

December 20, 2010

In literally hundreds of conversations, it has become my solid view that either I am going out of my mind, or this world –due to its hard shift to liberalism and the exploding appearance of social-communist progressives - has been falling off the cliff like. Evidence includes the formation of the European Union (EU), several decades worth of US efforts to send industries, jobs, technology and factories away, the insane US energy and immigration policies, the way the recent healthcare law was “achieved” (if you want to call it an achievement), the fact that no one talks about the unions becoming the cancer of Western society, the rampant spread of the environmental movement, the UN which had a long time ago positioned itself somewhere between a bad joke and a psychiatric ward run by inmates, and the global foreign and military policies to name a few. I will get to each and some more.

As a summary, I argue that the self generating spiral (Globalization is breeding liberals, who in turn support globalization) is getting to a point where the “Western” world is getting closer to a total collapse. I also argue that Globalization is an absolutely vital component to advance the liberal agenda. As much as Globalization is about “bringing people down to the lowest common denominator” the same philosophy is extrapolated and applied on larger blocks. Both sides of the Atlantic give us examples. The formation of the EU (for example, bringing Germany and Bulgaria into the same camp, or Germany and Portugal onto the same monetary platform, the Euro), and the creation of the US Department of Education in 1980 that took the rights of the individual states away, creating an educational disaster in the US. Borders, entry visas, import/export tax regulations, individual states rights in education, healthcare and similar concepts allow “individualism” and “exceptionalism” at the individual as well as state level, which are the polar opposite of the “lowest common denominator” concept and they also separate the various liberal crowds from each other. Liberals (run by social-communist progressives) must have the borders and other regulatory measures eliminated. They also need a “central government” to “effectively run” things. The EU government in Brussels is the antithesis to anything that is “effective”, but the liberals needed it. The US did not need the Department of Education nor Obama’s healthcare, but liberals and progressives could not have possibly gotten close to their agenda without them.

Where do I start? How do I weave all these together into one coherent matrix? Stay with me, I will try. I am asking you that while reading this Paper, keep your eye on this ball:

By definition, globalization is all about “equalization” - bringing everyone to the lowest common denominator. By extension, globalization is a socialist agenda. The only way to equalize everyone: the flow of wealth must come from the “haves” and flow toward the “have-nots”. Thirty years ago, the nation with the most wealth ranging from education, military, financing, advanced democracy, to industry, research, agriculture, etc. was the USA. Therefore “globalization” could not have (and indeed has not) meant anything but to reduce the wealth of the US system and “spread the wealth” among the “have-nots” within the US and around the world. Globalization therefore in large part is to “cut the US down to size”. I separated this Paper into two main modules: liberals and social-communist progressive activities 1) in the US, and 2) in Europe.

Several components of the modules have cross-correlation with each other; some of them are stand-alone. The common element of all is to achieve the lowest common denominator and break down individual rights, achievement-based evaluation, responsibility, discipline and exceptionalism - components that throughout history helped nations thrive and rebuild after two

December 20, 2010

world wars. Liberals and their social-communist progressive brothers (more times than not: handlers) have been working over the last 100+ years to replace all these with a model that has failed every single time, at every single place it was ever tried. This Paper is an examination of a list of fact-based topics and questions few people talk about.

It is not going to be an easy read, because the horizontal spectrum of various political, economical and social areas have been infested by liberals, and social-communist progressives, and each area they have penetrated is very deep. In this Paper, I am not (except in relevant areas) going to talk about the social-communist progressives, because this Paper is not about them.

Most of all, I write this Paper to generate questions, thoughts and conversations. If this Paper generates a half a dozen “I’ve never thought about this”, or “It is an interesting approach” in you, then I was successful writing it whether you agreed with me or not. Just keep your eye on the ball: throughout this Paper, identify the ever widening gap between “exceptionalism” and “common denominators”. That is what liberals do not want you to do. I hope you will enjoy it.

THE LIBERAL CROWD

Who is a liberal and what is the problem with them?

I guess this is the time to argue with a few popular definitions on the right: people have been defining liberals, as “used to call themselves progressives” then (after they trashed the label), “liberals” again; I do not think so. To me, the liberal spectrum has one fundamental, core concept: live in a self-defined paradigm that has no relationship with reality. They base their entire thinking on an ideology that disregards historical data and facts; no matter what, they are right and everyone else is wrong. There are several ways I define liberals, so let me share two that I regard as most descriptive with you:

a) “A liberal always knows what the desirable objective is, but never has the inner strength and conviction to take a hardship to get there”. I would like to use the fast decline of the global education system as an example, which is at catastrophic depths in the US. Liberals would be the first to agree that a strong, successful education system is the fundamental component of any society. This is the “desirable objective” part. Teaching and raising children requires discipline. This is the “hardship to get there” component. So what has liberal society done, especially in the last 30 years? Created laws to restrict teachers’ ability to discipline children, taught children to sue their parents if they are disciplined at home and eliminated the grading system. In the US they created the most insane “Outcome Based Education” and the law that students cannot be failed in the first five years. In short, they know what the “desired objective” is, but have no guts to discipline students, so they keep creating these patchworks hoping they somehow can circumvent the “discipline part” (the very same “patching it up” component is the cardinal element in the US airport security system that I come to later). The “crowning achievement” of this approach was the Columbine High School massacre, where the entire school management knew for a long time prior to the massacre what these three students were planning to do. One of the US’s leading educators suggested they

December 20, 2010

should arrest Columbine's principal and all of the vice principals on the charge of "accessory to mass murder", and he was right. The entire tragedy could have been prevented by using a disciplinary system when signals (as clear as the killers announcing their intentions on a web page) were acknowledged.

