Well, that fence now is basically complete” – May 10, 2011  
   
**Reality:** According to the Department of Homeland Security, the double-layer fencing on the U.S.-Mexico border is only five percent complete.   
   
**8. Claim:** " Between 2001 and 2009 [...] a very specific philosophy reigned in Washington: You cut taxes, especially for millionaires and billionaires; you cut regulations for special interests; you cut back on investments in education and clean energy, in research and technology.” – September 22, 2010  
   
**Reality:** During the Bush years, high-cost federal regulations increased by 70 percent, while federal expenditures on education increased by 58 percent in inflation-adjusted dollars.  
   
**9. Claim:** "No system of government can or should be imposed upon one nation by any other.” – June 4, 2009  
   
**Reality:** While the ‘should’ question is a different matter, the ‘can’ is historically illiterate. Systems of government have been imposed on foreign nations throughout recorded human civilization. Perhaps Obama would like to spend some time on the history of Germany and Japan after World War II?  
   
**10. Claim:** “We are five days from fundamentally transforming the United States of America.” – October 30, 2008.  
   
**Reality:** All that changed on Election Day 2008 was the leadership in Washington. Now, after two and half years, it’s become clear that the United States of America is the same way it’s always been – good-natured, freedom-loving and skeptical of too much power in Washington. Washington still spends way beyond its means, represses jobs & increases energy costs with more red tape & regulations.  Inept & inexperienced politicians make legislation that buys them votes and other favors.  Politicians don’t fundamentally change democracies, Mr. Obama. The voters who elect them do. But you’ll probably discover that soon enough.

You Lie!  How true.

<http://townhall.com/columnists/patbuchanan/2009/04/03/should_we_kill_the_fed/page/full/>

The Federal Reserve. "(T)he very people who devised the policies that produced the mess are now posing as the wise public servants who will show us the way out," writes Thomas Woods in "Meltdown."   Already in its sixth week on the New York Times best-seller list, this eminently readable book traces the Fed's role in every financial crisis since this creature was spawned on Jekyl Island in 1913.

The "forgotten depression" of 1920-21 was caused by a huge increase in the money supply for President Wilson's war. When the Fed started to tighten at war's end, production fell 20 percent from mid-1920 to mid-1921, far more than today.   Why did we not read about that depression?

Because the much-maligned Warren Harding refused to intervene. He let businesses and banks fail and prices fall. Hence, the fever quickly broke, and we were off into "the Roaring Twenties."

But, the Fed reverted, expanding the money supply by 55 percent, an average of 7.3 percent a year, not through an expansion of the currency, but through loans to businesses.

Thus, when the Fed tightened in the overheated economy, the Crash came, as the stock market bubble the Fed had created burst.   Herbert Hoover, contrary to the myth that he was a small-government conservative, renounced laissez-faire, raised taxes, launched public works projects, extended emergency loans to failing businesses and lent money to the states for relief programs.

Hoover did what Obama is doing.   Indeed, in 1932, FDR lacerated Hoover for having presided over the "greatest spending administration in peacetime in all of history." His running mate, John Nance Garner, accused Hoover of "leading the country down the path to socialism." And "Cactus Jack" was right.   Terrified of the bogeyman that causes Ben Bernanke sleepless nights -- deflation, falling prices -- FDR ordered crops destroyed, pigs slaughtered, and business cartels to cut production and fix prices.

<http://www.thenewamerican.com/opinion/ralph-reiland/10161-qsoak-the-richq-policies-and-the-great-depression>        In fact, the 1929 stock market crash turned into the long-running Great Depression because the counterproductive soak-the-rich policies of the federal government hadn’t “triumphed” in reversing the downturn.

Franklin Roosevelt’s forceful expansion of federal regulations and confiscatory taxation, his intimidation of “the rich,” encouragement of labor strikes, and half-baked policy experiments discouraged employers from hiring workers and provided strong disincentives to new business investment.

