



“Were we directed from Washington when to sow,  
and when to reap, we should soon want bread.”  
--Thomas Jefferson

## GOVERNMENT & POLITICS

### Just When You Thought It Was Safe

House Speaker Nancy Pelosi (D-CA) unveiled an \$894 billion health care takeover bill Thursday; the Congressional Budget Office puts the cost at \$1.055 trillion. The bill, a combination of three separate committee bills, should be light reading for our nation’s lawmakers, though -- it weighs in at a scant 1,990 pounds, er, pages.

The “reform” plan includes the dreaded “public option” that many thought might be dead and buried. The public option would create a government-run insurance plan to “compete” with private insurance. The obvious problem -- at least to those who understand the free market -- is that it would have several negative effects on health care and the economy. Many employers would drop their insurance coverage in favor of the small penalty paid to the federal government in exchange for putting employees on the government dole. Indeed, an estimated 120 million customers would leave private insurers. With fewer people buying private insurance, many insurance companies would increase rates, further restrict coverage, or go out of business altogether, thus creating a vicious death spiral.

Such a scenario would, of course, suit Pelosi and other Democrats just fine. They continue to condemn the “immoral” and “obscene” profits made by the insurance industry, though as it turns out, those profits are not so obscene after all, but are around 2 percent.

The public option is so unpopular that Pelosi is now trying to re-brand it, suggesting the “consumer option” or the “competitive option” as alternatives. “You’ll hear everyone say, ‘There’s got to be a better name for this,’” Pelosi said. “When people think of the public option, public is being misrepresented, that this is being paid for with their public dollars.”

Uh, Nancy, it will be. And by their great grandchildren’s dollars.

The bill will “provide” insurance for up to 36 million people by broadly expanding Medicaid and by giving subsidies to moderate-income Americans so they can buy insurance from either private companies or the new government-run plan. “Can buy” in this case means “have to buy” because of a newly minted unconstitutional mandate to buy insurance. And, the subsidies would be paid for in part with a surtax on individuals earning more than \$500,000 and couples earning more than \$1 million.

In the Senate, Majority Leader Harry Reid (D-NV) is working on an “opt out” provision for states that don’t wish to participate in the public option, though he’s not gaining much support. As currently written, the opt-out would cost states even more money because of the additional funding measures (read: strings) attached.

It would be similar to federal education guidelines, which states can opt out of -- at the expense of federal funding -- or the federally mandated drinking age states can ignore -- if they don’t want federal highway money. Sen. Patrick Leahy (D-VT) pointed out last week that the federal government used to regulate speed limits, and again, states could “opt out” at the loss of federal highway funding.

It seems that Don Corleone Reid’s public option is an offer states can’t refuse.

### Quote of the Week

“It’s not free. ... Someone’s going to have to pay for it and you bet it’s going to be the taxpayer.” --Sen. Joe Lieberman (I-CT) on the “public option”

### The BIG Lie

Congressman Bart Stupak of Michigan is a rarity among Democrats -- one who believes the federal government shouldn’t pay for abortions. When President Obama told a joint session of Congress in September that “under our plan no federal dollars will be used to fund abortions,” Stupak wondered how that was possible when both the House and Senate bills allow federal funding of insurance plans that cover abortions.

In speaking with the president about this apparent contradiction, Stupak found it’s only the (unwritten) health care reform plan in Obama’s mind that doesn’t fund abortions.

Unfortunately, the bill the president would sign is one of those thousand-plus page behemoths circulating through both houses of Congress -- or a combination of both.

Stupak wanted to add a prohibition similar to the long-standing Hyde Amendment preventing funding of abortions to the House bill but was told by Speaker Nancy Pelosi, "I will not have my amendment." Instead, placed in the House plan was a "compromise" where just one provider in each state's insurance exchange is required to cover abortions. Some compromise.

### **Hope 'n' Change: Bo Has a Birthday**

Presidential pets have always been pampered to some extent, so when the First Family's Portuguese water dog, Bo (a narcissistic name if ever there was one), had his first birthday it's no surprise the main course was a cake made of veal at a party held in his honor.

Granted, this Portuguese water dog isn't exactly the rescue puppy Obama promised to secure for his daughters upon moving to the White House, since such a purebred puppy can fetch up to \$3,000 on the open market. But in this day and age of average Americans having to cut back on things like feeding their own family pet, the normality of the Obama family feting the First Pet is an inspiration to all of us. Besides, having a birthday party for Bo is still cheaper than an overseas shopping trip or date in New York City -- a date whose criticism has already made Barack rather unhappy.

