

FREDERICK WILLIAM DAME

AN EXPOSÉ OF THE LIES AND MISLEADING STATEMENTS IN BARACK HUSSEIN OBAMA'S REMARKS ON FISCAL POLICY

INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT

On April 13, 2011, the putative president of the Republic of the United States of America, Barack Hussein Obama, gave a speech at George Washington University in Washington, District of Columbia. The subject of his remarks was the fiscal policy of the Barack Hussein Obama Regime. Immediately following Barack Hussein Obama's verbal onslaught, the leftist, lamestream media – all of them – began praising the great imposter's economic insight and how this criminal would be able to cure the exploding deficit that is a hamstringing the United States of America. Such positive accolades from ABC, CBS, NBC, CNN, even FOX, or from any XYZ broadcasting company are reminiscent of the *Gleichschaltung* politics of dictatorial regimes like Adolf Hitler's NAZI Germany, Josef Stalin's Communist Russia, Mao-Zedong's Communist China, Kim Jong Ill's North Korea of megalomania, and any other type of dictatorship. Indeed, the lamestream media in the United States of America ever tries to outdo the competitor in reporting about Barack Hussein Obama the Wonderful. The result is that these media floppers are not able to conduct the reporting of the news as it should be conducted: documented, non-partisan, and above all, truthful.

Attention is drawn to the fact that Barack Hussein Obama's presentation to a group of sheeple at George Washington University – What an insult to George Washington! – is titled *Remarks on Fiscal Policy*. This in itself is revealing. A *remark* is:

1. Something that is written or said briefly and casually as a comment or opinion.
2. The act of noticing or observing or mentioning.

A remark is often accompanied by the attitude that what is being stated is not necessarily of dire importance. O how this does apply to what Barack Hussein Obama says! Indeed, every speech that Barack Hussein Obama presents to the sheeple is nothing more than his saying something in passing, his mouthing off, his making a crack,

or his wisecracking on a subject about which he knows nothing, unless the subject matter is the destructive rules of Saul Alinsky.¹

A day after Barack Hussein Obama's remarks, the Founding Fathers and especially Benjamin Franklin stated their critiques of Barack Hussein Obama's remarks, namely that his regime's policy is one of taxation without legal representation and that his statements are not grounded in reason.²

The purpose of the following exposé is threefold:

1. To prove that Barack Hussein Obama's contentions in his remarks are misleading statements and lies.
2. To provide the patriotic reader with information to rebut Barack Hussein Obama's contentions.
3. To evaluate to what degree the Founding Fathers and especially Benjamin Franklin are correct in their assessments.

The following paragraph-by-paragraph commentaries **in red** are not quips. They are serious, intuitively obvious, and logical rebuttals to the content of Barack Hussein Obama's *Remarks on Fiscal Policy*.

The White House
(Barack Hussein Obama's House of Bull)
Office of the Press (Propaganda) Secretary
For Immediate Release
April 13, 2011

Remarks by the (putative) President on Fiscal Policy
George Washington University
Washington, D.C.

1:48 P.M. EDT

(Source: <http://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2011/04/13/remarks-president-fiscal-policy>.)

THE (putative) PRESIDENT: Thank you very much. (Applause) Please have a seat. Please have a seat, everyone. (This is a polite lie! There is nothing Barack Hussein Obama would like better than to have the sheeple keep standing!)

COMMENT: The putative president is being so gracious and polite to his subjects. He is thanking them for a standing ovation. The question that should be asked is: Why would any American patriot stand up for an ovation to an illegal president and a criminal? The sheeple react because they do not know or do not care that Barack Hussein Obama is occupying his office illegally.

It is wonderful to be back at GW. (A good orator, even a mediocre orator, no, even a bad orator would have stated the complete name of the university!) I want you to know that one of the reasons that I worked so hard with Democrats and Republicans to keep the government open was so that I could show up here today. I wanted to make sure that all of you had one more excuse to skip class. (Laughter) (This proves that sheeple can laugh!) You're welcome. (Laughter) (Evidently the sheeple have to prove that they can laugh again!)

COMMENT: Barack Hussein Obama did not work hard with the Democrats and Republicans. He worked hard to put the blame on a possible government shut down on the Republican members of Congress and to blame everyone else but himself, including some Democratic Party members.³ This author can think of better excuses to skip university classes. In all seriousness, why would anyone attend a speech being given by a Chicago gangster who supports Chicago gangsters?⁴

I want to give a special thanks to Steven Knapp, the president of GW. I just saw him -- where is he? There he is right there. (Applause) The sheeple react accordingly.

COMMENT: Does Steven Knapp realize that Barack Hussein Obama is a bogus potus? Evidently not!

We've got a lot of distinguished guests here -- a couple of people I want to acknowledge. First of all, my outstanding Vice President, Joe Biden, is here. (Applause) Our Secretary of the Treasury, Tim Geithner, is in the house. (Applause) Jack Lew, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget. (Applause) Gene Sperling, Chair of the National Economic Council, is here. (Applause) Members of our bipartisan Fiscal Commission are here, including the two outstanding chairs -- Erskine Bowles and Alan Simpson -- are here. (Applause) (The applauding sheeple are a community.)

COMMENT: Who is meant with **we**? Who is meant with **our**? The word **couple** means two. Evidently the genius cannot count. The word **distinguished** is a relative term. Criminals are also distinguished in their own right. The bogus vice president surely does

stand out! Later during Obama's remarks, Joe Biden will doze out and have a sleep-in! Tim Geithner, along with Barack Hussein Obama, the wrecker of American fiscal policy, should be in the Big House. Jack Lew, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, misleads the American public about the financial stability of the social security trust fund.⁵ Gene Sperling, Chair of the National Economic Council, caused "the repeal of the Glass-Steagall Act, which dismantled a longstanding separation between investment banks and deposit-taking banks. Critics have said the repeal contributed to the subprime mortgage crisis"⁶ The members of **our** (the Obama Regime?) bipartisan Fiscal Commission are:

Eskine Bowles (Democratic Co-Chair – appointed by President Obama), Currently on the board of directors of General Motors Corporation, Morgan Stanley) He is qualified, but not independent of Barack Hussein Obama.

Alan Kooi Simpson (Republican In Name Only, Co-Chair – Appointed by president Obama). He is being used by Barack Hussein Obama "as a caricature of the Republican Party."

Alice Mitchell Rivlin (Presidential Appointee – Democrat) "Alice Rivlin will take your money without making you suffer while giving it."

David M. "Dave" Cote (Presidential Appointee – Republican In Name Only), Chairman and CEO of Honeywell) The "GOP is not happy that he is calling himself a republican."

Andy Stern (Presidential Appointee – Democrat), President of the SEIU, represents 2.2 million union workers in US, Canada, and Puerto Rico. "Workers of the world unite" is a slogan he believes in. Most frequent visitor to the White House. " He is a crook if there ever was one! (H)e gets what he wants from the White House – including the waiver of the health insurance tax for union members in the health care bill, billions to save union jobs in the stimulus package, GM and Chrysler bailouts. Obama's appointee will probably stay on the way of any measure that stops the gravy train of benefits to the union workers. Many union benefits are turning into a death weight of unfunded liabilities for businesses, states and the federal bureaucracy. Don't expect the Obama commission to address these issues drastically."

Ann M. Fudge (Presidential Appointee – Democrat), Independent Director in General Electric Board of Directors. She is predominantly for taxing the rich to solve the deficit problems.

Kent Conrad (Democratic Senator from North Dakota) He wants to tax the rich to solve the budget deficit problems.

Max Baucus (Democratic Senator from Massachusetts) He is pro-ObamaCare.

Richard (Dick) Joseph Durbin (Democratic Senator from Illinois) He has supported Barack Hussein Obama since his Chicago days.

Judd Gregg (Republican (Republican In Name Only) Senator from New Hampshire) "Gregg was the leading Republican negotiator and author of the TARP program" which threw taxpayer money down the drain.

Mike Crapo (Senator Republican Senator from Indiana) He uses plain, common sense in his politics with little bargaining.

Tom Coburn (Republican Senator from Oklahoma) He wants to abolish wasteful spending.

Paul Ryan (Republican Congressman from Wisconsin) He is a popular Republican, but may not remain popular when "the Democrats start screaming propaganda like: Ryan will take your Medicare and Earned Income Credit welfare away!"

Dave Camp (Republican Congressman from Michigan) He wants to stop the assault of social programs on the federal budget.

Jeb Hensarling (Republican Congressman from Texas) He is a staunch fiscal conservative.

The statistics are 7 Democrats, 5 Republicans, 3 Republicans In Name Only who would rather vote for the Democrats. So much for bipartisanship!⁷

And we have a number of members of Congress here today. I'm grateful for all of you taking the time to attend.

COMMENT: Who is meant with **we**? The members of Congress just skipped their classes!

What we've been debating here in Washington over the last few weeks will affect the lives of the students here and families all across America in potentially profound ways. This debate over budgets and deficits is about more than just numbers on a page; it's about more than just cutting and spending. It's about the kind of future that we want. It's about the kind of country that we believe in. And that's what I want to spend some time talking about today.

COMMENT: Who is meant with **we**? The content is a lie! Budgets are always about cutting and spending. Barack Hussein Obama's view of the future of the United States

of America is not a healthy economical view. The word and action to watch out for with Barack Hussein Obama is **spend**! He will spend all that he can because it is not his money. It will be spent for extremely excellent programs – all socialist and communist. The debate about the budget should have nothing to do with the lives of students. It should have to do with the stoppage of spending. Who wants what kind of future? Who are **we** and what kind of country do **we** believe in?

From our first days as a nation, we have put our faith in free markets and free enterprise as the engine of America's wealth and prosperity. More than citizens of any other country, we are rugged individualists, a self-reliant people with a healthy skepticism of too much government.

COMMENT: Who is meant with **we**? Who is meant with **our**? This praise is the bait for a follow-up lie! This is a buttering up for the guillotine against a free market economy. The statement is completely contrary to what Barack Hussein Obama believes. That Americans have "a healthy skepticism of too much government" and that they have put their "faith in free markets and free enterprise" is an outdated political and economic attitude for Barack Hussein Obama. His intention for more taxation and government involvement that will appear later in his speech are indications that he loathes capitalism, free enterprise, free markets and individualism. At the same time, Barack Hussein Obama is not correct in his historical presentation. Free markets and free enterprise, supply and demand are the major components of capitalism. The term *capitalism* appears in this modern sense in its first usage by Louis LeBlanc (1850) and Pierre Joseph Proudhon (1861).⁸ Karl Marx in *Das Kapital* (1867) uses the word *capitalism* twice in Volume I. Marx preferred the terminology *capitalist mode of production*, which he uses 2,600 times in the three volumes of *Das Kapital*. Before and during the eighteenth century a **capitalist** was **one who owned capital**. What Barack Hussein Obama is most likely alluding to is mercantilism, a pre-stage of capitalism. With the Establishment of the British East India Company, founded on December 31, 1600, and the Dutch East India Company, founded on March 20, 1602, the commercial stage of capitalism began. Yet it took more than two hundred years for capitalism to become a mainstay of economic relations.