b) "*Liberalism is when we regulate 99% of the population in order to save ourselves from the 1%, as well as save the 1% from themselves*". My favorite example is the "hands-free cell phone" idea. There are two kinds of people: those who know that he/she can talk while driving, and those who do not know. So what did we do? We created a law that no one can talk on a not-hands-free cell phone while driving. The idiocy and inefficiency of the idea (other than it is a typical "bring everyone to the lowest common denominator) could be demonstrated by the fact that we did not regulate McDonalds' "Big-Mac" burger. What is the difference between being busy dialing while driving, and unpacking the burger? I mean aside of the differences that dialing requires one hand, you can raise your hand with the cell phone to your eye-line so you see the road while you dial, while "unpacking the burger" requires two hands and it happens on your lap. On top of that how many times have you had ketchup or mustard dripping on your pants while driving? We can safely summarize, that unpacking the burger takes two hands, you cannot keep it in your eye line while unpacking it and it also diverts your attention trying to be careful not to mess up your clothing while eating. But we regulated the cell phones. I am not trying to be funny; it is actually very sad. This is how idiotic, unreasonable, uninformed liberalism can be. Make no mistake about it: sometimes Republicans engage in "liberal thinking". It is neither the person nor the "party", it is the theory and thought process that is called "liberalism".

The liberal spectrum

Dividing the liberal spectrum, 90 percent of liberals are nice, well wishing, but clueless people. I have many liberal friends. Sometimes I envy them and would like to think like them. It would be easier. The problem is the ten percent on the far left, where people turn from "ideology driven" to being an ideologue. The further left you go on the last ten percent of the spectrum, the more chance you have to find people who have nothing to do with liberalism; they are totally blindsided and focused on their progressive ideology. The very end of this spectrum is occupied by people such as Vladimir Lenin and Adolf Hitler.

Social-Communist Progressives are a different breed altogether. These people are practically, spineless opportunistic sycophants, many times ruthless killers, hungry for power and money. They have zero ideology to speak of, other than their own enrichment. You can take the "killer" part literally in Joseph Stalin, Kaganovich and Berija's case around Lenin, or Goering, Himmler and Keitel, around Hitler. You should not take the "killer" literally in the definition of progressives surrounding Barack Obama (Andy Stern, Sol Alinsky, Van Jones, Jeremiah Wright, Jeff Jones, Cass Sunstein, Bill Ayers, Bernadine Dohrn, Rahm Emanuel, Harry Read, Nancy Pelosi and many others – while we need to record the fact that the activities of Ayers and Dohrn caused people's death) but you better believe the rest of the definition. These people are worse than Cosa Nostra style gangsters, because for power and money, they are willing to jam theories, practices and laws (they personally do not believe in) down everyone's throat. In Cosa Nostra, at least they believed in their own mission. Thank God, we all can put "jam" into past tense in Alinsky's and Cloward's case. These two have not been residing above

December 20, 2010

ground since 1972 and 2001 respectively. Piven is still around though. History has shown that in effective terms “social-communist progressive” and “gangster” are two interchangeable terms, so let us refer to them as such. I lived 32 years of my life under a socialist regime, and have a complete understanding of social, cultural and economic undercurrents, behavior models and unintended effects, supported by scores of historical data that a “let’s spread the wealth a bit” ideology can cause. Obama’s progressive circle did not spend a day being a citizen of a socialist country. Other than their blind ambition, arrogance and greed, they have nothing. This social-communist progressive group is well supported by either “dumb as a pile of rocks” or “corrupt to the core” people such as Valerie B. Jarrett, Chris Dodd, Barney Frank, Christina “the eight percent” Romer, Kathleen Sebelius, and a long list of others.

If you have any doubt with regards to my statement as to who is who, let me remind you: Nancy Pelosi said this on August 21st on TV when they asked her about the controversy regarding the Muslim mosque in lower Manhattan: ***“It would be interesting to investigate who is funding the opposition”***. This is how social-communists think. “Is there an opposition? Let’s investigate who funds the opposition”. Lenin did it, Stalin did it and Castro did it. First Amendment rights, factual issues with the opposition, discussions, agreeing with the other side be damned. “Let’s investigate the opposition”. This is the Speaker of the House of the United States of America today (but not much longer). Based upon her activities, it is my humble opinion that if someone promised Pelosi: she would stay as Speaker beyond 2011 at the cost of becoming a skinhead, or a nun, or a street hooker by sundown, she would take the deal.

The progressive circle has gone so unchecked around Obama, that Valerie B. Jarrett (sr. advisor and assistant to the president) announced that one of her “spiritual sources” is Mao Zedong. Those of us of course who can and like to read before opening our mouth, know from various studies (among them: Jung Chang’s book: “Mao”), how Mao Zedong was directly involved (did personally, ordered, or otherwise caused) in the killing of approximately 21 million people by the time he arrived in Peking to assume power. This woman today is a “senior advisor” to the president of the United States. This is how our nation’s leadership looks today.

Before my liberal friends and social-communist enemies accused me of “name-calling” let me say this: I have no interest in Cass Sunstein’s Harvard-type argument about the Constitution of the United States. It is my separate opinion that his argument is worthless garbage. I have a wider issue to discuss. I want Cass Sunstein and/or Barack Obama to give me a one word answer: a single country’s name where over the last century “central government” and “spread the wealth” succeeded in producing the betterment of that particular country. Because if Cass Sunstein cannot produce a single country, then by objective definition Ol’ Cass is either certified to spend time in a clinic that offers rooms with padded walls or a gutless thug with a huge anti-American agenda. This definition goes for the rest of Obama crew as well. This idiocy of “central government” and “spread the wealth” has been tried in different parts of the world, at different times, for different length of times and under different leaders. ***It has failed every single time and in every place they have tried it.*** So, to push it on the United States, you are either totally clueless, or a social-communist thug who wants to sink the country. I furthermore do not care about “you are name-calling”, or “how dare you”, or “this is the president of the United States you are talking about”. Sorry! Don’t care! This is a fact-based discussion! Tell him to give me a country’s name. Then I will listen.

