

Stockholm syndrome, or capture-bonding, is a psychological phenomenon, in which hostages express empathy, sympathy and have positive feelings towards their captors; sometimes to the point of defending them. These feelings are generally considered irrational in light of the danger or risk endured by the victims, who essentially mistake a lack of abuse from their captors for an act of kindness (Wikipedia). Stockholm syndrome is named after a 1973 bank robbery in Stockholm, Sweden where several bank employees were held hostage in a bank vault for six days. During this situation, the victims became emotionally attached to their captors, rejected assistance from government officials at one point and even defended them after they were freed from their six-day ordeal.

I am trying to define a new phenomenon which (I believe) over the next decade will become more pronounced; able people with degrees in psychology, education, social studies and a list of other disciplines will research it, write about it and will have conferences to discuss it. I named the phenomenon "Dallas Syndrome," for one reason only: I live in Dallas and if my thesis proves correct, I would like Dallas to be mentioned every time when the phenomenon is being discussed.

Dallas Syndrome is a psychological phenomenon supported by and rooted in education, social engineering (including government support in exchange for government control, healthcare as an extension of government control), mental and spiritual freedom, immigration control, people's economic, political and ethnic well being vis-à-vis their tendency to "hope for the best," to name a few. The essence of Dallas Syndrome is how a large part of society votes leaders into power after these leaders either announced how they will destroy the well being of the voting populous, or these leaders have already done their deed, a long list of correct data is available and well known about all the destruction; yet, the populous votes them back into power (either immediately, or a few years later). I regard Dallas Syndrome as a great extension of the Stockholm syndrome; as much as victims enter into a psychological state where they defend their captors, Dallas Syndrome describes how a vast number of people vote (or in worst case: "vote again"), for their own destruction by voting people into power who already announced: "Vote for me and I will destroy you." Because it needs to be researched and understood, why:

- Free people vote politicians into power who announced: "I will oppress you;"
- Free, emancipated women vote politicians into power who announced: "You will not be able to go onto the street without your husband's permit;"
- Messes vote politicians into power who announced: "I will raise taxes so high that all capital will leave our country;"
- Messes vote for politicians who announced: "I will chase several industries out of the country, so you will not have job and I will institute a healthcare policy that will not give you any kind of medical attention;"
- Messes vote proven cheats, liars, people who doubled food stamps, spent the country into oblivion and destroyed the fabric of the country back into office;
- Jews vote for proven anti-Israel politicians.

I labeled this paper "Part I.," because at a later point of time, I plan to write one on the "roots" of the phenomenon.

For years, -before I defined the phenomenon as Dallas Syndrome-, I argued that *"60% of any society is a herd mentality, unable to think moron, and this thesis has no correlation with the participating 60%'s education level."* Calling 60% a "moron" might be a correct statement, but it did not show the depth of the problem. As I previously argued, *"The '60%' assisted by a various percentage of the rest of the population is unable to follow a two step thinking process; 1) who they want to vote into power, and 2) how the candidate's background or statements correlate with their interest."* I have now arrived to a conclusion that the "unable to follow a two step thinking process" is the outcome, the result of a complex graph with deep roots in societal areas described above. Let us review a few, but highly characteristic examples of the presence of the Dallas Syndrome.

Before 1979, **Iran** was one of the most fantastic places on earth. Yes, there was dictatorship, and one could argue that the Shah should have put less pressure on his people. On the other hand, Iran was a thriving place, women had complete freedom and Tehran University was one of the best in the world. In 1963, the Shah introduced the White (e.g. "bloodless") Revolution with main points of land reform, nationalization of the forests, privatization of state assets, women's participation (voting rights, among other ones) in society,

workers' profit sharing in industry and general literacy. You can hate the Shah all you want, the White Revolution's objectives and efforts were as good and noble as they come. Life was good in Iran, people were educated and Iran was one of the top tourists spot on the planet.

Parallel to what the Shah was doing in Iran, Ruhollah Khomeini (exiled in 1964), moved between Turkey and Iraq, and ended up in France. His views were well known inside Iran; one of his 1963 arrests sparked three days of riots. While he was in exile, Khomeini wrote –most of them based upon his lectures- approximately forty books; one of which was titled “Islamic Government: Governance of the Jurists” in 1970. This book clearly described his intentions: recognized only God's law for society (happens to be Sharia; the word “Sharia” means “Pathway to be followed”) ---- The country's ruler should be a faqih who “suppresses all others in knowledge” --- Rule by monarch ---- Destroy anti-Islamic influence of any kind. Obviously, as everyone knew in Iran (as I stated before, Khomeini was not exactly unknown, and Iranian people were familiar with Sharia), Khomeini was a strong Sharia advocate; a Sharia that in its main areas of family relations, external and other relations, inheritance, crime and punishment, and economic system are diagonally opposite to the life Iranians, especially women, were accustomed to. In other words, everyone with a half a brain knew that Khomeini was bad news.

But they were excited about him, they started a revolution for his return, and more than one million people were waiting for him when he returned from France.

And guess what? He was bad news.

Shortly after his return, this holly man, opposing Bakhtiar's provisional government, publicly stated: *“I shall kick their teeth in. I appoint the government.”* Sharia was immediately installed, including strict dress code enforced by the Islamic Revolutionary Guards (basically a large, Iranian state-sponsored organization of criminal thugs). No drinks, no Western culture of any kind, no shorts for men, no men and women swimming together, no broadcasting of music of any kind other than religious; universities and other institutions were Islamized. While he closed down most newspapers and other publications, this holly man declared: *“The club of the pen and the club of the tongue is the worst of clubs, whose corruption is 100 times greater than other clubs.”* Deep poverty rates, in the first six Khomeini years, rose by 45%. And no wonder why: one of Khomeini's famous and most frequently used statement was: “Economy is for donkeys” (Let us quickly recap one of his mantras: “The country's ruler should be a faqih who ‘suppresses all others in knowledge.’” Now add up Khomeini's two statements and you most certainly conclude that this holly man was an arrogant, mindless dictator thug).

Just a few gemstones of the direct results of this holly man's activities: under Iran's criminal code, there are punishments like burying women from the waist down and stoning them to death for adultery; Spousal rape is not illegal; In any other kind of rape, four male witnesses or three men and two women are required for conviction; A woman or man found making a false accusation of rape is subject to 80 lashes; A man may escape punishment for killing a wife caught in the act of adultery if he is certain she was a consenting partner; The testimony of two women is equal to that of one man; A woman has the right to divorce only if her husband signs a contract granting that right, cannot provide for his family, or is a drug addict, insane, or impotent. A husband is not required to cite a reason for divorcing his wife; Iranian laws permit polygamy, employment laws favor men, and family laws entitle women to only half the inheritance of a man.

During the Khomeini years, there were an estimated 30,000 people (mostly political opposition) executed. In short, Iran had become a concentration camp for the very same people, who brought Khomeini back.

The question could be asked from everyone who participated: “What did you think?” “What did you expect?” “Didn't you read what he wrote?”

Rhodesia's predominantly white government issued a unilateral declaration of independence from the British Crown in 1965 and declared itself a republic in 1970. The period between 1967 and 1972 was a time that witnessed massive growth in the Rhodesian economy, despite stringent sanctions imposed upon the Smith government. The UN and Britain imposed total sanctions on the Smith government, declaring Smith government "renegade." *Accidentally, this is the same UN, that was directly or by negligence involved in the killing of 100,000 people in Burma, 200,000 in Yugoslavia, 800,000 in Rwanda, 500,000 in Sudan, 1,000,000 in the Congo; and this is the same UN, that elected Iran to serve a four-year term -- beginning in 2011 -- on the Commission on the Status of Women (CSW). The UN calls the Commission "the principal global policy-making body" on women's rights and claims it is "dedicated exclusively to gender equality and advancement of women."*

In spite all their efforts, during the first few years of freedom Prime Minister Ian Smith's "renegade" government was one of the most ably managed and least governed countries in the world. The white people and educated blacks enjoyed a standard of living much like that in the United States or UK, while the tribal villagers had the highest standard of living in black Africa. The Rhodesian government and business sector had closed ranks, invested in energy, housing, farming, manufacturing and mining. The financial services sector, awash with cash financed farmers through providing loans for the acquisitions. As a result, the economy was 70% self sufficient.

Then the Russian, Chinese and Cuban communists showed up with Marxist slogans and boatloads of guns and explosives – initially consisting mostly of landmines and submachine guns but later including late model East Bloc weaponry. Weapons that were employed against civilian farmers and tribal villagers... The terrorist incidents gradually escalated from isolated bandit attacks to full scale savagery. To communist "fighters," their enemies are seen simply as criminals – the upper classes slated for "liquidation," and the lower classes for "re-education" and domination through unspeakable terror. The world ignored horrific attacks like the slaughter and mutilation of innocent tribal villagers, and the Viscount disaster – where terrorists shot down a passenger plane with a Russian Strella missile, and then raped and butchered the survivors.

All the Russian, Chinese and Cuban "help" directed to Rhodesia was assisting the country's two Black Nationalist organizations ZANU and ZAPU that started a guerilla war against the government in 1972. Although the premier Ian Smith conceded to a democratic form in 1978, it did not stop the bloodshed. Finally, in 1980 the country's independence was recognized by the British and by the UN, and it became the Republic of Zimbabwe. Of the two (ZANU and ZAPU) ZANU's leaders were N. Sithole and Robert Mugabe, pushing ZANU to the left. Mugabe, a known Marxist, demanded a one party state with total black rule and monopolized land across Zimbabwe. They were exiled from Rhodesia, but continued organizing urban workers, miners, students, professionals and feminists. ZAPU and ZANU merged into ZANU-PF in 1980.

In 1976, Mugabe led the delegation in the Geneva peace talks, which gave him huge international exposure. Upon returning from Geneva, Mugabe (fearing of his influence and potential rivalry), ordered Wilfred Mhanda, the leader of ZANU's military wing to be arrested. They arrested 600 guerrillas, including Mhanda and the rest of the high command. The 64 top commanders were kept in jail for three years. The prisoners were packed into the cells like sardines; they slept on cement floors and weren't allowed to wear clothes. There were no toilets, so they had to defecate on the floor and eat and sleep in their own filth – the cells were cleaned once a month. They were infested with lice, had so little food they would put sand in their rice to bulk it out, had malaria and other fevers and froze in winter. Luckily, someone told Nyerere about the conditions under which they were being held and he prevailed on to relocate them to another camp where life was hard but bearable.

During the 1979 campaign, ZANU presented a moderate but completely false manifesto. Also, their manifesto was not underlined by their actions. They hid most of their alliance with communist China; party speakers often threatened that the war might continue if the party did not win; their party logo contained an image of an AK47 rifle, which the General Magistrate did not allow to put on their ballot papers; ZANU's activists intimidated voters in 23 out of the 56 districts of the colony. At the end of the war in 1979, Mugabe emerged as a hero in the minds of people and won the general elections of 1980. He was elected as prime minister in March 1980 winning 57 out of 80 Common Roll seats. The majority of the black population participated in large numbers. Subsequently, Mugabe abolished the prime minister post and became President of Zimbabwe in 1987.

Since 2000 the Zimbabwean government has taken most of the farmland previously used by commercial farmers (mostly white) and reallocated it. Most of this land reform happened in a corrupt way and land went to politicians close to the government, military leaders or leaders in the police forces who account to less than 1,000 individuals; also, more than 100,000 blacks were resettled on land which was previously owned by few whites. These new farmers were usually inexperienced or uninterested in farming, and could not maintain the intensive, industrialized farming of the previous owners. Short term gains were often made by selling the farm equipment. The loss of agricultural expertise also triggered a loss of agricultural financing and market confidence, making the recovery almost impossible.

By March 2000, little land had been redistributed as per the land reform laws that began in 1979, when Zimbabwe pledged to begin a fairer distribution of land between the white minority who ruled Zimbabwe from 1890 to 1979 and the black population. Little land had been redistributed and frustrated groups of government supporters began seizing white-owned farms. In recent years there has been a surge in violence and racism against the dwindling white community and particularly against white farmers. On September 18, 2010 droves of white people were chased away from participating in the constitutional outreach program in Harare at the weekend. Similar abuse happened in Mount Pleasant where white families were abused by Zanu PF supporters who later drove them away shouting racial slurs. There have also been many illegal seizures of farmland owned by white farmers by the government and pro government supporters.

