

One of my book's sections I wrote in 2010 was titled "Because They Can:"

"...Several commentators on various media outlets use the **"So if you think Obama is socialist, define socialist for me"** question as a "winning it all" sword. Let me help these people out. As I said earlier, I lived 32 years under socialist system, so I have a better nose to smell things than most American friends I have. It was very telling to me – forecasting pretty much everything that has come since - when Obama&Co. flew Air Force One at low altitude over N.Y., scaring the daylight out of everyone. If you remember, Robert Gibbs, the presidential spokesperson (I still have not figured out if Gibbs is the dumbest human in history or just forced to represent the White House's dealings, which makes him sound like a continuously lying, stuttering, and mumbling idiot) did his usual uhhhhhhhh-uhhhhhhhhhhhhhhh-uhh-uhhhhhh routine about it. At the time they did the Air Force One stunt, I told my friends: in the early 80s, the Hungarian Secretary of Defense was hunting protected game from a military helicopter, with an AK-47, in a national park.... because he could. Because the social-communist system as a whole, along with its self assurance, arrogance and look down on people was so great that he thought he could. This was the same reason why Air Force One flew over New York City. I would here again refer to my "moron or crook?" question. If you guys in the White House did not know how idiotic the plan was, you should not be in the White House. If you knew but you thought "you can," you – again - do not belong there...."

Since then, the core of the above described thesis keeps coming back, in a form of (in no particular order) "gun running," "ObamaCare," "Benghazi," "GM's shares to the union," "stimulus," "GSA," "IRS," "James Rosen," "EPS," "killing America's energy sector," "US Ambassador to Belgium," "czar system," "end runs around Congress and Supreme Court," "National Labor Relations Board," "mining industry," "wasting billions on green energy," "sending military shipments to Muslim Brotherhood," "appointments of progressive morons and gangsters to cabinet posts" to name a very few.

### The Direction

There has been a lot said and written about what direction our country took in 2008, and the direction we have been going. But, it does not feel like anyone has all the pieces on the board. I have been writing papers, articles, blogs, and I wrote two books; I did not put all the pieces on the board either. So let me try it here.

There are two basic questions we must examine:

- The relationship between Barack Hussein Obama and the United States of America, and
- Who is Barack Hussein Obama?

There is another component, before I begin my venture in writing this piece: if there ever was a writing that card-carrying members of the "60% Club" (as I argued in many of my writings, *"60% of any society is a herd mentality, unable to think moron, who could be taken to any point of the political spectrum. This thesis has zero correlation with the particular person's education level, degree(s) and diploma(s)"*) should have not read, -this is the one. To prove my point of the "60%"s existence, I frequently cited how in 1939, a nicely singing (populist) canary (with a funny mustache) talked large part of an extremely highly educated society to get grandma off the train and escort her into the gas chamber. I also argued that people actually were doing it first and foremost out of "self interest," and because "they were convinced" (both of which are a mile apart from "acting and thinking as a human being"). So, here is a simple test: let us assume, it was announced that Barack Hussein Obama will visit your neighborhood tomorrow and will walk by the front of your house. If you are excited, and plan to see or greet him, please do not read this writing any further; it is not for you.

Now for the rest of the readers:

First, let us define the terminology of "America's interest." America, in her short 237 year history (which is a drop in a bucket compared to European, Greek and other history's) became a world power. This is undeniable (even for progressives), so the only question is how could she do it? I think the most characteristic event in contemporary history is the change from Jimmy Carter's America to Ronald Reagan's America. Under Jimmy Carter (this sorry, mentally handicapped moron), America's economy was in the ditch and America had zero respect around the world. Then came Ronald Reagan with his "Shining City on the Hill" theory, doing everything possible to "shine that city;" as a result, America changed and the world had changed even faster in

respecting America; we had –again- become a superpower, and in eight years President Reagan bankrupted the mighty Soviet Union, that no one could do before him. Whether you like it or not, America's (and indeed the world's) interest and very existence are hinging upon America being a Shining City, a Bastion of Freedom, a policy setting, feared and respected superpower around the world with whom other nations want to do cooperation. "That" is "America's Interest."

### ***The relationship between Barack Hussein Obama and the United States of America***

Standing on 32 years of living under communist regime, living in America for 27 years, having done and continuing to do extensive studies and researches on the socialist and capitalist systems, the European Union, and the United States, it is my argument that maybe two percent of born Americans and maybe ten percent of the entire country has even limited understanding of what Obama is up to. This argument is born out of several facts; one of which that the United States of America has never had a president who fundamentally disagreed with the core concept of "America's Interest" (defined above) and set out to change it. America has never had a president who hated her core concept of "nation of achievers," and wanted to convert her system into "nation of dependents." Looking at Obama, Americans are on totally uncharted territory.