But there's always been another thread running through our history -- a belief that we're all connected, and that there are some things we can only do together, as a nation. We believe, in the words of our first Republican President, Abraham Lincoln, that through government, we should do together what we cannot do as well for ourselves.

COMMENT: Who is meant with **we**? Who is meant with **our**? Here comes the beheading of the free market and free enterprise that was voiced previously. "A belief that we are all connected" is a lie because it is not a thread that runs through American history. Other than the consent of We the People to live freely and responsibly under

the laws of the *Constitution for the United States of America* as patriotic, legal American citizens, there is no connection between Americans. There should be no other connection. The "things" that America has been able to do as a nation has always been to defend itself. That is the common identity that occurs in times of being attacked. Everything else Americans do, they accomplish as individuals, or as workers for organizations and corporations, but not as a collective community, which is what Barack Hussein Obama is alluding to. This is the slimy lie in Barack Hussein Obama's deviousness. First he praises free markets and free enterprise as elements that made the early nation of the United States of America wealthy, and now he places emphasis on the feeling of belonging to a community, a commune, if you will. Thus the transfer has taken place from a political system of freedom and free economy, to a system of commune politics and commune economy.

The reference to Abraham Lincoln is a misleading statement. This author knows of no such statement by President Abraham Lincoln: "that through government we should do together what we cannot do as well for ourselves." There is a similar original statement by President Abraham Lincoln:

"The legitimate object of government is to do for a community of people whatever they need to have done, but cannot do at all, or cannot so well do, for themselves, in their separate and individual capacities. In all that the people can individually do as well for themselves, government ought not to interfere. The desirable things which the individuals of a people cannot do, or cannot well do, for themselves, fall into two classes: those which have relation to wrongs, and those which have not. Each of these branch off into an infinite variety of subdivisions.

The first—that in relation to wrongs—embraces all crimes, misdemeanors and non-performance of contracts. The other embraces all which, in its nature, and without wrong, requires combined action, as public roads and highways, public schools, charities, pauperism, orphanage, estates of the deceased, and the machinery of government itself.

From this it appears that if all men were just, there still would be some, though not so much, need of government."⁹

The attentive reader will readily understand why Barack Hussein Obama did not quote directly, but insinuated that he was quoting directly.

And so we've built a strong military to keep us secure, and public schools and universities to educate our citizens. We've laid down railroads and highways to facilitate travel and commerce. We've supported the work of scientists and researchers whose discoveries have saved lives, unleashed repeated technological revolutions, and led to

countless new jobs and entire new industries. Each of us has benefitted from these investments, and we're a more prosperous country as a result.

COMMENT: Who is meant with **we**? Who is meant with **our**? The statements above are more lies. The military is a product of the federal government according to the law of the *Constitution*. Lie 1: Public schools and universities are not products of the federal government. They are institutions of local government, state government, and private undertakings. Lie 2: The building of railroads was a result of private enterprise. Lie 3: The building of roads was initially private undertakings, then communities, then states. Interstate highways are federal undertakings. Lie 4: Technological revolutions were not "unleashed" by the federal government, but by individual or institutional endeavors.

Part of this American belief that we're all connected also expresses itself in a conviction that each one of us deserves some basic measure of security and dignity. We recognize that no matter how responsibly we live our lives, hard times or bad luck, a crippling illness or a layoff may strike any one of us. "There but for the grace of God go I," we say to ourselves. And so we contribute to programs like Medicare and Social Security, which guarantee us health care and a measure of basic income after a lifetime of hard work; unemployment insurance, which protects us against unexpected job loss; and Medicaid, which provides care for millions of seniors in nursing homes, poor children, those with disabilities. We're a better country because of these commitments. I'll go further. We would not be a great country without those commitments.

COMMENT: Who is meant with **we**? Who is meant with **our**? This is a continuation of the lie that American citizens are connected in a community. There is no belief that Americans are connected together except under the provisions of We the People in the *Constitution*. Barack Hussein Obama is attempting to pull the wool of communism over the American citizens and illegal aliens. National security is the responsibility of the federal government. Dignity is the responsibility of the individual. Looking out for one's self is the responsibility of the individual. Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security are positive programs, but are they commitments *ad infinitum*? They surely are not commitments made by the *Constitution for the United States of America*. Regarding "There but for the grace of God go I", this author's position is that God executed wonderful grace in not allowing this author to become a Barack Hussein Obama.

The United States of America would be a better country if there were less (no) parasites and more (only) producers. It would be a better country if the federal government kept its tentacles out of the insurance industry and allow for free-market-health-care coverage. The federal government is becoming 100 percent-involved in ObamaCare. The United States of America via ObamaCare medical coverage will eventually become a second-rate, even a third-rate medical coverage country.¹⁰

Now, for much of the last century, our nation found a way to afford these investments and priorities with the taxes paid by its citizens. As a country that values fairness, wealthier individuals have traditionally borne a greater share of this burden than the middle class or those less fortunate. Everybody pays, but the wealthier have borne a little more. This is not because we begrudge those who've done well — we rightly celebrate their success. Instead, it's a basic reflection of our belief that those who've benefited most from our way of life can afford to give back a little bit more. Moreover, this belief hasn't hindered the success of those at the top of the income scale. They continue to do better and better with each passing year.

COMMENT: Who is meant with **we**? Who is meant with **our**? Isn't it enough that the top 1 percent of the most wealthy individuals pay approximately forty percent of the income tax? Barack Hussein Obama does not know the statistics and he does not care. Here they are:

Tax Year 2008

| Percentiles Ranked by AGI | AGI Threshold on Percentiles | Percentage of Federal Personal Income Tax Paid |
|---------------------------|------------------------------|--|
| Top 1% | \$380,354 | 38.02 |
| Top 5% | \$159,619 | 58.72 |
| Top 10% | \$113,799 | 69.94 |
| Top 25% | \$67,280 | 86.34 |
| Top 50% | \$33,048 | 97.30 |
| Bottom 50% | <\$33,048 | 2.7 |

Source: <http://www.ntu.org/tax-basics/who-pays-income-taxes.html>.

Now, at certain times — particularly during war or recession — our nation has had to borrow money to pay for some of our priorities. (under Barack Hussein Obama) And as most families understand, a little credit card debt isn't going to hurt if it's temporary.

COMMENT: Who is meant with **our**? Credit card debt always hurts, even if it is temporary! Should Americans not believe in "Forgive us our debts as we forgive our debtors"?

But as far back as the 1980s, America started amassing debt at more alarming levels, and our (Democrat Party leaders) leaders began to realize that a larger challenge was on the horizon. (They could purchase votes and elections by making socialized medicine promises!) They knew that eventually, the Baby Boom generation would retire,

which meant a much bigger portion of our citizens would be relying on programs like Medicare, Social Security, and possibly Medicaid. Like parents with young children who know they have to start saving for the college years, America had to start borrowing less and saving more to prepare for the retirement of an entire generation.

COMMENT: Who is meant with **our**? The United States of America has had a national debt since its inception, except for January 8, 1835.¹¹ The most alarming levels of national debt began under Barack Hussein Obama. The debt being continued under Barack Hussein Obama will be approximately 20 trillion dollars by 2015.¹² Another lie is that the federal government pays for one's Social Security and Medicare. Who does? Here is the answer: "Medicare is funded by the Social Security Administration. Which means it's funded by taxpayers: We all pay 1.45% of our earnings into FICA - Federal Insurance Contributions Act, if you're into deciphering acronyms - which go toward Medicare. Employers pay another 1.45%, bringing the total to 2.9%. (If you're self-employed, you must cough up the entire 2.9%.) The Medicare deduction on your paycheck might say FICA-HI. The HI refers to Health Insurance, and it's your premium cost for all Medicare coverage.

While the portion of our FICA taxes that cover payments into the Social Security system are levied only on the first \$106,800 in earnings for 2010, the Medicare tax is levied on every penny you earn."¹³

You will also pay some Medicare costs yourself when you start using the plan." What the government pays into Social Security are funds that keep it operating because government agencies keep borrowing from the funds and the government also has to pay interest on what it borrows.

To meet this challenge, our leaders came together three times during the 1990s to reduce our nation's deficit -- three times. (1990, 1993, 1997) They forged historic agreements that required tough decisions made by the first President Bush, then made by President Clinton, by Democratic Congresses and by a Republican Congress. All three agreements asked for shared responsibility and shared sacrifice. But they largely protected the middle class; they largely protected our commitment to seniors (Barack Hussein Obama surely means senior citizens.); they protected our key investments in our future.

COMMENT: Who is meant with **our**? What were the key investments in the future: the middle class, the senior citizens?

As a result of these bipartisan efforts, America's finances were in great shape by the year 2000. We went from deficit to surplus. America was actually on track to becoming completely debt free, and we were prepared for the retirement of the Baby Boomers.

But after Democrats and Republicans committed to fiscal discipline during the 1990s, we lost our way in the decade that followed. We increased spending dramatically for two wars and an expensive prescription drug program — but we didn't pay for any of this new spending. Instead, we made the problem worse with trillions of dollars in unpaid-for tax cuts — tax cuts that went to every millionaire and billionaire in the country; tax cuts that will force us to borrow an average of \$500 billion every year over the next decade.

COMMENT: Who is meant with **we**? Who is meant with **our**? Essentially, Barack Hussein Obama is stating that the national debt is George W. Bush's fault. The statistics speak a different conclusion. In the year 2000 the gross debt as a fraction of the gross domestic product was at 60. In the year 2010 under Barack Hussein Obama the gross debt as a fraction of gross domestic product was at approximately 98. In the year 2000 the gross debt was 8 trillion dollars. In the year 2010 the gross debt was approximately 14 trillion dollars.¹⁴ The so-called tax cuts went to every American; the marginal tax rates were lowered for all US tax payers. The Heritage Foundation maintains that the so-called American millionaires and billionaires were forced to shoulder more of the income tax burden and the poor shouldered less or none of the income tax burden.¹⁵

To give you an idea of how much damage this caused to our nation's checkbook, consider this: In the last decade, if we had simply found a way to pay for the tax cuts and the prescription drug benefit, our deficit would currently be at low historical levels in the coming years. (Just saying something is not proving it!)