By all accounts, Bo enjoyed his party even though his canine brother Cappy stole part of the veal birthday cake. (Cappy is obviously a Demodog.) So we too extend our birthday wishes to Bo and hope he enjoys three more in the White House.

### **From the Left: Barney Speaks Frankly**

Rep. Barney Frank (D-MA) got a little too comfortable on MSNBC recently and let slip what many of Americans already fear. After taking a few moments to blame Republicans for ruining big government's reputation, Frank said, "We are trying on every front to increase the role of government in the regulatory area." This from a man whose fingerprints were all over the drive to force mortgage lenders to grant home loans to fiscally risky candidates in order to increase minority home ownership. The end result of that move was, of course, the subprime mortgage meltdown and the resulting economic mess we're mired in today.

Frank, chairman of the House Banking Committee, is now one of the principal architects of sweeping regulatory changes to the financial services industry. These changes are meant to prevent the rampant speculation that caused the credit crisis; in reality they're more likely to strangle our free market system and send wealth-creating capital investment overseas. What Frank said is all too true: Democrats aim to expand government in every area, period.

### **New & Notable Legislation**

Senate Banking Committee Chairman Chris Dodd (D-CT) has introduced legislation to freeze credit card interest rates. "At a time when families are struggling to make ends meet, jacked up rates can quickly create crushing debt," Dodd said in a statement. "People need to be responsible with their money, but they shouldn't be taken to the cleaners by outrageous rates." This follows a bill passed in May -- the Credit Card Accountability, Responsibility and Disclosure Act -- which bars rate increases without a 45-day notification. Since that bill is due to take effect in February, banks, not being stupid, are raising their rates now. Thanks, Chris. All we need now is a law that forbids banks from canceling cards or refusing credit for any customers. Why do Democrats think that problems created by regulation can be fixed only with more regulation?

### **New York Congressional Special Election**

The special election to fill the upstate New York congressional seat vacated when Republican John McHugh was cleverly appointed secretary of the Army by Barack Obama has quickly become the most controversial race this year.

The Democrat candidate is businessman and lawyer Bill Owens, but the real contest here is between Conservative Party candidate Doug Hoffman, who is even leading in some polls, and Republican candidate Dede Scozzafava. As we have previously noted, Hoffman, a self-made millionaire, assumed the Conservative mantle after local GOP leaders picked the shamefully liberal Scozzafava as their candidate.

National Republican figures have come out in force to back either Hoffman or Scozzafava, and by doing so they have outlined the ideological battle lines that exist within the GOP. Former House Speaker Newt Gingrich endorsed Scozzafava, a New York Assemblywoman. Gingrich said that it's not his place to question the wisdom of local party leaders, while he also expressed concern that if

“we’re going to purge the party of anybody who doesn’t agree with us 100 percent [then] that guarantees Obama’s re-election.”

Gingrich may have a point here, but looking at Scozzafava’s background, one might wonder if she’s agreed with the Party even 10 percent of the time. She has been tied to ACORN and their leftist Working Families Party, she is pro-choice, pro-stimulus package and pro-card check for unions. In fact, she makes party-jumpin’ Arlen Specter look like a Reaganite.

Hoffman, on the other hand, is an avowed fiscal conservative who carries a strong message of bringing economic responsibility to Washington. Sarah Palin, Tim Pawlenty, Dick Armey, Fred Thompson and Rick Santorum have all lined up behind him. They have all stressed the importance of sticking to the conservative principles that are, or at least were, the backbone of the Republican Party.

### Essential Liberty Project

“Enlighten the people, generally, and tyranny and oppressions of body and mind will vanish like spirits at the dawn of day.” --Thomas Jefferson

Help restore constitutional integrity. As a primer on liberty, as “endowed by our Creator” and codified by our Founders in the Declaration of Independence and the U.S. Constitution, these handy pocket references are an essential resource for Patriots of all ages.

Purchase Essential Liberty guides for students, grassroots organizations, civic clubs, political alliances, military and public service personnel, etc. The booklets are available for [individual or bulk sales](#). Or, support the distribution of the guides by linking to the [Essential Liberty Project sponsorship page](#).