In the meantime, Obama sees America, as an arrogant, overbearing, too rich, unfair place that exploited foreign nations and resources, while oppressing its black population. As he stated in his speeches during his trip to Germany and France in 2009:

- *In America, there is a failure to appreciate Europe's leading role in the world.*
- *Instead of celebrating your dynamic union and seeking to partner with you to meet common challenges, there have been times where America has shown arrogance and been dismissive, even derisive.*

In Cairo, he stated:

- *Tension has been fed by colonialism that denied rights and opportunities to many Muslims and a Cold War in which Muslim-majority countries were often treated as proxies without regard to their own aspirations*
- *And I consider it part of my responsibility as president of the United States to fight against negative stereotypes of Islam wherever they appear*

Well, going in, the question could be asked: "If you hate America so much, why didn't you leave decades ago? Have you ever heard the 'America: Love it or Leave it' theorem? Should you reside in Indonesia? Because I hate to think that you are another Bill Ayers type "warm as a rattlesnake" spineless gangster who has a big mouth only in America, because America is the only place on the earth where slime-balls are not jailed for their opposition and can have a professorship at universities (even if "that" university is in Chicago, where anything goes). So let's exclude this option from Obama's profile. The very next question is; "So have you ever counted how many people from the democratic and how many from the republican party participated in the oppression of blacks? Governor Wallace? Ring the bell? How many were in the KKK? Sen. Byrd?? Anyone? How most of FDR and LBJ's legal creations destroyed the black community ("War on Poverty?" Hmm? Anyone?). How did they establish the "food stamp generations?" How ObamaCare is to destroy the American middle class? So, before you hate America, shouldn't you first separate the value from garbage, especially because most of your compadres belong to the latter pile?

I wrote a long time ago that to understand Obama, you need to look back to the turn of the 20<sup>th</sup> century and review world history from there. Since then, there were only three people, who came out of the same mold and became the leader under specific circumstances. In my book (*"To Answer Your Question," 2010*) I titled these "specific circumstances" as "History's most lethal recipe" consisting the [a historically vital time] + [a globally vital country] + [an honest but mad ideologue] + [a handful of gangsters managing the ideologue] + [unchecked power in the legal structure] + [a mindless crowd –the "60% Club"] equation. There were a lot of idiots and gangsters over the last 100 years, (from Mussolini, through Mao Zedong, Pol Pot, Kim Il-Sung and his mad family, Stalin, Jimmy Carter, the Castro brothers all the way to Hugo Chavez, and Hollande in France), but there were only three that fit the entire criteria set: Vladimir Lenin, Adolf Hitler and now Barack Hussein Obama.

Before anyone has a heart attack, let me say that I will actually explain almost to the point of excusing Obama for his deeds.

Vladimir I. Lenin, who coined the "All power to the Soviets" and "All land to the peasants" phrases, was the leader of overthrowing the Provisional Government in October 1917, which was formed after the overthrow of Tsar Nicholas. Lenin believed that all problems were coming from the fact that Russia's economic and political power consists of the "haves" and "have-nots." He thought the distribution of wealth (does this sound familiar to anyone?) was the cure for all the problems.

Adolf Hitler, leader of the National Socialist German Workers' Party was a Lutheran. Martin Luther (1483–1546) saw Jews as a rejected people guilty of the murder of Christ, and he lived within a local community that had expelled Jews some ninety years earlier. He considered the Jews blasphemers and liars because they rejected the divinity of Jesus, whereas Christians believed Jesus was the Messiah. In 1543, Luther's other major works on the Jews included his 60,000-word writing titled *Von den Juden und Ihren Lügen* (On the Jews and Their Lies), where Luther argued that the Jews were no longer the chosen people but "the devil's people:" he referred to them with violent, vile language. Luther advocated setting synagogues on fire, destroying Jewish prayer books, forbidding rabbis from preaching, seizing Jews' property and money, and smashing up their homes, so that these "poisonous envenomed worms" would be forced into labor or expelled "for all time." Luther's words "We are at fault in not slaying them" amounted to a sanction for murder. Just about every anti-Jewish book printed in the Third Reich contained references to and quotations from Luther. In *Mein Kampf*, Hitler refers to Martin Luther as a great warrior, a true statesman, and a great reformer, alongside Richard Wagner and Frederick the Great. Hitler, by his Austrian experience and his Lutheran studies was an anti-Semite to the point of being a ruthless madman. His oratorical brilliance (do we know anyone with "oratorical brilliance" these days?...) actually helped him convince the (mindless) populous.

