



## THE FOUNDATION

"A Constitution of Government once changed from Freedom, can never be restored. Liberty, once lost, is lost forever." --John Adams

## PATRIOT PERSPECTIVE

### 2008 in review: Top questions Barack Obama did *not* answer

By Mark Alexander

Perhaps you've noticed an abundance of "Top Ten" lists in recent weeks. As usual, the mainstream media has churned out a variety of year-in-review pieces of late. Two events vied for top billing on all those lists -- the financial meltdown and the presidential election. At present, it isn't clear which of those debacles presents the greater threat to our nation.

The factors leading up to the economic collapse in the last two quarters are clear (see Economics 101). What is not clear, however, is whether we can limit the damage to a mere recession.

On the other hand, we have learned that Barack Hussein Obama (as he prefers to be named for his oath of office) is a charismatic master of deception and deflection. What we haven't learned, therefore, are the answers to a plethora of questions about his citizenship, his mentors, his faith, his worldview, and his tragic childhood -- a childhood which gave rise to the pathological narcissism that launched his political career and guides him to this day.

Not that many of those questions weren't asked. Plenty of them were posed in our profiles of Obama but were met with obfuscation, prevarication and equivocation.

So, who is this guy?

In one sense he answered that question in his political autobiography, "The Audacity of Hope": "I am new enough on the national political scene that I serve as a blank screen on which people of vastly different political stripes project their own views."

That explains who he is in the glassy eyes of his messianic following, but who is he really? Who is Barack Hussein Obama, the president-elect of the United States of America?

In pursuit of an answer, I have compiled a list of some important questions directed at BHO that he did *not* answer in 2008.

Where to start ... how about the beginning: Are you a natural-born citizen, as constitutionally prescribed in Article II, Section 1 and Amendment XX, Section 3, for the office of president?

When the question of citizenship came up a year ago, I presumed that this issue was a "straw man" -- that your strategy was to send some adversaries on a rabbit trail to nowhere, only to release your official birth certificate just prior to the election. But you didn't do that.

I believe that you were born in Honolulu, but I have been to the hospital where you were, ostensibly, born, and they could not produce any birth records or tell me who the attending OB might have been. Of course, 1961 is many years past.

Hawaii Gov. Linda Lingle has sealed your on-file birth records, making them unavailable for verification. You refuse to request that the documents in question be made available for examination by dispassionate analysts.

To obtain a driver's license, one has to provide some proof of citizenship -- so why did you not comply as a presidential candidate? Surely you can influence the state of Hawaii to release your original birth certificate for public inspection, so this lingering question can be put to rest before your inauguration.

We know that you hold constitutional rule of law in contempt, but in the unlikely event that it is revealed

sometime after your inauguration that you are not a natural-born citizen, we would be faced with a serious constitutional crisis. When do you plan to release your original birth certificate?

Moving on, given your strange childhood and broken family (similar to that of Bill Clinton, the last unmitigated narcissist to occupy the White House), you indicated that your primary childhood mentor was a communist, Frank Marshall Davis.

How did his mentorship shape your understanding of the role of government and economics?

You claim that you never heard any of the anti-American and black-supremacist rants of your mentoring pastor, Jeremiah Wright. However, you spent 20 years in Wright's church, he officiated at your marriage and the baptism of your children, and you identified him as a "father" figure.

Is it possible that you have been so steeped in his racist rhetoric and hatred for America that you failed to recognize it for what it was?

You claim that terrorist William Ayers was "just a guy in my neighborhood," and that you were "just eight years old when he was a terrorist." However, you were 34 when Ayers used his radical celebrity to launch your political career from his living room. You were 40 when this unrepentant terrorist was featured in a New York Times article (on the morning of September 11, 2001) and quoted in the opening paragraph proclaiming, "I don't regret setting bombs. I feel we didn't do enough." Ayers added, "America makes me want to puke." You were working on your second major "philanthropic" project with Ayers at that time, and when interviewed for your first Senate run, you claimed that your primary qualification for public office was your role with the ultra-Leftist Annenberg Foundation -- an appointment that you received from Ayers.

So, what is the real nature of your relationship with Ayers?

Regarding your ties to the Socialist New Party, the ACORN crowd, Rod Blagojevich, Tony Rezko, Saul Alinsky, Father Michael Pflieger, Khalid al-Mansour, Kwame Kilpatrick, Louis Farrakhan, Rashid Khalidi, Raila Odinga and other haters, hard Leftists and convicted felons, are we to assume these were just "guys in your neighborhood"?