COMMENT: Who is meant with **we**? Who is meant with **our**? Barack Hussein Obama is lying. The Democrats in Congress wanted the prescription drug program to be larger which would have made it most expensive. It was the Democrats in Congress who caused government spending at unprecedented levels, the outcome of which will be the destruction of capitalism¹⁶

But that's not what happened. And so, by the time I took office, we once again found ourselves deeply in debt and unprepared for a Baby Boom retirement that is now starting to take place. When I took office, our projected deficit, annually, was more than \$1 trillion. (This is a lie! It was approximately 1.5 trillion dollars.¹⁷) On top of that, we faced a terrible financial crisis and a recession that, like most recessions, led us to temporarily borrow even more.

COMMENT: Who is meant with **we**? Who is meant with **our**? So these are the reasons why Barack Hussein Obama took over automobile companies, hired more government employees, halted domestic oil production, gave billions of dollars to Brazil so that the United States can purchase oil and gas from Petrobras, and above all, these are the reasons why Barack Hussein Obama does not want any congressional approval

of his policies on Libya. The financial crisis was caused by the Democrats, Barney Frank, Christopher Dodd, and the institutions Fanny Mae, Freddie Mac. If "On top of that, we faced a terrible financial crisis and a recession that, like most recessions, led us to temporarily borrow even more", then the logical thing to do would have been to stop borrowing money and spending money that was not available. If the situation was so drastic then there is absolutely no economical intelligence in adding 3 trillion dollars to the national debt in two-plus years. The real crisis is that over the next ten years the projected Barack Hussein Obama budget will produce a deficit of 10.9 trillion or 5.3 percent of the gross domestic product (GDP) on average.¹⁸

In this case, we took a series of emergency steps that saved millions of jobs, kept credit flowing, and provided working families extra money in their pocket. It was absolutely the right thing to do, but these steps were expensive, and added to our deficits in the short term.

COMMENT: Who is meant with **we**? Who is meant with **our**? A successive lie! There is no possible method to calculate the number of jobs saved.¹⁹ It was absolutely the wrong thing to do. The emergency steps were the first advances towards American economic death, for they caused more national debt and more payoffs for those who supported Barack Hussein Obama in his presidential election candidacy. "It was absolutely the right thing to do, ..." Like providing for research and safety for a race of rats in Nancy Pelosi's district? Allowing the FED to send money to overseas banks?²⁰ "Through the Fed the riffraff of every country is operating on the public credit of the United States Government."²¹ This has been happening since the founding of the FED on December 23, 1913.

So that's how our fiscal challenge was created. That's how we got here. (Barack Hussein Obama does not know the truth behind the Federal Reserve System, or he does know the truth and is criminally profiting from the system.) And now that our economic recovery is gaining strength, Democrats and Republicans must come together and restore the fiscal responsibility that served us so well in the 1990s. We have to live within our means. (Barack Hussein Obama, you set the example! At least Jimmy Carter wore a sweater in the Oval Office during the winter and did not set the thermostat to 80 degrees!) We have to reduce our deficit, and we have to get back on a path that will allow us to pay down our debt. And we have to do it in a way that protects the recovery, protects the investments we need to grow, create jobs, and helps us win the future.

COMMENT: Who is meant with **we**? Who is meant with **our**? The United States fiscal challenge began under President Carter with his policy of making it possible for every American, no matter how poor, to be able to own their own home. It got him votes but the policy was not good for the American economy. Let the market economy create jobs, and allow for growth.

Now, before I get into how we can achieve this goal, some of you, particularly the younger people here -- you don't qualify, Joe. (Laughter) (Typical sheeple reaction!) Some of you might be wondering, "Why is this so important? Why does this matter to me?"

COMMENT: Who is meant with **we**? Joe Biden doesn't qualify? How true!!! He doesn't qualify as the vice president because he was elected on an illegal Democratic Party Nomination ticket.

Well, here's why. Even after our economy recovers, our government will still be on track to spend more money than it takes in throughout this decade and beyond. That means we'll have to keep borrowing more from countries like China. That means more of your tax dollars each year will go towards paying off the interest on all the loans that we keep taking out. By the end of this decade, the interest that we owe on our debt could rise to nearly \$1 trillion. Think about that. That's the interest -- just the interest payments.

COMMENT: Who is meant with **we**? Who is meant with **our**? The argument is that the United States of America will become a vassal state of China. That is what Barack Hussein Obama wants. The interest on the debt rising to almost one trillion dollars was advanced forward by Barack Hussein Obama's ignorance of economics: borrowing and printing money!

Then, as the Baby Boomers start to retire in greater numbers and health care costs continue to rise, the situation will get even worse. By 2025, the amount of taxes we currently pay will only be enough to finance our health care programs -- Medicare and Medicaid -- Social Security, and the interest we owe on our debt. That's it. Every other national priority -- education, transportation, even our national security -- will have to be paid for with borrowed money.

COMMENT: Who is meant with **we**? Who is meant with **our**? Education should not be a national priority. Transportation should not be a national priority. There are no logical reasons for the federal government to meddle in these areas. Let the free market economy do it. Allow competition!

Now, ultimately, all this rising debt will cost us jobs and damage our economy. It will prevent us from making the investments we need to win the future. We won't be able to afford good schools, new research, or the repair of roads -- all the things that create new jobs and businesses here in America. Businesses will be less likely to invest and open shop in a country that seems unwilling or unable to balance its books. And if our creditors start worrying that we may be unable to pay back our debts, that could drive up interest rates for everybody who borrows money -- making it harder for businesses to expand and hire, or families to take out a mortgage.

COMMENT: Who is meant with **we**? Who is meant with **our**? Raising taxes will cost jobs and damage the economy! Raising taxes will prevent investments. Raising taxes will cost jobs and this will have an effect on the quality of schools. The teacher unions will make the situation worse, no matter how good or how excellent the schools are/were before the teachers are/were unionized. Barack-Hussein-Obama-Regime bureaucracy will prevent small businesses from investing. The creditors have already started worrying. There are efforts under way to stop the U.S. dollar from being the world's leading currency. The **ifs** are now reality.

Here's the good news: That doesn't have to be our future. That doesn't have to be the country that we leave our children. We can solve this problem. We came together as Democrats and Republicans to meet this challenge before; we can do it again.

COMMENT: Who is meant with **we**? Who is meant with **our**? This is nothing more than the Hope-and-Change theme and the mentioning of bipartisanship to soothe the feelings of the sheeple. Hope and Change means Barack Hussein Obama Regime socialism/communism. Nothing else! The real challenge is to get Barack Hussein Obama out of office!

But that starts by being honest about what's causing our deficit. You see, most Americans tend to dislike government spending in the abstract, but like the stuff that it buys. Most of us, regardless of party affiliation, believe that we should have a strong military and a strong defense. Most Americans believe we should invest in education and medical research. Most Americans think we should protect commitments like Social Security and Medicare. And without even looking at a poll, my finely honed political instincts tell me that almost nobody believes they should be paying higher taxes. (Laughter) (Typical sheeple reaction!)

COMMENT: Who is meant with **we**? Who is meant with **our**? When Barack Hussein Obama talks about being honest, it is as if Satan is saying that he is all goodness! Honesty is something that Barack Hussein Obama abhors! Barack Hussein Obama talks about "stuff" that government spending buys. The term "stuff" is a typical leftist, progressive term. It is negative in its projection. Barack Hussein Obama is negative in his projections. Barack Hussein Obama, you are nothing but stuff! **Stuff** is low caliber. Barack Hussein Obama uses the word **stuff** because he is of low, extremely low caliber.

The word **stuff** is really the same word as **stop**. (Barack Hussein Obama is stuff that must be stopped!) Its Indo-European root is the same for both words: **stewə**, meaning *to cluster*, in Sanskrit **stūpa**, meaning *tuft of hair or crown of the head*.²² Via Greek and Latin and Old French with the word *estoffe* (1241) and the verb *estoffer* since ca. 1190, which meant *provisions, to provide something*, the word entered the English language and came to mean *furnishings, supplies, fillings, cramming*, as well as the respective

verb forms. According to *The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language*, the modern usages of **stuff** mean:

1. The material out of which something is made or formed; substance.
2. The basic substance or essential elements of anything; essence.
3. Material not specifically identified.
4. Informal: Household or personal articles collectively; belongings.
5. Worthless objects; refuse or junk.
6. Empty words or ideas.

Barack Hussein Obama, the material out of which you are and your utterances are is hot air! The basic substance of Barack Hussein Obama is evilness. The remaining definitions most surely describe Barack Hussein Obama!

So because all this spending is popular with both Republicans and Democrats alike, and because nobody wants to pay higher taxes, politicians are often eager to feed the impression that solving the problem is just a matter of eliminating waste and abuse. You'll hear that phrase a lot. "We just need to eliminate waste and abuse." The implication is that tackling the deficit issue won't require tough choices. Or politicians suggest that we can somehow close our entire deficit by eliminating things like foreign aid, even though foreign aid makes up about 1 percent of our entire federal budget.

COMMENT: Who is meant with **we**? Who is meant with **our**? Spending is popular with Republicans (especially RINOs) and Democrats because it is not their money. Not only do "We just need to eliminate waste and abuse.", we need to eliminate Barack Hussein Obama.

So here's the truth. (This is the indication that a lie is coming.) Around two-thirds of our budget -- two-thirds -- is spent on Medicare, Medicaid, Social Security (Here is another lie!), and national security. Two-thirds. Programs like unemployment insurance, student loans, veterans' benefits, and tax credits for working families take up another 20 percent. What's left, after interest on the debt, is just 12 percent for everything else. (Here is the lie!) That's 12 percent for all of our national priorities -- education, clean energy, medical research, transportation, our national parks, food safety, keeping our air and water clean -- you name it -- all of that accounts for 12 percent of our budget.