Both of these were off the chart ideologues, to the point of being political madmen. But...they were honest in their belief. Lenin was deeply convinced about distributing wealth (did you hear this phrase from someone lately??...) among people, take a large part of the wealth from the "haves" and give it to the "have-nots" under the banner of "make it fair" (anyone?? recent memory??). Hitler, —based upon his studies, his upbringing, his religion, and his Austrian life experience- was convinced that the elimination of the Jews was a fountain of all problem solving.

Lenin and Hitler were also convinced that they were "the" one who knew the truth, saw the direction, and were absolutely convinced that once they achieved their dream and vision; ---everyone else would (finally) see it, recognize it, and would appreciate it. If you look at the contemporary events of their respective time through this lens, you understand that neither of these two saw himself as a monster. They were following their "vision," working toward the moment when everyone else would see the light that they saw for a long time. Because of their (first and foremost) genetic make-up, plus contemporary social environment, upbringing, studies and beliefs, both were living in a twilight zone, where the end justifies the means. As an example, contrary to most peoples' (especially Russians') belief, Lenin was not the one who started the revolution in March of 1917. Lenin in fact read about the revolution in Switzerland in a coffee house. He rushed home, took over the Workers' Party, overthrew the legit Provisional Government in October and became the leader. And few people know that Nicholas II, the last czar of Russia and his family were murdered on Lenin's direct order, in July, 1918. There was no rationale behind wiping out the entire Romanov family, but "the end justified the means" for Lenin.

In a more recent historical reference, we can examine President Nixon's case. Nixon was far from being an off the chart ideologue like Lenin and Hitler, but he deeply believed in his cause (serving the country), and from the very early days of his political career was convinced that he was "the" one (and the only one) who saw things correctly, and saw the light at the end of the tunnel. The Alger Hiss case seemed to confirm his beliefs in his mind. I always thought that Nixon's unlawful moves and actions came from his deep conviction to his cause; therefore the end justified the means for him. And let's be honest here: in most cases, President Nixon did serve America's interest. Henry Kissinger's "shuttle diplomacy," opening China, the triangulation between the US, China and Soviet Union to curb the Soviets, and his boldest move of sending everything with wings on, over to Israel in October, 1973 to help Israel during Yom Kippur War (accidentally, the US military cargo planes had to refuel in mid air, because no European country would let them land). Surely, President Nixon

did not choose to “lead from behind” on that one. But –most unfortunately- most people remember President Nixon as a “Watergate President.”

I think it is very safe to argue, that the common denominators of these three were:

- They did not see their actions as “unacceptable” or illegal,
- They were deeply convinced that they were “the chosen one,” who saw the light on the horizon and all they needed to do was to show it to everyone else, and
- Their means to get to their end-goal were justified, and it would be clearly seen by everyone in the end.

Again, there is a great difference between being an “off the chart ideologue mad man” and a deeply convinced person, so let’s stipulate that on the chart where Lenin and Hitler shared “100,” Nixon was at “40.” But, he most definitely was “on the chart.”

Undoubtedly they needed a ring of people around them, who could not have agreed more with them and enthusiastically supported them ..... for a totally different reason than these three thought. The three respective rings also had their common denominator: members of the rings were opportunistic, spineless people with the objective to grab power, money or both. In order of doing so, they took advantage of the honest but –in political terms- madman “leader,” who thought everyone was peddling in the same direction.

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

Subsequently, between 1924 (after Lenin’s death in January 1924 and Stalin’s accession to power) and March of 1953 (Stalin’s death), Stalin killed approximately 20 million of his fellow citizens. The number includes approximately 14.5 million that needlessly starved to death, at least one million executed for political “offences,” at least 9.5 million more deported, exiled or imprisoned in work camps, with many of the estimated five million that were sent to the ‘Gulag Archipelago,’ never returning alive. Other estimates place the number of deported at 28 million.

Just as with Lenin, the success of Hitler drew people such as Hess, Goebbels, Goering, Himmler and many others. These people used Hitler and his madness. As an example, Goebbels was earning 300,000 Reichsmarks a year in “fees” for writing in his own newspaper, Der Angriff (The Attack), as well as his ministerial salary and many other sources of income. These payments were in effect bribes from the paper’s publisher Max Amann. He owned a villa by the lake at Wannsee, and another on Lake Constance in the south, which he spent 2.2 million Reichsmarks refurbishing. The tax office, as it did for all the Nazi leaders, gave him generous exemptions. Hitler apparently connived at the corruption of his lieutenants because of the power it gave him over them.