## NATIONAL SECURITY

### Warfront With Jihadistan: ‘Dithering’ Continues

The commander in chief has taken some well-deserved lumps of late for “dithering” on this decision regarding troop numbers in Afghanistan. Indeed, it’s been two months since General Stanley McChrystal made his urgent request to President Obama for more troops. During a visit to Naval Air Station Jacksonville on Monday, Obama said, “I will never rush the solemn decision of sending you into harm’s way.” To reiterate what we said last week in response to a similar comment from Defense Secretary Robert Gates, perhaps Obama should tell this to our troops in Afghanistan, understaffed and looking death in the eye.

No worries, though -- John F. Kerry has his back. The new Senate Foreign Relations Committee chairman declared that Gen. McChrystal’s plan “goes too far, too fast.” Let the record show that the Massachusetts Democrat was *for* winning in Afghanistan before he was against it. Five years ago, he ran against George W. Bush and repeatedly droned that Bush had “taken his eye off the ball” by seeking to also win in Iraq.

As columnist Ken Blackwell writes, “Kerry made his career as an outspoken advocate for the Nuclear Freeze of the 1980s. We now know that the Freeze movement was largely financed by the Kremlin. But even back then, American advocates of the Nuclear Freeze had the satisfaction of knowing they wanted the U.S. to back down in the face of Soviet threats while Britain’s Margaret Thatcher, West Germany’s Helmut Kohl, and even France’s Francois Mitterrand wanted us to stand firm. With a record of being wrong on virtually every issue involving American interests and national security, there is only one question left about the long-faced Massachusetts senator: How has John Kerry managed to avoid winning a Nobel Peace Prize?”

### UN-Believable

Agence France-Presse (AFP) reports, “US drone strikes against suspected terrorists in Afghanistan and Pakistan could be breaking international laws against summary executions, the UN’s top investigator of such crimes said.” UN Special Rapporteur on Extrajudicial Executions Philip Alston said, “The problem with the United States is that it is making an increased use of drones/Predators [which are] particularly prominently used now in relation to Pakistan and Afghanistan.” He added, “My concern is that drones/Predators are being operated in a framework which may well violate international humanitarian law and international human rights law.”

Obviously, our objective is not to kill innocent civilians, and the drones have been highly successful against terrorists, particularly in Pakistan. That’s probably why the UN is now so “concerned.” According to AFP, “Since August 2008, around 70 strikes by unmanned aircraft have killed close to 600 people in northwestern Pakistan.” Admittedly, it’s often difficult to tell the difference between regular “people” and terrorists, but AFP makes no attempt to distinguish the two. They’re almost as UN-helpful as the UN.

### Department of Military Correctness: ‘Don’t Ask’ Discharges

As mentioned two weeks ago, Barack Obama announced that he remains committed to scrapping the Pentagon’s

16-year-old “Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell” policy, which was implemented in 1993 by President Bill Clinton. The policy itself weakened the military’s historic ban on homosexuals serving in the military. One of the arguments used by homosexual activists trying to overturn DADT is that discharging openly homosexual soldiers threatens national security by significantly reducing troop numbers. As so often occurs with leftist arguments, once facts are checked, the argument falls apart.

In examining the latest data on military discharges, it turns out that the number of military personnel discharged for homosexuality was less than 1 percent of the total number discharged for all other reasons. For example, according to Pentagon numbers for 2008, some 634 soldiers were discharged for homosexuality, which is only 0.338 percent of the 187,331 total discharges in 2008. Got that? One-third of 1 percent of all discharges was for violating DADT, and that number has remained consistent over the years. So, while the actual affect of these discharges on the U.S. military is negligible, according to homosexual activists, this loss threatens national security.

What actually threatens our national security is the loss of military discipline, cohesion and moral standing that occurs when agenda driven pressure groups and spineless lawmakers attempt to “normalize” an abnormal behavior in the ranks -- a fact recognized by our Founders. During the Revolutionary War, General George Washington had homosexuals drummed out of the ranks and punished; Thomas Jefferson authored a bill proposing castration as a punishment for sodomy; and the Continental Congress directed that American officers “discountenance and suppress all dissolute, immoral, and disorderly practices,” which included sodomy. Ah, but there’s nothing like “evolving standards.”

### Defense Bill Signed

Barack Obama signed the \$680 billion defense authorization bill Wednesday. The bill contains the unrelated provision extending so-called “hate crimes” protections to homosexuals and others with gender-disorientation pathology. The measure had failed on its own for years, so Democrats shamelessly attached it to the must-pass defense bill. That failure is largely due to the fact that it makes certain thoughts a crime. Rep. Mike Pence (R-IN) summed it up: “Hate crimes legislation is antithetical to the First Amendment, unnecessary and will have a chilling effect on religious freedom.”