COMMENT: Who is meant with **our**? The national priorities -- education, clean energy, medical research, transportation, national parks, food safety, clean air and water and you name it were part of the national priorities named by Barack Hussein Obama in his State of the Union Speech on January 25, 2010. The other items that Barack Hussein Obama said are national priorities are:

Unleash a clean energy revolution

Double the nation's supply of renewable energy by the end of 2012

Spur innovation through new energy standards

Create Energy Innovation Hubs

Invest in clean energy solutions

Promote energy efficient industries

Invest in Advanced Vehicle Technology

Accelerate biotechnology, nanotechnology, and advanced manufacturing

Complete DNA sequencing for major diseases and drive sequencing innovations

Create nanotechnology solutions

Launch breakthrough technologies for advanced manufacturing

Develop breakthrough space capabilities and applications

Drive breakthroughs in health care technology

Expand the use of health IT

Enable innovation in medical technologies and medical care

Create a quantum leap in educational technologies

Advance development of educational technologies

The blatant lie is that all of these Barack Hussein Obama national priorities are national priorities because Barack Hussein Obama says they are national priorities. Saying they are such does not make them such. All of them could and should be priorities of the free market. They do not have to be controlled by the federal government. For Barack Hussein Obama control means absolute control and absolute control means loss of freedoms. For example, there is no reason why a free market economy cannot provide for clean energy. It does not have to be imposed on Americans by the government. The items above can be provided by a free market economy.

Another lie is the percentage of the budget that is used for particular items.

According to Barack Hussein Obama

- a. Two-thirds of the budget is spent on Medicare, Medicaid, Social Security, national defense = 66.66%
 - b. Twenty percent is spent on unemployment insurance, student loans, veterans' benefits, tax credits for working families = 20.00%
 - c. Twelve percent is spent on everything else = 12.00%
- = 98.66%

Is the remaining 1.34% of the annual budget the amount of interest paid on the national debt? Barack Hussein Obama says that it is. But he is lying. The real figure is that 6% of the 2010 federal budget was used to pay off interest debts.²³ This means that the other percentage figures are not correct either. Barack Hussein Obama's presentation of the relationship of Social Security to the budget is also a lie!

The truth about Social Security is that it "is not part of the federal budget. It is a separate account and has its own source of income (Payroll Taxes). Social Security payments go in the Social Security trust fund, and should NOT be counted as general revenue. The trust fund is supposed to be used to pay future benefits. ... As of August 2010, there is less being paid into the Social Security Trust Fund than is being paid out to beneficiaries. Social Security is now using its 'surplus'. Government agencies that borrowed from the trust fund, now have to pay the money back. But they've spent it. Where will they get it? More bail outs (taxes) coming.²⁴ The payroll taxes are going into a bottomless hole.²⁵ What is present is a Barack-Hussein-Obama-continued ponzi scheme! Perhaps the reason is that Barack Hussein Obama has at least 39 social security numbers and he wants to cash in on all of them.²⁶ Fraud is fraud!

Now, up till now, the debate here in Washington, the cuts proposed by a lot of folks in Washington, have focused exclusively on that 12 percent. But cuts to that 12 percent alone won't solve the problem. So any serious plan to tackle our deficit will require us to put everything on the table, and take on excess spending wherever it exists in the budget. (Cuts are cuts and spending is spending!)

COMMENT: Who is meant with **our**? Who are the folks? **Folks** is a common colloquialism that can mean **common people, tribe, multitude**. When thus meant, it is used by people who do not have a real command of the English language. At the same time, the use of the word folks could be a pejorative slam at the Republicans in Congress. Would Barack Hussein Obama do that? Take a slap at the Republicans? The ones he desires to work with in Congress as he stated above? Of course, he would! Insulting and belittling others is part and parcel of his immoral character. It is part of the evilness that is his essence.

A serious plan doesn't require us to balance our budget overnight (**It should!**) – in fact, economists think that with the economy just starting to grow again, we need a phased-in approach – but it does require tough decisions and support from our leaders in both parties now. Above all, it will require us to choose a vision of the America we want to see five years, 10 years, 20 years down the road.

COMMENT: Who is meant with **we? Who is meant with **our**? The economists who prefer a phased-in approach are most likely socialist/communist economists. The 5, 10, 20 year-increments are nothing more than socialist/communist 5, 10, 20-year plans. They never worked out properly.**

Now, to their credit, one vision has been presented and championed by Republicans in the House of Representatives and embraced by several of their party's presidential candidates. It's a plan that aims to reduce our deficit by \$4 trillion over the next 10 years, and one that addresses the challenge of Medicare and Medicaid in the years after that.

COMMENT: Who is meant with **our? Okay, where is the problem?**

These are both worthy goals. They're worthy goals for us to achieve. But the way this plan achieves those goals would lead to a fundamentally different America than the one we've known certainly in my lifetime. In fact, I think it would be fundamentally different than what we've known throughout our history.

COMMENT: Who is meant with **we? Who is meant with **our**? Barack Hussein Obama's statement is a lie! The Republican plan would lead to a free market economy in these fields with the participants responsible for themselves. Perhaps the American economy before Barack Hussein Obama's lifetime was better. The real problems have occurred since the creation of the Federal Reserve System, the elimination of the gold standard, the introduction of Keynesian economics, and the socialist policies of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, which have been added on to by successive presidents.**

A 70 percent cut in clean energy. A 25 percent cut in education. A 30 percent cut in transportation. Cuts in college Pell Grants that will grow to more than \$1,000 per year. That's the proposal. These aren't the kind of cuts you make when you're trying to get rid of some waste or find extra savings in the budget. These aren't the kinds of cuts that the Fiscal Commission proposed. These are the kinds of cuts that tell us we can't afford the America that I believe in and I think you believe in.

COMMENT: Who is meant with **we? The cuts listed by Barack Hussein Obama are lies! Cutting clean energy by 70% is nothing more than a cut in the Obama Regime's "support for otherwise unwanted, non-competitive clean energy programs -- but it's not**

at all a cut to clean energy itself. It's only a cut to clean energy itself if government is the be-all and end-all of all "investment" and all progress."²⁷ A 25% cut in education is really "a 25 percent cut from federal government support for education that is not a 25 percent cut in the nation's education: It's a 3.68 percent cut in total government support for education (local, state and federal combined). And that doesn't even take into account how much other money goes to private education (more than 6.2 percent of American students go to private schools). Considering how much waste and duplication²⁸ stems from federal education programs, and merely clutters up the works, that's a 3+ percent which, when cut, might actually improve the quality of education by removing red tape.²⁹ Likewise, a 30% cut in transportation does not mean that 30 percent of all transportation in the United States will be cut back. It only means that government-run transportation like Amtrak will have to cut back on their wastes and mismanagement, which may cause them to be more productive.

I believe it paints a vision of our future that is deeply pessimistic. It's a vision that says if our roads crumble and our bridges collapse, we can't afford to fix them. If there are bright young Americans who have the drive and the will but not the money to go to college, we can't afford to send them.

COMMENT: Who is meant with **we**? Who is meant with **our**? The Republican budget play does not paint a vision. It delineates a solution that is realistic. The Republican budget plan is oriented toward freedom and individualism. Barack Hussein Obama is stating another lie! Except for interstate highways, roads and bridges are the responsibility of the states and communities. That a bridge may crumble, as one did in Minneapolis, Minnesota in 2007, is not necessarily due to lack of upkeep. Like the bridge in Minneapolis, Minnesota, it is likely due to the design.³⁰

Why should the federal government (If that is who Barack Hussein Obama means with **we**.) be responsible for sending Americans to college and universities? They should see to it that they send themselves, and if they receive government loans and or grants, they should be required to pay them back.

The American that Barack Hussein Obama believes in is a Muslim-Socialist America where freedom is defined by the national government according to Sharia law.

Go to China and you'll see businesses opening research labs and solar facilities. South Korean children are outpacing our kids in math and science. They're scrambling to figure out how they put more money into education. Brazil is investing billions in new infrastructure and can run half their cars not on high-priced gasoline, but on biofuels. And yet, we are presented with a vision that says the American people, the United States of America — the greatest nation on Earth — can't afford any of this.

COMMENT: Who is meant with **our**? Barack Hussein Obama, you go to China and stay there! Businesses would open research labs and solar facilities in the United States if the free market were allowed to operate properly without over-burdening it with regulations, bureaucracy, and taxes. South Korean children are performing better than American children because the South Korean schools are not invested with leftist, progressive, immoral theory and educational principles. Brazil is productive because the United States is providing for some of its infrastructure. Socialist regimes assist socialist regimes. The United States of America cannot "afford any of this" because Barack Hussein Obama and his goons will not allow it!

It's a vision that says America can't afford to keep the promise we've made to care for our seniors. It says that 10 years from now, if you're a 65-year-old who's eligible for Medicare, you should have to pay nearly \$6,400 more than you would today. It says instead of guaranteed health care, you will get a voucher. And if that voucher isn't worth enough to buy the insurance that's available in the open marketplace, well, tough luck — you're on your own. Put simply, it ends Medicare as we know it.

COMMENT: Who is meant with **we**? Who is meant with **our**? This is a lie and a scare tactic. The promise of Medicare and Medicaid will be supported by Representative Paul Ryan's recent budget proposal. It is the only budget plan that has positive, long-term goals.³¹

It's a vision that says up to 50 million Americans have to lose their health insurance in order for us to reduce the deficit. Who are these 50 million Americans? Many are somebody's grandparents -- may be one of yours -- who wouldn't be able to afford nursing home care without Medicaid. Many are poor children. Some are middle-class families who have children with autism or Down's syndrome. Some of these kids with disabilities are -- the disabilities are so severe that they require 24-hour care. These are the Americans we'd be telling to fend for themselves.

COMMENT: Who is meant with **we**? These are Obama-Alinsky scare tactics that tell the sheeple that they had better vote for Barack Hussein Obama and re-elect him for another four years of destruction. All of the scare tactics are lies. The truth is that "For all of the weeping, and wailing, and gnashing of teeth from the Left, Paul Ryan's budget only slows the growth of entitlement spending to manageable terms. His careful, responsible reforms actually provide a better safety net than the current programs, including ObamaCare.

Medicaid today so badly underpays doctors and hospitals that the poor face major difficulties in gaining access to essential health care under the program, and suffer worse health outcomes as a result. States would be free under Ryan's proposed reforms to provide financing to the poor to purchase private health insurance,

empowering the poor to enjoy the same health care as the middle class, because they would enjoy the same health insurance as the middle class.

Similarly, Ryan's proposed Medicare reforms are clearly better for seniors than the \$15 trillion in Medicare cuts under ObamaCare and President Obama's Medicare reimbursement policies already enshrined in current law, and the further Medicare cuts President Obama endorsed to be adopted by unelected, unaccountable bureaucrats on his Independent Medicare Advisory Board. Unlike Ryan's careful reforms, these Obama cuts apply to seniors already retired today. The government's own actuaries and scorekeepers are already telling us that seniors will not be able to get essential health care under these unworkable, irresponsible cuts."³²

And worst of all, this is a vision that says even though Americans can't afford to invest in education at current levels, or clean energy, even though we can't afford to maintain our commitment on Medicare and Medicaid, we can somehow afford more than \$1 trillion in new tax breaks for the wealthy. Think about that.