“From 1929 to 1940, from Hoover to Roosevelt, government intervention helped make the Depression Great,” writes Amity Shlaes in *The Forgotten Man: A New History of the Great Depression.* “The trouble, however, was not merely the new policies that were implemented but also the threat of additional, unknown, policies. Fear froze the economy, but that uncertainty itself might have a cost was something the young experimenters simply did not consider.”

Roosevelt’s goal was to enlarge the power of the public sector, increase revenues to the government, and expand the economic controls of the centralized bureaucracy, even for dubious projects.

*As Roosevelt stated it in his second inaugural address, he sought “unimagined power.”*

Those two words alone were enough to turn employers and investors into John Galt, the fictional character in Ayn Rand’s novel *Atlas Shrugged* who, refusing to become a cog in an anti-individualist society, urges the world’s producers, including businessmen, to strike, to withdraw their talent and investments from society in order to bring about the collapse of collectivism.

In their 2010 book, *Return to Prosperity: How America Can Regain Its Superpower Status*, Stephen Moore and Arthur B. Laffer summarize the Roosevelt legislative victories that deepened and lengthened the Great Depression.

Draining investment capital from the system, the top income tax rate was raised from 25 percent to 63 percent in 1932, and then to 79 percent, creating clear disincentives for business expansion and ever-higher obstacles to capital accumulation and new investment.  The corporate tax rate was raised from 11 percent to 12 percent in 1931, 13.75 percent in 1932, and 15 percent in 1936 with a 27 percent surtax on undistributed profits.

The highest inheritance tax rate was more than doubled in 1932, from 20 percent to 45 percent, raised to 60 percent in 1934 and 70 percent in 1935. In 1932, a gift tax was reinstated with a top rate of 33.5 percent, raised to 45 percent in 1934 and 52.5 percent in 1935.  
The result was enduring stagnation, just like the results of the trickle down government of Obamanomics.

<http://news.investors.com/Article/594568/201112121848/gridlock-is-obamas-best-hope.htm?Ntt=gridlock-may-be>            *Back in the 1930s, John Maynard Keynes cautioned President Roosevelt about demonizing and threatening business.* Yet FDR, who said in his famous first inaugural address, "We have nothing to fear but fear itself," *spent the rest of the decade spreading fear to businesses and investors — and wondering why there was still mass unemployment, despite his record-breaking spending.*

Back in 1920-21, there was a sharp economic downturn, with unemployment spiking to 11.7%. President Warren G. Harding did nothing, except for cutting government spending. Yet the economy quickly recovered and annual unemployment rates ranged from a high of 6.7% to a low of 1.8% in the rest of the decade.

In the mid-1940s, as World War II neared its end, Keynesian economists were frantically trying to come up with postwar plans to prevent massive unemployment when 12 million people were to be discharged from the military and millions of civilians would lose their jobs when plants producing military supplies shut down.

Two things prevented those “wonderful” Keynesian plans from being put into operation.

First, the atomic bomb brought the war to an end much sooner than anyone expected.

*Secondly, the Republicans got control of Congress, producing the "do-nothing 80th Congress" that President Harry Truman excoriated during his 1948 election campaign.  (sound familiar)*

In short, plans for vastly expanded government intervention were thwarted — and the "problem" that such intervention was supposed to solve did not materialize. There was a G.I. Bill of Rights for returning military veterans but this was a fraction of what liberal Keynesians had been contemplating.

Anticipating postwar employment problems, former Vice President Henry A. Wallace wrote a book titled "60 Million Jobs," advocating sweeping government interventions to achieve this otherwise unattainable goal.

Wallace's interventions never took place, but the free market created 60 million jobs anyway.

A stock market crash in 1987 broke some records set in 1929.  But Ronald Reagan did nothing, despite howls from the media, and the economy recovered — leading to 20 years of prosperity.

<http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article/502442/200908041840/Revenue-Plunge-Is-Nothing-New.aspx>                    the now-infamous Revenue Act.  At the time, it seemed reasonable. Faced with a downturn in the economy and shriveling revenues, President Hoover worried about a growing budget deficit. He signed tax hikes into law, and FDR, who entered office in 1933, kept them in place.