Meanwhile, the defense bill contains provisions far more

deleterious to national defense, such as terminating production of the F-22. Of gutting the nation’s air superiority, Obama crowed that he was being fiscally responsible: “When Secretary Gates and I first proposed going after some of these wasteful projects, there were a lot of people who didn’t think it was possible, who were certain we were going to lose, who were certain that we were going to get steamrolled. Today, we have proven them wrong.” He then added, “There’s still more fights that we need to win.” (Like the fight against bad grammar, maybe?)

Obviously, to Democrats, “defense” means pushing aberrant sexual behavior while leaving the nation defenseless.

## BUSINESS & ECONOMY

### Regulatory Commissars:

#### Oil Off Limits for Thriving Bears

Believing themselves to be smarter than the average bear, bureaucrats in the Obama administration continue their quest to create a, well, bear market -- at least for oil. The White House decided to designate more than 200,000 square miles of Alaskan land and coastline as “critical habitat” for polar bears -- the same bear population that has reached greater numbers than previously recorded in history. In fact, despite what Al Gore and his fellow global warmists would have us believe, the population has actually risen by 40 percent since 1974.

This new non-endangered species habitat is enormous enough to qualify as the third largest state in the union, placing it between Texas and California in terms of square miles. Former UnitedHealth general counsel and now Assistant Interior Secretary Tom Strickland claimed at a news conference that the greatest threat to the bear is Arctic ice melt and that “we will continue to work to protect the polar bear and its fragile environment.”

However, the new designation as a critical habitat is the first step in requiring even more government consideration of the supposed negative effect on the escalating polar bear numbers before allowing oil and gas development. The state of Alaska responded by filing a complaint in an effort to stop the listing under the Endangered Species Act.

In the meantime, some 30 percent of the world’s gas supplies and 4 percent of the estimated global oil supply will be placed off limits because of this deceitful claim that the polar bear population is endangered. Next up, the loggerhead turtle, which, if listed as endangered, would bring regulations on everything along the eastern seaboard,

including what lights you can put on the ocean-facing side of your house.

### **Income Redistribution: Public Option Phones**

Bill Clinton may have declared in 1996, "The era of big government is over," but Obama must have missed the message. Never in American history has the era of big government encroached on so many areas of our lives -- and with more on the docket. We can now add another one to the list: Safelink Wireless, a "government supported program that provides a free cell phone and airtime each month for income-eligible customers," all paid for with "Obama money" -- and you know where *that* comes from.

SafeLink is an extension of or adjunct to the FCC program known as "Lifeline and Link-up." In a nutshell, "poor" people, often already on the dole with other state and federal welfare programs, can apply to receive a free cell phone and 70 minutes of airtime per month from TracFone Wireless, Inc. The Lifeline program pays one-half (up to \$30) of installation costs for wired telephone service at a primary residence and provides up to a \$10 per month discount for basic monthly service. Oh well, at least these recipients are required to pay *some* of the costs from their bi-monthly "county" checks. The program uses funds from those little universal service fund (USF) charges that show up on our phone bills. Of course, Lifeline program participants are exempt from USF charges on their bills.

Once again, we're left scratching our heads and searching for the Article and Section of the Constitution under which free phones can be found.

### **Barack Obama's Flying Circus**

If Monty Python were a financial news agency, we could imagine the headline "Dow Exceeds 10,000 to Much Rejoicing." The media devoted multiple column inches and minutes of airtime to that event last week, but few asked, "Why?" The short answer is currency devaluation. Barack Obama's strategy of talking down the U.S. economy has produced its first dividend for his administration, a surging Dow supported by foreign investment. But, like agricultural commodities in the 1970s and commercial real estate in the 1980s, these gains are due solely to the weakness of our currency rather than the strength of our economy. A dollar with lower value makes buying American assets more attractive to foreigners. Each of those previous examples saw a short term increase in values followed by profit taking and a long-term decline. Sure the Dow is over 10K, but what's the dollar worth?

Furthermore, the market bottomed out at 6,500 before beginning its recovery in March, when, as The Washington Times points out, "[T]he Obama administration stopped trying to talk down the economy." Also, "The bottom line is obvious. Part of the increase in stock prices is illusory from the falling dollar. A lot of the remaining increase is simply a recovery from the Obama administration's rhetoric talking down the market." Unfortunately, if they're not talking it down, they're trying to beat it down with regulations.