COMMENT: Who is meant with **we**? Who is meant with **our**? There would be nowhere near 1 trillion dollars in tax breaks for the wealthy. The statement is an outright lie! If all of the money from all of the billionaires and millionaires in the United States of America was confiscated, indeed taken from persons earning 200,000 dollars a year and more, which is probably what Barack Hussein Obama would like to do, and applied to the American national debt, that would cover only six or seven months of the national debt. If all of the profits of the Fortune 500 companies were confiscated, the government could operate for only 40 days. Confiscating only the wealth of the 400 billionaires would allow the government to operate only until August 2011.³³

If Barack Hussein Obama is having visions, particularly visions that are going to continue to destroy the United States of America, he should be committed to a psychiatry ward and observed 24/365 *ad terminus*!

In the last decade, the average income of the bottom 90 percent of all working Americans actually declined. Meanwhile, the top 1 percent saw their income rise by an average of more than a quarter of a million dollars each. That's who needs to pay less taxes?

COMMENT: The United States Congress was controlled by the Democrats in the last two years of the George W. Bush administration and their control of Congress enabled the financial crisis to explode. The Democrats also stopped the attempts of President George W. Bush to regulate the financial industry.³⁴ The top 10% of income earners, beginning with those earning 114,000 dollars in adjusted gross income, already pay somewhat over 70% of the taxes.³⁵ The reality is that the Bush tax cuts for the rich

actually favored the poor.³⁶ The statement is a lie and it is not a lie! Barack Hussein Obama states that his figures are for the last decade. However the only years that constitute a decade are from 1998 to 2008. After 2008 there are no reliable statistics. Furthermore, the statement takes into consideration only income before taxes and not income after taxes.³⁷ Income before taxes is often less than income after taxes because the itemization of tax deductions.

They want to give people like me a \$200,000 tax cut that's paid for by asking 33 seniors each to pay \$6,000 more in health costs. That's not right. And it's not going to happen as long as I'm (the putative) President. (Applause) (The sheeple have no sense of logic!)

COMMENT: Who is meant with **they**? Some more scare tactics and a lie! The figure is pulled out of Barack Hussein Obama's hot air. If he had stated that there would be a 300,000 dollar tax cut he would have said there would be 50 senior citizens having to pay 6,000 dollars more in health costs. Under ObamaCare they are already spending more than they would if there were no ObamaCare. The truth is this:

- The \$575 billion cut to Medicare over the next decade -- which is needed to pay insurance subsidies for 32 million new people -- will force one in seven hospitals, nursing homes, home health agencies, and hospices out of business.
- By 2050, 40 percent of existing health care facilities will be forced to close their doors.

Nearly half of the 32 million newly insured people will be enrolled in Medicaid (those whose incomes are at or below 133 percent of the poverty line will have no choice), but they shouldn't expect the level of care that current Medicaid recipients receive, says John Goodman, President, CEO and the Kellye Wright Fellow of the National Center for Policy Analysis. Continues Mr. Goodman, "For many low-income people, there's not going to be much difference. Now they get care at community health centers and hospital emergency rooms. The Medicaid system won't be able to handle them in a substantially different way. They'll end up going to the same doctors and the same facilities they go to as uninsured."

The wait for care will be much, much longer:

- ObamaCare will provide 100 million Americans with much more generous insurance than they have today, with no co-pays and no deductibles.
- This will give people new incentives to access medical care even though there won't be enough doctors to handle the increased demand.
- A looming shortage of nurses won't help, either.

Many physicians already refuse to accept new Medicare patients. More will refuse when payments from the government fall below cost."³⁸

This vision is less about reducing the deficit than it is about changing the basic social compact in America. Ronald Reagan's own budget director said, there's nothing "serious" or "courageous" about this plan. (The statement and quotes are taken completely out of context!) There's nothing serious about a plan that claims to reduce the deficit by spending a trillion dollars on tax cuts for millionaires and billionaires. And I don't think there's anything courageous about asking for sacrifice from those who can least afford it and don't have any clout on Capitol Hill. That's not a vision of the America I know.

COMMENT: One can only know facts. One cannot know a vision, unless one is totally crazy. If that is the case, the person should not be even a bogus potus! Barack Hussein Obama may have a vision, but he surely can never know the vision until the vision becomes reality. The truth about this lie is: "Internal Revenue Service data show that the income of people who were in the lowest income tax bracket in 1996 rose by 91 percent by 2005. But people in the "top one percent" had their incomes drop by 26 percent in those same years."³⁹ Barack Hussein Obama's vision is a vision based on lies.

The America I know is generous and compassionate. It's a land of opportunity and optimism. (It was before Barack Hussein Obama arrived on the scene!) Yes, we take responsibility for ourselves, but we also take responsibility for each other; for the country we want and the future that we share. (This is the socialist/communist propaganda.) We're a nation that built a railroad across a continent (A lie!) and brought light to communities shrouded in darkness. (Another lie!) We sent a generation to college on the GI Bill (Another lie!) and we saved millions of seniors from poverty with Social Security and Medicare. (Another lie!) (Those who pay into Social Security should get something out of Social Security. Those who don't pay in get nothing. It should not apply to illegal immigrants.) We have led the world in scientific research and technological breakthroughs that have transformed millions of lives. That's who we are. This is the America that I know. We don't have to choose between a future of spiraling debt and one where we forfeit our investment in our people and our country.

COMMENT: Who is meant with **we**? Who is meant with **our**? Taking responsibility for one's self is healthy American individualism. Taking responsibility for others is socialism/communism directed by the state. The lies are lies because: The nation the United States of America did not build a railroad across the continent. Private enterprise built such railroads. The government did not bring light to communities. Private enterprise and inventive genius did. The GI Bill did not send people to college. It provided only a financial support opportunity if some of the former soldiers wanted to go

college. There is no method of proving that millions or even one person was saved from poverty by Social Security or Medicare. The lead in scientific research and technological breakthroughs was a result of individual genius and private enterprise. If Barack Hussein Obama thinks that the government did all of these things, then he surely does not know America. The America he supposedly knows is a fiction of socialism and communism.

To meet our fiscal challenge, we will need to make reforms. We will all need to make sacrifices. But we do not have to sacrifice the America we believe in. And as long as I'm President, we won't.

COMMENT: Who is meant with **we**? Who is meant with **our**? To meet the fiscal challenge requires not spending money *ad infinitum* that is not available. What is the America we believe in? Is it a socialist/communist America? The true American patriot believes in the America of the *Declaration of Independence* and the America of the *Constitution for the United States of America*.

So today, I'm proposing a more balanced approach to achieve \$4 trillion in deficit reduction over 12 years. It's an approach that borrows from the recommendations of the bipartisan Fiscal Commission that I appointed last year, and it builds on the roughly \$1 trillion in deficit reduction I already proposed in my 2012 budget. It's an approach that puts every kind of spending on the table -- but one that protects the middle class, our promise to seniors, and our investments in the future.

COMMENT: Who is meant with **our**? Notice the wording: "a more balanced approach" is not the same as a balanced budget. This is a prime example of steer stooling. It is another lie. Barack Hussein Obama's approach will stop the real spending cuts proposed by the Republicans. This is nothing more than class warfare politics. This is the idealism of the left and it is a very selfish idealism. In placing higher taxes on the rich and even corporations there will be more loss of jobs, jobs that might be moved to foreign countries. As such, the middle class will be hit harder, the poor will be hit harder and across the board there will be more parasites on the dole than there will be workers earning a living.

The first step in our approach is to keep annual domestic spending low by building on the savings that both parties agreed to last week. That step alone will save us about \$750 billion over 12 years. We will make the tough cuts necessary to achieve these savings, including in programs that I care deeply about, but I will not sacrifice the core investments that we need to grow and create jobs. We will invest in medical research. We will invest in clean energy technology. We will invest in new roads and airports and broadband access. We will invest in education. We will invest in job training. We will do what we need to do to compete, and we will win the future.

COMMENT: Who is meant with **we**? Who is meant with **our**? All of these great investments: investing in medical research; investing in clean energy technology; investing in new roads and airports and broadband access; investing in education; investing in job training, can be better accomplished and with more efficiency by private enterprise. Winning the future under Barack Hussein Obama is winning steps backwards.

The second step in our approach is to find additional savings in our defense budget. Now, as Commander-in-Chief, I have no greater responsibility than protecting our national security, (Why doesn't Barack Hussein Obama do this then, instead of pandering to terrorists, and Islamists?) and I will never accept cuts that compromise our ability to defend our homeland or America's interests around the world. (This is the reasoning behind a 78-billion-dollar cut in the budget for the Department of Defense and getting involved in a war in Libya without Congressional approval?) But as the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, Admiral Mullen, has said, the greatest long-term threat to America's national security is America's debt. So just as we must find more savings in domestic programs, we must do the same in defense. And we can do that while still keeping ourselves safe.

COMMENT: Who is meant with **we**? Who is meant with **our**? Some savings in domestic programs should include a stop on the banning of drilling for oil and exploring new energy reserves. The reasoning equation is not logical. Just because there should be savings in domestic programs, does not mean that there should be savings in defense programs. With Barack Hussein Obama's vision of safety, who needs enemies?

Over the last two years, Secretary Bob Gates has courageously taken on wasteful spending, saving \$400 billion in current and future spending. I believe we can do that again. We need to not only eliminate waste and improve efficiency and effectiveness, but we're going to have to conduct a fundamental review of America's missions, capabilities, and our role in a changing world. I intend to work with Secretary Gates and the Joint Chiefs on this review, and I will make specific decisions about spending after it's complete.

COMMENT: Who is meant with **we**? Who is meant with **our**? Intending to work with Secretary of Defense Robert Gates and the Joint Chiefs of Staff is not doing so! Barack Hussein Obama will become bored and play golf!

The third step in our approach is to further reduce health care spending in our budget. Now, here, the difference with the House Republican plan could not be clearer. Their plan essentially lowers the government's health care bills by asking seniors and poor

families to pay them instead. (This is a lie!) Our approach lowers the government's health care bills by reducing the cost of health care itself. (This is another lie!)

COMMENT: Who is meant with **our**? Barack Hussein Obama's method of lowering the government's health care bills will result in lower cost treatment and fewer health care services. It will not lower health care cost. It will raise the costs or shift them somewhere else.⁴⁰

Already, the reforms we passed in the health care law will reduce our deficit by \$1 trillion. My approach would build on these reforms. We will reduce wasteful subsidies and erroneous payments. We will cut spending on prescription drugs by using Medicare's purchasing power to drive greater efficiency and speed generic brands of medicine onto the market. We will work with governors of both parties to demand more efficiency and accountability from Medicaid.