Reviewing Zimbabwe's human rights record, torture, harassment and politically motivated prosecutions of human rights defenders and perceived opponents have been rampant. Due to Mugabe's socialist-trend government's doing, the Zimbabwean economy has been in ruins for decades. While the white minority government maintained 3.8% per year average growth between 1966-1979, the economy has shrunk by 40% since 2000. Unemployment is 80%, as of today Zimbabwe has no national currency (they shut it down), inflation is 85% per hour (every hour on the hour), food output capacity fell 45%, manufacturing output fell by 110% between 2005-2007, government spending is 97.8% of GDP. By 2006, only 500 of the original 5,000 farms were operating. The economy deteriorated from one of Africa's strongest economies to the world's worst. It is important to understand, how much Mugabe's plans, Marxist worldview, and thug nature were on display for everyone who had eyes, ears and a half a brain in Zimbabwe from 1972. Yet, the people supported him. Now, the very same people are "enjoying" 85% inflation per hour.

The question could be asked from everyone who participated: "What did you think?" "What did you expect?" "Didn't you see what Mugabe was doing before his first election?"

O

There was a so-called "communist" government in **Hungary** up until 1989. I mean "so called communist" because aside from their name and flag waving, they –from 1968- did not have much of anything common with real communism, practiced in places such as Cuba. And there was relative freedom from approximately 1984. I argued in the mid 1980s and have been arguing to this day, that should the Hungarian government of 1985 have opened borders, created hard currency, and completed a well thought but far reaching privatization, the system of 1985 would still be intact in Hungary today. In obvious disagreement with the government and the ways they handled issues, I immigrated to the US in 1986; therefore I claim the right to defend the good sides of the administration of 1980-1986. The simple fact is, that today, Hungary is in ruins; financially, economically, socially, as a respected country by others, as a "voice in Europe," and as a democracy, to name a few categories. The best way to describe the prevailing situation and my argument is the summary paragraph I wrote in my book in 2010:

*"...In 1956 the communists took over Hungary in ruins. There was nothing but bombed buildings, 350,000 people left the country, and there was fresh oppression after the revolution. After 33 years, the communists gave Hungary over to "freedom" in 1989... You guys took over a country with a **functioning** industry, R&D, agriculture, and education system. Now it has been 21 years. The country is in ruins, unemployment is 20%, 72% (government data!) of the retired population is living under poverty line (and believe me: that "line" is not high to begin with), nothing left from what you took over, the economy is at 1/6th of its 1989 size, the country is polarized, the right-wing is coming up, there are open and rampant movements against the Jewish and gypsy population, it is not a "respected job" to be a teacher, the*

doctors are going to London to make some money, most Hungarian universities are falling in rank on the international lists like a rock, international Patent filings are nowhere near where they were twenty years ago, and the country is one of the most corrupt of all former Eastern European countries. In 1989, Hungary was the strongest within the "Soviet Camp," the "darling" of the West and the envy of the East; now it is listed with Ukraine and it is just beyond Romania in economic power.... Twelve more years and you guys will be at par on a time-line with the communists. "What have you done? What do you have to show for it?..."

The result of the 23 year worth continuous governmental stupidity and gangsterism has by 2012 Christmas produced these situations: on December 24, 2012 around 1pm (13:00h), I personally saw a line of four person wide, approximately 600ft (200m) long crowd (roughly 25% of them children) ending at the front of a free soup kitchen in the center of Budapest; I also saw that approximately 60% of Budapest's main shopping street's stores are boarded up; "For Rent" signs in the windows. Picture this: you were walking down Fifth Avenue (New York), Maria Hilfer Strasse (Vienna, Austria), Oxford Street (London), Champs Elysees (Paris), or Zeil (Frankfurt) and saw 60% of the shops closed, empty, "For Rent" signs on them. Most other stores open are second hand Chinese clothing stores. This is what Budapest, Hungary has become.

The "stupidity and greed road" most Hungarian governments have been traveling over the last 23 years has lead to political situations, such as: on November 26, 2012 a right wing representative of the Hungarian Parliament (Marton Gyongyosi) stood up in the Parliament and recommended to list all Jews in Hungary (later he modified it to "all Jews in the Parliament). How can this happen in the center of the glorious European Union is another conversation topic, but Hungary today is a deeply anti-Semitic, deeply divided country with no meaningful industry, failing agriculture, approximately 28% unemployment, right on the edge of total financial ruin. A country where black uniformed thugs (called the "Garda") shot into the homes of gypsies. A country where a city council member of the sixth largest city of Hungary stood up in a City Council meeting and declared: *"So long as I am here, there will be no Jews performing in our theater"* reflecting on an upcoming, programmed event where a famous Hungarian (Jewish) writer was to perform.

This all within twenty-three short years from a peaceful, fully employed Hungary, where (throughout my first 32 years) I have never once heard the word "Jewish." To a point that –as it turned out in the late 80s- two of the four, life-long friends of mine are Jewish. They never hid the fact, it was just not a topic of discussion before 1989. That transferred to the *"So long as I am here, there will be no Jews performing in our theater"* in a short 23 years. The fine point to this argument is the fact that all major political parties have been on power at some point since 1989; therefore no one is blameless in the overall situation the country has today. In this context, it is interesting to point out how the current Hungarian government (FIDESZ) came to power in 2010. The same government was in power between 1998-2002 and put all their characters and specifics on display. This was a government where I personally saw an interview (around 2001) with the Police Chief of Hungary, which went like this:

Reporter: *"Chief, do you have knowledge of the fact that X Police General (the General was named) and Y Ukrainian mob boss (the boss was also named) own a hotel in a large Hungarian city (the hotel and the city were named) as partners?"*

...

Hungary's Police Chief: *"Can you show me a specific Hungarian law that forbids an active police general and a mob boss owning a hotel in Hungary?"*

In any half decent country, five minutes after this interview the "general" would have been arrested, the police chief fired, and the Secretary of Interior along with his deputies would have resigned. Not in Hungary. Beside the total absurdity of this interview, there are two major points: One, that while visiting Hungary, I had dinners with friends, former classmates, etc., where many times approximately half of the table turned out to be "anti government" and the other half was supporting it. I observed that no matter how factual information the "anti" side brought up, the "for" side dismissed as "socialist propaganda." I was sitting there, knowing that the information (such as the interview I mentioned) is true, factual and correct, it did not make a dent on the other side. This is the most interesting and specific characteristic of the Dallas Syndrome, which repeats itself over

and over again, replacing the “socialist” in the “socialist propaganda” with the timely qualification, such as “right wing propaganda” in the US which morphed from “right wing conspiracy” (but we will talk about it in a minute). The other point is all the corruption, anti democratic, thug way the government handled issues, were on full display for everyone to see. They proved to be an incapable, hugely corrupt, deeply dividing bunch that ruined the country between 1998-2002. There were several books written giving detailed accounts of the FIDESZ’s doings while in power.

Came 2010, and people voted FIDESZ back to power. Not only “voted them back,” they were voted back with two-third majority. Using that, they destroyed the Hungarian Constitution (as one of government’s member famously noted after election: “Budapest as the capitol of Hungary will be the only sure thing in the new Constitution”). They closed newspapers, TV and radio stations, people close to the government publish anti Jewish and anti Gipsy pieces, they destroyed Hungary way beyond the point of no return. Based upon their 1998-2002 performance, they have not done anything (not one thing) that anyone with a half a brain, open eyes and ears could have not anticipated. But people voted them back to power.

So, again, the question could be asked from everyone who voted for them: “What did you think?” “What did you expect?” “Didn’t you see what they were doing before?”

O

The **European Union** was formed on a totally false premise, although it was not readily and clearly apparent for most people. A few facts, though well known to everybody who is allowed to walk in public without supervision: Europe is a socialistic system and they had successfully been running it for one –and only one– reason: they were diversified. Their currencies were diversified and their economies were diversified. This gave them a huge advantage because while some of them were doing good, others were not. On average, they could keep the boat floating sort of speak. It was also clear to anyone who has ever seen a see-saw that one side of it is always “up” while the other is “down.” It should have been categorized under the “my goat understands it” label, that (as an example) Germany and Portugal (having hugely different economies, representing the two sides of the see-saw) cannot possibly be governed from one central bank and one central bank interest rate, because the central bank will not be able to do good; it will hurt one side, while helping the other. The years which followed 1989 clearly showed that the European Union is not just “road to nowhere” but it is “road to total ruins;” as it turned out, the ECB’s rate were always set to German interests, that “Western EU” was taking all assets, markets, innovations and valuable human capital over, closing down practically everything in “Eastern EU,” and forming a highly educated labor camp out of the former Eastern European countries. By 2009, it has become clear to everyone, that Spain, Italy, Portugal and Greece would be much better off if they left the “Unholy Alliance,” got their central bank, currency; in short, their sovereignty back. The see-saw problem (that was always “up” for Germany) has destroyed their economy and their public life. It has also become clear that the “new beginning” will be a miserable, yet would still be much better than this slow death with agony.

Along the way, the EU’s “happy citizens” also witnessed a more than interesting exercise: “democracy EU style,” during the signing process of the EU Constitution. The European Constitution was signed in 2004 by representatives of the then 25 member states of the European Union, and needed to be ratified by all member states to enter into force. 23 member states completed the ratification procedure, but the rejection of the Constitution by French and Dutch voters in May and June 2005 called the future of the Constitution into question. Imagine that! France, the “cradle of democracy” rejected the EU’s glorious democratic Constitution! I guess the French know a “democratic” document when they see one, and this was not it. The leaders of the EU governments were first speechless, then quiet for two years (they gracefully called it a “reflection period”). As it turned out the “reflection period” was used as a “reflection on how to game the system.” And they did not waste it. After two years of “reflection” they came up with a brilliant idea: they gathered in Lisbon in October 2007, and adopted the final text of the Treaty. The heart and soul of the new treaty is that from here on out, governments, in their respective countries **without referendum** can ratify the treaty. Isn’t that convenient? Let’s leave the people out if they do not want to vote for it! (Just as a historical reference: the last person with a playbook of “if there is a conflict between the people and the government, we replace the people” was Joseph Stalin). Thus, the Heads of State and Government of the 27 Member States of the European Union

happily signed the Treaty of Lisbon on the 13th of December.

It is also clear and predictable that the European Union will at the end implode from Germany, when Germany will find it beneficial. It will happen when –through the ECB- the German and French banks received all, or at least most money back they gave to Greece, Portugal, and a long list of other economies.

And yet, there are countries that still want to “get in” (probably the best phrase to be used is “be unionized”) while countries who are on the verge of total ruins are still “hoping,” “cutting public spending,” etc.

So –again- two questions should be asked: what the “responsible leaders” of Spain, Portugal, Italy, Greece, and practically all former Eastern European Block countries were thinking, when they signed for this disaster, and where have they been since, when they should end the unholy alliance? What did they think then, and what have they been thinking since?

O

Up until 2012 May, **France** had a relatively (although far from great) substantial weight in world affairs. For almost a hundred years, they were the ultimate “back-door people.” General Patton had good reason to say “I’d rather have a German tank division a front of me than the French behind me.” Hallmarks of the French behavior and general spine included De Gaulle quitting NATO in 1969, de Villepin first actively organizing African and Arab nations against the Iraqi war, then lying into Collin Powell’s face at the UN conference, cheating the world on the Iraqi “oil for food” program; the French have been busy “taking care of number one” at the cost of others. But they were a fantastic tourist destination, they have been serving food almost eatable, etc. Up until May 2012, France was a fun place to visit, in spite of being the most social welfare state that everyone with a half a brain knew will one day collapse. Then came 2011, with Francois Hollande’s campaign and subsequent election in May 2012. I have to give it to Hollande, he did not lie all that much. He stated at various rallies before large crowds (I –at that time- thought he “forewarned” them), he is a socialist, he will restore the socialist retirement age Sarkozy changed, he will hugely increase tax on the wealthy, he will hire one hundred thousand teachers, he will increase minimum wage, he will increase workers and unions’ rights, to name a few anti-economy and anti-market measures that throughout history destroyed every single economy. The one thing Hollande did not mention: how will he pay for all that. People had to know, this would lead to flight of capital, weak economy, high unemployment, companies closing down, and relocating to China, India and other countries, prices will skyrocket to name a few outcomes.

Then the French people voted Francois Hollande into office.

And guess what? He has proven to be a socialist, restored most socialist laws (retirement age was one of them) Sarkozy eliminated, increased tax on the wealthy to 75%, he is on in his way to hire the one hundred thousand teachers, increased minimum wage, and is increasing workers and unions’ rights. His Minister of Industrial Renewal, Arnaud Montebourg, now disclosed a plan to nationalize (e.g. “confiscate”) one of ArcelorMittal’s (one of France’s largest steel producer) factories and announced, “ArcelorMittal is no longer wanted in France.” Hollande has gone to such extreme stupidity that he proposed a law against homework in elementary schools on the ground of inequality between “poor students” and “wealthy students” completing it.