BUILDING BLOCKS TO DEVELOP A LIBERAL

According to Webster, "Logic":

"1 ...the science of correct reasoning; the science which deals with the criteria of valid thought,

...5. The system of principles underlying any art of science..."

Now let us examine how the liberal issues, behavior models and agendas correlate with basic logic.

The core of liberalism

Liberalism is the blind hope that different parts, cultures, religions, economic circumstances and social behaviors of the world can be equated by bringing everyone to the lowest common denominator.

The only problem is this: to make this model work, they must take the "human element" out of the equation. Remember V.I. Lenin and Joseph Stalin's dogma? "In communism, people produce based upon their abilities, and consume based upon their needs". For young liberals, who cannot remember socialism: between 1917 and 1989, it was actually thought in schools throughout the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe that the point when "socialism" advances to "communism" is when money will not be needed any more because people will produce based upon their maximum abilities, but they will consume based only upon their needs. In other words, people will have one pair of shoes and they go to the shoe store when the existing one has fallen apart. This is the "...consume based upon needs" part of the definition. The only element they had to overcome was the "human nature" ingredient. For 70 years in the Soviet Union and 43 years in Eastern Europe, they tried every artificial, anti-common-sense, jam-down-people's-throat models to circumvent the point that cannot be circumvented: the human element. And how did that work out, huh??

In a more recent example of the direct continuation of the "human element" argument, let me give you another example of one of many reasons why Obama's health care will not work: in one of the Eastern European countries, the increase of "chatter box patients" (people who go to the doctor because it is a daily program) had gotten to an intolerable level. To prevent this, the government created a new law: from that point, everyone had to pay a fee at the door before the doctor saw the patient. The fee was equal to 1.3 cheeseburger at the local McDonalds. This fee, lower than two cheeseburgers, reduced the visiting patients number by 63% in the first six months of the program. That is one of the aforementioned "human elements" that will destroy the US healthcare.

Over the last 30-40 years, there are different organizations (United Nations, World Trade Organization, European Union, "Climate Change Commission") have been trying – just as communist dictators since Lenin did - to jam the same anti common-sense, artificial models down our throat, in an attempt to eliminate human nature from the equation. It is all to force an unenforceable structure on the world's population.

December 20, 2010

Unless the liberals are right and everyone else is wrong, there is no formula that works without the human element. By default, the entire liberal experience is a farce.

...But the other side...

My experience in discussing the issues with my conservative friends was educational because I learned: their view and mine were within a five percent tolerance 98% of the time. Most discussions with my liberal friends have been very tiresome; trying to pull a straight YES/NO answer out of a liberal is like pulling the teeth of a crocodile. Most fact based conversations end up in deep silence on their part, or their announcement of "let's not argue over this", or the most frequent: you say "well, Obama has been doing this"; a standard liberal answer: "why? Didn't George Bush do that??" This is where most of my conversations stop (before they even have a chance to start) because my liberal friends do not take my lecture lightly: "Look we can allocate time to talk about George Bush. I asked a question about Obama". "Yes but didn't George Bush....." And the conversation ends.

Just be factual will you?

Liberals will find a large percentage of my statements reprehensible. In most conversations my liberal friends try to substitute logic with "should be, could be, ought to be, might be, may be, got to be" prefixes describing "another way" and these have never cut it and never will. Have a clearly defined "other way" that is factual, logical, reasonable and historically proven; then let's talk. Liberals never want to do that.

The liberal mindset dictates to never, ever, under any circumstance give a straight answer to any question. Ever.

- Talk about illegal immigrants? – Let's talk about poor babies are born to these poor people, with no healthcare.
- Talk about closing the border? -- Let's talk about "restricting commerce".
- Talk about Phoenix, Arizona becoming the kidnapping capital of the US? – Let's talk about federal vs. state rights.
- Talk about how the unions have been raping the US industry and economy? -- Let's talk about "That dirty Wal-mart has the guts paying \$6-\$7 per hour to someone, who has no education whatsoever.
- Talk about America is failing to educate the children? – Let's talk about the students' First Amendment Rights.

Republicans: the party of "NO"

To further my "just be factual, will you?" argument, I offer another one. At the time of the writing of this paragraph (8/20/10), liberals have been accusing Republicans of being "the party of NO". I want to reiterate: this Paper is not "Pro-Republican" or "Anti-Liberal". This Paper is an inventory of facts. If you want to talk about the problems, disasters (political, economical or

December 20, 2010

otherwise) Republicans caused, I am ready for that, but not now (I would like to refer to the “But the other side” argument). When I hear the “Republicans are the party of NO” argument, I always think of a family where one of the brothers is a cheating, coke dealing, skirt chasing bank robber crook. So, when the family comes together, this brother talks about how he cheated his friends out of money; the family is appalled. Then the conversation turns to how he scored last week by robbing a bank; the family strongly objects it. After discussing how he will acquire fifty pounds of cocaine through his contact next week and the family gets very irritated, he jumps up saying: “You guys are a family of NO. You object to everything I do”. I think you get the picture. In short, once the liberals and social-communists progressives of the US government stop creating anti-US and idiotic laws and start to work in a bi-partisan way, the Republican party more than likely will stop saying NO. Because this is a fact Paper, let us get some facts here. The Obama government so far:

- Illegally took the car industry over by illegally giving priority to unsecured shareholders (his union cronies) over secured shareholders (bond holders),
- Spent a trillion dollars and the unemployment rate is going up,
- Lied about “shovel ready” programs,
- Illegally protected the Black Panthers and ACORN,
- Appointed a tax cheat to supervise IRS,
- Appointed a legally tainted person to run DOJ,
- Created a tsar system to centralize power,
- Pushed through a healthcare bill by openly bribing 30% of their own party members, and arrogantly taking over 1/6th of the US economy without a single minority vote,
- Apologized to the whole world hoping that the standing of the US will improve; it has fallen lower than it was under Jimmy Carter,
- Brought Miranda rights to the battle field,
- Let Barney Frank and Chris Dodd (the two who caused the subprime mortgage mess) run amuck and have the Frank-Dodd bill,
- Sued Arizona for protecting itself, while installing a set of signs throughout Arizona warning Americans not to go to a certain part of the state (just checking: a part of the USA) because it is “dangerous”,
- By not lifting the Jones Act, did not let oil skimmers come where the oil spill was. By extension Obama’s government had become one of the major causes of the economic disaster in the Gulf of Mexico. He lifted the Jones Act after 70-80 days; by that time 70% of the skimmable oil had evaporated and 30% was on the shorelines, out of the skimmers’ reach, and
- Imposed a six month moratorium on drilling; it has not just killed tens of thousands of jobs and caused major rigs to move away from the Gulf of Mexico, but Obama’s government imposed the moratorium by apparently falsifying experts’ opinion.

Thank God the Republican Party said “NO” to all of this (and much more).

“Hope” is not half way to “Know”

Doug Schoen was interviewed on FOX on June 28, 2009 at 10:35 am, about Obama’s “green energy” program. I wrote down three statements, stated on national television by a person who

December 20, 2010

has been a “Democratic Strategist” since I came to the US. Again (just to make sure everyone gets it): he is a Democratic **strategist** (not a cook or a brick layer, with democratic feelings). This Democratic strategist stated:

- “We hope we reduce energy dependence”
- “We hope that green energy generates jobs”
- “The jury is out on how many jobs green energy will generate”

Obama & Co (including Doug Schoen) **does know** that we need to increase the number of jobs and decrease our dependency on foreign oil. But they **hope** that green energy will do the trick. They have no basis to **“know”** it, no one has ever proven it, or succeeded doing it, there is no affordable technology for it, so what is left --- **they hope**. Why this defies any common sense is this: when you have an economy problem (lose your job, get very sick, lose everything on the stock market), you reach for, and deploy the most proven ways to stabilize your instable situation. If you have \$1 million and you lost \$970,000, will you take the last \$30,000 to the same broker to play with that too? Of course not. You will sit tight on it, and find ways to make the most of it to survive and increase its value. In the US, we are down to the last “\$10,000”. What Obama & Co. is doing? They disregard clean coal, nuclear power, offshore drilling and Alaskan territory drilling (all proven energy generation) and turn to a **“hope”**.

What is very telling, that at the time of writing this paragraph (8/1/10), the same Doug Schoen who has been a “Democratic **strategist**” as long as I remember, now title himself a “Democratic **pollster**” whenever he shows up on TV. Even Mr. Schoen does not want to take part of Obama’s practices.

Are you a moron, or a crook with an agenda?

If I have to name the five most important points in this Paper, this one is within the top three: It is all too frequent that liberals and social-communist progressives define functional definitions, character (or lack of) descriptions as “name calling” during arguments, or resort to the “it is unfair to question each other’s motives in an argument” statement. You hear this second one on US national television at least five times a week. So let me put this on the table: court systems have been based on the thesis of “motive”. To counter prosecutors’ efforts to link facts and motive with defendants, there is an alarming increase in defense attorneys using the “My client was insane” defense. This thesis provides a clear conclusion of available alternatives: “you either had a motive you understood and acted upon, or you were insane, not knowing what you were doing”. Can you imagine a third way? No. Of course not. So, for liberals and progressives coming up with “it is not fair that you question my motive” is somewhere between a bad joke and blind mindless arrogance. I am not going to “question your motive”, once you admitted that you are an idiot. But you cannot have your cake and eat it too. I am going to refer to this argument at many places with the **(moron or crook?)** note. Liberals love to play this, and they have been plying it well whenever, whichever serves their purpose.

The “Moron or Crook” argument cannot possibly be exhibited in a better way than to examine the global warming issue and people. Global Warming. Remember? The one now called “Climate Change”. No liberal ever argued with me was allowed to use the Climate Change phrase, because I take it as an intellectual insult, that you assume I am an idiot with the memory

December 20, 2010

span of a goat so you can change definitions on me as you please and I will just nod. So, let's stick with "Global Warming" shall we? A fresh graduate from a low-end technical trade school will tell you: if I use a model for years with a given set of data provided by "credible" sources and all of a sudden it turns out that the data not just flawed, but intentionally, in a pre-meditated way, systematically, for years, were cooked, distorted, test results and scientific evidence withheld, then you start from scratch, reexamining the entire model; in other words, you put everything on hold. Got it?

Now let's look at what global warming people (with Al Gore's leadership) have done over the last few years. The entire global warming model blew up right into their faces, when several "global experts" from the University of East Anglia Climate Research Unit, one of the "most prestigious institutes" of the world (at least: until 2009) turned out to be a bunch of crooks. Communications unearthed by the hacker included:

"I've just completed Mike's Nature trick of adding in the real temps to each series for the last 20 years (i.e. from 1981 onwards) and from 1961 for Keith's to hide the decline."

"The fact is that we can't account for the lack of warming at the moment and it is a travesty that we can't. The CERES data published in the August BAMS 09 supplement on 2008 shows there should be even more warming: but the data are surely wrong. Our observing system is inadequate."