The bill ravaged the economy by raising the top tax rate on the "rich" from 25% to 63%, doubling the estate tax and boosting corporate taxes by nearly 15%. It also raised sales taxes on all sorts of things that average (read: "nonrich") Americans bought, including gum, soft drinks, gasoline, tires, trucks and jewelry.

Meanwhile, Roosevelt began a series of massive spending projects to "stimulate" the economy — following Hoover's tragic lead. The result? A serious recession turned into the Great Depression, an epic downturn lasting a decade into the early 1940s, when the entire economy was put on a war footing.

Contrast that with what happened just 11 years before. The U.S. had entered a serious recession in 1919, with real GDP (in 2000 dollars) dropping 3.2% and per-person income down 6.4% by 1921. To some, it looked like the start of a depression.  Instead, it lasted just two years. Why? Then-Treasury Secretary Andrew Mellon engineered a series of tax cuts in 1921, 1924, 1926 and 1928.

In response, the economy boomed, with one of the largest increases in both economic activity and entrepreneurship in our nation's history. From 1921 to 1929, real GDP rocketed 45%, while personal incomes climbed 29%. It's not for nothing that the 1920s were called the "Roaring Twenties."

As we've noted repeatedly, this wasn't an isolated instance. Tax cuts in the 1960s, 1980s and even 2000s led to rising economic output. Usually, they led to higher tax revenues.

By contrast, tax hikes almost always bring the opposite — lower output, or even recession, and slowing tax receipts.  It's shocking that today's policymakers, searching desperately for revenues to fund a $10 trillion expansion in federal government, seem willfully ignorant of such clear lessons in our history.

As Mellon put it, "It seems difficult for some to understand that high rates of taxation do not necessarily mean large revenue to the government, and that more revenue may actually be obtained by lower rates." And yet, that's the truth.

<http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article/511396/200911041853/The-Ghosts-Of-38.aspx>       a tale of overreach and hubris — one that holds lessons for today's Democrats.

It starts with a series of far-reaching changes to the economy that FDR initiated after entering office in 1933. They included the Agricultural Adjustment Act, which slapped new taxes on farm goods and forced prices to go higher, and the National Industrial Recovery Act, which created business cartels, set prices and imposed more than 500 "codes" governing prices, wages and workweeks.

Both the NIRA (1935) and AAA (1936) were found unconstitutional. But they set the tone for economic tinkering. In a 2007 landmark study, economists Harold Cole and Lee Ohanian calculated that without these restrictive policies, the economy would have recovered in 1936 — seven years before it actually did recover.  Conditions only got worse in 1936 and 1937. Worried about budget deficits and the possibility of inflation, the Fed contracted the money supply.   As it did, the newly enacted Wagner Act raised labor costs, encouraging many companies to lay off workers. Those who still had jobs noticed that their paychecks had shrunk, as Social Security withholding kicked in for the first time ever.

The Roosevelt Democrats also unveiled a 5% tax on corporate dividends, and raised the top income tax rate to 90% from 63%.

As today, anti-business rhetoric was rife. FDR called businessmen "economic royalists." Congress imposed new taxes on corporate earnings and put more restrictions on the stock market.

By 1937, notes the Mackinac Center for Public Policy's study "Great Myths of the Great Depression," the economy had scored a first — a "depression within a depression." Real output fell in 1938 by 6%, as business investment shrank by a third.

Democrats are following the same playbook today, spending wildly, trying to raise taxes and imposing government control over vast swaths of the U.S. economy. They'd be wise to back off. If they don't, 2010 could turn into a repeat of 1938.

<http://townhall.com/columnists/thomassowell/2010/06/17/a_mind-changing_page/page/full/>   one page that can undermine or destroy a widely-held belief. But there is such a page-- page 77 of the book "Out of Work" by Richard Vedder and Lowell Gallaway.

The widespread belief is that government intervention is the key to getting the country out of a serious economic downturn. The example often cited is President Franklin D. Roosevelt's intervention.  Although the big stock market crash occurred in October 1929, unemployment never reached double digits in any of the next 12 months after that crash. Unemployment peaked at 9 percent, two months after the stock market crashed-- and then began drifting generally downward over the next six months, falling to 6.3 percent by June 1930.