And guess what?

High financial earners are moving out of France, (sales) listing of luxury properties exponentially increasing, tax lawyers have never had so much top-rated clients, and businesses are closing down. According to Charles-Marie Jottras, chairman of Daniel Feau Estate Agents: *“Our agencies in the best parts of Paris say that a third of their December revenues are on sales of apartments for people leaving France. I have never seen anything like this before in my 27 years at the agency.”* By now (which is only seven months of Hollande’s sorry presidency), people such as Gerard Depardieu (actor), Yves Bontaz (car industry supplier), Jean-Gil Boitouzet (on-line brokerage), and dozens of other high earners are leaving France. Mr. Depardieu’s \$65 million Paris mansion is up for sale and he announced: he will give up his French citizenship. Most of the high earners are relocating to Belgium; Bernard Arnault, France’s richest man, along with the billionaire Mulliez family, also applied for Belgian citizenship. As a result, 27% of the Belgian city Nechin’s population is French.

Jean-David Chamboredon, a high caliber investor in startups, said: *"My forecast is that investment by business angels may well decrease by a third or maybe a half in 2013. There will be hundreds of startups that will die or will not get off the ground."* Alcohol consumption has been falling in France since the socialist government increased tax on excised duties by 14%. Serge Papin, head of Systeme U supermarket chain said: *"People are no longer choosing between types of toys – it's only the price that counts."*

The response from this degenerate French government and their Prime Minister Jean Marc Ayrault: *"...paying your taxes is an act of solidarity and patriotism...."*

By now, the same (stupid) messes who elected Hollande and his bunch are deeply shocked. The real question is: Why?

So, again, the question could be asked from everyone who voted: "What did you think?" "What did you expect?" "Didn't he tell you what he is going to do?"

O

The Muslim Brotherhood in **Egypt** was forced underground during the reign of President Mubarak. And (as it turned out) for good reason. It would take a long discussion how good or bad the Mubarak regime was, but Egypt was a free, almost secular country. His Egypt was the cornerstone of peace of the Middle East for 30 years. Multiple religions were freely practiced by those who wanted to practice. It could be a long and separate conversation how (if at all) President Mubarak deserved to be eliminated from power. The issue at hand, why and how the people of Egypt voted Mohamed Morsi and the Muslim Brotherhood into power. As it is well known, the Muslim Brotherhood was founded in 1936, and its founder wrote up a 50 point Manifesto. Before we look at the manifesto, the point is the "1936" portion. It could have not been and in fact was not a surprise for the Egyptians what Morsi and his organization stood for. Just a few interesting points from the Manifesto:

- "...A reform of the law, so that it will conform to Islamic legislation in every branch;
- A strengthening of the bonds between all Islamic countries, especially the Arab countries, to pave the way for practical and serious consideration of the matter of the departed Caliphate;
- The surveillance of the personal conduct of all its employees, and an end to the dichotomy between the private and professional spheres;
- Conditioning the people to respect public morality, and the issuance of directives fortified by the aegis of the law on this subject; the imposition of severe penalties for moral offences;
- Segregation of male and female students; private meetings between men and women, unless between the permitted degrees [of relationship] to be counted as a crime for which both will be censored;
- The closure of morally undesirable ballrooms and dance halls, and the prohibition of dancing and other such pastimes;
- The expurgation of songs, and a rigorous selection and censorship of them;
- Due consideration for the claims of the moral censorship, and punishment of all who are proved to have infringed any Islamic doctrine or attacked it, such as breaking the fast of Ramadan, willful neglect of prayers, insulting the faith, or any such act;
- Consideration of ways to arrive gradually at a uniform mode of dress for the nation;...."

Again, it has been known since 1936 and was known during the latest election cycle, that the people of Egypt voted someone into the presidency that represented all this, and much more.

And you wouldn't guess....:

Today, in Cairo the "Arab Spring" is lost. Gone. Instead, hundreds of thousands of women who contributed so much to the downfall of Mubarak, and voted for Morsi are marginalized, if not ignored. The parliamentary change brought 12 seats for women in the 498 seat House. "The truth is that women were doing better under Mubarak," said Dina Shobra, a 20-year-old law student at Al-Azhar University. The Muslim Brotherhood's spokeswomen, Manal Abdul Haasan suggested "fathers, brothers and husbands to march and protest

on behalf of women,” upon the women who demonstrated virginity tests were forced on the unmarried. Male guardianship now is becoming the norm, from the cafes and restaurants dominated by pontificating men, to the huddles of teenage girls making do with cracked civic benches for their social life as burly male police officers keep an eye on them.

The danger is that if Islamists dominate not only the parliament, but the executive and judiciary, women's rights are likely to regress further. Suzanne Mubarak, the deposed first lady, pushed for pro-women legislation including the right of wives to sue for divorce and a quota system favoring female election candidates. The latter has already been scrapped, while the former is under threat. Disturbing new measures, currently before parliament, include a reduction in the age at which girls can marry to fourteen, while proposed changes in custody law will award children over eight to divorced fathers.

On the political front, let's not forget that at the beginning of the Arab Spring, the Muslim Brotherhood declared their intention not to have a candidate in the presidential election. In other words, they lied (just as a side note: the small group of people –aside the Egyptian public- who either did not really know, or were lying about “not knowing” of what the Brothers were really planning, was Barack Hussein Obama and his government. Aside of them, everyone –with half a brain- was openly talking about how the Brothers are fooling everybody). If the Manifesto was not enough forecast for the populous, this should have been; but it was not. The “intention not to participate” lead to the “our guy is the president” outcome. It also resulted in the Muslim Brotherhood lead parliament voting all night on the new “Constitution” which tries to edge the Supreme Court out of power. The “Constitution” rushed through parliament was boycotted by all other parties (more than a quarter of the total) but the “Brothers.” It also led to Morsi declaring himself to be above the law. Aside all internal issues which were part of the Muslim Brotherhood's Manifesto, it was clear from the very first minute of the Arab Spring that the “Brothers” are vastly anti-Israel, and the only thing that keeps them from declaring a hostile relationship with Israel is the American money they receive every year. But this obviously holds the key to Pandora's Box. The minute someone steps up with the dough, there could be war between Egypt and Israel, in which many thousands of Egyptians will die.

In other words, the complete disaster that we all face today in Egypt was out there in the open from the very first anti-Mubarak demonstration on Tahrir Square at the dawn of the Arab Spring. But the messes of Egypt voted for the Brothers.

So, again, the question could be asked from everyone who voted for the Brothers: “What did you think?;” “What did you expect?;” “Wasn't the Manifesto clear enough for you?;” “Wasn't the fact the Brothers lied throughout the entire process enough for you?;” “You are predominantly Muslims, don't you know your own religion?”

O

Barack Hussein Obama was elected to be the President of the **United States** in November, 2007, to keep the seat occupied between January 2009 and January 2013. Obama's successful election was attributed to several factors:

- It is a proven fact that the US electorate has been trying 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 (by that yardstick, this person was 14 when Jimmy –tragically- got into the White House, therefore had no knowledge of Jimmy's doings). The person who voted first time in 2008, was born in 1990; which meant, this person was between 16.5-18 year of age during primaries; hardly an age to recognize a socialist. 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 segment had absolutely zero knowledge how it really works.
- Black population was a given

- Latino (mainly Mexican) 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. Once this crowd will show me a single example in history where “borrowing ourselves 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. Accidentally, 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.
- Young population (mostly with college degree was a given on emotional basis; as Churchill said, “If you are not a liberal at age 25, you don’t have a heart; if you are not conservative at age 35, you don’t have a brain.” Obama was young, attractive, exciting, smooth talker, “let’s elect the first black guy;” he had nothing to back it up, but “reality” does not count when you make emotional decision, and that’s what you do at 25.
- You had to give it to Obama, he was clever. A finely singing canary with as much ground to stand on, as the canary. But few people recognized the four thesis he based his entire campaign on:

“All propaganda has to be popular and has to accommodate itself to the comprehension of the least intelligent of those whom it seeks to reach.”

“The broad masses of a population are more amenable to the appeal of rhetoric than to any other force.”

“By the skillful and sustained use of propaganda, one can make a people see even heaven as hell or an extremely wretched life as paradise.”

“Make the lie big, make it simple, keep saying it, and eventually they will believe it.”

Even fewer people knew (and know), that these mantras were formulated by another fine canary, with a funny looking mustache and “Adolf” as his first name. That particular canary had the singing capability of talking intelligent, cultured, schooled human beings (this gives you hands-on reference that there is no correlation between “university degree” and “being a member of the ‘60%’”) into escorting millions of other human beings into the gas chamber, gas them, then burn their bodies (just think about the quality of the “60%’s” mind). 50+ million people died as a result.

- For a long time, I could not figure out the Jewish community. In the Jewish religion and way of living, “education” is valued above all considerations. It perhaps 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 built was a prayer room and a school. Jewish exceptionalism has shown in academia, media, film, financing and, in most cases, industries. Obama’s socialist, globalizing, “spreading the wealth” ideology, statements, occupation as “community organizer,” gangster friends such as Bill Ayers, and mindless anarchist friends such as Jeremiah Wright, 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.
- The other crowd I could not figure out was the side of 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 free 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,
 - 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,
- He multiple times said: “if he is elected, he will bankrupt the US coal industry;”
- If these were not enough for the business community, there was his wife’s “Barack will change the history of the country” comment.

One must give it to Obama, he delivered. He delivered on everything he promised. Destroyed the economy, unemployment constantly stayed over 16% in his four years (No, not 8.1%. That’s a boldfaced lie. “8.1%” is the percent of people, who currently are in the system and being counted). Add the “under-employed,” you have well over 22% of the population who either does not work, or does not work at the level his/her degree predestined the person. Black unemployment is 14%. He increased the food stamp recipients’ number from 27 million to 47 million. Unemployment under age is roughly 22%. Obama has been acting as a “Jimmy Carter on steroids” in a sense that Carter only let the Shah of Iran down, Obama assisted to the fall of **every single** America friendly dictator, but did not touch dictators who have been advancing the Muslim cause around the world. Most of all, he increased America’s debt from 9.6 Trillion to 16.3 Trillion, in four years. The country has never been more divided than it is today. It would take a complete book to tally all that Obama & Co. has done against the USA but let’s just say, we have become a banana republic.

.....then came November 6th, 2012....

Understand this: presidents up until 2008 could have not come close to being reelected with a far better record, than Obama had. He destroyed every single segment of the society, and he did it one by one. As an example, by socializing the student loan business, the loan interest has gone through the roof. The aforementioned “under 25” age bracket now has to pay much more for a student loan but they don’t have a job. There is a complicated structure within ObamaCare, but one section orders all hospitals to provide birth control pills except this is diagonally opposite with those hospitals’ regulation that are being run by the Catholic Church. Another part of this albatross is the part ordering companies employing more than 50 people to provide health insurance or pay a fine, or have them work less than 30 hours per week, qualifying them as “part time.” which will totally destroy all public universities and tens of thousands of “adjunct professors” who work there. These professors have been working for the university but the university does not provide insurance. Now they either will become “part time” or will be fired altogether.

Obama promised legalization of the 11 million illegal immigrants then did not deliver. Obama –instead of working on employment- invested two years into “ObamaCare,” which (first time in US history) dictates private citizens what to purchase. Under Obama, the US Senate has not even filed a single budget (in four years). Under Obama, the US government sued the State of Arizona, for protecting its borders, which was the federal government’s job, but they neglected to do it. First time in US history, more people (51%) take money out of the system than pay into the system. First time in US history, government jobs pay more (I mean: far more, approximately 35% more) than the private sector. Also, -under Obama- the government sector has been exponentially growing. Businesses are suffering from tax, from the EPA, and from government regulation. People do not have a job. Debt of the country has gone through the roof. No one around the world has any respect for the USA. Our Secretary of Defense wanted to visit China, the Chinese government rebuked. The Pakistani government jailed the very doctor, who lead us to Bin Laden. We protested, the Pakistanis did not give a hoot.

It was also a simple fact, that black population has never –over the last 30 years- had higher unemployment rate than in 2010-2011.

In hard data, it looks like this:

- The day Obama was inaugurated, 134.38 million Americans were working and unemployment was 7.3%; in January 2013, 134.02 million Americans work, and unemployment is 7.8% (again, this is government data).
- The day Obama was inaugurated, 32.2 million people were on food stamps; in January, 2013 the number is 47.5 million people.
- The day Obama was inaugurated, poverty rate was 13.2%; in January, 2013 it is 15.1%.
- The day Obama was inaugurated, Social Security was projected to go broke (if we did not do something) in 2041; in January 2013, this forecast dropped to 2037.
- The day Obama was inaugurated, the US national debt was \$10.627 Trillion; in January 2013, it is \$16,435 Trillion.