If you were a Civil Service Employee, could you pass a background check to receive a basic "Secret" clearance? If not, why should the American people trust you as the steward of their security? (OK, I know the answer. "No.")

When you turned 18 years of age, did you register with the Selective Service System as required by law?

Regarding your "realtor" friend Rezko, how do the unusual circumstances surrounding the purchase of your Chicago mansion differ from the purchase made by former Rep. Randy "Duke" Cunningham (R-CA) of his California house -- a purchase that ended with his arrest and conviction?

George Bernard Shaw once wrote, "A government which robs Peter to pay Paul can always depend on the support of Paul." All committed Socialists understand this principle. In 100 words or less, can you compare and contrast Adam Smith's Wealth of Nations with Karl Marx's Communist Manifesto? In 50 words or less, can you describe any significant difference between International Communism and National Socialism?

Whom do you hold accountable for the economic fiasco, and what is your plan to ensure it doesn't recur? What is your plan to halt the imminent inflation resulting from the Fed's printing of money to fund TARP and all the additional handouts?

Why do you think government can provide better and more efficient health care than the private sector? Keep in mind, yours is the same party that was regulating the housing market when it became the first economic domino to fall.

Can you explain how excessively taxing large corporations (which, in turn, pass these "fees" on to the consumer) provides economic "stimulus," or how this makes lower- and middle-income Americans wealthier?

The motto of your campaign was "change," but you have never specified what that change means -- change *from* what *to* what? Based on the goals you have spoken about, it appears that you (and your handlers) would like to change our country from a democratic republic to a socialist/Marxist one. Would you please disabuse me of this notion?

You campaigned about needing "new blood" in Washington. Given this, how do you explain your selection of so many people from the Clinton and Carter administrations?

Our national debt stands at \$10 trillion, and rises at a rate of roughly \$75 million per hour each day. Do you see any problem with such large numbers, and if so, do you have a plan to fix it?

What is your plan to rein in congressional spending?

Define "rich." As in "taxing the rich." The amount appears to have varied depending upon which speech you and Joe Biden made during the campaign. \$250,000? \$200,000? \$150,000? None of these pre-income tax amounts would qualify anyone as being rich, and yet, you voted to increase taxes on the "rich" at the \$40,000 level.

During Bill Clinton's administration, he raised taxes and government revenue collections decreased. George W. Bush reduced taxes and revenue collections increased. Why?

What yardstick will you use to determine when our troops should return home from OIF and/or OEF? How will you measure success? Given that the surge strategy in Iraq has, without question, worked, why is it that you cannot simply admit you were wrong?

What is it about leaders of states who sponsor terrorism and harbor terrorists that makes you believe peace is negotiable with them? What makes you think that Iran, Syria and terrorist entities such as Hamas, Fatah and Hezbollah will adhere to anything they might "agree" to in a signed document?

What is your position on amnesty for illegal immigrants? What is your vision for immigration reform, generally?

Vice president-elect Joe Biden said, "Mark my words. It will not be six months before the world tests Barack Obama. ... Remember I said it standing here if you don't remember anything else I said. Watch, we're gonna have an international crisis, a generated crisis, to test the mettle of this guy. I can give you at least four or five scenarios from where it might originate. And he's gonna need help. ... He's gonna need you ... to stand with him. Because it's

not gonna be apparent initially, it's not gonna be apparent that we're right."

What in heaven's name was he ranting about?

In regard to your so-called "National Service Plan" you stated, "We've got to have a civilian national security force that's just as powerful, just as strong, just as well-funded [as the military]." That sounds like a force of like-minded socialists, young pioneers, brown shirts, Obama youth, ready to trade brooms for guns.

What were you talking about?

On the subject of guns, you said of the Second Amendment (the palladium of all other rights), "I believe in the Second Amendment. Lawful gun owners have nothing to fear. I said that throughout the campaign. I haven't indicated anything different during the transition. I think people can take me at my word." However, your nominee for attorney general, Eric Holder, reaffirmed in the recent Heller case his long-held position that the Second Amendment confers no rights of individual gun possession by private citizens.

Can we still take you at your word?

What is your position on the Enumerated Powers Act (H.R. 1359), which would require all legislation introduced in Congress to "contain a concise and definite statement of the constitutional authority" empowering Congress to enact it?