COMMENT: Who is meant with **we**? Who is meant with **our**? The reforms will not reduce the deficit by 1 trillion dollars.⁴¹ It is a lie! ObamaCare will cost America at least 800.000 jobs.⁴²

We will change the way we pay for health care – not by the procedure or the number of days spent in a hospital, but with new incentives for doctors and hospitals to prevent injuries and improve results. (And the rich will be taxed to pay for the poor!) And we will slow the growth of Medicare costs by strengthening an independent commission of doctors, nurses, medical experts and consumers who will look at all the evidence and recommend the best ways to reduce unnecessary spending while protecting access to the services that seniors need.

COMMENT: Who is meant with **we**? A government bureaucracy will tell patients and doctors what they need, when they need it, and when to stop the medical services.⁴³

Now, we believe the reforms we've proposed to strengthen Medicare and Medicaid will enable us to keep these commitments to our citizens while saving us \$500 billion by 2023, and an additional \$1 trillion in the decade after that. But if we're wrong, and Medicare costs rise faster than we expect, then this approach will give the independent commission the authority to make additional savings by further improving Medicare.

COMMENT: Who is meant with **we**? Who is meant with **our**? Let the free enterprise system regulate Medicare. There is no socialized medical welfare program on the earth that does not run a deficit. There are more arguments contra socialized medicine than there are arguments pro socialized medicine.⁴⁴

But let me be absolutely clear: **(Beware! A lie is coming!)** I will preserve these health care programs as a promise we make to each other in this society. I will not allow Medicare to become a voucher program that leaves seniors at the mercy of the insurance industry, with a shrinking benefit to pay for rising costs. I will not tell families with children who have disabilities that they have to fend for themselves. We will reform these programs, but we will not abandon the fundamental commitment this country has kept for generations.

COMMENT: Who is meant with **we? Barack Hussein Obama is uttering scare tactics and class warfare demagoguery. The lies are as follows:**

Lie 1. The Republican budget proposal does not call for disabled children to “fend for themselves.”

Lie 2. Most senior citizens would prefer vouchers allowing them to purchase medical insurance that they want and not rely on Medicare. The voucher system would permit senior citizens to purchase insurance from a regulated government list, which is what federal employees use.

Lie 3. The Republican budget proposals do not abandon the commitments to Social Security and Medicare or Medicaid.

That includes, by the way, our commitment to Social Security. While Social Security is not the cause of our deficit, it faces real long-term challenges in a country that’s growing older. As I said in the State of the Union, both parties should work together now to strengthen Social Security for future generations. But we have to do it without putting at risk current retirees, or the most vulnerable, or people with disabilities; without slashing benefits for future generations; and without subjecting Americans’ guaranteed retirement income to the whims of the stock market. And it can be done.

COMMENT: Who is meant with **we? Who is meant with **our**? The sky is falling!**

The fourth step in our approach is to reduce spending in the tax code, so-called tax expenditures. In December, I agreed to extend the tax cuts for the wealthiest Americans because it was the only way I could prevent a tax hike on middle-class Americans. But we cannot afford \$1 trillion worth of tax cuts for every millionaire and billionaire in our society. We can’t afford it. And I refuse to renew them again.

COMMENT: Who is meant with **we? Who is meant with **our**? The lie is two-fold.**

Lie 1: There would not be 1 trillion dollars worth of tax cuts for every millionaire and billionaire and

Lie 2: That Barack Hussein Obama has no plan to repeal the part of the Bush tax cuts that went to families earning less than 250,000 dollars does not mean that he will not tax the middle class.⁴⁵ Inflation itself is a tax on everybody!

Beyond that, the tax code is also loaded up with spending on things like itemized deductions. And while I agree with the goals of many of these deductions, from homeownership to charitable giving, we can't ignore the fact that they provide millionaires an average tax break of \$75,000 but do nothing for the typical middle-class family that doesn't itemize. So my budget calls for limiting itemized deductions for the wealthiest 2 percent of Americans -- a reform that would reduce the deficit by \$320 billion over 10 years.

COMMENT: Who is meant with **we**? This is steer stooling! The formulation "reduce spending in the tax code" is a disguised way of saying there is going to be a tax hike.⁴⁶ If the comedian John Stewart has this opinion, it is probably true.

But to reduce the deficit, I believe we should go further. And that's why I'm calling on Congress to reform our individual tax code so that it is fair and simple -- so that the amount of taxes you pay isn't determined by what kind of accountant you can afford.


COMMENT: Who is meant with **we**? Who is meant with **our**? Here are more reforms that are not explained. Beware taxpayers! Your shirt, or what is left of it, is being pulled off your back by the Barack Hussein Obama Regime. At least 47% of Americans do not need an accountant because 47% of Americans do not pay income tax.⁴⁷

I believe reform should protect the middle class, promote economic growth, and build on the fiscal commission's model of reducing tax expenditures so that there's enough savings to both lower rates and lower the deficit. And as I called for in the State of the Union, we should reform our corporate tax code as well, to make our businesses and our economy more competitive.

COMMENT: Who is meant with **we**? Who is meant with **our**? This author would not be surprised if Barack Hussein Obama taxed the middle class more. Would reforming the corporate tax have as a result that General Electric would be paying taxes?⁴⁸ Perhaps tax deregulation for everyone would be better! Oops, that is a George W. Bush policy!

So this is my approach to reduce the deficit by \$4 trillion over the next 12 years. It's an approach that achieves about \$2 trillion in spending cuts across the budget. It will lower our interest payments on the debt by \$1 trillion. It calls for tax reform to cut about \$1 trillion in tax expenditures -- spending in the tax code. And it achieves these goals while protecting the middle class, protecting our commitment to seniors, and protecting our investments in the future.

COMMENT: Who is meant with **we**? Who is meant with **our**? This is the graph projection by the Congressional Budget Office.



Source: <http://super-economy.blogspot.com/2011/04/doing-math-president-obamas-plan-to-tax.html>

0.7 Trillion dollars is not 1 trillion dollars. Where is the significant deficit reduction? Protecting the middle class? The result will be that all classes will disappear except the progressives. Then there will be just "the administration of things".

Now, in the coming years, if the recovery speeds up and our economy grows faster than our current projections, we can make even greater progress than I've pledged here. But just to hold Washington -- and to hold me --- accountable and make sure that the debt burden continues to decline, my plan includes a debt failsafe. If, by 2014, our debt is not projected to fall as a share of the economy -- if we haven't hit our targets, if Congress has failed to act -- then my plan will require us to come together and make up the additional savings with more spending cuts and more spending reductions in the tax code. That should be an incentive for us to act boldly now, instead of kicking our problems further down the road.

COMMENT: Who is meant with **we**? Who is meant with **our**? Barack Hussein Obama is being held accountable on a number of matters: Article II, Section 1, Clause 5 of the

U.S. Constitution; illegal Social Security numbers; a falsification of his Selective Service Registration, being one of Washington, D.C.'s most corrupt politicians since 2006.⁴⁹ Why wait until 2014? Why wait until the 2012 elections? Why not hold Barack Hussein Obama accountable now?

So this is our vision for America – this is my vision for America -- a vision where we live within our means while still investing in our future; where everyone makes sacrifices but no one bears all the burden; where we provide a basic measure of security for our citizens and we provide rising opportunity for our children.

COMMENT: Who is meant with **we**? Who is meant with **our**? Barack Hussein Obama says "this is my vision for America", therefore it is all about him!

There will be those who vigorously disagree with my approach. I can guarantee that as well. (Laughter) (The sheeple never fail in their idiotic adoration!) Some will argue we should not even consider ever -- ever -- raising taxes, even if only on the wealthiest Americans. It's just an article of faith to them. I say that at a time when the tax burden on the wealthy is at its lowest level in half a century, the most fortunate among us can afford to pay a little more. I don't need another tax cut. Warren Buffett doesn't need another tax cut. Not if we have to pay for it by making seniors pay more for Medicare. Or by cutting kids from Head Start. Or by taking away college scholarships that I wouldn't be here without and that some of you would not be here without.

COMMENT: Who is meant with **we**? This is more steer stooling that claims that the Republican plan is doing such, while the truth is that Barack Hussein Obama is blaming the Republicans for what he is doing and wants to do! It is the typical Saul Alinsky method. The American public would like to see the documents relating to Barack Hussein Obama's scholarships.

And here's the thing: (Attention! Attention! Attention! Barack Hussein Obama has a thing!) I believe that most wealthy Americans would agree with me. They want to give back to their country, a country that's done so much for them. (This is an allusion to John F. Kennedy's "Ask not what your country can do for you – ask what you can do for your country, which by the way, was plagiarized!) It's just Washington hasn't asked them to.

COMMENT: This author knows some wealthy Americans and they do not agree with Barack Hussein Obama. The real situation is that politicians in Washington, D. C. do not ask wealthy Americans to give something (money) for their country. The politicians just spend the money that the government does not have to secure their seats in Congress at the next election. It is a modern form of bread-and-games politics that was an ultimate cause of the downfall of the Roman Empire.

Others will say that we shouldn't even talk about cutting spending until the economy is fully recovered. These are mostly folks in my party. I'm sympathetic to this view -- which is one of the reasons I supported the payroll tax cuts we passed in December. (This is a lie!) It's also why we have to use a scalpel and not a machete to reduce the deficit, so that we can keep making the investments that create jobs. But doing nothing on the deficit is just not an option. Our debt has grown so large that we could do real damage to the economy if we don't begin a process now to get our fiscal house in order. (Is there not real damage now?)

COMMENT: Who is meant with **we**? Who is meant with **our**? Barack Hussein Obama agreed to the extension of the Bush tax cuts because he realized that by not extending them, there would be more job losses. The jobs that the Obama Regime creates are inflated, (bogus) jobs that do not really exist anew!⁵⁰ Barack Hussein Obama did an additional three-trillion-dollar-debt damage to the United States of America in only 27 months! Barack Hussein Obama will "get the house in order" by making more debt and printing money to pay it off.

Finally, there are those who believe we shouldn't make any reforms to Medicare, Medicaid, or Social Security, out of fear that any talk of change to these programs will immediately usher in the sort of steps that the House Republicans have proposed. (The complete relationship is depicted as a scare tactic.) And I understand those fears. But I guarantee that if we don't make any changes at all, we won't be able to keep our commitment to a retiring generation that will live longer and will face higher health care costs than those who came before.