- The day Obama was inaugurated, the public debt amounted to 40.8%; on December 31, 2012, it was 72.8%.
- The day Obama was inaugurated, median household income was \$51,190; according to the latest data available (2011), the median income fell to \$50,054.
- Under Obama, the economy has grown at the 0.4% per year clip; in the decade prior to Obama the average growth was 1.6%, 2.6% in the previous 20 years, and 3.2% since World War II.
- Black unemployment rate was 11.2% when Obama got into the White House. This rate was 14.3% on the election day January, 2013.

You know what? You can be black, white, yellow, green, blue or polka-dot; you can be a male, female, a transvestite, a gay, strait, a bi-sexual, tall or short, fat or skinny; this is a dismal record ...unless this was "the" plan all along; to cut America down to size. Then, this is a success. Absent that, you (if you have just a bit of spine and a grain of decency) should not run for reelection in the first place. But since you did, the people should have enough brain to chase you away.

On September 11, 2012 our Ambassador was killed in Libya, our Embassy was burned to the ground. Obama, Hillary and about 15 senior government people lied through their teeth. I have been continuously amazed by even the conservative media's blind stupidity. Let me line up some facts here:

- As most people know, the attack happened on September 11.
- It was also known from day one, that the State Department saw the entire attack real time, on TV, because a drone was sent over the compound.
- Susan Rice, the US Ambassador to the UN appeared on five national broadcasting stations on September 16th and claimed the attack was a result of a "got out of hand" demonstration because of a video.
- From then on, the entire US media (including FOX news) was preoccupied with the idea of "who gave Susan Rice the bad info?"

The fact, notwithstanding, that Obama still has not answered where he was during the attack (all we know is that the White Situation Room was occupied and Hillary Clinton was in the White House), let me look at this from a rational standpoint:

- Susan Rice is a State Department employee....
-Therefore her boss is Hillary Clinton...
-and the State Department had the real time video footage as to what happened (as a matter of fact, they were the only ones who had it, if we believe Obama, that he did not see it now this is a big "if")

In other words, to this day, no one has woken up to the fact, that we should not bother the CIA, the NSA, or the DNI; all (let me repeat: **A-L-L**) pertinent information was at hand ***on the night of September 11th***, within the State Department ... and Susan Rice went on five Sunday TV programs five days later and lied. And the US media and the US public ate up all of this "now you see it, now you don't" public relation garbage. It was shameful. Remember, all this happened way before the November 6th election.

And the people of the United States of America reelected Barack Hussein Obama.

It took a long time to analyze the reasons, because the last comparable model was between 1976-1979. The findings are interesting:

In 1979:

There was a proportional number of:

- Jews
- Liberals
- Blacks who voted for democrats
- The "elites" from Berkley, Harvard, Columbia and other junkyards
- Unemployment 5.9%
- Black unemployment was 13.2%
- US debt \$826 billion
- 1979 GDP 2.9%

There were two million illegal immigrants in the US.

Unions were twice as strong as today.

With that, President Ronald Reagan practically eliminated Jimmy Carter.

In 2012:

- Jews, liberals, blacks and the “elites” represented the proportional number compared to the increased US population
- We have 12 million immigrants but they cannot vote
- The “elites” from Berkley, Harvard, Columbia and other junkyards are still there
- Unions are weak
- Unemployment 8.1%
- Black unemployment was 14.3%
- US debt \$16.2 Trillion
- 2012 GDP 1.3%

With that, Barack Hussein Obama won the reelection over Mitt Romney.

What happened?

It is hard to explain without offending a huge mess of people (“the messes”), so I will not pretend trying. In the America of 1979; patriotism, education level, the concept of achievement and exceptionalism, the concept of “wanting something in, and with one’s life” was three magnitudes higher than today. In the America of 1979, a very marginal population felt “cool” to receive welfare checks and/or food stamps every month. In the America of 1979, the absolute decisive portion of the people felt very bad not to have a job and earn the living. Today, 48% of Detroit is functionally illiterate, 51% of Chicago of high-school students never graduate, and half of the remaining 49% cannot read and write on the day they graduated. Which in-itself would not be alarming; what is alarming that the Teachers’ Unions were on strike in Chicago in 2012 for higher wages. Let me say it again, maybe someone missed this one: in Chicago, less than 25% of high-school graduates can read and write, and the Teachers’ Union who is responsible for the one hundred percent (100%) of students, wants higher wages. It is in very close parallel with managing a factory that produces 75% garbage, but the management wants higher wages. This is the real problem.

The ratio of the messes I define as “Hopies” (who have the facts staring at them but they “hope”) and “Check Addicts” (e.g. “Welfare Check” Addicts) has grown to such an overwhelming proportion within the society, that it became the direct cause of Obama’s win in spite of his despicable and shameful record. I define people as “Hopies” who have education, therefore should have some kind of brain capacity; and should use that capacity looking at facts such as:

- “we spent six trillion dollars and have close to 10%-12% unemployment;” or
- “Obama had 27 million people on food stamps when he came into office and had 47 million on the day of election;” or
- listened to Obama’s own voice from 2007 saying “it was un-American for George Bush to grow the deficit by four trillion in eight years,” then growing the deficit by six trillion in four; or
- should have looked at the situation on how Phoenix, Arizona became the kidnap capital of the US, then saw how the US government sued the State; or
- should have listened how Obama’s DOJ lied just about every time he opened his mouth; or
- no matter how nice “general healthcare” is, the US Constitution (you know! The document America can thank for her success over the last 230 years or so), does not allow the US government to make anyone purchase anything; or
- The under 25 population with diplomas should have read just a bit about how student loan interest rates skyrocketed on the one hand, and we have 20%+ unemployment in this bracket, on the other.

These are not “left,” “right,” democratic, or republican issues; these are American issues. The Hopies should have concluded, “You know what, I hate Romney, but Obama’s record is really bad, so I am not going to vote.”

I know my Jewish friends who voted for Obama will be angry with me to be included in this category, but this is what happened at the DNC Convention in September, 2012: first time in fifty years, the DNC Platform dropped the “Jerusalem as Israel’s recognized capitol” concept then (after sizable media coverage) they soiled their pants and quickly put it back. It was obvious to my goat (I actually discussed this with my goat), that Obama got really scared to lose the Jewish vote and ordered the Convention to put it back. The sad part of the story

is that several of my Jewish friends interpreted the event this way: "Obama is brilliant, because now he can claim he is pro-Israel."

I wrote a blog on September 7. Part of the blog read:

"...Just a few conclusions I would like to share here:

*Those of you who believe B. Hussein Obama was **not** in the decision making loop dropping it from the platform, please call me. I would like to sell you a truck full of high value Greek bonds.*

Those of you who argue that "it was a great move by Obama to put it back, so now he can claim ownership;" those of you need to send me an email, and I will send you a 'Certificate of Valued Member of the 60% Club'.... Here is why: if you claim to be Jewish (by the way, I am catholic, so I can say anything I want on this topic), if you claim to be a "Jew," this issue has become infinitely larger for you than it was before the DNC. It has transferred from "politically charged" to "life and death;" by definition you must turn away from Hussein Obama and the DNC. If you will not do it, you either not a Jew any more, or you are a Jew without a spine. In recent history, your homeland, your ancestors' land has been in a daily fight for more than sixty years to have a privilege calling Jerusalem, its Capitol. You know, the place where the First and the Second Temples are; the place that is literally soaked in blood from 2,000 years of fighting and protecting it; the place that no Jew could visit before 1963; the place hundreds of thousands of your fellow Jews wanted to go to, and died getting there; the place where the Wailing Wall is. If you turn your back on all that, you cannot consider yourself a "Jew" any more..."

I mean how anyone –being Jewish- could wake up on September 10th, look into the mirror and say: "I know what happened at the DNC congress," but I will still vote for Obama." Don't you have self-respect? Even this wasn't enough to clarify your thinking about Obama? . I no longer consider myself "Hungarian" (beside the fact I was born there; I am a (disillusioned, pro-American, Constitutional conservative) American. But: if someone did this with Hungary, I would not be able to vote for that person. And I don't have 10% mental and emotional connection with Hungary than most Jews have with Israel. This is the point. And, this is why you are part of the "Hopies" group.

Check Addicts are the part of the "51%" currently taking money out of the system, who are not retired, disabled, or otherwise need assistance. People who did not pay their fair share into the system, and have able body to work ...just don't want to. The prevailing morality took the United States where it is today. Putting it another way, there is no morality left in the United States of America. And it showed on November 6th, 2012. The Hopies and Check Addicts went out and enthusiastically voted; For Obama.

Most people in the US (along with me) made a mistake predicting the election result of November 6th. It is not an excuse, it is a fact: no one had arithmetic to forecast these two groups' mood, their understanding of the situation, their patriotism, their willingness to vote for someone like Obama (I personally was betting on their "patriotism," because their understanding....). No one had a matrix as to how the Jews will vote after the(ir) Democratic Convention scrapped the "Jerusalem must be the Jewish capitol" idea from the platform.

And then, when all this will be said and done, we can ask the same question we asked around the world: "Is this what you had in mind"? Which part of the "policies that made the US great, and the policies of B. Hussein Obama are diagonal opposites, and they will create opposite result" was too complex for you? "Have you people lost your minds?"

O

The list of historical and recent examples is very long, the messes' "anti self interest" stupidity boggles the mind, making all rationally thinking people drawing the conclusion: we should really get rid of general voting rights." Just to prove it, let me provide you with the "Mother of All" historical examples.

In the **United Kingdom**, Prime Minister Chamberlain signed the Munich Pact with Nazi leader Adolf Hitler in 1938. It gave Czechoslovakia to Hitler, but (according to Chamberlain, whose mental capacity was equal to Jimmy Carter, Dick Durbin, Chuck Schumer, Patrick Leahy, Francois Hollande, Herman van Rumpoy,

and a long list of others trying to pass as a leader) was supposed to bring "peace in our time." Subsequent to that (because liberals never learn), Hitler invaded Poland in September 1939. Chamberlain woke up (as all liberals do) late, declared war against Germany but the ensuing situation proved to be way outside of his pay-grade. Hitler wanted to show who was in charge, and occupied Norway in April 1940, then Belgium, and the Netherlands in May. This was just about enough for the Royal Subjects of the UK, and they threw Chamberlain out (as we say it in the US, "a day late a dollar short"). Churchill was elected Prime Minister on May 10, 1940. The only problem was that by the time the "Royal Subjects" woke up, Hitler took most of Europe and the UK was in grave danger. Long story short, the rest is history: Churchill singlehandedly developed a coalition, worked it, kept it, got FDR convinced to enter, and won the Second World War. He pretty much saved the very life of the "Royals" and their "Subjects" on the West side of the English Channel. As a byproduct, he also saved Europe from Nazism and from total elimination.

It absolutely deserves time and space to review some of the facts between 1930-1945; nothing in the 20th century (maybe nothing in human history) can demonstrate how much destruction, devastation and tragic loss can be the result of the advanced Dallas Syndrome. How much tragedy can be the root cause of human stupidity, complacency, appeasement, being "hopeful" (*where did I hear "hope" last time....? Got it! "Hope and Change!!"*), replacing wisdom and common sense with "understanding the other side" (*where did I hear that last time....? Got it! "Leading from behind," "Palestinian statehood," "containment of Iran's nuclear program!!"*), advocating the "if we are nice, other people will be nice too" (*where did I hear that last time....? Got it! In Benghazi by "not defending our Embassy because it would offend the locals!!"*), claiming "It will never happen again," and the "winning the hearts and minds of the people" (*where did I hear that one last time...? Got it! "Winning the hearts and minds of the Iraqi and Afghan people"*) philosophy. I predicted this last one, years ago: all the "winning the hearts and minds" cost us roughly a trillion dollars, approximately 7,000 brave Americans just to be at the exact same place where we started: Taliban is in power, people blow each other up. This actually came from President Bush. Obama's policies are worse than this one, they just have not had time to run their course.

So what led the two World Wars (I and II)? Just in a nutshell:

Before World War I (1914-1918) [*]:

- In 1901, in a speech, Churchill said: "...astonished ... to hear with what composure, and how glibly Members, and even Ministers talk of a European war..."
- Right before the war, most European country government and people believed that the war on economical ground is impossible. When the war broke out, everyone thought it will be over fast and at low cost.
- In 1913, Churchill argued for the development of "naval aeroplanes superiority." At the same time, the French general Foch argued: "It's just a sport –the aeroplane- it is zero in war."