And on the subject of constitutional authority, on 20 January, you will be taking this constitutionally prescribed oath: "I do solemnly swear that I will faithfully execute the office of President of the United States, and will to the best of my ability, preserve, protect and defend the Constitution of the United States."

Exactly what Constitution are you swearing to "preserve, protect and defend" -- that which was written by our forefathers and defended by the blood of Patriots for generations since, or its vestigial remains, the so-called "Living Constitution" as amended by Leftist judicial diktat? After all, you said you would nominate Supreme Court Justices who met your ideological test rather than those who were impartial jurists.

If the latter, should anyone take your role as commander in chief seriously?

And a final question: At a Florida rally four days before the presidential election, you asserted: "[W]e want to do this, change our tax code (a.k.a. 'redistribute the wealth'). ... John McCain [calls] this socialistic. You know I, I, I don't know when, when, uh, when they decided they wanted to make a virtue out of selfishness."

For the record, when you were an adolescent (by your own account, smoking dope and snorting coke) John McCain was a POW in Hanoi. Despite being a Naval Academy graduate and the son of a high-ranking admiral, McCain had requested combat duty and was assigned to the USS Forrestal. He was on the flight deck of the Forrestal during the inferno that killed 134 of his fellow sailors. He was flying his 23rd mission as part of Operation Rolling Thunder over Vietnam when his A-4E Skyhawk was shot down by a missile over Hanoi. He was subjected to more than five years of horrific torture by the Communist NVA, including two years of solitary confinement.

You claim that John McCain has made "a virtue out of selfishness." When will you issue a public apology for that odious remark?

## GOVERNMENT & POLITICS

### Hope 'n' Change:

#### Scandals and inexperience ... again

New Mexico Governor Bill Richardson withdrew himself from consideration to be commerce secretary for the incoming Obama administration this week. He is a subject in an investigation into state contracts received by his political donors and dropped out to avoid further scandal for Barack Obama. In short, CDR Financial Products received transportation contracts worth over \$1 million from the New Mexico state government in 2004 and 2005 after its CEO, David Rubin, gave some \$100,000 to three separate political action committees run by Richardson.

Richardson believes he will be vindicated, but the optimistic assumption that the timing of the donations and the contract award are mere coincidence ignores the full extent of Rubin's political activity. Law enforcement officials are examining Rubin's ties to Pennsylvania Governor Ed Rendell, and Democrat officials in Illinois, California and Flor-

ida. CDR also had close ties to Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, investing in lucrative programs that contributed to the housing bubble and our current economic predicament. Obama, who is now weathering his second "pay-to-play" scandal in as many months, said he was sorry to see Richardson go. It looks as if the culture of corruption has found a new home.

As the door swings shut on Richardson, it opens wide for former Clinton Chief of Staff Leon Panetta, who is being nominated to head the CIA. This announcement has confused many Democrats, Republicans and members of the intelligence community because despite his long résumé of government jobs, he has no experience whatsoever in intelligence. Senate Intelligence Committee stalwarts Dianne Feinstein (D-CA), John Rockefeller (D-WV), and Christopher Bond (R-MO) all expressed concern about Panetta's complete lack of intelligence experience. Perhaps he should tell them he once stayed at a Holiday Inn Express.

Obama's choice of Panetta was entirely political, as Obama opted for someone beholden to him who would help him avoid inconvenient inquiries into his own past. Former 9/11 Commission co-chair Lee Hamilton said it best when he indicated that Panetta's lack of intelligence experience was not as important as boosting public confidence in the embattled agency. Perhaps the title "Director of Central Intelligence" should be changed to "Public Relations Director," the better to suit Panetta's role.

Meanwhile, the inauguration looms, and Michael Newdow, the atheist crusader who has fought a string of unsuccessful lawsuits to remove references to God from the Pledge of Allegiance and our currency, is back on the offensive with a lawsuit that seeks to remove the phrase "so help me God" from the oath of office. With the help of the American Humanist Association, the Freedom From Religion Foundation and other atheist groups, Newdow has named Chief Justice John Roberts, the presidential, congressional and Armed Forces inaugural committees, and Revs. Rick Warren and Joseph Lowery in his suit. He has not named Barack Obama, though, because Obama has a right as an individual to express his religious beliefs. Never mind that the large number of Americans who comfortably embrace their faith might be offended by Newdow's crusade -- he says that watching the inauguration will make atheists feel excluded and stigmatized. If that's the case, maybe conservatives should sue, too.