That doesn't mean that Team Obama won't take credit for any improvement in the market or the economy as a whole. When the newest estimate of 3.5 percent economic growth in the third quarter was announced this week, Obama said the country has "come a long way" since his inauguration, and the new figures are "an affirmation that this recession is abating and the steps we've taken have made a difference." The White House went further Friday, claiming that the \$787 billion stimulus has "created or saved" at least 650,000 jobs, or one million if all spending is considered. Yet unemployment is 9.8 percent and rising, so most of those jobs must have been "saved" -- which is a clever way of saying we'll never know.

## **CULTURE & POLICY**

### **Around the Nation: Swine Flu Emergency!**

The Obama administration has, for the second time in six months, declared the H1N1 virus, or swine flu, a national emergency. The administration first made this declaration in April, but perhaps they needed a bit more time to stir up the desired frenzy. And set up a Web site -- flu.gov. Americans are now running to the hospital by the thousands, overcrowding emergency rooms and standing in line for their shots when often the provider has already run out of vaccine. However, all this panic is driven not as much by their physical symptoms as by a government-run campaign of hysteria.

The administration has made much of the fact that approximately 1,000 Americans have died and another 20,000 have been hospitalized after falling ill with H1N1. But, according to the Centers for Disease Control, these numbers, while tragic, are actually much smaller than the number of deaths each year from more common strains of flu. As a matter of fact, Australia and New Zealand, which did not use the H1N1 vaccine, have reported fewer flu deaths this year than in the past.

The declaration of a national emergency has also increased the powers of Health and Human Services Secre-

tary Kathleen Sebelius. She now has the authority, for as long as this “crisis” lasts, to sidestep certain federal laws that govern the use of tax dollars for medical treatment.

While some claim this is an administrative move that will allow the government to preempt a possible pandemic, for others it brings to the forefront issues concerning the quality and reliability of government-controlled health care. Imagine, for example, that we really *were* in danger of dying from a disease for which the government’s much bragged about supply of vaccinations had fallen so woefully short?

American journalist H.L. Mencken once said, “The whole aim of practical politics is to keep the populace alarmed, and hence clamorous to be led to safety, by menacing it with an endless series of hobgoblins, all of them imaginary.” Perhaps flu.gov stands for “Fear-mongering Leftists Unlimited.”

### Second Amendment:

#### NJ Court Says No Right to Buy Handgun

“A New Jersey appeals court has concluded that Americans have no Second Amendment right to buy a handgun,” CBS News reports. “[T]he superior court upheld a state law saying that nobody may possess ‘any handgun’ without obtaining law enforcement approval and permission in advance.” Given that the Supreme Court ruled last year in *DC v. Heller* that the Second Amendment guarantees “the individual right to possess and carry weapons in case of confrontation,” this ruling is a bit surprising. New Jersey Appellate Division Judge Stephen Skillman, writing for the unanimous three-judge panel, said that *Heller* “has no impact upon the constitutionality of” the state law.

It’s true that the Supreme Court avoided some larger questions in *Heller*, even specifically saying that the ruling does “not address the licensing requirement.” However, the Second Amendment to the Constitution reads: “A well regulated Militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear Arms, *shall not be infringed*.” Based on our reading of that plain language, there’s nothing in there about permission from a court or law enforcement for particular arms. We hope the Supreme Court addresses this question when it hears *McDonald v. Chicago*, challenging Chicago’s handgun ban, later this year.

### Climate Change This Week: China, India, Cats and Dogs

Lashing out at the growing skepticism that global warming is real, Barack Obama last week blasted as agenda-driven “[t]he naysayers” who “pretend that this is not an issue.” According to Obama, “From China to India,

from Japan to Germany, nations everywhere are racing to develop new ways to produce and use energy.” But the issue may not be important enough, even to the president. It seems he will skip the much-touted Copenhagen climate conference and instead drop by Oslo to accept his Nobel Peace Prize.

Could this be because “racing” China and India came to a screeching halt last Thursday when they nixed mandatory carbon emissions constraints, effectively pulling out of any Copenhagen treaty? These two nations recognize what Obama denies and what Wang Jin wrote in China’s *Science Times* journal: “The real intention is not for the global temperature increase, but for the restriction of the economic development of the developing countries.”