This was what happened in the market, before the federal government decided to "do something."   What the government decided to do in June 1930-- against the advice of literally a thousand economists, who took out newspaper ads warning against it-- was impose higher tariffs, in order to save American jobs by reducing imported goods.

Within six months after this government intervention, unemployment shot up into double digits-- and stayed in double digits in every month throughout the entire remainder of the decade of the 1930s, as the Roosevelt administration expanded federal intervention far beyond what Hoover had started.

If more government regulation of business is the magic answer that so many seem to think it is, the whole history of the 1930s would have been different. An economic study in 2004 concluded that New Deal policies prolonged the Great Depression. But the same story can be found on one page in "Out of Work."

[**http://news.investors.com/article/617318/201207061734/government-stimulus-doesnt-creat-more-jobs.htm?Ntt=keynesian-stimulus-fails-in-theory&p=full**](http://news.investors.com/article/617318/201207061734/government-stimulus-doesnt-creat-more-jobs.htm?Ntt=keynesian-stimulus-fails-in-theory&p=full)

Many Americans believe President Franklin D. Roosevelt's Keynesian conversion beat back the Great Depression. It's pure myth. In the 1930s, the United States doubled government outlays relative to GDP. The unemployment rate didn't fall; instead, it jumped from 3.2% in 1929 to 25.2% in 1933 — an outcome contrary to Keynes' doctrine.  See chart!!  [**http://news.investors.com/photopopup.aspx?path=ISS3c070912.gif&docId=617318&xmpSource=&width=600&height=431&caption**](http://news.investors.com/photopopup.aspx?path=ISS3c070912.gif&docId=617318&xmpSource=&width=600&height=431&caption)=

Only two periods of rising government spending have been associated with falling unemployment — 1917-19 and 1941-45. ***They're both times of major world wars, where millions of adults were plucked from the civilian labor force to serve in the military.***  The share of the adult population on active duty rose from 0.3% in 1916 to 4.5% in 1918 and from 0.5% in 1940 to 12.3% in 1945.

***In short, unemployment fell not because of government spending but because of government conscription — hardly a good way to cure joblessness or evidence of a Keynesian miracle.***

At all other times during this 110-year sweep of U.S. history, government spending and unemployment rates have moved in the same direction. In the 1920s, both trended downward. The Depression decade saw them rise in tandem.  From the 1950s through the 1970s, spending and unemployment moved up and down together. In the 1980s-90s, they had another nicely choreographed decline.

Yet another Democrat Obama Keynesian policy failure hasn't led to a reappraisal of the belief that spending can solve the economy's problems???

[**http://creationrevolution.com/the-kidneys-irreducibly-complex-systems/**](http://creationrevolution.com/the-kidneys-irreducibly-complex-systems/)

**“The Designed Body.” For the complete series,** [**see here**](http://www.evolutionnews.org/continuing_seri/the_designed_bo/)**.**

Stephen Meyer has described the complexity of the cell, the numerous systems within it, and what they must do for it to work properly. But each cell, no matter where it is located, is blind to the overall needs of the body. We have seen this in how the water content and blood levels of sodium, potassium, calcium, and nitrogen (protein) affect organ function and body survival. The common pathway the body uses to control all of these chemical parameters leads through the kidney.  The functioning unit in the kidney is the *nephron*, and there are about one million per kidney. The nephron filters fluid out of the blood by squeezing it through a specialized capillary system called the *glomerulus*. The kidneys filter about 7.5 liters of fluid, with its chemical content, out of circulation per hour. This fluid enters tubules, which wind their way through the tissue of the kidney on its way to becoming urine. ***As the fluid moves along the cells lining, the tubules reabsorb or secrete different chemicals to the degree that is necessary for body survival.***  Evolutionary biologists may be good at describing how kidneys look and imagining how they evolved, but they ***never seem to mention how they work or what they would have had to do to keep the transitional organisms they belonged to alive.***

[**http://creationrevolution.com/brains-unlimited-memory-capacity/**](http://creationrevolution.com/brains-unlimited-memory-capacity/)