Before World War II (1939-1945):

- The German rearmament began in 1921.
- In May 1931, Churchill argued: "The new custom union between Germany and Austria is a prelude to a future German annexation of Austria. If that happened, Czechoslovakia would soon be menaced by Germans."
- In 1932, Churchill argued: "Once Hitler's Germany had been allowed to rearm without active interference by the Allies and former associated Powers, a second World War is certain."
- As soon as Hitler came to power, Churchill read Mein Kampf, Hitler's memoir. He wrote: "there was no book which deserved more careful study from the rulers. Political and military, of the Allied Powers. All was there..." Churchill described it the "new Koran of faith and war: turgid, verbose, shapeless, but pregnant with message." At the same time, a journalist (Vernon Bartlett) said it is "unfair" to judge Hitler by his decade long writings." Lloyd George said, "Hitler wants friendship and peace with England," and "I only wish we had a man of supreme quality at the head of affairs in our country."
- Upon Churchill's article about Hitler in 1935 in The Strand magazine, Sir Robert Vansittart, the permanent under-secretary, wrote Churchill: "It is hardly to be thought that this article would be at all palatable to the powers that be in Germany It might therefore be questioned whether republication just now is advisable."
- A prominent Anglican bishop claimed that Hitler "is a very religious man himself."
- Anglican clergies expressed their "boundless admiration for the moral and ethical side of the National Social program, its clear-cut stand for religion, and Christianity."

- American historian, Arnold Toynbee, and journalist, Walter Lippmann, in writing praised Hitler and his program in mid-1930s.
- In 1933, Churchill said at the Royal Society of St. George: "Nothing can save England if she will not save herself. Weaponry in defense, not words in diplomacy, should be the policy."
- In 1935, Churchill (on the floor of the Parliament) named twenty-four German air force factories and called for the expansion of the Royal Air Force. Clement Atlee, deputy leader of the governing coalition, called Churchill's argument "nationalist and imperialist delusions."
- In 1937, Chamberlain said that the situation in Europe was "relaxed."

After World War II:

- Eleanor Roosevelt called Churchill a "warmonger."
- Seven US senators called Churchill a "threat to world peace."
- Churchill said in 1951: "Appeasement in itself may be good or bad according to the circumstances. Appeasement from weakness and fear is alike futile and fatal. Appeasement from strength might be the surest and perhaps the only path to world peace."

[*]: James C. Humes: Churchill The Prophetic Statesman

[Although this topic would unreasonably expand the length of this Paper, let me make a brief comment here: it is more than educational to parallel the time, statements, official platform and attitude of governments between 1930-1940 in Europe, and what the consecutive US governments have been doing between 2003-today.]

The war was won on April 25, 1945, and the jubilant United Kingdom (freshly escaped the death sentence) had their post-war election. The election results were posted on July 26, 1945. The grateful, adoring masses of the UK, whose very lives were saved by Winston Churchill, and who considered Churchill a National Hero, **voted Winston Churchill's party out of power** and voted another "Chamberlain size sorry liberal moron (representing the Labour Party), Clement Attlee into power. Not only voted Labour in, but gave them the majority. Labour's program called for collectivism, nationalization of industries and centralized state direction of the economy based upon Keynes theories (US readers: does this ring the bell? Anyone?). It did not work. Specific example was the "National Coal Board" supposedly managing coal mines (ring the bell? anyone? ObamaCare?). As a result, by the summer of 1946 the UK was facing a coal shortage for the upcoming winter with stock piles, 5 million tons too low. Nationalization exposed both lack of preparation for public ownership and a failure to stabilize the industry in advance of the change.

Simon Basketter wrote a review on David Kynaston's "Austerity Britain 1945-1951:"

"...'Dreariness is everywhere,' wrote one schoolteacher in 1948. 'Streets are deserted, lighting is dim, people's clothes are shabby and their tables bare.' ... David Kynaston's history of the period from 1945 to 1951 is full of anecdotes recorded in diaries and letters, and from the Mass Observation archive.... The Labour government set about nationalizing the Bank of England, coal mines, electricity and gas, railways, British Airways and other sections of the economy. Labour nationalized around 20 percent of the economy and created the NHS. Crisis hit the economy in 1947. In 1948 Labour chancellor Sir Stafford Cripps introduced an austerity budget including a wage freeze. He told the TUC congress, 'There is only a certain sized cake. If a lot of people want a larger slice they can only get it by taking it from others. Unemployment rose from 400,000 to 1.75 million. Britain was dependent on a £1.1 billion US loan. To combat absenteeism, sport was banned during the week....'

On October 26, 1951, Winston Churchill was asked back to be a Prime Minister again.

Should this in itself make the case for "we must rethink the concept of general voting rights??"

So let me see do I get this clearly:

The people of **Iran** willingly and knowingly helped Khomeini into power; in exchange, he instituted Sharia, named himself faqih who "suppresses all others in knowledge," formed the Islamic Revolutionary Guards. Banned drinks, western cultures of any kind, shorts for men, men and women swimming together, broadcasting music of any kind other than religious, Islamized universities and other institutions, increased deep poverty rate by 45% in the first six years, by instituting the "Economy for donkeys" mantra. Instituted

punishments such as burying women from the waist down and stoning them to death for adultery, laws such as “spousal rape is not illegal,” in any other rape cases, the raped women needs four male witnesses or three men and two women for conviction; the testimony of two women is equal one man, a woman has the right to divorce only if her husband signs a contract granting that right, cannot provide for his family, or is a drug addict, insane, or impotent. A husband is not required to cite a reason for divorcing his wife. Iranian laws permit polygamy, employment laws favor men, and family laws entitle women to only half the inheritance of a man. During the Khomeini years, there were an estimated 30,000 people executed. This is in the nutshell.

The people of **Zimbabwe** willingly and knowingly helped Mugabe into power; in exchange, most land was illegally seized and corruptly redistributed, white farmers were either killed or chased away, agriculture was decimated, human rights suspended, torture, harassment and politically motivated prosecutions have been rampant, the economy is in ruins, unemployment is 80%, no national currency, inflation 85% per hour, manufacturing capacity fell by 110%, the economy deteriorated from one of Africa's strongest economies to the world's worst;

In spite, the well known fact that all (not “most;” all) former Eastern European countries have lost 30%-80% of their former economic power between 1995-2012 to the Western side of the EU, there are still countries outside of the **European Union** wanting to get in. This is equivalent to Obama and the Hungarian government's reelection. The people know what they will get, close historical data is staring them in the eye, and furthermore the “future leaders” actually are announcing what kind of misery they will bring and the messes still vote for them. The “Hopies” still do what they are good at: “hope.” As the Hungarian prime minister lately announced at a press conference: “Don't listen to what I said, look at what I do.” As much as socialism sounded good in 2007 for the American public (when they voted for Obama), this “let's be one people with a combined economy” looked somewhat rational (again to people who should not be in public without supervision) between 1995-2000. But this is 2013 now. Thirteen years' worth of data should be sufficient. To begin with, it should have tipped off most people when the European Union (in his founding document) declared: “The main reason to create the EU is to be a counterweight to the US economy.” I have seen people creating ventures, companies, associations, sport -and social clubs; all were created “for” something. The EU's funding document plainly declared: it is created “against” the US. This was the first of anything, I have seen in 58 years, to be created “against” something. It was “dead on arrival” in my mind on that day; I knew this would go down before it goes up. And I knew (and did speeches, presentations and wrote articles) that they would rob everybody until everyone, in the Eastern bloc, has nothing left. Then they will close it down. In short, the concept was wrong, the execution was in the range bordered by “idiotic” on one side and “criminal” on the other, and the spirit was “anti” something. After seventeen years worth of pure disaster, it is clear, documented, and understandable. But, the “60%” is still excited, still is “hoping,” still has a menu full of explanations and excuses.

The people of **Hungary** willingly and knowingly helped consecutive governments into power; in exchange by these governments' doing, Hungary has gone from the “darling of the West” and being the strongest economy of Eastern European bloc to being the worst economy, where unemployment is close to 18% below age 25, and 40% over 50. The people of Hungary voted FIDESZ back into power **with absolute majority** in 2010, after FIDESZ proved to be an ultra-right “not playing with the full deck of cards” bunch between 1998-2002. As a result, the trends described above have been amplified, anti-democracy and anti-Semitism have been exponentially growing, is rampant and in the open; the country has become borderline fascistic.

On January 5, 2013 a writer by the name of Zsolt Bayer, who is one of the very few closest and long time friends of the prime minister (Viktor Orban) of Hungary, and owns the Serial no. 5 membership card of FIDESZ (raining party in Hungary) wrote an article in the FIDESZ sponsored daily newspaper in Hungary:

“...a large part of the gypsies are not qualified to live together within the society. Not qualified to live with other humans. This part of the gypsies behave like animals. They want to fornicate with anyone they see. If they are prevented, they kill. They want to empty themselves anywhere and anytime they need to. If they are prevented, they kill. They want everything they see. If they don't immediately get it, they kill. This part of the gypsies are unable to any kind of human communication. Most of the time inarticulate noises come from their animal heads, and all they understand from this rotten world is violence. While the gypsies have become

these animals, they use the idiotic western world's advantages. Look at how they pose on Facebook, with guns in their hands, a pound of gold around their neck, with the "I can kill you any time, you stupid Hungarian peasant" grin on their faces. We cannot tolerate them we must eliminate them. .. These animals should not exist. At all. We have to solve this – immediately and in any necessary way we can."

Once again, this was published in Hungary, in a government newspaper, by a guy who is one of the best friends of the prime minister, in 2013, in the middle of the European Union, some 130 miles from Vienna, Austria.

The people of Hungary willingly and knowingly helped the current government into power in spite of full knowledge of the current government's style and philosophy. As a very direct proof of the defined, unavoidable, and foreseeable outcome of the Dallas Syndrome, here, let me share a piece written by Hari Kunzru in "The New Yorker" on January 8, 2013, titled The Frightening Hungarian Crackdown:

In November 2012, the Nobel prize-winning novelist Imre Kertész announced his retirement. The writer, who as a fourteen year-old was transported to Auschwitz, has become one of Europe's most eloquent and respected literary witnesses to the Holocaust.... In books such as "Fateless" and "Kaddish for an Unborn Child," he has made the paradoxical case that "the concentration camp is imaginable only and exclusively as literature, never as reality—not even—or rather least of all—when we have directly experienced it." Since his working life has been devoted to this act of imagination, his decision to house his archive not in his native Hungary but, rather, in Germany appears to be a profound gesture of reconciliation. Yet, when I said so on Twitter, a Hungarian writer friend e-mailed to tell me that Kertész's decision was also driven by more negative concerns:

"I'm afraid there is something more to it: he has also good reasons to believe that in Hungary his legacy wouldn't be treated with as much respect as in Germany, as he is regarded by the current political elite as an "unHungarian" and then I've been euphemistic. For example, currently his work is not part of the Hungarian national education program, due to some changes in school material in which, at the same time, three famously anti Semitic writers have been included. "

My friend has asked to remain anonymous, as he fears that if he is publicly identified as a critic of the government it could cause problems for him and the company where he works. His fears appear to be well founded. Across Hungary, the cultural scene is in a state of crisis.

The current Prime Minister, Viktor Orbán, has rebranded Fidesz, once a liberal youth party (with the vintage countercultural slogan "Don't trust anyone over thirty-five") as a right-wing Christian nationalist organization. After Fidesz won a large majority in national elections in 2010, Orbán set about remaking the country, changing the constitution in ways that observers allege, have removed important checks on the power of government. The courts are being packed with government loyalists, and media is scrutinized for "balance," with the threat of crippling fines for those deemed to have strayed. Dozens of "opposition" journalists have been fired from state-run media, and Klubrádió, the country's most prominent independent radio station, has been refused a broadcasting license.

The new constitution "recognizes the role of Christianity in preserving nationhood," and art that is deemed blasphemous or "anti-national" is now the target of a full-blown campaign of suppression. After the election, the mayor of Budapest fired the head of the New Theatre (one of the country's leading producers of contemporary drama) and appointed in his place György Dörner, an actor who supports the far-right Jobbik opposition party, an openly anti-Semitic, anti-gay, and anti-Roma organization with a recently disbanded paramilitary wing, whose Presidential candidate has declared that Israeli Jews are "lice-infested dirty murderers." Dörner has promised to reverse what he sees as a "degenerate, sick liberal hegemony," and to produce only Hungarian plays. Last August, protests forced him to cancel a proposed production of "The Sixth Coffin," a play set in France after the First World War, featuring "a group of powerful Jews plotting to destroy Hungary and plunge humanity into another world war."