## News from the Swamp: Who will join the U.S. Senate?

Embattled Illinois Gov. Rod "F" Blagojevich called everyone's bluff by announcing 71-year-old former Illinois attorney general Roland Burris as his pick to fill the state's vacant Senate seat. Barack Obama expressed disappointment at the move, Illinois Lt. Governor Pat Quinn was outraged, and Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid (D-NV) initially refused to seat Burris. Reid lost badly in that showdown. Blagojevich, who clearly relishes the fight against federal investigators and the Senate over his "pay-to-play" scheme to sell Barack Obama's Senate seat late last year, cleverly played the race card by picking Burris, who is now the only black person in the U.S. Senate. Blagojevich was also confident the law was on his side. He is still governor and retains the power of appointment, a fact that apparently escaped Reid until *after* he made himself a laughing-stock. That said, Burris might have a tough time getting elected in his own right when the time comes.

In Minnesota, the long undecided Senate race is headed to the courts. The state canvassing board declared Democrat "funny man" Al Franken the winner of the recount by a margin of 225 votes, but the results remain unofficial pending an election certificate signed by the secretary of state. Incumbent Norm Coleman has exercised his option to take the matter to court, where he will challenge the arbitrary and entirely muddled recount process. Franken's people in Minnesota are calling on Coleman to give up, and Sen. Reid went so far as to declare the race as over. Reid doesn't have a great track record on such prognostications, however -- recall his 2007 declaration that Iraq was lost. Senate Democrats announced that they plan to seat Franken, most likely in an effort to persuade Coleman to drop the lawsuit, but so far Coleman, whose term ended last Saturday, is not deterred.

In the House: Speaker Nancy Pelosi (D-CA) is planning to dispense with some of the House rules instituted by Newt Gingrich. And with a 256-178 majority (one vacancy), Democrats can do whatever they want. The Republican minority will no longer be able to introduce alternate legislation or offer amendments to Democrat bills and will not even be guaranteed open debate. All in the spirit of "bipartisanship," of course.

## GOP learning lesson at last?

Those in charge at the Republican National Committee may slowly be awakening to the fact that straying from principle led to the drubbing Republicans took in both 2006 and 2008. Our idea of "change" is constitutional conservatism, and perhaps this awareness is signified by two recent events leading up to the RNC meeting in late January.

In response to the outgoing president and his policies, the RNC's vice chairman and other officials are sponsoring a resolution that will oppose the Bush White House's support of seemingly bottomless bailouts for Wall Street and the auto industry. "We can't be a party of small government, free markets and low taxes while supporting bailouts and nationalizing industries," noted resolution co-sponsor Solomon Yue of Oregon.

Another unprecedented event occurred earlier this month when all six candidates for RNC Chairman (current chairman Mike Duncan, Michael Steele, Saul Anuzis, Ken Blackwell, Katon Dawson and Chip Saltsman) came together to debate issues the party faces going forward. Sponsored by Americans for Tax Reform, topics discussed included the technology gap between Democrats and the GOP, fealty to party principles by candidates and elected officials, and building a "farm team."

The task for movement conservatives is to develop, engage, and, most important, educate those who haven't developed or are amenable to change their political philosophy by actually limiting government while explaining why this is to the public's benefit; the anti-bailout resolution can be helpful in this regard.

Principle over politics need not be unpopular. 2009 could be the year we begin the recovery -- not just an economic one but one of constitutional government as well.

## Cuba 'celebrates' 50 years of Communist rule

Leftists the world over rejoiced on 1 January, but it wasn't to ring in the new year. They were celebrating the 50th anniversary of Fidel Castro's seizure of power in Cuba. Congratulatory statements flooded in from the leaders of China, Russia and Venezuela, in addition to other leftist Latin American countries, to commemorate a failed social experiment that has

continued for half a century at the expense of millions of Cubans.

True to the communist tradition of placing the rhetoric of revolution over the lives of the citizens for whom they claim to fight, Raul Castro declared, "This hasn't been a failure, not even under these conditions. It has been a constant fight." The "conditions" Castro refers to are the 46-year-old U.S. economic sanctions. Throughout its 50-year run the Castro regime has blamed everything and everybody -- from the Americans, to the Soviets, to the weather -- but its own ruthless plundering of a previously prosperous nation.