Unlike computers, which have fixed registers and RAM, the human brain seems to have almost limitless capacity for short-term memory (the kind you use when actively observing and thinking, as opposed to long-term storage).  For more on how memory works, see [***Nature Communications***](http://www.nature.com/ncomms/2016/160621/ncomms11991/full/ncomms11991.html) about the hippocampus as a “convergence zone, **binding different aspects of an episode** into a **coherent representation**, by **integrating information from multiple brain regions.**”

[**http://creationrevolution.com/mount-rushmore-evidence-of-design/**](http://creationrevolution.com/mount-rushmore-evidence-of-design/)

Sculpted from a massive granite bluff, the memorial covers about five square kilometres (two square miles), with each head measuring about 18 metres (60 feet) from forehead to chin — making the individual sculptures twice as high as the head of the Great Sphinx of Giza in Egypt.  To suggest these images just happened to appear on the granite face as the result of millions of years of rain, wind, and frost would of course be ludicrous. It is impossible to imagine that the recognizable images of four great American leaders could appear by accident, regardless of the time allowed for such a process.

[**http://creationrevolution.com/the-pitch-for-noahs-ark/**](http://creationrevolution.com/the-pitch-for-noahs-ark/)

Anyone who takes the time to consult a reasonable dictionary of geology will find that pitch can be extracted by distilling or heating wood. In fact, prior to the rise of the petroleum and coal industries, this was exactly how pitch was made.

[**http://creation.com/were-dinosaurs-on-noahs-ark?utm\_media=email&utm\_source=infobytes&utm\_content=us&utm\_campaign=emails**](http://creation.com/were-dinosaurs-on-noahs-ark?utm_media=email&utm_source=infobytes&utm_content=us&utm_campaign=emails)

Although there are about 668 names of dinosaurs, there are perhaps only 55 different ‘kinds’ of dinosaurs. Furthermore, not all dinosaurs were huge like the *Brachiosaurus*, and even those dinosaurs on the Ark were probably ‘teenagers’ or young adults. Indeed, dinosaurs were recently discovered to go through a growth spurt, so God could have brought dinosaurs of the right age to start this spurt as soon as they disembarked—see [**Dinosaur growth rates: Problem or solution for creationists?**](http://creation.com/dinosaur-growth-rates-problem-or-solution-for-creationists)

Creationist researcher John Woodmorappe has calculated that ***Noah had on board with him representatives from about 8,000 animal genera (including some now-extinct animals), or around 16,000 individual animals.*** When you realize that horses, zebras, and donkeys are probably descended from the horse-like ‘kind’, Noah did not have to carry two sets of each such animal. Also, dogs, wolves, and coyotes are probably from a single canine ‘kind’, so hundreds of different dogs were not needed.  According to [**Genesis 6:15**](http://biblia.com/bible/esv/Genesis%206.15), the Ark measured 300 x 50 x 30 cubits, which is about 460 x 75 x 44 feet, with a volume of about 1.52 million cubic feet. ***Researchers have shown that this is the equivalent volume of 522 standard railroad stock cars (US)***, ***each of which can hold 240 sheep***. By the way, only 11% of all land animals are larger than a sheep.  Without getting into all the math, ***the 16,000-plus animals would have occupied much less than half the space in the Ark*** (even allowing them some moving-around space).

[**http://www.wnd.com/2016/06/big-hit-renowned-scientists-video-shows-god-exists/**](http://www.wnd.com/2016/06/big-hit-renowned-scientists-video-shows-god-exists/)

Those with questions about faith have flocked to his original video, which asks, “Is God a mathematician?” “I have concluded that we are in a world made by rules created by an intelligence,” he said on the site. “Believe me, everything that we call chance today won’t make sense anymore. To me it is clear that we exist in a plan which is governed by rules that were created, shaped by a universal intelligence and not by chance.”  In his original video, he describes the interaction of math and physics over the years, the study of which has resulted in “string theory”

[**http://creationrevolution.com/nobody-understands-chemist-debunks-evolutionary-viewpoint-on-lifes-origins/**](http://creationrevolution.com/nobody-understands-chemist-debunks-evolutionary-viewpoint-on-lifes-origins/)

Dr. James Tour is a professor of chemistry, computer science, and materials science and nanoengineering at Rice University. He has written over 590 research publications and over 100 patents, and he is the recipient of numerous scientific awards.