In the art world, an organization called the Hungarian Academy of Arts (M.M.A.), founded as a private association in 1992, has recently been made into a public body and given control of the lion's share of

the national cultural budget. They will now select the directors of museums and administer prizes. Beginning this month, the M.M.A. has taken control of Budapest's Mucsarnok, the country's most significant contemporary-art venue. The eighty-year-old head of the M.M.A., György Fekete, has said that, "in addition to artistic excellence, "unambiguous national sentiment" is required for membership in his organization." A member has to be "someone who feels at home and doesn't travel abroad in order to revile Hungary from there." He has pledged to prevent blasphemy in state institutions, citing an exhibition at the Mucsarnok called "What Is It To Be Hungarian?" (which had sections on "stereotypes" and "conflicts"), as an example of the kind of show that will no longer be presented. In a TV interview, he stated that Hungary is "built on Christian culture; there is no need for constant, perpetual provocation." Asked about the separation of church and state, he said that he wished it were not so, despite the fact that the separation is central to modern democracy. "I don't give a damn for this modern democracy, because it's not modern and it's not a democracy."

Major cultural figures are coming under pressure. The pianist András Schiff has said that he will no longer travel to Hungary because of the prevailing political climate. "It would be suicide for me to go there," he told a Finnish interviewer. "They would chop off my hands." In 2011, five left-leaning philosophers, including Ágnes Heller, were placed under investigation for the misappropriation of two million dollars in grant funds. Heller's colleagues characterized this as harassment. A letter of support was signed by over sixty prominent Hungarian academics, including several Nobel laureates. The social theorist Jürgen Habermas called on the European Union to investigate. In May, 2012, the Budapest police closed the investigation, claiming there was no evidence of a crime. When the veteran journalist Paul Lendvai published (in German) "My Squandered Country," an exposé of the Orbán government's corruption of the Hungarian public sphere, a coordinated campaign of criticism was mounted through government-controlled media, including the allegation that Lendvai had spied for state intelligence during the Communist period. Nationalist exiles picketed international readings, forcing the cancellation of an event in Frankfurt after threats of violence. The first publisher of a proposed Hungarian edition cancelled the book.

Then there is the question of what the Culture Secretary said to Béla Tarr. After the director of "The Turin Horse" picked up the Silver Bear at the sixty-first Berlin International Film Festival, he gave an interview to Berlin's *Der Tagesspiegel* in which he claimed that the Orbán government was cracking down on cultural dissenters. "The government hates intellectuals because they are liberal and oppositional," he reportedly said. "It insults us as traitors." Forty-eight hours later, he appeared to repudiate that statement. "That writing is not in my style," he told a Hungarian news agency. "I do not fight, debate, or argue that way. I consider it very humiliating that all this has soiled the success and reception of our film, sinking it to the level of quotidian politics." The State Secretary for Culture, Géza Szocs, claimed that during that time he had phoned Tarr "to congratulate him on his win," and that Tarr had assured him the quotes were fake. Meanwhile, the Hungarian distributor of "The Turin Horse" cancelled its première, and shelved plans to distribute the film.

The situation for Hungarian writers is no less fraught. In 2011 and 2012, the same Géza Szocs (who came to prominence as a poet) was the president of Hungarian PEN, which, despite its mandate to protect freedom of speech, has become closely associated with the Orbán government. In 2012, Hungarian PEN instituted a fifty-thousand-euro government-funded literary prize, which it offered to Lawrence Ferlinghetti. The American turned it down, stating that "the policies of this right-wing regime tend toward authoritarian rule and the consequent curtailing of freedom of expression and civil liberties... I hereby refuse the prize in all its forms." The activist Elie Wiesel has also returned a Hungarian award, in protest against the attendance of government officials at the reburial of a writer who was a member of the National Socialist Arrow Cross Party, which, for a few months at the end of the Second World War, led a brief and bloody "government of national unity," murdering between ten and fifteen thousand of their countrymen and deporting around eighty thousand to Auschwitz.

Intellectuals who live in Hungary, or who wish to work or lecture there, are extremely circumspect in their criticism. Two internationally renowned novelists I contacted for this article declined to comment. One writer who would speak is the poet and translator George Szirtes, who lives in the U.K. "The government has been looking to impose itself and its view of what it considers to be 'the nation' on not only the political sphere but the cultural, too," he told me. "In effect, it wants to return the country to the

condition of the thirties... the atmosphere is full of hatred." Szirtes laments "the creation of a climate that seems to me inimical to the country I have loved and admired. Little by little, I find every part of it is being dismantled and banished."

Far from being an unforced reconciliation with his former persecutors, Kertész's decision to give his archive to Germany should appear as an urgent warning sign. Unlike Germany, which has transformed itself through a national process of Vergangenheitsbewältigung ("coming to terms with the past"), Hungary remains in a wistful, toxic relationship with the nineteen-thirties, with a fantasy of Jewish conspiracy and national moral decline. As the memory of the iron curtain fades and Europe recenters itself, Hungary's fascist resurgence should be a matter of concern for all. Kertész's own reaction is to quote Karl Kraus: "The situation is desperate, but not serious."

I have absolutely no doubt, that no liberal reader will regard, any of the long list of facts as "serious," "valid," "something we cannot explain" or "inexcusable." But that is the very definition of the Dallas Syndrome.

The people of **France** willingly and knowingly helped the current socialist government into power; in exchange, as a result of this government's doings, people and companies who have been in the front line of creating jobs, making investments and paying taxes, are leaving France in droves, people are losing their jobs, companies are closing down or relocate, and the collapse of the French economy has been transformed from the category of "if" to the category of "when" (or more precisely: "how soon");

The people of **Egypt**, willingly and knowingly helped the Muslim Brotherhood into power; in exchange, the Brothers have been destroying the fabric of Egypt that has worked for decades. They are instituting a complete Muslim system, including Islamists domination of parliament, executive and judiciary branches, women's rights have been scrapped, girls can marry at 14, changes in custody law that will award children over eight to divorced fathers. The economy is in shambles. In other words, the Brothers are changing Egypt into a society no one (or: very few people) wanted;

After four years of complete and utter disaster, that the Obama led government created, the people of the **United States**, willingly and knowingly helped Barack Hussein Obama's government back into power; they did this after Obama added six trillion dollars to the national debt (the combined national debt, created by all presidents between Lincoln – G. W. Bush was \$9.6 trillion, which amounts to Obama creating 70% debt in four years that all presidents created in 143 years before him), kept unemployment over 12%, under employment over 20%, raised the number of food stamp recipients from 27 million to 47 million, illegally transferred General Motors from creditors to his union cronies, created ObamaCare (an unconstitutional, illegal piece of monstrosity), made the United States a laughing stock of the world, created the most unstable global situation since World War II., his entire administration lied in the Benghazi incident, made the US more divided than ever, most of his cabinet members have been proven either a sorry, incapable moron, or a lying slime ball. And –as a token of his appreciation- Obama has started to pay the various groups of Hopies and Check Addicts back for their fine contribution for his second term. He started with the Jews, by nominating Chuck Hagel (a known and proven anti-Israel person, who at the same time is pro-Palestine, pro-Hamas, pro-Iran and pro-Hasbollah) as Secretary of Defense. The Hagel case vis-à-vis the Jewish section of Hopies is particularly illuminating; since 2008, Sen. Hagel has endorsed to engage Assad in Syria, and –among other statements- made the "Iran had rights for women long before many countries..." Obama also sent 20 new F-16 fighter jets and 200 Abrams tanks to Morsi to Egypt. Interestingly, the "tank" issue is the more dangerous one; it helps the Brothers to zoom through the desert and reach Israel.

I hope no Jewish friend of mine will ever whine about the Department of Defense's policies and actions, or if one day Morsi thinks he now can easily start a war against Israel; after all, now he has 200 brand new Abrams tanks, so the job is not that difficult. As Churchill said, "Every country has a government it deserves." And of course (as per the long tradition of the United States), if Sen. Hagel will not be confirmed, he will not be confirmed because of the Republican side. But of course, the American Jews will vote –again- for democrats in 2016. What can you say?;

The devastating effect of the growing Dallas Syndrome cannot be portrayed better than the following comparison:

Presidential candidate George H.W. Bush declared, on August 18, 1988, at the Republican nominating convention: "*Read my lips; no new taxes.*" He –as president- broke this one promise. Although the fact does not need an excuse, because he in fact, broke his promise, it is interesting to know, that he did it because both the House and the Senate were under democratic control and they did not agree to any budget unless Pres. Bush raised tax (it pretty much amounted to blackmail at that time). He did it to lower the budget deficit. That one broken promise was enough to unseat Pres. Bush from the presidency in 1992.

Barack Hussein Obama promised

- "Cutting the deficit in half in the first term" then nearly doubled it
- "No one making under \$250,000 will see a dime tax raise" then tax was raised
- "ObamaCare will lower the health insurance cost by \$2,500 per family" ... then it went up by \$3,500 per family
- "Everyone who wants to keep their insurance and their doctor will be able to do it" ... then Obama's own Congressional Budget Office reported an estimated seven million people who will be pushed out of their job-based insurance coverage as the result of ObamaCare
- "Unemployment will **never go over** 8% if we do the stimulus package" ... then not one, but two stimulus packages later, the unemployment **never was lower (!)** then 8% under Obama's presidency.

The entire list of Obama's broken promises (he broke nearly every single one he made) would equal in length to the distance between Dallas and Chicago (if you single space it), but these are the most visible ones. And the people of the United States re-elected Barack Hussein Obama.

The most likely outcomes of this election will encompass results such as:

- By 2016, our debt will exceed 23 Trillion dollars, channeling roughly 85 cents of every revenue dollar to debt service. This will increase tax, drop property values, destroy business, increase unemployment, chase even more companies out of the US, trash the dollar and take gold prices to over \$3,000/ounce.
- With 15 cents of every dollar left in the cashier, all social services will shrink, and the US military will be decimated.
- There will be no one (as no one has been between 2009-2012) around the world, who takes the US and/or Obama seriously. This, combined with the collapsing Europe, the weak Russia, rapidly weakening China and virtually no US military, will have implications around the world that no liberal sees today.
- The Arab Spring will continue to turn into an ice storm and the region, all the way down to Mali, Nigeria, and across to Sudan and Ethiopia, will be in flames (the Muslim Brotherhood will make sure of that). The Arab economies will continue to rot and they will blame their rotten conditions on Israel, finding a convenient scapegoat to fight against.
- All countries involved in the "Arab Spring" will have a strict Muslim government and system, which will be far worse for the people than the previous one was.
- After Obama lost Egypt (it depends on a personal viewpoint how this "loss" was "for" or "against" Obama's wishes), we're about to lose Jordan too. With that, Israel will be encircled.
- Iran most likely will get the nuke; whether they use it against Israel or not is almost beside the point. The major issue is how many more instable Arab regimes will want and get one, after Iran developed it. The world will have a handful of nuclear bombs in many corrupt, instable and itching-to-use-it hands. Someone in the "unholy camp" will find it a good idea to use it against Israel. At which time, Israel will respond in kind; the world will quickly fall into "for" and "against" camps, and there it is; you have your recipe for World War III. All this will not depend on the US any more.
- Don't be surprised if China will wake up one day with the idea of "Well Taiwan should belong to 'Mother China,'" and "it is about time to get the few Japanese islands by the Chinese shore back to China."
- The US energy industry, especially coal, also the land-based oil and gas production will be decimated. Obama just does not see a good reason why the US should stop paying hundreds of billions to his

Arab brothers.

- It is going to be a “big brother is watching you” not just mentality, but as a system. It will not be too far from a Soviet type big-brother approach. You run a large public company and criticize the government, you will receive bad and encompassing publicity; government contracts will be cancelled; if you are a smaller company or individual backing republicans, the IRS will show up at your door; they will regulate social media, and communication platforms; they will try to find ways to regulate or shut up cable TV, syndicated radio programs and talk shows; it is “socialism,” folks.
- We will figure out some way to make this twelve million illegals becoming “legal.” Hey! We need a high caliber voting bloc, don’t we?
- The number of “Obama supporters,” will exponentially grow (including the 11 million). Obama will make sure of that. Charles Krauthammer said late night on November 6th: “we are looking at a bright future, because the new generation like Marco Rubio comes in.” Unfortunately, Mr. Krauthammer is missing one ingredient: as Churchill said, *“you do not need to be afraid of a government; you must be afraid of the people who elected the government.”* And this is where it is at. The “kind of people” this administration will create (with i.e. “Obama phones” in Ohio), will not vote for Jesus Christ, unless Christ promises a free phone, cash, stove, food stamps, free healthcare free something anything. The more people who cannot recognize anyone’s picture but Britney Spears’ are the merrier... Hey! We need more voters!! You can understand it, can’t you? This will prevent another republican from becoming the president of the United States in the next three cycles at minimum. That’s sixteen years from today.
- Speaking of the “presidency:” it is my humble prediction, that –unless a health or other sudden problem prevents her- Joe Biden will resign from being the Vice President in 2013, and Hillary Clinton will “graciously” be willing to “shoulder the burden” after which Hillary will run for the presidency in 2016. This all is according to the original plan devised around September, 2012; about the time Bill Clinton started to “assist” Obama. The “services” of either Clinton is not cheap, but could be bought.