In President Nixon’s case, one can argue that as he was “40” on the “100 scale ideologue chart” the people around him were also “40” on the “being a ruthless gangster for own reason” chart. It can be argued that President Nixon (not being a madman) had the ability to control people around him far better than Lenin and Hitler. At least Colson, Mitchell, Hunt, Ehrlichman, Haldeman, and several others were not building a financial empire under Nixon, and were trying to protect the president and his cause (using illegal means). But they were not working for their own pocket.

Staying with Lenin and Hitler, they had other common denominators, such as being a brilliant orator, highly intelligent and with an uncanny ability to gauge the public and its brain capacity. To prove this point let me cite Hitler’s four main theses here (and I will get back to this a bit later):

*“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 person 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."*

And ..... of course... both of them sorely needed the "60% Club," the adoring, but totally mindless crowd. It is also very telling how much –in spite of bringing unseen disaster to people's lives in Lenin's case, and mass killing in Hitler's- both were adored by the (mindless) populous thanks to their oratorical capability; by the same talking, the 60% hated President Nixon (who had no oratorical capability whatsoever) while Nixon did much more good for America than the other two for their respective countries and people. It is very safe to argue that for the "60% Club," facts do not count; oratory is everything.

In Barack Hussein Obama's case, people's opinions who oppose him could be sorted into four major categories: a "naïve," a "moron," a "cleaver conman," or a "gangster." And no one understands why 95% of Obama's doings cannot be clearly slotted into either of these categories.

No one has a clear understanding because –looking at his actions with common sense- most of Obama's doings are self-defeating, defeating and degrading the Office of the President, brings the country down, and/or defeats the Democratic Party. From someone, who is the No.1 guy in the respective party and the President of the United States is unheard how Obama:

- Illegally played a large percent of General Motors into his union cronies hands
- Is totally anti democratic and anti American "czar system"
- Is anti gun, anti Christian and anti Israel
- Eliminated any and all respect for the US around the world
- Instituted exclusively anti energy policies
- Brought ObamaCare upon the America, and has been lying about it from day one
- Gave up air defense system in Poland and Czech Republic
- Did not support the Iranian people in their 2009 uprising
- Wasted close to \$40 billion on green energy
- Gave unchecked power to EPA, which has been running wild
- Terminated Yucca Mountain nuclear waste depository
- Established corporate average fuel economy (CAFE) standard requiring auto makers to hit an average 54.5 miles per gallon by 2025
- Allowed the numerous scandals of the last two years portraying a totally anti democratic, anti American, vastly partisan, and most of the time illegal activity by his regime.

So what's the correct term?

What people are totally missing about Barack Hussein Obama: he is a politically totally blind, off the chart ideologue, a political madman, on a mission. On a mission he feels to be "the" one with a correct vision, "the only one" who sees the light and he is here to show it to the rest of us. Just like Lenin and Hitler. In a TV interview with Obama (September 17, 2013), the interviewer asked:

- Interviewer: "38% of the American people say, ObamaCare will greatly increase their premium. Are they all wrong?"
- Obama: "Yes they are"

There you have it. As I wrote in January, 2013:

"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 Direction

August 25, 2013

- 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, it is a success...."**

Because:

- If America nearly doubled her debt of 140 years within less than five years, and
- America has her lowest workers participation since the data recording had begun, and
- America has the smallest military since World War II, and
- America has the highest number of voters (a.k.a. "highest food stamp recipients") voting for democrats **was "the" plan**, then

yes, this is an unmitigated success. Otherwise it is an unmitigated disaster.

It was also telling how the 2009 cabinet was set up, how all major players (Hillary Clinton, Janet Napolitano, Kathleen Sebelius, Eric Holder, Tim Geithner, Christina "the eight percent" Romer, Rahm Emanuel, Steven Chu, and Arne Duncan) were chosen, how 90% of Obama's czars (Van Jones, Cass Sunstein and all others), were off the chart Alinsky ideologues, and how every single one of them performed at the level it was foreseeable. Without going into details on each, let me just put my argument forward: I have been following US politics since the Nixon years; I have never (not even remotely) seen a sorrier bunch than this one. These people and Obama underline the meaning of the "bird of a feather" concept.