Meanwhile, two professors from New Zealand have actually suggested ditching cats and dogs in favor of edible pets -- and, no, we’re not talking animal crackers. In their book, “Time to Eat the Dog? The Real Guide to Sustainable Living,” Brenda and Robert Vale contend that when you account for food production and carbon emissions, a cat is about as bad for the environment as a Volkswagen Golf, a medium-size dog is twice as destructive as a Toyota Land Cruiser, and two hamsters are equivalent to a plasma TV. The authors write, “There is certainly some truth in the fact that if we have edible pets like chickens for their eggs and meat, and rabbits and pigs, we will be compensating for the impact of other things on our environment.”

What to do with the surplus of Rovers and Fluffies? Perhaps they should be served à la carte at Copenhagen. Given such consistently outlandish arguments from the global warming crowd, we don’t expect any waiting lines at Copenhagen diners.

### From the ‘Non Compos Mentis’ File

In a no doubt fleeting act of fairness and balance, CNN’s Campbell Brown actually stuck up for rival Fox News in an interview this week with White House adviser Valerie Jarrett. And it didn’t take long for Jarrett’s answers to turn humorous. Here’s the exchange:

**Brown:** So do you think Fox News is biased?

**Jarrett:** Well, of course they’re biased. Of course they are.

**Brown:** Okay. Then do you also think that MSNBC is biased?

**Jarrett:** Well, you know what? This is the thing. I don't want to -- actually, I don't want to just generalize all Fox is biased or that another station is biased. I think what we want to do is look at it on a case-by-case basis. And when we see a pattern of distortion, we're going to be honest about that pattern of distortion.

**Brown:** But you only see that at Fox News? That's all that -- you have spoken out about Fox News.

**Jarrett:** That's actually not true. I think that what the administration has said very clearly is that we're going to speak truth to power.

It's quite amusing how quickly Jarrett backpedaled when confronted with her own bias; she clearly wasn't prepared for the MSNBC question. Not that Brown acknowledged CNN's bias, mind you.

As for the tired old slogan "speaking truth to power," Jarrett might want to check her pay stub. She works for the White House, which is the very embodiment of power. Wall Street Journal columnist James Taranto quipped, "The job of those in power is not to 'speak truth to power,' though it would be nice if they spoke the truth once in a while."

#### **Knoxville Murder Update: Another Guilty Verdict**

Just as the ink was drying from Barack Obama's signature on so-called "hate crimes" legislation, a jury found Lemaricus Davidson guilty of premeditated murder, felony murder, robbery, kidnapping, rape and theft in the 2007 deaths of University of Tennessee student Channon Christian and her boyfriend Christopher Newsom. Davidson, who is black, was the ringleader of four blacks who gruesomely murdered the white couple. In August, Davidson's brother Letalvis Cobbins was convicted of murder and other counts and was sentenced to life in prison without parole, while George Thomas and Vanessa Coleman await trial. Davidson faces the death penalty. While the Obama administration and its Leftist ilk have repeatedly invoked the names of Matthew Shepard and James Byrd of late, it's no surprise that they've yet to utter a single syllable about the victims of this particular hate crime.

#### **And Last...**

As the races for governor in New Jersey and Virginia hit the home stretch, Barack Obama is spending a little political capital to help the two beleaguered Democrat candidates -- incumbent John Corzine in New Jersey and Creigh Deeds in Virginia. Corzine is virtually tied with Republican Chris Christie in a tight race, while Deeds is 10-15 points behind Republican Bob McDonnell. Deeds's plight is so dire, in fact, that Obama pulled out a secret weapon that seems to have served him well in the past, particularly with black audiences -- "Cousin Pookie." Obama told a crowd at Old Dominion University to "go out and get your cousin who you had to drag to the polls last November, Cousin Pookie -- you go out and get him and you tell him, 'You got to vote again this time.'"

So who is this "Cousin Pookie"? Back in 2007, when Obama trotted out the phrase, Jonathan Tilove at Free Republic wrote, "Pookie emerges as a stock character of the black popular imagination, a name that has come to personify the kind of layabout kin who, if endearing, is also a source of some embarrassment and consternation to his more successful relations. And, it turns out, in his use of Pookie, Obama reveals something about himself." He then quoted South Carolina writer Kevin Gray, who said, "Pookie means a whole lot of different things; none of them are good. Pookie's always the foil." To our way of thinking, "pookie" is just about the perfect word for Obama's policies; we invite him to trot it out any time he wants.

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

(Please pray for our 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.)