The people of the **United Kingdom** knowingly and willingly tossed Winston Churchill out of power, after Churchill single handedly saved the UK, Europe and indeed the world. The same people elected a socialist government in Churchill’s place.

Am I missing something here?

The exponentially growing blindness of the messes boggles the mind at so many levels it is hard to list all of them without writing a book, the size of Leo Tolstoy’s War and Peace. So let’s just try the headlines shall we?

To safely and efficiently make any drastic tax increase on the wealthy or on anyone qualified as “job creator” you need to secure two fundamental ingredients: lock the workers within a country and lock the capital within the same country. Which is an ugly but rational idea (the Russians were very good at that for almost 75 years). Absent that, the problem messes are facing is a world order they applauded throughout the last two decades: it is called “Globalization.” Under “globalization,” capital, factory, trust funds, assets; every single solitary means capable of creating job for the stupid messes can and will be moved at a heartbeat. When that happens, all you will have left is high unemployment, and incapable liberals trying to pass off as government. If this is true (as it is), then why are the messes so happy kicking out the only one segment of a society that has the potential of giving them livelihood?

The number of concrete, historical factual examples how messes voted liberal morons into position and how these “leaders” –as a token of their appreciation- ruining the messes’ life is practically infinite. Just a few examples:

It has been a historical fact that due to the State of New York’s social-liberal government (lead by Gov. Paterson), wealthy people and companies were leaving New York in droves. When a high profile “rich man” Rush Limbaugh said “enough is enough, I am leaving” (causing New York another –most probably seven digit- tax loss), Governor Paterson’s response on April 2, 2009 (just to remember: in the middle of the deepest economy depression for 70 years, when every dollar was desperately needed) in a press conference was as follows: *“If I knew that would be the result, I would’ve thought about the taxes earlier.”* This sorry, mentally degenerate social-

communist progressive moron (and my friends, this is not “name calling;” this is a list of facts, accurately describing the Governor of the State of N.Y.) was supposed to be “the” CEO of the State of New York, carrying “the buck stops here” responsibility for the welfare of his state.

When (in 2007) Halliburton announced it will open a corporate headquarters in Dubai, they also announced to keep their existing corporate office in the US as well as its incorporation in the United States, Senator Patrick Leahy, a democrat from New Hampshire, called the company's move *"corporate greed at its worst...."* In his remarks, Sen. Leahy was not interested in facts, that is not his style. Beside Halliburton still pays the (abnormally high) US tax rate, Sen. Leahy cursed them anyway. Transocean, the largest drilling contractor on the planet moved its headquarters to Switzerland, and by doing so pays **16 percent tax on its \$4.4 billion global operating income.** **The regular corporate income tax in the United States stands at about 35 percent.** Patrick Leahy obviously subscribes to the notion that government has the right to increase taxes, destroy the economy, spend a trillion dollar for “creating jobs” while not creating any.... but American enterprises (of which Leahy would not know a first thing about – this criteria puts him at par with Obama, and Gov. Paterson) should just stay in the US being financially robbed.

And of course France's government (let's not go that far; people occupying the seats where real “government” used to sit) has been on the drive to chase just about everyone who can create jobs, out of the country. And guess what? Their prime minister's response comes like clockwork: *"...paying your taxes is an act of solidarity and patriotism...."*

Why do these messes live under this delusion, that rich people and rich companies will pay a dollar (Euro, Yen, Pound, etc.) more tax? Which part of these messes do not capture that a roughly twenty page document is needed for a billion dollar corporation to be relocated to i.e. Switzerland? And why Leahy and other degenerates believe that companies will not write up this document?

"...paying your taxes is an act of solidarity and patriotism...."

"...If I knew that would be the result, I would've thought about the taxes earlier...."

"...corporate greed at its worst...."

These three quotes should frighten any rational person as to what kind of people are in global leadership today. Admittedly, the “leadership” designation here must be stretched beyond limit, to include these clowns who are running the world today. How far have we come from a Jack Kennedy, Golda Meir, Konrad Adenauer, Ronald Reagan, Willy Brandt, Anwar Sadat, Margaret Thatcher, or even a Bill Clinton?

Why is it that the messes are unable to put a handle on a simple paradigm: a coal mine owner (pharmaceutical, chemical, refinery.... pick one) whose operation was shut down in Pennsylvania (or any other place), will stay in the mining (...pharmaceutical, chemical...) business, by investing somewhere else, and the one and only person who will be left without any job are the people who were laid off. That these premeditated government, EPA, union, animal protection, green party (just about everybody and everybody's brothers') action against various industries will only create one effect: a huge unemployment for the stupid messes; and the only effect it **will not** create: making rich people poor. So, what's the purpose? Doesn't it sound a bit counter-productive?

Anyone with a half a brain would clearly understand that by Obama's Health-Rape System –HRS- (it has little to do with care, but much with “power grab,” “socialism,” “buying votes”) will not have an iota effect on “rich people” and/or “rich entities” of the US society. None. Nada. Zero. They will be able to buy their private health care policies, or if they get really pissed about how “makes no sense” the system has become, they just pack their bags and will be gone. HRS supposed to take care of 30 more million patients with no more doctors, and at much lower pay to the doctors I mean doctors, who will stay in the system; because hundreds of thousands of doctors already said, they will leave the practice if this idiocy will be implemented. If you believe that much fewer doctors will take care of 30 million more people at lower pay, and the quality will be the same, call me: I would like to sell you the US Capitol building, which I bought a while ago for a very affordable sum So what do the stupid messes think, who will be hurt, if hundreds of thousands of doctors quit the profession and the rest will not accept Medicare and Medicaid patients? The rich people who will have money to pay for it, or them?

Which part of the “Obama is anti-Catholic” concept was too complex for the catholic messes in the US after Obama’s government passed an anti-Constitutional (First Amendment: “Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof;...”) law in ObamaCare vis-à-vis the contraception issue in catholic hospitals? Because the monstrosity of ObamaCare is a diagonal opposite of and in direct violation with the First Amendment Right’s “...free exercise thereof;...” text. ObamaCare directly prevents these hospitals to “freely exercise” their religious rights and freedom. And they voted for Obama.

Why was all Obama’s four year worth of doing, too complex for the American Jewish community? If the DNC experience was not enough for you, did you notice that most US’s European allies announced they will vote for Palestinian statehood in the UN, making sure there will never be a “two state solution?” That this is how much “pro-Israel” and “international leadership” your president has provided on your homeland’s behalf? Which, if you get down to it, perfectly in-line (again) with Obama’s previous “70% voting ‘Present’” practice in the Senate; he votes “No,” while making sure the overall outcome of the vote is “Yes.” Or wasn’t it demonstrative enough for you when your president referred to the Nazi German death camps as “Polish death camps” in May, 2012 showing his complete ignorance?

The unions are losing me on two main fronts: inability to serve their own interest, and supporting liberal causes such as immigration. The “being greedy and stupid, lead by gangsters as union leaders” contributed to the unions’ great downfall around the world. In the United States, the unionized workers’ participation has gone from close to 30% to just over 6% in the private sector in 35 years. Their inability to have a minimum amount of common sense led to strikes around the world in situations where every single workers’ job was at stake, if the union did not start to seriously negotiate (Alitalia would be a great example). In the US, a company named “Hostess” began as Interstate Bakeries Corporation in 1930 and over time became the largest wholesale baker and distributor of bakery products in the United States. Hostess had forever closed its doors in early November 2012, putting more than 13,000 workers out of a job. The closing was in large part attributed to the union’s failure to agree with the company’s management. Hostess had 372 collective bargaining agreements with a dozen unions and had roughly \$2 billion in unfunded pension liabilities to its various unions’ workers, had insane work rules based on labor contracts—including the requirement of separate drivers, separate trucks haul same kind of products to the same address (creating very high labor costs), generous pensions and health care benefits negotiated by unions. A certain number of management mistakes were also listed, but the direct cause of bankruptcy was the union’s inability to agree.

Another specific example of unions’ blind, arrogant stupidity is coming from the State of Michigan. The State of Michigan is one of the worst managed, closest to bankruptcy of the fifty states. Detroit has close to 50% unemployment, 37% of all household are on food stamps, while people in Michigan (especially in Detroit) have been watching how businesses move next door to Indiana which is a “right to work state” (while Michigan has been maimed by the unions). It so happened that the Republican Governor and Congress of Michigan had had enough, and decided to stop the madness, change the laws to become “right to work” state, and bring businesses back. And the (stupid) messes of Michigan were up in arms against the move. Apparently for a lot of people in Michigan, Indiana was just too far to look and compare why companies were moving into Indiana ... and away from Michigan. And no one in that crowd, who made a fool of him/her-self in the State Capitol Building, had a simple thought in his/her head: this guy (the governor) actually wants to bring jobs back, while my union has been chasing them away.

On the more general level, the global progressive movement and the unions have been in each other’s pocket, whereby the unions have been financing the progressives, and drive their members to vote for them. In the US, they have been doing it, while the democrats want to legalize ten million illegal immigrants, and want to open borders. I understand that the unions have never had anyone’s but their own interest at heart, but they should probably not be that stupid to act against their own interest. In the current sham, the unions finance democrats – democrats want to increase the number of cheap workers through legalizing immigrants - which immigrants will compete on the already weak job market – which will push wages down – which will hurt the workers. Does this flow-chart make any sense to anyone? Because if not, a question seems to be reasonable: “so why the unions do not support republicans, who want real reform instead of amnesty”

I have been arguing with conservatives about the idea of: *“the conservatives want to show everyone how good you are, how clever you are, how do we trust you, while the liberals want to control you because*

they know what is best for you." Neither of these two statements are correct. We conservatives cannot suppose that the "messes are cleaver" while being pissed at how the same messes voted for Obama (Hollande, the Brothers, FIDESZ,...). It is either/or. You cannot be "cleaver" and vote for your destruction, all at the same time. The other part of the statement is also false; indeed, liberals want to "control" the messes but not because they want to "take care of the messes." They just want to control the messes because they can (the messes allow them), and because the liberals (unlike the conservatives) have been perfectly aware of the "60%'s" mental capacity. How do I know this? Just let me share three very simple examples with you:

- Upon discovering that people do not buy "Global Warming" (plus it turned out in the UK, that the "books were cooked"), the Pope of Hypocrisy and Slime (Albert Gore) and his troops re-branded the "product" to "Climate Change" (did you notice it?)
- Upon discovering "Gun Control" did not fly that well, Obama & Co turned around and labeled it "Gun Violence" (did you notice it?)
- For better part of the last two years, the US Congress has been chewing on an issue, which is nothing but pure entertainment, labeled: "the "fiscal cliff," the "sequestration," etc. All in the name of "cutting the debt" (have you heard about it?). The essence of this entertainment, is to argue over "we reduce debt by 1.2 or 1.6 trillion." There was a "4 trillion" debt reduction floating for a short while. All these in 10 years. Let me grab my calculator... So, you people in the US Congress are telling me, that (taking "the" highest number) your "dream scenario" is a 400 million debt reduction per year, while the US debt projection is 1.2 Trillion in 2013 alone? This is not about "debt reduction," this is about "mildly changing trajectory," "nibbling around the edges" at the absolute very best.

So, let me ask this (from my esteemed conservative friends): in your mind, what is the US liberal leadership thinking about the populous' mental quality; if they have the guts to come up with these kinds of low-level, demeaning, belittling ideas? And in your mind, are they right or wrong?

Why did Egyptian women think that the Brothers will not implement the set of laws they have been living by for more than seventy years, and have been waiting for that long to finally implement them?

Which part of the "socialized high student loan" vs. 13%-17% unemployment" was so hard for young students and graduates in the US to understand? Obama socialized your student loan system, -as a result- your loan interest had gone way up. In the meantime, you saw four years worth of double digit unemployment, a doubling food stamp program; wasn't it clear for you, that you will not have a job, but you will have to pay a lot more money back? And you still voted for the person who did all this?

Which part of the "over 50 employees, you will pay a fine for healthcare contribution" statement was too complex for US universities and colleges (another example of "being educated and intelligent do not go hand in hand) before they voted for Obama? You guys did not count the people around you? It would be also fun to know how many adjunct professors (whose very livelihood is in grave danger today) actually voted for Obama.