The most glaring example that Obama is "someone America has never seen before," was the "Keystone Pipeline" issue. Think about this: before November, 2012, Obama had done everything in his power to kill the American energy industry; closed down most federal lands, did not issue drilling permits, his EPA prevented the energy industry to operate, killed the coal industry, and single handedly created tens of thousands of job losses. By the time the Keystone issue came around, everyone (I meant: everyone who does not need supervision being in public) knew that Obama hates our energy industry. The "build or don't build the pipeline" had zero relevancy to Obama's second term, because it will take 10-12 years to complete. The environazis (pardon me: the environmental experts, such as Albert Gore...) would have been vexed a bit, but that could have taken 2-3 weeks at most, plus it would have been offset by the unions' support, because of new jobs. The most important point for Obama could have been to prove once and for all, he is "reasonable," he is "rational," he is "not here to kill the energy industry;" he had the perfect opportunity to show "I approve any energy related project that makes sense."**Again, at absolutely no cost to him.** And he did not do it. Using the above mentioned ("naïve," a "moron," a "cleaver conman," a "gangster") categories, the Keystone does not fit in any of them. This is what's confusing just about everybody who tries to slate Obama into these categories.

- If he was "cleaver" he approved it in a heart bit, picking up an Ace from the table that he "approves any good energy program when he sees one";
- If he was a "gangster," he would have approved it for political favors with the unions;
- If he was a "moron," he could have not maneuvered the issue around different agencies to slow it down. He probably would have refused it off-hand;
- I don't think "naïveté" was involved here.

But, if we look at Keystone through the “political madman on the mission” lens, we will understand him. Thus, he had no regards to the ensuing consequences. He hates the American energy industry and he will kill it come hell or high water. As a further example, the separation between the “honest political madman” and the circle around him cannot be portrayed better than the “Solyndra” and GE windmill type ventures. I actually believe Obama, that he imagines a clean energy technology future. The entire industry is trying to prove to him that this is idiotic, but –again- he thinks he “sees the light.” On the other hand, the circle around him knows it better; but they have a serious political and economical interest to peddle the boat in the wrong direction (just let me mention one: on its \$14.2 Billion profit, GE did not pay taxes in the United States of America. None. As a matter of fact, GE claimed a tax benefit of \$3.2Billion from the US Government. By absolute coincidence, Jeff Immelt is on Obama’s Jobs and Competitiveness Board, and frequently plays golf with Obama).

The great confusion for most Americans is coming from two sources:

- The last three generations (anyone born since 1940) have never seen an anti-American person in the White House. Someone who hates everything that America has been standing for, for 230+ years. LBJ’s Great Society and Carter’s idiotic moves are not coming near to the definition of being “anti American.” LBJ meant well, Carter was an idiot.
- The US electorate has been trying the socialist agenda once every 30 years. It last happened before/under Jimmy Carter. Carter 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 Carter (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 understanding 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 years 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 very good on paper to everyone who did not live through it; this segment had absolutely zero knowledge how it really works.

The combined effect of the above mentioned two factors has been very confusing for Americans to figure out who Barack Hussein Obama is. By examining Obama’s doings through the

***“What if this guy is an off the chart socialist ideologue, a zealot ‘on a mission’ who (just like Lenin and Hitler) thinks of himself as ‘the one’, who was put into the US Presidency to ‘make America a better place’ by cutting America down to size, and fundamentally change the country’s core concept,”***

will explain just about everything Obama has done. I mean what sense does it make to raise corporate taxes to the highest in the world when a freshman student from a third rate university’s Faculty of Economics will tell you: companies will go where the tax is lower? But it will immediately make sense if you think this:

- Increasing corporate tax will chase companies away from the US, thereby
- Decreasing America’s power, thereby
- It will push America to be “one of the nations,” thereby
- The “global fairness” doctrine will be applied and will succeed.

In the Keystone pipeline case, the “losing 25,000 jobs” (unions’ problem), and proving “I approve a good energy project when I see one” theorem to everyone in America issues, did not come near to his “higher vision” of killing America’s energy industry by not letting America have the Keystone. That’s the lens Obama is looking through.

In several of his July, 2013 speeches he declared:

*“So, where I can act on my own, I will act on my own. I won’t wait for Congress.”*

*“This means whatever executive authority I have to help the middle class, I’ll use it.”*

*“We are going to do everything we can with or without Congress.”*

Does this sound to you like a democratically elected president of a Constitutional Republic, where checks and balances are in place, or a madman with a “vision,” of being “the one?” If this was not disgusting enough, it was made whole by the great applause after each line. The 60% was celebrating. The rest of us were throwing up.