Proponents of Castro's revolution have touted his health care and education reforms. But surely those reforms could have been brought about without executing 16 million people, imprisoning another 100,000 in labor camps, and reducing the gross national product to five percent of what it was pre-revolution. But this loss of life and liberty is apparently nothing to those in the communist camp who believe, as Scottish columnist Gerald Warner so eloquently put it, "[that] murdering members of the bourgeoisie is just breaking eggs to make the Marxist omelet."

Perhaps the Castros really do have reason to celebrate: the impending ascension of Barack Obama this month. President-elect Obama has also promised them change -- in the form of unconditional talks and relaxed rules with Cuba. *Si, se puede!*

## NATIONAL SECURITY

### Warfront with Jihadistan:

#### Israel defends herself

The Israeli offensive in Gaza continues this week as Israel targets Hamas' terrorist strongholds, though Israel is receiving the usual international pressure to agree to the same kind of ceasefire as the ones ignored by the Palestinians for most of recent memory. Israel now faces a two-front war with the latest rocket attacks coming from Southern Lebanon, an area under the control of Iranian and Syrian-backed Hezbollah. The attacks against Israel are a continuation of the proxy war waged by Iran and the Islamofascists against Western democracies.

However, the recent humanitarian approach to war fighting in the Middle East by the U.S. and Israel has produced nothing but contempt and a version of the old Chinese torture known as "death by a thou-

sand cuts." Time and again Israel was poised to annihilate its enemies and yet it stopped for political and humanitarian reasons. This latest Israeli counterattack on Hamas is in danger of faltering as well, despite strong initial talk of "conclusive battle" and "decisive strikes." Still, it would not be surprising to see Israel land a decisive blow against Iranian nuclear efforts since they are well aware of who is pulling the Hamas strings and what the real threat will soon be. Israel should be aiming for nothing less than a convincing victory and needs to strike Hamas a deathblow. What they have successfully done is set the policy table for the incoming Obama administration.

Meanwhile, all this follows the recently confirmed link between a Pakistani spy agency and the Mumbai attack in India. Indeed, we may soon see two democratic allies drawn into regional war, all ignited by the common flame of Islamofascism. With at least three nuclear powers involved in this escalating military activity, the U.S. had best be prepared for every eventuality as these most dangerous scenarios play out.

### Deep Six for Fort Dix Six

Justice has finally been served on the "victims" of federal racial profiling and entrapment -- the so-called "Fort Dix Six." We highlighted these fine specimens of radical Islam in May 2007, when we reported on their thwarted plot to murder U.S. servicemen at Fort Dix, New Jersey. Five face potential life sentences for conspiracy to commit murder, while a sixth pleaded guilty to weapons charges. Naturally, the Left's shrieks of racial profiling and entrapment have been non-stop since the six were arrested. Evidently, federal jurists disagree.

For our part, if by "racial profiling" liberals actually mean that the six felons all happened to be, well, Islamic terrorists committed to "kill[ing] as many soldiers as possible" (actual quote), then we would agree they have been, er, "profiled." Likewise, if "entrapment" means a predisposition to purchase machine guns, rocket-propelled grenades, C-4/nitro explosives and 9mm handguns from an FBI informant to kill U.S. soldiers, then we would agree that they have been "entrapped." For the rest of planet Earth, however, these Islamofacist vermin got off too easy, considering their despicable ends.

Why is this topic so important right now? Well, for starters, perhaps the thugs-as-victims screeds from

the logic-impaired Left would lose their luster standing beside the overshadowing memory of the nearly 3,000 murdered in the 9/11 attacks. Or perhaps the Left has yet to ask itself why the U.S. hasn't witnessed a "9/11" since 9/11. We have certainly pondered this question, and we keep coming up with a two-word answer: George Bush. To be sure, we haven't pulled any punches in our criticism of the President's political and economic policies in these pages. Even so, President Bush has faithfully and fully executed his most critical charge, namely, keeping those within America's sovereign purview safe from enemies, foreign and domestic. The Obama administration would be wise to take note.