"Can you delete any emails you may have had with Keith re AR4? Keith will do likewise. He's not in at the moment – minor family crisis. Can you also email Gene and get him to do the same? I don't have his new email address. We will be getting Caspar to do likewise."

"This was the danger of always criticizing the skeptics for not publishing in the "peer-reviewed literature". Obviously, they found a solution to that—take over a journal! So what do we do about this? I think we have to stop considering "Climate Research" as a legitimate peer-reviewed journal. Perhaps we should encourage our colleagues in the climate research community to no longer submit to, or cite papers in, this journal. We would also need to consider what we tell or request of our more reasonable colleagues who currently sit on the editorial board...What do others think?"

"I will be emailing the journal to tell them I'm having nothing more to do with it until they rid themselves of this troublesome editor." "It results from this journal having a number of editors. The responsible one for this is a well-known skeptic in NZ. He has let a few papers through by Michaels and Gray in the past. I've had words with Hans von Storch about this, but got nowhere. Another thing to discuss in Nice!"

The only decent way for Gore and his followers to handle would have been: "stop the train, we were cheated, let's start from scratch, because we think our Anthropogenic Global Warming theory in fact is still valid". I would argue that Gore & Co. could have increased the number of their followers by a factor of three. It would have shown to the world that they are honest people, searching for the truth. Instead of doing that, Gore made this statement on December 9, 2009 on CNN: "...Is there any substantive reason to worry about them (the scandal L.O.)? No.

December 20, 2010

.... Over time the scientific process whereby all these scientists pick over every detail openly and fully...that process works..." Yes Mr. Vice President, it sure does, but not in a way you and your cronies were doing it.

A foreign object: "Discipline"

Since I already introduced the Webster definition of "logic", let me introduce an even harder terminology that no self-respecting liberal can pronounce, spell, understand or write down: "discipline".

According to Webster, "Discipline":

**"...1. Training that develops self-control, character, or orderliness and efficiency,...
....3. a system of rules or methods..."**

In these 15 words, the following are totally foreign to the liberal philosophy: self-control, orderliness, efficiency, rules and methods.

Back to my favorite cell phone example, instead of saying: "you hit someone with your car while holding a cell phone, you get six months with no parole if the person did not suffer permanent injury, you get up to six years if the person did, and 10 years (with no parole) if the person dies. And it will not matter, that your defense attorney claims your mother did not buy you enough lollypops at age 3, this is why you were on the cell phone while driving and as a result, a human being is now dead. This very simple method would bring down the car cell-phone use in a hurry. I know that most liberals who are reading this are now reaching for an oxygen mask, but to calm your nerves let me share a historical fact with you. Between 1989 and 2007, there was a general lawlessness in people's driving habits in Hungary, especially speeding. There were a tremendous number of accidents and deaths as a result. So, in late 2007, the Hungarian government instituted the "point system" whereby you can get a certain (very low) number of points, at which time you automatically lose your license. And they started to practice it in earnest. In about two months (yes, yes, I know this is hard to stomach for a liberal), the 18 year old, seemingly "unchangeable habits" changed throughout Hungary on a simple terminology: *discipline*.

To strengthen my argument exclusively for self-respecting liberals who do not see common sense easily, here is another one: in Singapore, the government advertises every day in a daily newspaper the exact limit of different drugs, under which you – if caught - qualify as a "user", and over which you qualify as a "dealer". And you will be judged as such. Isn't it simple?? This is the precise reason liberals do not understand it. The Singaporean definition does not include excuses, bad childhood, divorced parents, being drunk, "I did not know it", bad teachers' influence, or abusing priests; for God's sake, it does not even include lollypops. Have you heard about an epidemic of drug abuse in Singapore? Of course not. You know why? I am not going to answer the question, because if you have a grain of common sense you know the answer, if you are a liberal, you will never know.

HISTORICAL OVERVIEW

History's most lethal recipe

The most lethal recipe of history prescribes a ***large number of Social-Communist Progressives surrounding an honest ideologue whose political views and conviction are so far to the left of the spectrum that he/she could correctly be characterized as "politically mad", in a historical time when a large segment of the population is ready for some major change.*** The population is not ready for a "turn-left-and-go-as-far-as-you-can" change; they are just ready for any change. These are the times when mad ideologues think their philosophy is finally understood, and progressives see their time and chance have finally arrived.

A vital ingredient of the recipe is the unfortunate fact that about 45% of any population is a herd mentality mindless mass, easy to take practically anywhere on the political spectrum. If you do not believe the "herd mentality" you should read a bit about how Austrians greeted the occupying Nazis in Vienna. I mean these people crowded the streets of Vienna, wildly cheering for the Nazis marching in, ***while being occupied!!!*** How much more "herd mentality" do you want to get? Since I do not think you believe me, let me quote Professor Eric R. Kandel, an Austrian born Nobel Prize winner, from his book "In Search of Memory":

"....Even though the president of Austria acquiesced to all of Germany's demands, Hitler invaded the country the next day.

Now came the surprise. Rather than being met by angry crowds of Austrians, Hitler was welcomed enthusiastically by a substantial majority of the population. As George Berkley has pointed out, this dramatic turnabout from people who screamed loyalty to Austria and supported Schuschnigg one day to people who greeted Hitler's troops as "German brothers" the next, cannot be explained simply by the emergence from the underground of tens of thousands of Nazis. Rather, what happened was one of history's 'fastest and fullest mass conversions'. Hans Ruzicka was to write 'These people who cheered the Emperor and then cursed him, who welcomed democracy after the Emperor was dethroned and then cheered [Dollfuss's] fascism when the system came to power. Today he is a Nazi, tomorrow he will be something else...' (In Search of Memory P.27.)