How many born Americans that are on uncharted territory, was shown even by Rush Limbaugh. After Obama announced (around July 20<sup>th</sup>, 2013) his new round of speeches of “we need to refocus our economy; it is working well and would be working even better if the Republicans did not oppose everything,” Rush lamented: “this is the most cynical lie in US history.” What Rush does not understand, is that Obama is not lying. He is serious about “this is working well” (according to his objectives), and it “would be working even better (e.g. if the Republicans did not oppose the implementation of his plans) if the Republicans did not oppose everything.” But, if you look at the Obama speech through his socialist progressive liberal madman lens, you will conclude that:

- a) He is right; his plans have been successfully implemented. America is much weaker, much less respected, and much closer to the socialist Western Europe, than she was in mid 2008, and
- b) All “Obama parameters” would be much stronger if the Republicans did not oppose everything.

Beginning July 22, 2013, Obama, in all his speeches defined Congress’ efforts (investigating the regime’s doings) as “destructions, political pestering, and phony scandals.” Limbaugh, Gov. Huckabee, and everyone else commented on it. What they all were missing was that Obama (based upon the Obama objectives) is right and truthful. He clearly does not understand “what is the big deal” with IRS, Benghazi, James Rosen, gun running, NSA and all others. All these “phony scandals” are way below, and serve his “big vision” that – according to Obama- will ultimately serve the rest of us ---although we are just not yet capable of visualizing it. The great similarity between Nixon’s “enemy list” and Obama’s “BOLO” list (“Be On the Look Out” by the IRS) and Eric Holder going after James Rosen (then lies about it in his sworn testimony) is not happening by accident. ***“It should not be a big deal, it serves the greater good, and its end completely justifies the means.”*** Governor Huckabee even talked about how Obama’s one hour six minute long speech did not contain a single new issue since his first campaign speech. Gov. Huckabee is right and wrong. Right, because it really did not contain a new element, but he is wrong, because Obama neither needs nor wants new element. What he said in 2008 stands today, America was just not listening in 2008. And this is the core point of the problem. We still don’t understand that Obama’s vision is to “cut America down to size, bring America down from the ‘hill’ and break her ‘shine.’” If we looked at his doings through this lens, all his actions will immediately make sense.

In one of his speeches (in Galesburg, IL) Obama declared: *“This growing inequality isn’t just morally wrong; it’s bad economics ..... reversing these trends must be Washington’s highest priority. It’s certainly my highest priority.”* This says it all. Obama looks any and all economic and political questions through his socialist, community organizer, “spread the wealth” lens. What people also need to understand, that the above statement is the fullest extent of Obama’s capacity in understanding the economy. He –from his community organizing days- has absolute zero clue about anything beyond this statement.

I have been discussing it since early 2008, that Obama (just like his predecessors) needs the enabling tight circle around him: a group of ruthless, opportunistic, spineless gangsters taking advantage of him. He is surrounded by Richard Trumka (visited the White House more the 200 times between 2009-2012), Andy Stern, Van Jones, Jeremiah Wright, Jeff Jones, Cass Sunstein, Bill Ayers, Valerie B. Jarrett, Kathleen Sebelius, Rahm Emanuel, Harry Read, Nancy Pelosi and many others. These people are worse than Cosa Nostra gangsters, because for power and money, they are willing to jam theories, practices and laws (they personally do not believe in) down everyone’s throat. At least, in Cosa Nostra, they believed in their own mission. I think it is enough to bring up the issue of how the entire US Senate (under Reid), wants exemption from ObamaCare, and how Reid jammed a 100 million dollar payment to Nevada into the “Immigration Bill” under the heading of “promoting tourism.” These people are there for money and power.

95% of Obama’s doings have been either illegal or unconstitutional from the moment his regime, on behalf of the unions, illegally robbed GM’s bondholders blind, all the way to arbitrarily suspending part of ObamaCare, and making illegal end-runs around states in the voting rights issue. 95% of his doings are the clear and well defined hallmark of the “end justifies the means” committed ideologue, which is here to enlighten the rest of us. Although he tries to stay away from being implicated and has his henchmen (first and foremost Eric Holder who would be titled as a consigliere if they were part of Cosa Nostra; he also fulfills Stalin’s role under Lenin) do the dirty work, Obama’s efforts would be futile if it were not tragic for the nation. It only serves to game the 60%.