### Profiles of valor:

#### U.S. Marine Corps Capt. Brent Morel

United States Marine Corps Capt. Brent Morel of Martin, Tennessee, was a platoon commander with 1st Reconnaissance Battalion, 1st Marine Division during the first offensive in Fallujah as part of Operation Iraqi Freedom. On 7 April 2004, Morel's platoon encountered enemy fire from more than 50 insurgents. A rocket-propelled grenade crippled the lead vehicle in the convoy, and the platoon was besieged with mortar and machine gun fire. After ordering the last two vehicles to establish flanking positions for the convoy, Morel left his vehicle to lead an assault across an open field to maneuver into firing positions. His assault eliminated several enemy fighters. But seeing his fellow Marines pinned by enemy fire, he again left the safety of his position in order to counterattack. It was then that he issued his final order: "Cover me. We're assaulting through." Though he took out more enemy fighters, he fell mortally wounded. The Marines rallied and defeated the ambush, killing more than 30 terrorists.

When informed of his son's death, Mike Morel could only ask, "Was he in the front?" Yes, he was. He replied, "I always knew that's where he would be." For his bravery, Capt. Morel was posthumously awarded the Navy Cross. A second Navy Cross went to Sgt. Willie L. Copeland III, who fought alongside Morel that day.

## BUSINESS & ECONOMY

### Income Redistribution:

#### New Year, new bailout beggars

In the midst of our current government-induced recession, the biggest news is the continuing mal-

feasance of the Troubled Asset Relief Program (TARP) as taxpayers are treated to the spectacle of industry after industry begging for taxpayer dollars that they need not account for later. Financiers, banks, credit card companies, automakers, farm implements, steel makers, commercial real-estate industries and -- we're not making this up -- even the "adult entertainment" industry have all lined up for the accountability-free funds.

Thus far, no recipient bank will reveal how the public money was spent, though the Treasury announced that \$266.9 billion of it has been disbursed. But the Treasury isn't accountable, either. The Wall Street Journal notes a report released by a five-member congressional oversight panel for TARP: "The U.S. Treasury has failed to reveal its strategy for stabilizing the financial system, not answered questions asked by a government watchdog, and has done nothing to help struggling homeowners." You don't say.

Even socialist-style big-government takeovers of private markets cannot escape the immutable law of unforeseen consequences. In the case of the government loans to General Motors and its financial arm, GMAC, the government placed its bet on the GM/GMAC horse in the automakers' horsepower race. Now that the government enabled the two entities to return to the zero-percent financing seen at various times since 2003, GM products will compete with carmakers that lack the financing muscle of the federal government. No antitrust problems there -- move along folks, nothing to see here...

Closely related to the \$17.4 billion lent to GM and Chrysler and the bailout's intent to equalize the troubled companies disproportionate salaries with foreign competitors comes news that the United Auto Workers have reneged on any understanding to make concessions on wages and benefits -- *after* the money was lent, of course. The UAW knows liberal politicians owned by the union in both Congress and the Obama administration will back them up. Still, the UAW is not wise to bite that hand that feeds it.

Perhaps the most ironic bailout seeker is the already heavily subsidized ethanol industry, which never has been economically viable without government help even in the best of times due to its inherent energy inefficiency. This government-sponsored boondoggle is best laid to rest.

In other economic news around the world, the Bank of England cut interest rates Thursday to 1.5 percent, the lowest level since 1694. (Yes, you read that right -- 315 years ago.) And, in a development that could present further challenges to the U.S. economy, it appears that China may not be interested in taking on any more U.S. debt for the time being as it seeks to pay off its own \$600 billion stimulus.

### Obama's 'tax cuts' are not what they seem

What do you call an economic policy that rewards business failures, discourages personal entrepreneurship, and redefines the term "government engineering"? Well, if you're President-elect Obama, you call it a tax cut. Even before taking office, the candidate of change is proving himself to be just that -- changing the very definition of "tax cuts" while preserving the rhetoric that fools so many Americans.

Case in point: Obama's \$300 billion in proposed "cuts," which will give government handouts to those paying no income taxes and cash payouts to businesses showing losses. Far from slashing taxes across the board for businesses and individuals whose productivity fuels the economy, Obama's cuts are what some are calling "outcome-based" cuts, aimed not at providing real relief but at engineering desired results.

Said Obama transition team spokeswoman Stephanie Cutter: "We're working with Congress to develop a tax-cut package based on a simple principle: What will have the biggest and most immediate impact on creating private-sector jobs and strengthening the middle class?"

But such handouts from Uncle Sam have never produced the intended "big and immediate impact," and abusing the term "tax cuts" will do nothing to change this reality -- even for the candidate of change himself.