Why is it, that the messes brought Khomeini into Iran knowing he will maim the Iranian people; brought the "Brothers" into Egypt, knowing they will turn everything up-side-down, and by doing so maim large part of the society; brought the French government into power knowing they will chase everyone who can create jobs out of the country; brought the Hungarian government back to power knowing who they are from their previous four years; brought Mugabe to Rhodesia, knowing who Mugabe is and what will he do; extended Barack Hussein Obama's time by four years knowing what kind of disaster he created. Because all this (and so much more) was out there, factual, and written. All the messes needed to do, was read it.

It could be an interesting thought process that, in my time, aspiring politicians at least had to lie about what they really had in mind. By 2012, it has gotten to the point that people, who aspiring to lead countries actually announce how they are going to maim the country, oppress the populous, kill the economy, political system, education (among other things); and they know the populous will still vote for them.

As Churchill said: "No one should be afraid of a government; everyone must be afraid of the people who elected the government."

Don't get me wrong, I understand the Willie Sutton premise. As many people know, Sutton was a bank robber, who famously said "I go rob banks because that's where the money is." I do understand self-serving moves, even when people are not playing with a full deck, sort of speak, just to reap financial or other benefits. What I do not understand, when people work (or vote) hard for something that serves nothing but their disadvantage and ultimate destruction. In an environment where their destructors publicly stated multiple times "Elect me and I will screw you over good, I will destroy you." Staying with the Sutton analogy, the contemporary "60%" messes love to break into the bank, blow up the security door, kill the security guard, drill up the safe ... then **put money into the safe**, place birth certificate, driver license and two forms of credit cards on the table (in banks, you cannot be too careful identifying yourself), casually walk out, be arrested and spend thirty years in jail.

This is what I don't get. In short, all we see throughout the world is that the respective "60%" are voting people into power who told them up front: "I will destroy you." This is Dallas Syndrome in its full blossom.

The Dallas Syndrome cannot possibly be discussed without mentioning the "ostrich" segment of each society. These people (have been representing a close to constant percent of any given population) will tell you:

- Why bother to know or discuss what's going on, we cannot fully know the situation anyway, or
- I am happy in my job, I have a nice family so I don't care, or
- I don't listen to news, they lie anyway, or
- Why bother, you cannot change a thing anyway, or
- I want to totally disassociate myself from the daily problems, or
- Affiliation notwithstanding, politicians are a bunch of crooks, so why bother, or
- The people in power are my people, I don't question them, I trust they know what they are doing, or
- I think you are wrong, my city is doing great, or
- I don't care about (..or I hate) politics, so I just don't pay attention, or
- I trust that at the end, they will figure something out, or
- Partial or full permutation of the above, augmented by other bumper sticker slogans.

Again, the underlying problem that history is not on the "ostriches" side (as much as history has never proven Hopies and Check Addicts right either). You, valued members of the "ostrich club," will soon find out that no matter how deep you dig your head into the sand, someone will kick the body parts you've left out. You will also find out that totally burying yourself means that you are dead, so that does not work too well either. Short of that:

- Ask the people in Greece and Spain with their 35% across the board unemployment, or the people in Eastern Europe with their 20% average, how the "I don't care what is happening around me" philosophy has worked out?;
- People of Iran and Egypt have discovered, that the government in Iran and the Brothers in Egypt do not differentiate between those women who had their heads into the sand, and those, who actively opposed them coming into power; neither woman can go onto the street without male supervision;
- The financing that is leaving France will leave all three workers without jobs; the one who voted for Hollande, the one who voted against, and the one who had his head in the sand;
- Hussein Obama's Health-Rape-System (HRS) will leave a lot of people without healthcare, the fact notwithstanding you were for, against, or only your behind was sticking out of the sand. The 12%-14% unemployment, weak economy, overregulated life, gun control, 12 million illegals added to the democratic voting bloc, "big brother sticking his nose into every aspect of your life," will affect you whether you want it or not.
- And since your head was in the sand, let me inform you: during Obama's HRS discussion, my goat and I sat down and discussed how is it not possible to put 30 million more people on the system and lower costs. My goat thought it is mathematically impossible. As it turned out, my goat was right. The promised "\$2,500 lower cost a year" has become —due to HRS— a "\$3,500 **higher** cost." It is for everyone, with or without you having your head in the sand.
- And here is another newsflash for you. Due to Obama's "revenue increasing" (a.k.a. "tax increase") ways of operating, everyone's tax has been and will be increased. This has affected, and will affect your tax, living expenses, (falling) real estate price and a list of other areas.

It does not pay to be an ostrich and makes no sense at all. But, (just as people being liberals or progressives —which is essentially the same thing but different label) people still take it as a "possible attitude."

This will be an interesting study ("Part II" as it planned) to what kinds of social changes have different societies gone through over the last thirty years to get to this pitiful situation. Education must be one. Religion could be another, but –in Iran and Egypt- there was strong religion before, Rhodesia, the EU, France, Hungary and the US, this change was not governed by religion. In other words, "religion" might be out of the equation. Technology platforms gluing people between age 3-53 to the TV, computer, video game, iPad and telephone screen (making them a "target rich" environment), could be another, social changes such as violence, hip-hop, rap, and the liberal (e.g. no respect) way of life, yet another. On a strictly American side of the problem, I believe the cardinal problem is complacency. America has become hugely complacent. America was born, grew, existed on as a global superpower by "having opinion," and firmly standing on one side of a given issue. "Was it always the right side?" That is for another Paper. But America was standing there. America lost most of that. Immigrants coming to this country (and speak English) will uniformly tell you: *"Americans have no clue where they were born and what they have."* It is a polite way to say, *"Americans don't give a damn about their own country,"* and it is –no matter how bad it sounds- largely true. I have a much larger social network (friends, colleagues, business associates) than most people, most of them born American; if anyone asked me, I would not be able to come up with a single name (of born American) whom I have discussed this issue with, and he/she disagreed. America is complacent. I believe a very strong case can be made, that Hussein Obama has entered the White House in January, 2009 because of that. I have been arguing that Hussein Obama has realized (quite brilliantly I might add), that his *"Let me take care of you, you don't need to worry about a thing, the government will do it for you, just vote for us"* bumper sticker slogan will find a huge and exponentially growing audience; due to increasing complacency. He –unfortunately- was (and is) right on the money. One thing is for sure: this isn't going in the right direction.

The Argument

The world has become divided. Over the last thirty years, people, by their nature were drawn into either the "thinking" camp, or the "hoping, feeling, understanding" camp. The two camps could be well identified and defined in every region in the world (some of them were analyzed in this Paper). In the US, the dividing line was not a problem even fifteen years ago; people could discuss issues while the discussion was about the difference between policies the democrats or the republicans advocated. This dates back to Tip O'Neil vs. President Reagan, Newt Gingrich vs. President Clinton in recent memory. People in line with one side or the other could talk about it. It is long gone. Over the last four years, the Obama White House divided the nation to a point, where people representing the two sides cannot talk with each other anymore. Families, friends are torn because of it. And rightfully so. It took me a while until I found the rightly calibrated reply to the "why can't you sit down with so and so, it is true he is an Obama supporter, but otherwise a nice person. Why don't you look at 'that' side?" The correct answer to the question is this: "Would you have sat down with a person in 1939 who was a reliable shopkeeper, an educated, intelligent person, played the piano at gatherings, but was a Hitler supporter?" It is not to compare Obama with Hitler (at least not in this discussion), it is to compare the mental facilities of people who could support Hitler and Obama. You did that (or are doing it) and your capacities are not to be trusted. This is the Obama legacy (well; one of them).

I used to think of many of my associates, friends, colleagues, family members and other people as "representing the other view." Reviewing all the facts and solid evidence in this Paper, I –sadly- now think of them as "you lost your mind, you simply not worth my time." I have a rapidly decreasing tolerance for these people. This saddens me more than anything. I believe, several parts of the world including the US are in such a grave danger, maybe last seen in the 1930s. So, the stake is much higher than a "policy discussion."

To hit a peace-seeking tone, let me say that I have become convinced: ***one of us has no rational thinking, not using a grain of common sense, blatantly disregards all data, has no historical view and knowledge, has zero understanding what is going on, lost any and all rational judgment; in simple terms behave like an ostrich.*** But, tell you what: it could be me. So, if you are able to put together a five minute worth of rational, fact based, logical argument as to where, or why I am wrong, and I am the one who lost his mind, you will find me all ears. But, the moment you using either words of "hope" and/or "believe," I will get up and walk away.

So, to start the discussion, let me lay down my "five minutes." I can argue against every single group named in this Paper, but let me choose the American Jewish case for my Jewish friends and family members.

- I hope we are not going to argue over the fact how nasty Obama handled Prime Minister Netanyahu. It is widely known and reported. There are dates, and events;
- I also hope we will not argue that Obama authorized the 20 new F-16 fighter jets and 200 Abrams tanks to be delivered to Egypt;
- We also do not need to argue over the fact that under Obama the radical, Jew hater wing of the Muslim religion (Morsi: "*Jews are 'the descendants of apes and pigs'*") gained huge power in Egypt, Algeria, Yemen, Libya, Mali;
- Iran keeps developing nuclear technology;
- Iraq and Afghanistan are becoming another Cambodia after Obama left them (why are we still in South Korea after fifty years, it is beyond me);
- In short, Obama –knowingly or unknowingly (which could be a healthy debate)- helped the radical Muslims encircle Israel.
- Obama had also mismanaged the European support against the "Palestinian State" issue in the UN, and by doing so (or "not doing a thing") delayed the chance by decades.
- Not including the "Jerusalem as the Jewish Capitol" concept from and by the DNC platform is also a fact.

After all this, 69% of the Jews voted for Obama. Someone needs to explain the rational beyond that.

There are countless "understandings" and "excuses" floating with regards to these facts; every single one of them were born in Fantasy Ville (I listed on in this Paper with regards to the DNC Platform). These should not be part of the discussion, for two reasons: one, it insults one's intelligence, and two, the hard, core, undisputable facts (listed in the bullet points above) remain just that: hard, core, undisputable and factual.

Looking at these facts, one cannot help but start to ponder the mental capacity of the residents of Fantasy Ville. What "hope," "change," "understanding" and "excuse" have created for roughly 1.5 billion people addressed in this Paper, is not up for dispute or argument. These are simple facts. It increasingly looks like that the balance between Hopies and Check Addicts (residents of Fantasy Ville) and people living in Real Ville is reaching unattainable proportion. All of us are in a life boat, and the water is an inch below the deck.

Although history has proven all Fantasy Ville residents wrong over the last 30-40 years, and it will prove them wrong in the US section of Fantasy Ville, one cannot help but citing a tragic parallel for the Jewish citizens of Fantasy Ville; maybe this will do the trick in waking them up.

Chamberlain signed the Munich Pact with Hitler hoping for peace (where did I hear "hope" recently??? Got it! "Hope and Change!!"), and believing Hitler.

- Was Chamberlain a bad person? NO
- Was he a nice? YES
- Was he educated (educated in Rugby School, one of England's most prestigious)? YES
- Was he dishonest? NO
- Was he naïve? YES
- Was he an idiot? ...Well, that's debatable
- Were people around him yelling at the top of their lung not to do it? YES
- Was every single close historical fact and signs available and well known that Hitler will not keep the agreement? YES

So let us sum this up: Chamberlain's "hoping," "believing" behavior and action directly assisted close to eight million Jews' death, and 55 million deaths during the second World War. This should be a simple fact for you even if you live in Fantasy Ville. You should also remember that the leading opponent of Chamberlain was Winston Churchill, who was called every name in the book ("war monger," "right wing nut"....). And close to eight million Jews died. If one adds up Stalin's doings, East Germany, and the communist bloc, all formed after the German invasion the Russians got involved, the total number is much higher. And all this happened because of Chamberlain's "hope" in face of reality, facts, and knowledge.

You can hope, change or believe all you want, but:

- France (like California) is fast losing wealthy people, factories, companies, investment
- The Middle East is in flames. Libya, Algeria, Yemen, Egypt, Sudan, Mali are in the hands of radical Islamists.

Dallas Syndrome

February 8, 2013

- Israel is getting encircled
- With the exception of Jordan, all Arab governments that have been pacifying the region, are gone
- The US is sliding toward economy and social chaos. If you don't believe me, read again the US section of this Paper; the part that starts with "In hard data, it looks like this:." That should be sufficient for you.
- Spain has 34%, Greece 42%, overall European unemployment rate (if you took Germany out) is 17%-22%

This concludes my "five minute" argument.

Now let's see yours.