I lived 32 years of my life under a socialist regime, and have a complete understanding of social, cultural and economic undercurrents, behavior models and unintended effects, supported by scores of historical data that a "let's spread the wealth a bit" ideology can cause. Obama and his progressive circle did not spend a day being a citizen of a socialist country. Other than their blind ambition, arrogance and greed, they have nothing. If you have any doubt with regards to my statement as to who is who, let me remind you: Nancy Pelosi said this on August 21, 2009 on TV when they asked her about the controversy regarding the Muslim mosque in lower Manhattan: *"It would be interesting to investigate who is funding the opposition."* This is how social-communists think. "Is there an opposition? Let's investigate who funds the opposition." Lenin did it, Stalin did it and Castro did it. Now Obama and his cronies are doing it. The Nancy Pelosi statement from 2009 and the "Obama's IRS suppressing political opposition between 2010-12" cases are identical. Obama & Co. is acting in concert. First Amendment rights, factual issues with the opposition, discussions, and agreeing with the other side are damned. "Let's investigate the opposition." She was the Speaker of the House of the United States of America at that time. Based upon her activities, it is my humble opinion that if someone promised Pelosi that she could get back to being the speaker in 2014 at the cost of becoming a transvestite skinhead, or a nun, or a street hooker by sundown; she would take the deal. This is the core element of the circle surrounding Barack Hussein Obama.

As democrats have been exploiting the "60%"'s stupidity for decades, Obama does the same. He understands (Lenin and Hitler understood it too) how much human behavior could be altered, and he also knows how: constant pressure, economical disadvantage, uncertainty, fear of (IRS, EPA, NAACP, DOJ, NLRB... etc.) and persecution effect it. Human behavior can be altered to this degree: I saw a documentary of a Bangladesh based eye surgeon visiting North Korea, and doing 1,000 cataract surgeries within a short period of time. After the surgery, they gathered the 1,000 people in a room, the doctor went from person to person, took the bandage off their eyes. 1,000 out of 1,000 (one at the time) ran to the front of the room, thanked the "great leader" (whose picture was hanging on the wall) for the "miracle:" no one (I mean no-one) of the 1,000 thanked the doctor, who was standing right there. You can make the argument that people were doing this out of fear, and in 25% of the cases it might be correct. But one could see the people's eyes and behavior, that they are serious about thanking the Great Leader (who had nothing to do with the whole thing). The way how people's behavior and thinking can be altered was perfected in North Korea. It so happens, the very same tools were used in Cuba, Venezuela, Russia, China, and many other countries. It is also a fact that all these countries by coincidence are communist. If you look at Obama's doings, the US's direction over the last 53 months, you can make your own judgment as to the direction of the United States.

There are countless examples of how much Obama looks down the "60%": in his speech on July 30<sup>th</sup> 2013, he declared (I am paraphrasing): "Republicans keep pushing the Keystone pipeline that will create 50 permanent jobs. This is not a job program we need" (and the adoring 60% was applauding). Beside the retard nature and idiocy of the statement, what it portrayed to me was that Obama is convinced: he can serve any kind of garbage; the 60% will eat it up. Like if he had a pig farm. To say that the few thousand mile long Keystone will generate 50 "permanent jobs" is to say "a 20 story condo complex will generate four permanent jobs: two doormen and two security guards." Yes. But you have to build it first. But, the 60% was applauding.

### Who is Barack Hussein Obama??

Upon the Trayvon Marting case, Obama lamented (I am paraphrasing): "Cultural background, issues, and experiences you grew up with (such as people following you, ladies grab their purses when a black man enters the elevator) stay with you." I cannot agree more with Obama. But, anyone outside of the "60% Club" (or outside of a psychiatric clinic's locked down section) would have a few follow up questions. One that immediately comes to mind is Obama's Muslim background, the way, social environment, cultural and religious support he was raised in. The very next question is; how much of these decades, long experiences are ingrained into his mind and soul? Based upon his own thesis, it must have surely "stayed with him."

From the day he stepped into the White House, it was very telling how he separated the world into "Muslim interest" and "Non-Muslim Interest."

- Right after his oath, he could not wait to bow to the Saudi King (April 2, 2009),