### This week's 'Alpha Jackass' award

"It is true that we cannot depend on government alone to create jobs or long-term growth, but at this particular moment, only government can provide the short-term boost necessary to lift us from a recession this deep and severe. Only government can break the vicious cycles that are crippling our economy -- where a lack of spending leads to lost jobs

which leads to even less spending; where an inability to lend and borrow stops growth and leads to even less credit." --Barack Obama

### Obama expands jobs goal again

Soon to be inaugurated presidents-elect generally temper their promises in order to avoid raising the public's expectations too high. Not so Barack Obama regarding jobs. During the campaign, he said he wanted to create or save a combination of one million new jobs. Last month, he raised that number to 2.5 million. (The economy lost more than 500,000 jobs in December, and about 1 million in November and December combined. Unemployment is at 7.2 percent.) Never mind the fact that there is no way to measure accurately how many jobs can be saved and/or created due solely to Obama's policies over the next four years; he's going to take credit for all of them anyway. Perhaps the most telling statement in his latest proposal to create three million new jobs is that "more than 80 percent of them [are] in the private sector." Which is to say that 600,000 new jobs will be in *government*. He's from the government, and he's here to help.

### 'The paradox of thrift'

For years, sage economists have been pleading for Americans to increase their savings rate to support the continued growth of the American economy. It is a basic conservative tenet that one should live within one's means and retain assets against future adverse developments. But The Wall Street Journal reported this week on "the paradox of thrift" -- the idea that an increased savings rate in a recession aggravates and prolongs said recession. Macroeconomics states that the good of the whole is served when consumers increase spending during a recession, but *microeconomics* recognizes that in a recession the individual consumers will constrain spending to preserve future liquidity.

We concede the basis of the paradox but point out that relying upon the middle class to increase spending to turn the tide of a recession is a bit like relying upon a zodiac boat for a transoceanic voyage: Yes, it can be done, but it is fraught with risk. We would rather that Americans take a lesson from this experience and embrace the benefits of frugality, the virtue of deferred gratification, and the flexibility afforded by increased liquidity.

## Regulatory Commissars: Penalizing TV in California

In the constant struggle to force people to do what is right, California is now considering regulations requiring retailers to sell only the most energy-efficient big-screen televisions. Turns out, at peak periods (during the Super Bowl, for example), TVs in the state collectively consume up to 40 percent of the power generated by the San Onofre nuclear power station running at full capacity. Rather than build a couple more San Onofres, why not eliminate the ability of consumers to buy inefficient sets? If you can't beat them, beat *on* them.

True, this will mean fewer people are able to afford big screen TVs, and this could place some of the manufacturers and distributors of less efficient TVs at a competitive disadvantage, resulting in mass layoffs and threats of bankruptcy. However these flaws appear, all that will be necessary is a government bailout crafted to purchase everyone in the state their own personal (efficient) big screen TV.

## CULTURE & POLICY

### 2A News: Concealed carry in national parks faces legal battle

In December, we reported that the Interior Department had issued new regulations allowing concealed carry in national parks. The previous regulation, established during Ronald Reagan's term, required that guns be unloaded and stored in a place not easily accessible, such as a car trunk. The rule change is set to take effect before Barack Obama takes office. He will no doubt work to overturn it, but that process could take months or years, and he may meet much resistance in trying to take away a right.

Hoping to bridge the gap between administrations, the Brady Campaign filed suit to stop the rule change, as did the National Parks Conservation Association and the Coalition of National Park Service Retirees. "The Bush administration's last-minute gift to the gun lobby, allowing concealed semiautomatic weapons in national parks, jeopardizes the safety of park visitors in violation of federal law," said Paul Helmke, the group's president. "We should not be making it easier for dangerous people to carry concealed firearms in our parks." Memo to Helmke: It's precisely *because* dangerous people ignore the law and may prey on the unarmed that law-abiding citizens should be able to defend themselves. The delusional members of the Brady Campaign, however,

threaten in the lawsuit that they will no longer visit national parks "out of fear for their personal safety from those who will now be permitted to carry loaded and concealed weapons in such areas." Treating citizens as criminals for exercising their constitutional and legal right to carry firearms is getting rather tiresome.