History has intersected:

[a historically vital time in a globally vital country] + [an honest but mad ideologue] + [a handful of gangsters managing the ideologue] + [unchecked power in the legal structure] + [a mindless crowd]

only three times on the planet over the last 100 years, producing Vladimir Lenin, Adolf Hitler and now Barack Hossein Obama. The list of people fitting the "ruthless, spineless opportunistic, progressive killer" definition surrounding these three is long and undistinguished, and would in itself take a study.

December 20, 2010

Vladimir I. Lenin, who coined the "All power to the Soviets" and "All land to the peasants" phrases, was the leader of overthrowing the Provisional Government in October 1917 which was formed after the overthrow of Tsar Nicholas. Rosa Luxemburg wrote about Lenin in 1904: "...Lenin's thesis is that the party Central Committee should have the privilege of naming all the local committees of the party. It should have the right to appoint the effective organs of all local bodies from Geneva to Liege, from Tomsk to Irkutsk. It should also have the right to impose on all of them its own ready-made rules of party conduct... The Central Committee would be the only thinking element in the party. All other groupings would be its executive limbs...." ***Luxemburg strongly opposed Lenin's views on centralism and suggested that any successful revolution that used this strategy would develop into a communist dictatorship.***

Lenin believed, that all problems were coming from the fact that Russia's economic and political power consists of the "haves" and "have-nots". He thought the distribution of wealth (does this sound familiar to anyone?) was the cure for all the problems. As he said on April 17, 1917: *"....The specific feature of the present situation in Russia is that the country is passing from the first stage of the revolution—which, owing to the insufficient class-consciousness and organization of the proletariat, placed power in the hands of the bourgeoisie—to its second stage, which must place power in the hands of the proletariat and the poorest sections of the peasants...."*

Just as the other two, Lenin had his share of people such as Stalin, Berija and many other gangsters who cared for their own betterment, and used Lenin to get it. To see Stalin up close and personal, one should understand that in 1903, at the Social Democratic Labor Party Conference in London Stalin voted against Lenin, resulting in Lenin creating the Bolshevik Party. Then came November, 1917 when Lenin came to power. Just days before Lenin's arrival back to Russia from exile in Switzerland, Stalin as one of the editors of the Pravda (major daily newspaper) was supporting the Provisional Government. Ten days after Lenin's return Stalin made his move. In Pravda he wrote an article dismissing the idea of working with the Provisional Government.

Subsequently, between 1924 (after Lenin's death in January 1924 and Stalin's accession to power) and March of 1953 (Stalin's death) Stalin killed approximately 20 million of his fellow citizens. The number includes approximately 14.5 million needlessly starved to death, at least one million executed for political "offences", at least 9.5 million more deported, exiled or imprisoned in work camps, with many of the estimated five million sent to the 'Gulag Archipelago' never returning alive. Other estimates place the number of deported at 28 million, including 18 million sent to the 'Gulag'. To briefly revisit my earlier argument that 45% of any society is a mindless herd, there are few demonstrations you see in Russia without more than a few people carrying Stalin's picture.

Adolf Hitler, leader of the National **Socialist** German **Workers'** Party was a Lutheran. Martin Luther (1483 –1546) saw Jews as a rejected people guilty of the murder of Christ, and he lived within a local community that had expelled Jews some ninety years earlier. He considered the Jews blasphemers and liars because they rejected the divinity of Jesus, whereas Christians believed Jesus was the Messiah. In 1543, Luther's other major works on the Jews included his 60,000-word treatise *Von den Juden und Ihren Lügen* (On the Jews and Their Lies), where Luther argued that the Jews were no longer the chosen people but "the devil's people": he referred to them with violent, vile language. Luther advocated setting synagogues on fire,

December 20, 2010

destroying Jewish prayer books, forbidding rabbis from preaching, seizing Jews' property and money, and smashing up their homes, so that these "poisonous envenomed worms" would be forced into labor or expelled "for all time". Luther's words "We are at fault in not slaying them" amounted to a sanction for murder. Just about every anti-Jewish book printed in the Third Reich contained references to and quotations from Luther. Heinrich Himmler wrote admiringly of his writings and sermons on the Jews in 1940. In *Mein Kampf*, Hitler refers to Martin Luther as a great warrior, a true statesman, and a great reformer, alongside Richard Wagner and Frederick The Great. Hitler, by his Austrian experience and his Lutheran studies was an anti-Semite to the point of being a ruthless madman. His oratorical brilliance helped him convince the (mindless) populous.

After failing to overthrow the Republic by a coup, Hitler pursued a "strategy of legality": this meant formally adhering to the rules of the Weimar Republic until he had legally gained power. He would then use the institutions of the Weimar Republic to destroy it and establish himself as dictator. (if this did not create resonance in you vis-à-vis terminologies as "ObamaCare", "Dodd-Frank Regulation", "Suing Arizona", "Specific withdrawal date from Afghanistan", "illegally giving priority to GM unions over bond holders" – nothing will. "Staying more or less within the system, jamming your unwanted, hugely opposed agenda down everyone's throat, destroying the system from within": this is the Obama government *modus operandi*). Just as with Lenin, the success of Hitler drew people such as Hess, Goebbels, Goering and Himmler. These (and a list of others) used Hitler and his madness. As an example, Goebbels was earning 300,000 *Reichsmarks* a year in "fees" for writing in his own newspaper, *Der Angriff (The Attack)*, as well as his ministerial salary and many other sources of income. These payments were in effect bribes from the paper's publisher Max Amann. He owned a villa by the lake at Wannsee and another on Lake Constance in the south, which he spent 2.2 million *Reichsmarks* refurbishing. The tax office, as it did for all the Nazi leaders, gave him generous exemptions. Hitler apparently connived at the corruption of his lieutenants because of the power it gave him over them.