- His “Cairo speech” was delivered on June 4, 2009, while his first visit to Israel (our closest ally) came in March 2013. Now: it is very customary, telling, and advisable for a new US president to carefully choose the sequence of the countries he visits. Remember, Tel Aviv is less than 30 minutes flight from Riyadh, and less than that from Cairo. Obama flew on Air Force One for nine hours to deliver a speech to his Arab brothers, but did not get around to visiting Tel Aviv which was thirty minutes flight time away.
- He let every single US friendly Arab leader down, during the “Arab Spring,”
- He supported the Muslim Brotherhood before and during their power, and supports them now, after they were swept away. Of course, under the heading of “democratic process”
- He supported the “Brothers” to the tune of delivering F-16 fighters and Abrams tanks to them. Now, when the Brothers are in jail, the US government is “delaying” the shipment.
- He has never considered invading Syria, the strongest Iran ally. By taking Assad out, Iran’s stranglehold on the Middle East would be eliminated not only in Syria, but in Lebanon and in Gaza. It could be safely argued that having a US friendly government in Egypt and Syria would finish Iran’s dominance along with any future plan for good. But again, what about the “Muslim brotherly love?”
- While he let Iran further develop the nuke (which Obama’s regime is crowing about as “the success of crippling sections”), Obama did not lift a finger to help the Iranian uprising in June, 2009 after the Iranian presidential election was rigged. Let’s stop here for a moment:
  - It requires a particular cynicism to crow about the “success of our crippling sanctions” as a means of smoking the existing regime out. If my (fading) memory still serves me, there is a country called “North Korea,” against which the collective Western world has “crippling sanctions” for close to fifty years, and Korea has been one of the largest nuclear and other weapon exporters in the world. So, let me ask: how did those sanctions work out? Looking at North Korea (which Obama’s team must, because the North Koreans make sure they are noticed; one day they elect this pimple-farm-faced fat boy, freshly escaped from his short pants, as their “supreme leader,” next day they launch a missile toward Japan.... these sort of things). So, if you are part of the Obama regime, see what’s happening in North Korea after fifty years of “sanctions,” and have the arrogance to crow about the “Iranian sanctions” you are either a certified moron, or a gangster with the accurate gauge of sixty percent of your countrymen.
  - The “Who is Barack Hussein Obama” question could practically be answered by looking at two independent historical points: in 2009, Obama could not care less for the treasured “democratic process” in Iran (Muslim interest prevailed). Came 2013, Obama is up in arms against “not following the democratic process” in Egypt (anti-Muslim interest prevailed). Just think about that.
- He gave up Iraq, and is now giving up Afghanistan, giving the Muslim radical terrorists to come back.

I cannot describe how much I enjoyed seeing pictures of a very irritated Obama after Morsi and his Muslim gang was swept aside. The events made clear for him, that the “grand vision” as far as the Arab world is concerned, might need cataract surgery.

So who is Barack Hussein Obama?

I have, from day one counted Obama as the worst person to ever run this country, and the first person in US history who actually has the chance to kill the United States of America. The extreme danger comes from Obama’s madman psychopathic mind, combined with his oratorical brilliance, and the historical backdrop how he came to power; the economic crash, combined with the two wars, Iran’s nuke, the weakness of the European Union, and Russia. The US financial collapse of 2008 would have been problematic enough to come out of even at optimal circumstances. America was lucky having Ronald Reagan after the economy slump Carter created. We were not lucky at this time. The 2008 crash was followed by Obama, then Obama again. Thanks to the 60% Club. It might prove to be catastrophic.

In a sense, Obama is unique, a class by himself, a true “one of a kind,” because he has a side even Lenin and Hitler did not. Those two wanted to build their countries “up” while Obama wants to destroy the US system. Those two had in mind serving their countries by using their country’s social, political, military, and economical framework; Obama serves the global Muslim cause; an interest residing outside of America. That’s unique. As he said, memories, cultural backgrounds, upbringings stay with the person. I believe him.

## The Direction

August 25, 2013

---

Don't get me wrong. As I mentioned at the beginning, I am on the "mission" to excuse Obama, because I am relatively confident his doings are coming from the "political madman" angle. I am not gauging him as being a "Muslim Agent" or a traitor. However, one does not need to be a "Muslim Agent" to serve the Muslim Cause. Being an "agent" is a contractual category, "serving a cause" is a mental standing, believing in the cause. As Obama himself said, "upbringing stays with the person."

At the end, the discussion with regards to Obama shall be conducted before the historical backdrop of the Soviet Union and Germany. The destruction these two systems created is empirical data; it is not up for liberal dispute or lamentation. It is also a significant historical fact that one of the two systems which was left alone (Soviet socialism) was functioning for more than seventy years by the time it collapsed under its own weight. Parallel with the systems' history stands with Obama's two predecessors: Lenin and Hitler. On a long run, Lenin's creation was proven contrary to the Russian people's cultural and religious background, as much as the German people proved themselves not to be a killing machine. Yet, Lenin's creation caused roughly 30 million deaths; Hitler's was close to 60 million deaths.

America is not only far from what Obama has in mind, it is the polar opposite to it, and America will prove it. Unfortunately (thanks to the ever present 60% Club's activity) it looks like, it might take a decade or so, through which time the America, that my family, I, and hundreds of millions of people came for and truly love, will disappear.

So, back to the original question of "The Direction," all history does, is repeats itself? Everyone, I consider a thinking person thinks America truly, more than ever in her rich history, is at a crossroads. We have come across a few over the last 230+ years. and always choose the right path. No one, I know, is convinced we will do the same at this time.