[**As previously reported**](http://christiannews.net/2014/10/13/renowned-chemist-says-evolutionists-do-not-understand-the-origin-of-life/), Tour has spoken and written extensively about current limitations in various scientific fields. Even the ***theory of evolution, which has been largely embraced by the secular scientific community, fails to account for the complexity of life, Tour says.*** In his most recent paper, a 12,000-word essay titled “[**Animadversions of a Synthetic Chemist**](http://inference-review.com/article/animadversions-of-a-synthetic-chemist),” Tour tackles a question that has puzzled scientists for centuries: Where did life come from? The essay was published in the most recent edition of Inference: International Review of Science.  ***“Life requires carbohydrates, nucleic acids, lipids, and proteins,” Tour wrote in his essay’s opening lines. “What is the chemistry behind their origin?***

[**http://creationrevolution.com/new-dna-study-confirms-noah/**](http://creationrevolution.com/new-dna-study-confirms-noah/)

A new analysis of human mitochondrial DNA exposes two new evidences that validate the biblical beginnings of mankind.

Mitochondrial DNA comes from mothers. Mother egg cells transmit their mitochondrial DNA (mtDNA) into the cellular mitochondria of every child born. Bible-believing molecular biologist Dr. Nathaniel Jeanson downloaded publically available human mitochondrial genome sequence data to do exactly that. Publishing in*Answers Research Journal*, his results show that the number of today’s mtDNA differences exactly matches the number predicted by the Bible’s 6,000 years of human history.1 Mitochondrial DNA from around the world shows no trace of the 200,000 or so years’ worth of mutations that the evolution model predicts.  The center of the diagram shows three main trunks. Each reflects a specific mtDNA sequence with only a handful of differences from the other two.  Could these three trunks represent the unique mtDNA from the wives of Shem, Ham, and Japheth?

[**http://creationrevolution.com/what-it-takes-to-build-a-nuclear-membrane/**](http://creationrevolution.com/what-it-takes-to-build-a-nuclear-membrane/)

In the cartoon depictions of cells we often see, the nucleus looks about as complicated as a balloon. It’s drawn as a thin membrane bubble surrounding the chromosomes. The balloon pops when the cell divides, then the cell blows new balloons around each daughter cell’s DNA. What could be simpler?  ***Authors in*** [***Current Biology***](http://www.cell.com/current-biology/fulltext/S0960-9822%2816%2930002-1) ***give a reality check by describing in detail the structure of the nuclear membrane. It’s mind-boggling how sophisticated it is*** — and they don’t even get into the most mind-boggling part: the nuclear pore complexes that let cargo in and out. (At the risk of redlining the boggle-meter, we’ll save that subject for another time.)  In their “Quick Guide to Lamins,” Wei Xie and Brian Burke introduce us to the complexities of the critically important proteins that make up the nuclear membrane.

[**http://creationrevolution.com/five-atheist-miracles/**](http://creationrevolution.com/five-atheist-miracles/)

Atheists believe that *everything* came about by purely material processes—the universe, life, mind, and morality. However, do they have a rational, logical basis for this belief?  They actually believe in miracles without any reasonable cause for the miracles. That is, they believe in *magic*, or the occurrence of things without a sufficient cause.  Nothing became everything with no cause whatsoever. Magic!  *“The universe burst into something from absolutely nothing—zero, nada. And as it got bigger, it became filled with even more stuff that came from absolutely nowhere. How is that possible?  However, these three associated miracles must have happened or the big bang does not work because of the ‘*[***horizon problem***](http://creation.com/light-travel-time-a-problem-for-the-big-bang)*’. More magic!  Cosmologists invented ‘dark matter’, which is invisible undetectable ‘stuff’ that just happens to generate a lot of gravitational attraction just where it is needed. More magic!9*