COMMENT: Who is meant with **we**? Who is meant with **our**? The plan the Republicans pose is a valid solution to the problems of Medicare and Social Security. All administrations, including the Obama Regime, have borrowed from Social Security since 1937. "The Treasury Department 'borrows' surpluses in the Social Security trust funds for use across the federal government. As a practical matter, the amount of money borrowed equals the balances in the trust funds after benefits are paid out. Two funds exist: one for disability benefits and a much larger one for retirement benefits. The surplus in those funds at the end of fiscal 2007 (September 30, 2007) was about \$2.2 trillion, all in non-marketable U.S. Treasury bonds. The bonds now earn about 5 percent interest. Last year the government paid \$110 billion in interest to the trust funds. This practice began in 1937 with the creation of the Social Security system during Franklin D. Roosevelt's administration. That first year the government paid \$2 million in interest on money it borrowed from the retirement trust fund."⁵¹ In about two years the Obama Regime has borrowed about 100 billion dollars plus x from the Social Security trust fund.⁵²

Indeed, to those in my own party, I say that if we truly believe in a progressive vision of our society, we have an obligation to prove that we can afford our commitments. If we believe the government can make a difference in people's lives, we have the obligation to prove that it works – by making government smarter, and leaner and more effective.

COMMENT: Who is meant with **we**? Who is meant with **our**? Of course, government can make a difference in people's lives. But when compared with what independent citizens can make of their lives, the government outcome is extremely negative. At the same time, in a free republic the government should not get involved in people's lives to the degree of absolute socialist/communist controls. People should be left to make their own difference in their own lives. That government is smarter and leaner and more effective, indeed the smartest and the leanest and the most effective when it governs the least.

Of course, there are those who simply say there's no way we can come together at all and agree on a solution to this challenge. They'll say the politics of this city are just too broken; the choices are just too hard; the parties are just too far apart. And after a few years on this job, I have some sympathy for this view. (Laughter) (Sheeple will be sheeple!)

COMMENT: Who is meant with **we**? Barack Hussein Obama has relegated the highest office in the United States of America to just a job. Under his illegal occupation the position is not longer a patriotic duty. It is just a job!

But I also know that we've come together before and met big challenges. Ronald Reagan and Tip O'Neill came together to save Social Security for future generations. The first President Bush and a Democratic Congress came together to reduce the deficit. President Clinton and a Republican Congress battled each other ferociously, disagreed on just about everything, but they still found a way to balance the budget. And in the last few months, both parties have come together to pass historic tax relief and spending cuts.

COMMENT: Who is meant with **we**? What is historic about cutting 38.5 billion dollars in spending for the current fiscal year when the fiscal year 2011 deficit is the world's largest? There is really not much difference between a 1.5 trillion-dollar deficit and a 1.6 trillion-dollar deficit.⁵³

And I know there are Republicans and Democrats in Congress who want to see a balanced approach to deficit reduction. And even those Republicans I disagree with most strongly I believe are sincere about wanting to do right by their country. We may disagree on our visions, but I truly believe they want to do the right thing.

COMMENT: Who is meant with **we**? Who is meant with **our**? That is the reason they are republicans, except for the RINOs, the Republicans In Name Only.

So I believe we can, and must, come together again. (The *Yes We Can* tirade!) This morning, I met with Democratic and Republican leaders in Congress to discuss the approach that I laid out today. And in early May, the Vice President will

COMMENT: Who is meant with **we**? The bogus vice president might "begin regular meetings with leaders in both parties with the aim of reaching a final agreement on a plan to reduce the deficit and get it done by the end of June" if he ever wakes up from Barack Hussein Obama's monologue! In the meantime Barack Hussein Obama will play golf!

I don't expect the details in any final agreement to look exactly like the approach I laid out today. This (is) a democracy; (This is a lie!) that's not how things work. I'm eager to hear other ideas from all ends of the political spectrum. And though I'm sure the criticism of what I've said here today will be fierce in some quarters, and my critique of the House Republican approach has been strong, Americans deserve and will demand that we all make an effort to bridge our differences and find common ground.

COMMENT: Who is meant with **we**? Who is meant with **our**? The United States of America is not a democracy. It is a republic. Barack Hussein Obama will surely receive criticism, but he will accept his position only! The common ground according to Barack Hussein Obama is gangster politics.

This larger debate that we're having -- this larger debate about the size and the role of government -- it has been with us since our founding days. And during moments of great challenge and change, like the one that we're living through now, the debate gets sharper and it gets more vigorous. That's not a bad thing. In fact, it's a good thing. As a country that prizes both our individual freedom and our obligations to one another, this is one of the most important debates that we can have.

COMMENT: Who is meant with **we**? Who is meant with **our**? The size and role of government is limited by the *Constitution for the United States of America*. Govern according to the *Constitution* and there is no need for unnecessary debate. Indeed, the debate is present because the political parties and their minions think that only they know the answers to problems, and if there are no problems, then the parties will create them so that they can justify their presence and importance in governing.

But no matter what we argue, no matter where we stand, we've always held certain beliefs as Americans. We believe that in order to preserve our own freedoms and pursue our own happiness, we can't just think about ourselves. We have to think about

the country that made these liberties possible. We have to think about our fellow citizens with whom we share a community. And we have to think about what's required to preserve the American Dream for future generations.

COMMENT: Who is meant with **we**? Who is meant with **our**? Think about respecting and upholding the laws of the *Constitution*! Americans do not share a community with anyone. There is no American community. Barack Hussein Obama is implying that the United States of America is really one big commune. The United States of America is an independent republic. The American Dream is never preserved. The opportunity to achieve the American Dream is always present, but not the preservation of the American Dream itself. There is no legal requirement to guarantee the fulfillment of the American Dream.

This sense of responsibility -- to each other and to our country -- this isn't a partisan feeling. It isn't a Democratic or a Republican idea. It's patriotism.

COMMENT: Who is meant with **our**? Patriotism is a love of and a devotion to one's country. Barack Hussein Obama's statement that patriotism is a responsibility to each other and to country is a socialist/communist application of the term. Barack Hussein Obama is saying that making the rich pay more taxes is patriotism. That is the forced re-distribution of wealth, which is communism. The Boston Tea Party was a revolt against taxes. The American Tea Party Movement is a revolt against taxes. That is patriotism. Free, independent Americans do not want the government to provide for everything they need because free, independent, and patriotic Americans know that such a government is powerful enough to take away anything it wants to from its citizen sheeple. Barack Hussein Obama's devotion to the United States of America is to destroy it.

The other day I received a letter from a man in Florida. He started off by telling me he didn't vote for me and he hasn't always agreed with me. But even though he's worried about our economy and the state of our politics -- here's what he said -- he said, "I still believe. I believe in that great country that my grandfather told me about. I believe that somewhere lost in this quagmire of petty bickering on every news station, the 'American Dream' is still alive...We need to use our dollars here rebuilding, refurbishing and restoring all that our ancestors struggled to create and maintain... We as a people must do this together, no matter the color of the state one comes from or the side of the aisle one might sit on."

COMMENT: Who is meant with **we**? Who is meant with **our**? Barack Hussein Obama is saying that you can disagree with him as long as you obey and vote for him. The letter is very similar to the 2012 campaign kick-off video.⁵⁴ The theme of the letter is the theme of Barack Hussein Obama's re-election campaign.

"I still believe." I still believe as well. And I know that if we can come together and uphold our responsibilities to one another and to this larger enterprise that is America, we will keep the dream of our founding alive -- in our time; and we will pass it on to our children. We will pass on to our children a country that we believe in.

COMMENT: Who is meant with **we**? Who is meant with **our**? Barack Hussein Obama is a believer – a believer in socialism/communism! The "larger enterprise" is the American community, which does not exist. The dream of America's founding was not a dream. It was an act of reality and still is. The reality is in the *Declaration of Independence* and the *Constitution for the United States of America*. Barack Hussein Obama is keeping these documents alive every day by breaking every principle and rule of law in them respectively. Barack Hussein Obama and his lackeys will pass on to their children an America that is bankrupt and a third-rate nation capable of accomplishing nothing!

Thank you. God bless you, and may God bless the United States of America.
(Applause) (The sheeple in their final action!)

COMMENT: When Barack Hussein Obama refers to God and says "may God Bless the United States of America", it is as if the devil is exercising al-taqiyya: Barack Hussein Obama will lie and do anything to further his cause!

END

2:31 P.M. EDT

CLOSING STATEMENT

Collectively speaking everything that Barack Hussein Obama says in his *Fiscal Remarks* is a lie that misleads. There are 5,768 words in 75 paragraphs with a total of 304 sentences that are full of lies. The exact lies that have been commented on number 46, more than half the number of the paragraphs

The whole speech is another it-is-all-about-Barack-Hussein-Obama speech. He refers to himself 78 times with the first person singular pronoun **I** and the first person singular possessive pronoun **my** 15 times, giving a total of 93 references to himself. Supportive of the **I** references are the third person plural references **we**, 169 times and third person plural possessive references **our** 122 times, giving a total of 291.

The reader does not know who is meant with **we** and **our**. Barack Hussein Obama does not explain who belongs to this grouping. However, it is not beyond doubt that at times Barack Hussein Obama means Americans, the United States of America, and probably most of the time his regime. Yet the reader is never sure.

The phrase *win the future* is used three times. However, the content of the future is not apparent, unless the reader makes the connection between *community*, *together*, and the *future*. That would incline the reader to believe that Barack Hussein Obama means socialism/communism. This author is not inclined to believe this. This author is totally convinced that Barack Hussein Obama's concept of the future for the United States of America is socialism/communism. Barack Hussein Obama wants to take American taxpayer dollars and rebuild, to change, redistribute them as he sees fit. This author is and all American patriots are willing to keep their own dollars, to rebuild what concerns them, and redistribute the dollars as far as the redistribution concerns the patriots. Barack Hussein Obama's form of living is coercion and collectivism. This author's form of living and the American patriots' form of living is freedom and individualism. At one time in American history people came to America because they wanted to work. Now they come because they know that they can freeload. Barack Hussein Obama supports freeloading because freeloading is socialism/communism.

Furthermore, the future is not a game. The future for American can only be successful, on par, or unsuccessful. The future cannot be won, metaphor or not! The future must be achieved. It must be a success. But surely it must not be socialism/communism! This author wants to be left out of anything reeking of socialism/communism.