Dylan Pemberton said in 2007: "...Hitler's speeches were clearly **brilliant** enough to **mobilize and brainwash an entire nation into following his perverse ideology**.... He studied patiently the means that commanded authority and respect: words, gestures (movements of the hands), stance, posture and attitude. What he was also **very good at was reading the audience reaction** and aiming his considered delivery very precisely in almost staccato like chunks. Some would say **he had a magnetic power** that attracted the **huge crowds** whereas others would cite the fact many attendees were almost compelled to be there and prompted to react at key points in an almost staged fashion - the **Nazis were after all the pioneers of political spin**..." (I have made the bolding and underlining just in case the terms about Hitler remind you of anyone closer to our time...)

Barack Hossein Obama, his time, ascension to power and overall circumstances are well portrayed by the chart below:

	Lenin	Hitler	Obama
Huge political ambition	x	x	x
Brilliant orator	x	x	x
		German population wanted change	Financial

About Liberals

December 20, 2010

December 20, 2010

In my view there were several contributing factors that allowed Obama to become president of the US.

I think I was the very first on record putting Obama and “socialist” into the same sentence in early 2008. Let’s face it: Obama is a socialist. This is what Lenin wrote in Letters on Tactics: “...Nor can it stray into the swamp of anarchism, for anarchism **denies the need for a state and state power** in the period of *transition* from the rule of the bourgeoisie to the **rule of the proletariat**, whereas I, with a precision that precludes any possibility of misinterpretation, **advocate the need for a state in this period**, although, in accordance with Marx and the lessons of the Paris Commune, I advocate not the usual parliamentary bourgeois state, but a **state without a standing army, without a police opposed to the people...**”

Obama’s drive for state power in banking regulation, socialized healthcare, yearning for “cap and tax” regulation, centralized power grabbing, assisted by his tsar system are virtually identical to Lenin’s “advocate the need for a state in this period” statement; “spreading the wealth” (= Lenin’s “rule of the proletariat”), weakened US military (=“state without standing army”), and his weak immigration ideas, the lawsuit against Arizona, while not opposing the “sanctuary cities” (=“without a police opposed to the people”) further prove his socialist core.

Obama has proven to be a socialist in one more way: the US Constitution sets up the “three branches of government” system to keep each other in check. It also gives wide latitude to people in power and it has been serving the country well. The US Constitution could have not been set for History’s Most Lethal Recipe, because it would have strangled the entire US structure for 98% of the rest of the time. Because of it, those who occasionally had more power (when the President and Congress’s majority parties were the same), were required to be decent, use their power but not abuse it. Unfortunately, it is the first time in a hundred years when history’s most lethal recipe showed how correct the recipe is and how much damage could be done when it is abused. Obama does not just have the House and the Senate, does not just have absolute majority in the Senate (with Collins and Snow, the two liberal snitches, it surely is a bullet proof majority), but each chamber is being run by a spineless, opportunistic and corrupt-to-the-core political hack gangster: Pelosi and Reid.

So what was the composition of the electorate that voted for him? Let’s review it shall we?

- It is a proven fact that the US electorate tries the socialist agenda once every 30 years. It last happened before/under Jimmy Carter. Aside of the fact that since 1976 I have been continuously considering Carter a certified case for a well guarded psychiatric institute (and boy he has been working hard over the last 30 years to prove it), Jimmy was the last liberal that put the US into grave danger. Let’s use some math here: the person who could vote first time when Jimmy (thankfully) got out of the White House was born in 1962. The person who voted first time in 2008, was born in 1990. In other words, everyone who was born between 1962 and 1990 had absolutely no clue about the social-liberal experience. And since socialism looks good on paper to everyone who did not live through it, this huge crowd has absolutely zero knowledge of the inner works of it. As an example, one of my sons campaigned for Obama ... my son was born in 1984, was five year old when the Berlin Wall went down. That is your direct reason why he campaigned for Obama. I “forgave” my son, because as Churchill said: “if you are not a Democrat at

December 20, 2010

age 20, you don't have a heart; if you are not a Republican by age 30, you don't have a brain".

- Black population was a given
- Latino (mainly Mexican in this regard) population was promised amnesty
- Intellectual (Harvard and Hollywood type liberal) crowd was a given. These people have always demonstrated that being "educated" and "intelligent" do not always go hand in hand. This is not "name calling", it is a fact. Once this crowd will show me a single example in history where "borrowing us out of poverty" worked, "spreading the wealth" worked, "central government and planning" worked, or bureaucracy was better than "free market", I will give my full attention. This is the same crowd that labeled President Reagan a reckless "cowboy" who would press the nuclear button at the drop of a hat, while President Reagan was busy saving the world from the Soviet Union. Do not bring up the "free market caused the 2008 meltdown" just yet. I will deal with that shortly. Dodd's and Frank's names will be mentioned more times than any liberal or social-communist progressive would like.
- The first crowd I cannot figure out is the Jewish community. Jews most of the time are liberals in nature and thinking, but Obama had way exceeded any and all boundaries of a "liberal". He is a socialist ideologue. What bothers me most is that in the Jewish religion and way of living, "education" is valued above all considerations. It perhaps is best represented by the fact that a large segment of the ultra orthodox Jews never work. Not a day of their life. They study. It also important to point out that throughout history, whenever Jews had to relocate to a new area of the world (and it happened numerous times over the last 2,000 years), the first building a Jewish community builds is a prayer room and a school. Jewish exceptionalism has shown in academia, media, film, financing and in most cases industries. I have been saying since the early 1970s, that we should not hate the Jews, we should learn from them. Studying, teaching and exceptionalism have kept the Jewish people throughout their history when they were the subject of all possible tragedies including a holocaust (just as a side note: largely caused by mindless liberals on both sides of the Atlantic, who deemed Winston Churchill an alarmist). Obama's socialist, globalizing, "spreading the wealth" ideology, statements, occupation as "community organizer", gangster friends such as Bill Ayers, mindless anarchist friends such as Jeremiah Wright, lies, vague explanations were against anything and everything Jews have been standing for throughout their history: exceptionalism, individual achievements, money, business and industries to name a few. And yet, 71.5% of Jews voted for him. It should be reported here, that there is an overwhelming "buyers' remorse" within the Jewish population. At dinners and parties I am invited to by my Jewish friends, there is dead silence when politics is brought up, and I ask: "Who among you voted for Obama??" They know they screwed it up.
- The other crowd that I cannot figure out is the business crowd that supported Obama. While (as I said earlier) Jimmy Carter has been a mental case probably since he was born, I understood how he became president. After the Nixon administration, and Ford's comment on "Poland's democracy", a mild mannered, always smiling, southern governor seemed to be an OK choice. No one knew he was an idiot. But for God sake, Obama put all his cards on the table, and what he did not, other people did.
 - There was his 70% voting record of "present" indicating he is a calculating, spineless-to-the-core, "inside DC" politician,