## Climate change this week: It's getting cold out there

As we took stock of the events of 2008, a headline in The Daily Telegraph of London caught our attention: "2008 was the year man-made global warming was disproved." This is contrary to everything the American media has been reporting, right through the bitter cold and snowfall of the past month. It's also contrary to most British media reports, including one in the Telegraph on 21 May: "Climate change threat to Alpine ski resorts." Fortunately for skiers, this was followed on 19 December by a report that "The Alps have best snow conditions in a generation."

Christopher Booker writes in his "warming disproved" column that there are three significant respects in which the tide has turned on the global warming fear mongers. "First, all over the world, temperatures have been dropping in a way wholly unpredicted by all those computer models which have been used as the main drivers of the scare," he writes. Furthermore, arctic sea ice ended the year at the same level as in 1979, despite predictions that the polar ice cap would be gone. "Secondly," Booker says, "2008 was the year when any pretence that there was a 'scientific consensus' in favour of man-made global warming collapsed," and, "Thirdly, as banks collapsed and the global economy plunged into its worst recession for decades, harsh reality at last began to break in on those self-deluding dreams which have for so long possessed almost every politician in the western world." In short, the evidence is counter to global warmists' claims, "consensus" doesn't exist, and it is not economically feasible to combat a phantom problem. Somehow, though, we doubt this will deter Al Gore and his minions.

For example, in an innovative move, the EPA has suggested branding dairy cows with a tax of \$175 each as a means of controlling greenhouse gases (our guess is CO2 may not be the objectionable gas here). Beef cattle would get hit with a tax of \$87.50, hogs maybe \$20. Large herds would need a permit. Got to control those gases.

### **Around the nation: Inhabitable for humanity**

Residents inhabiting homes built by Jimmy Carter's Habitat for Humanity are complaining that the homes are falling apart. Fairway Oaks, a neighborhood of 85 homes, was built by Habitat on a northern Florida wasteland eight years ago by 10,000 volunteers in only 17 days. Hollywood celebrities bankrolled the development. Yet, there is trouble in paradise. One man claims that his home was built on a pile of trash -- he pulled up his kitchen floorboards to find it five feet deep underneath. One woman says her children are suffering from skin rashes, and other residents complain of being overrun by cockroaches and mildew. "The intentions are good, but when the politicians and big-shot stars have left we're stuck with the consequences," said one woman. The malaise didn't exactly surprise us, but many on the Left are getting defensive, saying residents simply need to clean house. It's hard to know with whom to side -- the one who built the house on the sand or the one who got it for free and is now complaining. Maybe Jimmy should take his operation to Gaza.

### **And last...**

With a resurgent Taliban in Afghanistan, U.S. intelligence officials have started looking for new ways to sway the hearts and minds of the various tribal chieftains who control large swaths of the country and whose assistance is needed to defeat the Taliban. U.S. operatives say that money or weapons are not necessarily the best choice. A variety of services or other items are used, too, including tools, medicinal treatment for family members, toys or school equipment for children, travel assistance, and, in a brilliant display of outside-the-box thinking, occa-

sional pharmaceutical assistance for aging leaders whose spirit is willing but whose flesh, uh, can't quite keep up. Enter Viagra, the famous little blue pill that has revolutionized "senior moments" and, now apparently, U.S. intelligence-gathering capabilities as well.

In a country where multiple wives are common, along with the implied but unspoken sexual prowess of tribal chieftains and associated tribal authority which that represents, Viagra is using medical technology in a way that the Taliban simply cannot match. Describing a recent encounter, a U.S. operative gave an Afghan chieftain four blue tablets, then returned a few days later to a grinning chief who gladly offered a treasure trove of information on nearby Taliban movements and supply routes, followed, naturally, by a request for more pills. Other operatives report that they are given free rein of controlled areas after making their delivery. As one operative said, "Whatever it takes to make friends and influence people -- whether it's building a school or handing out Viagra." Indeed, "make love, not war" may be one of the more memorable catch phrases from the hedonistic, anti-war 1960s, but who would have thought that it could ever describe an effective new military tactic?

*Veritas vos Liberabit -- Semper Vigilo, Fortis, Paratus, et Fidelis!* Mark Alexander, Publisher, for *The Patriot's* editors and staff.

(Please pray for our Patriot Armed Forces standing in harm's way around the world, and for their families -- especially families of those fallen Soldiers, Sailors, Airmen, Marines and Coast Guardsmen, who granted their lives in defense of American liberty.)