In answer to the purpose of this exposé as stated at the beginning under the section Introductory Statement:

1. This exposé has proved beyond doubt that Barack Hussein Obama's contentions in his remarks are misleading statements with lies. Barack Hussein Obama lies because he knows that if he lies enough, the sheeple will accept what he says as being the truth.
2. This expose has provided the patriotic reader with 72 documented sources of information to rebut Barack Hussein Obama's contentions.
3. This exposé finds that the statement of the Founding Fathers, namely that "Taxation without representation by a president who was illegally elected to the position because the Democratic Party and the Democratic National Committee did not adhere to the provision of Article II, Section 1, Clause 5 of the *Constitution for the United States of America*, is an act of totalitarianism."⁵⁵ is totally correct.

4. This exposé finds that the statement by Benjamin Franklin, namely that "The speech was a thundering, threatening, rainstorm of words, but not one drop of reason." is completely true.
5. Further, the statement by Benjamin Franklin that "Barack Hussein Obama, you are an enemy of the Republic of the United States of America, and I am Yours."⁵⁶ is most clear in its judgment.

Barack Hussein Obama! You are an enemy to all patriotic Americans!!!

Frederick William Dame
Patriotic, Steadfast, and True

April 23, 2011

ENDNOTES AND SOURCES

¹ Stating it nicely, Saul Alinsky (1909-1972) was Barack Hussein Obama's community organizing mentor. Alinsky's *modus operandi* is in his book *Rules For Radicals* (1971). There is probably more destructive evil in the book than there is constructive good. Hillary Rodham Clinton (1947-) wrote her political science bachelor of arts thesis on Saul Alinsky titled *There Is Only The Fight*, at Wellesley College, Wellesley Massachusetts in 1969. Her praise of Alinsky is on par with the praise Barack Hussein Obama gives Saul Alinsky. Consult: <http://nukegingrich.files.wordpress.com/2007/08/hillaryclintonthesis.pdf>; <http://nationalreformsociety.blogspot.com/2009/12/obama-praises-marxist-founder-of.html>).

² *A Truthful Critique of Barack Hussein Obama's Remarks on Fiscal Policy by the Founding Fathers and Especially Benjamin Franklin* at <http://www.colony14.net/sitebuildercontent/sitebuilderfiles/atruthfulcritique>.

³ <https://romanticpoet.wordpress.com/tag/obama-dems-republicans-govt-shutdown-fed-budget/>.

⁴ http://www.dailymotion.com/video/xcozle_s-baldwin-obama-is-the-greatest-chi_news; <http://rightwingnews.com/barack-obama/president-obama-bailing-out-chicago-mobster-alexi-giannoulis/>.

⁵ <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2011/03/10/AR2011031004683.html>.

⁶ <http://blogs.wsj.com/deals/2011/01/07/gene-sperlings-economic-track-record/>.

⁷ <http://www.bigbureaucracy.com/?p=626>.

⁸ Fernand Braudel, *The Wheels of Commerce: Civilization and Capitalism 15-18 Century*, Harper and Row, 1979, p.237; Peter Saunders, *Capitalism*, University of Minnesota Press. 1995, p. 1.

-
- ⁹ Abraham Lincoln, *Fragment on Government*, July 1, 1854, at <http://showcase.netins.net/web/creative/lincoln/speeches/quotes.htm>.
- ¹⁰ <http://www.ncpa.org/healthcare/interstate-competition-in-the-individual-health-insurance-marketplace>.
- ¹¹ <http://www.politifact.com/truth-o-meter/statements/2010/jan/11/george-lemieux/fla-senator-says-jan-8-1835-only-day-us-has-been-d/>.
- ¹² [http://upload.wikimedia.org/wikipedia/commons/thumb/3/3b/2010_Budget - Deficit and Debt Increases.png/250px-2010_Budget - Deficit and Debt Increases.png](http://upload.wikimedia.org/wikipedia/commons/thumb/3/3b/2010_Budget_-_Deficit_and_Debt_Increases.png/250px-2010_Budget_-_Deficit_and_Debt_Increases.png); "Budget of the United States government: Browse fiscal year 2010: Budget documents: Updated summary tables {Schedule S-13, S-14}"; GPO Access: *Budget of the United States Government: Fiscal Year 2010: Updated Summary Tables*, pp. 30-31.
- ¹³ http://money.cnn.com/retirement/guide/retirementliving_healthcare.money.com/index3.htm.
- ¹⁴ <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/File:USDebt.png>.
- ¹⁵ Brian M. Riedl, "Ten Myths About the Bush Tax Cuts". The Heritage Foundation, at <http://www.heritage.org/Research/Reports/2007/01/Ten-Myths-About-the-Bush-Tax-Cuts>.
- ¹⁶ http://articles.cnn.com/2002-05-11/politics/democrats.radio_1_prescription-drug-drug-companies-fda-requirements?_s=PM:ALLPOLITICS; [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Medicare Prescription Drug, Improvement, and Modernization Act](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Medicare_Prescription_Drug_Improvement_and_Modernization_Act); <http://www.wnd.com/index.php?pageId=118592>.
- ¹⁷ <http://cedarcomm.com/~stevelm1/USDebt.png>.
- ¹⁸ <http://super-economy.blogspot.com/2011/04/doing-math-president-obamas-plan-to-tax.html>.
- ¹⁹ <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB124451592762396883.html>.
- ²⁰ <http://sleeplessandtired.com/?p=2003>; <http://julieborowski.wordpress.com/2011/04/05/federal-reserve-documents-reveal-massive-foreign-bank-bailouts/>.
- ²¹ <http://hiwaay.net/~becraft/mcfadden.html>.
- ²² See Julius Pokorny, *Indogermanisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch*, Francke Verlag, Tübingen, Basel: 2005, entry 1035.
- ²³ <http://www.cbpp.org/cms/index.cfm?fa=view&id=1258>.
- ²⁴ <http://www.federalbudget.com/>.
- ²⁵ <http://www.federalbudget.com/socsec.html>.
- ²⁶ <http://www.freerepublic.com/focus/f-news/2305027/posts>; <http://www.scribd.com/doc/21193106/KEYES-BARNETT-v-OBAMA-86-1-Attachments-1-Affidavit-Expanded-affidavit-by-Susan-Daniels-use-of-ss-number-of-the-deceased-by-Barack-Obama-Tait>.
- ²⁷ http://www.hyscience.com/archives/2011/04/on_focusing_our.php.
- ²⁸ http://coburn.senate.gov/public/index.cfm?a=Files.Serve&File_id=73039811-667b-4620-811a-69f7690e2360.

-
- 29 http://www.hyscience.com/archives/2011/04/on_focusing_our.php.
- 30 http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/I-35W_Mississippi_River_bridge.
- 31 <http://www.renewamerica.com/columns/garry/110416>.
- 32 <http://spectator.org/archives/2011/04/20/obamas-taxes-and-americas-jobs/2>.
- 33 <http://www.mrc.org/biasalert/2011/20110413125208.aspx>;
<http://www.mrc.org/biasalert/2011/20110413083959.aspx>.
- 34 <http://frustratedconservative.blogspot.com/>.
- 35 <http://gillreport.com/2011/04/top-10-of-earners-already-pay-70-of-tax-burden/>;
<http://www.ntu.org/tax-basics/who-pays-income-taxes.html>.
- 36 <http://allfinancialmatters.com/2008/05/13/bushs-tax-cuts-for-the-rich-actually-favor-the-poor/>.
- 37 <http://www.politifact.com/truth-o-meter/statements/2011/apr/14/barack-obama/obama-says-incomes-increased-more-250000-top-1-per/>.
- 38 http://www.ncpa.org/sub/dpd/index.php?Article_ID=19720.
- 39 http://www.rapidcityjournal.com/news/opinion/columnists/national/article_0459faee-654e-11e0-a8d3-001cc4c03286.html.
- 40 <http://www.timesgazette.com/main.asp?ArticleID=175197&SectionID=1&SubSectionID=382>;
<http://blogs.investors.com/capitalhill/index.php/home/35-politicsinvesting/1645-obamacare-will-shift-not-lower-the-cost-of-being-a-woman>;
<http://ezinearticles.com/?Oops,-You-Mean-Obamacare-Doesnt-Lower-Healthcare-Costs?-My-Bad&id=5432944>.
- 41 <http://socyberly.com/issues/obamacare-the-good-the-bad-and-the-ugly/>.
- 42 <http://hotair.com/archives/2011/02/10/video-cbo-admits-obamacare-will-kill-800000-jobs/>.
- 43 <http://www.sodahead.com/united-states/get-ready-for-healthcare-rationing-under-obamacare-truly-evil-what-the-democrat-socialists-have-pl/question-1700355/>;
<http://frontpagemag.com/2010/08/30/obamacares-bureaucracy-nightmare/>;
<http://blog.heritage.org/?p=53534>.
- 44 <http://www.thefreemanonline.org/columns/17-arguments-against-socialized-medicine/>;
<http://www.cato.org/pubs/catosletter/catosletterv3n1.pdf>.
- 45 <http://super-economy.blogspot.com/2011/04/doing-math-president-obamas-plan-to-tax.html>.
- 46 <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=CuDhjSEJsa8>; <http://21stcenturytaxation.blogspot.com/2010/10/tax-system-equity-and-tax-expenditures.html>;
<http://21stcenturytaxation.blogspot.com/2011/03/interesting-tax-expenditure-example.html>.
- 47 <http://www.theatlanticwire.com/business/2010/04/47-percent-don-t-pay-taxes-no-big-deal/24826/>.
- 48 http://www.cleveland.com/open/index.ssf/2011/04/rep_marcy_kaptur_says_ge_pays.html.
- 49 <http://www.judicialwatch.org/washingtons-ten-most-wanted-corrupt-politicians>.

-
- ⁵⁰ <http://washingtonexaminer.com/maps/Bogus-jobs-created-or-saved-by-the-Stimulus.htm>.
- ⁵¹ <http://www.dcourier.com/main.asp?SectionID=74&SubSectionID=589&ArticleID=54771&TM=42596>.
- ⁵² <http://www.federalbudget.com/>; <http://www.aaas.org/spp/rd/presentations/aaasrd20110321.pdf>.
- ⁵³ <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748704657104576142122744337858.html>.
- ⁵⁴ http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=f-VZLvVF1FQ&feature=player_embedded.
- ⁵⁵ *A Truthful Critique of Barack Hussein Obama's Remarks on Fiscal Policy by the Founding Fathers and Especially Benjamin Franklin* at <http://www.colony14.net/sitebuildercontent/sitebuilderfiles/atruthfulcritique>.
- ⁵⁶ *A Truthful Critique of Barack Hussein Obama's Remarks on Fiscal Policy by the Founding Fathers and Especially Benjamin Franklin* at <http://www.colony14.net/sitebuildercontent/sitebuilderfiles/atruthfulcritique>.