December 20, 2010

- It turned out he lied just about everything including his involvement with Jeremiah Wright, Bill Ayers and others,
- He actually said on camera that “spreading the wealth” is a great idea,
- If these were not enough for the business community, there was his wife’s “Barack will change the history of and the country” comment.

Yet, the US business community supported him and financed him. What did they expect? They expected that he will double-cross everyone and will become a centrist? Even Newt Gingrich said on FOX in July, 2010, that he “did not think” Obama will do it. Why not? The former Speaker (whom I immensely respect) said, “No one thought this possible”. With all due respect to the Speaker, I beg to defer. I have five witnesses from February 2008 that in a speech I called McCain, Obama, and Clinton a “Jimmy Carter”; a social-communist five times Jimmy Carter respectively; and, I had a definition for Hilary too. Now, everyone calls Obama a “Jimmy Carter on steroids”.

Business leaders such as Jeff Immelt (GE), Ivan Seidenberg (Verizon), Jim McNerney (Boeing), Doug Oberhelman (Caterpillar) and a long list of others are now upset with him. The only question is why? You should have known it. It was all on the table. Where were you between November 2007 and November 2008? In coma? Because you must give it to Obama: he has been doing exactly, to the letter, what he talked about during campaign.

The parallel between Lenin-Hitler-Obama has all the hallmarks of what liberalism, coupled by social-communist progressivism in a specific point of time and place, can do to the whole world.

Lenin’s activity cost the world Stalin, millions of deaths, and 70 years of socialism.

Hitler’s activities cost 57 million deaths, huge destruction around the world and the cold war.

Obama’s activities can easily cost the world World War III, by letting Iran have a nuclear capability, whereupon Iran wipes Israel and a few other countries off the map, the world will group in a “for” and “against” camps, and you have World War III.

Churchill said once that the most difficult problem is to recognize and eliminate evil early on. He was the only one in 1931 who notified the world about Hitler. But the world, including (Obama’s hero) FDR in the US and Chamberlain in the UK closed their eyes hoping that things will somehow, miraculously get better. Incidentally, this was the same FDR, who told Churchill in Jalta: “I think Mr. Stalin is a gentleman and a man of his words”. As we (who read) know, in Jalta, Churchill opined to send the Russians back behind their borders, Stalin wanted Eastern Europe; FDR was the tip of the scale. His way of “tipping” cost 40 year socialist misery, the cold war, the Soviet Union, the German Democratic Republic, the revolutions in 1956, 1968 and 1980 and countless other problems. It even caused JFK limited negotiating room during the Cuban missile crisis, because JFK was afraid: if he took Cuba, Russia would have overrun West Berlin. The reason I have gone a bit deeper into Obama’s case, because with Lenin and Hitler we talk about history; on the other hand, if we let Obama run unchecked, we are facing the elimination of the USA as a world power, the elimination of Israel and the very high possibility of World War III.

December 20, 2010

Don't get me wrong - I like Obama as a person. I respect him for putting himself through Harvard. I believe if I knew Obama on a personal level I would like him. This does not mean however, that I do not think he can be categorized as an "honest political ideologue madman". It is not his fault; Barack Obama is just being Barack Obama. I will argue in this Paper that ***if the United States of America becomes a "socialist-type" country it will happen because we have been changing the electorate from "achievers" to "dependents"***. It is not Obama's fault that he became the president of the US; it is the intersection of educational, social and economical vectors, all pointing in a leftist, social direction that has been changing the electorate. Barack Obama is not a "cause"; he is a "result". It is also important to state that in my belief most of his policies are products of the progressive circle around him, who – in the end - will have him be the fall guy. No one in twenty years will remember who Rahm Emanuel or Valerie Jarrett were; people will talk about the huge failure of the "Obama presidency" not "Valerie Jarrett's failed advisorship". Obama will be the sacrificial lamb to his own group of people. The magnitude of the tragedy in my view as follows: I was extremely proud to be an American when we elected the first black man as president. I know a half a dozen black politicians (half of them conservative democrats) I would vote for. It is my fear (shared by many people) that the residual outcome of Barack Obama's presidency will for decades be that no black person will be elected to any meaningful office, because people will have a built in memory: "remember what happened the last time a black guy was president?". The "tragic" component in this statement is that Obama's presidency has absolutely nothing to do with his skin color. He could have been a red Irish decent with the same upbringing, same people surrounding him, same church he went to for 20+ years, and the Chicago-based gangster circle around him. The result would be the same. Point of reference: everyone hated (most sane people still do) Carter and he was not black. In short, the people to whom Obama & Co is doing a real disservice is the black population.