

## In The Beginning Obama Created...

And you thought Bill Clinton was slick, arguing over the meaning of the word “is.” Well, Clinton might want to pay attention to the flim-flam skills of the current occupant of the White House. The nation’s thug-in-chief stated on Friday the 13th (feel free to assume that the date has significance) that his \$789 billion “stimulus package” is “only the beginning” of his process of “turning our economy around.” Regrettably, he is probably correct. But he’s turning it in the wrong direction.

Obama and his advisors are obsessed with getting “credit flowing again.” Of course, too much credit was what caused many of the problems in the first place, from individuals who bought houses and cars they couldn’t afford to over-extended businesses that expanded irrationally to entrepreneurs who bought newspapers that didn’t have the necessary circulation numbers to justify their purchase price. Now that the piper has arrived and demanded payment, Obama and his entourage of Keynesian nitwits want to continue the Bush-Paulson folly of handing out money so that outstanding debt can be paid off with even more outstanding debt. The piper may be foolish enough to fall for the con a second time, but the third time may not be anywhere near a charm. Eventually the piper will demand something of actual value, rather than U.S. currency, and that will be the official moment of rude awakening.

Anyone who doesn’t expect gold prices to soar is a fool. Anyone who thinks the federal government isn’t going to print money is a bigger fool. And anyone who doesn’t see hyperinflation in his future is someone whose doctor told him he has only six months left to live.

It won’t be pretty.

In the meantime, one can’t help but be impressed by the effrontery of the man who learned how to salute Marine guards more quickly than Bill Clinton and who also knows how to word a promise with enough wiggle room to accommodate the future U.S.S. Frank Marshall Davis battleship. If you’re wondering which of Obama’s many promises fills that bill, it’s his economic plan that *“will ignite spending by businesses and consumers, make the investments necessary for lasting economic growth and prosperity and save or create more than 3.5 million jobs over the next two years.”*

Three and a half million jobs over the next two years! You can bet that Mitt Romney, Sarah Palin, and Bobby Jindal have that Obama promise on tape, ready to quote in the very first Presidential debate of 2012. *“In this economy, there’s no way he can create 3.5 million jobs,”* chortled Romney, Palin, and Jindal after Obama spoke on February 13. (We’ll assume new RNC Chairman Michael Steele is also taking detailed Obama notes.)

*But hold on for a moment...* Obama didn’t say he would *create* 3.5 million new jobs, he said he would *save or create* 3.5 million new jobs. The average American may not think there’s much difference in those two phrases, but those are the people who elected Obama. The rest of us have been around the block enough times to recognize “fine print.”

We know that the cost of “free delivery” is simply included in the purchase price. We know that the Ford Taurus and the Mercury Sable were the same car. We know that if something is priced “4 for \$20” you don’t save any money by buying four. We know that Susan Sarandon would never have had such a “distinguished acting career” had she not looked good in her underwear when she auditioned for the “Rocky Horror Picture Show.”

Obama promises to “save or create 3.5 million jobs over the next two years.” Won’t we just count the number of American workers at the end of 2010 and see if the number went up by 3.5 million? That will prove whether Obama fulfilled his promise.

That may be enough to satisfy the naïve residents of River City, Iowa, but the rest of us may want to see the band instruments and uniforms before we hand over our hard-earned, temporarily-still-worth-something U.S. currency.

“*Save or create.*” Exactly how is that measured? If the number of working Americans goes up by 1.5 million over the next two years, does that automatically mean that Obama failed? Not if he can help it. Imagine the press conference:

Helen Thomas: “*Mr. President, you said you would create 3.5 million jobs, but you created only 1.5 million. How does that compare to the number of jobs destroyed by your predecessor, the most evil person ever to have walked the face of the earth?*”

Obama: “*Thank you for your question, Helen. But let’s not bring up the failed policies of the past, as I’m sure it’s up to historians, and not me, to determine whether George W. Bush was a brutal, fascist dictator who failed to believe in global warming and thus doomed our children to a future where the entire state of Florida will be under water and they are deprived of going to Disney World. As far as jobs, let me remind you that I promised to save or create 3.5 million new jobs. So, even though the nation has only 1.5 million more Americans employed than it had two years ago, my policies also saved four million jobs from being destroyed. So, you see, I actually saved and created 5.5 million jobs, easily exceeding my pledge and justifying my election in 2012. For the American people, of course, not for me.*”

Republicans and conservatives who have been paying attention readily realize the game Obama is playing with his jobs promise. For Democrats, liberals, leftists, Hollywood celebrities, and Larry King, here is a simplified explanation of the “fine print” in Obama’s pledge:

*No matter what the level of employment is after two years, Obama can say he fulfilled his promise. If the number of people employed is up by five million, Obama takes credit. If the number is up by only one million, he can say he “created” one million jobs and “saved” 2.5 million (or more). Even if the number of employed Americans drops by seven million, Obama can take credit:*

Rush Limbaugh: “*So, there you have it folks. Two years into the Obama regime, and his economic policies have proven to be a disaster - just like I said they would. The latest*

*figures from the Department of Labor - and these are the Democrat's own numbers - show that the number of employed Americans has dropped by seven million workers! This guy has totally destroyed the econo..."*

Announcer: *"Federal Fairness Doctrine legislation is now in effect. The EIB network has now officially changed from the home of conservative talk radio to the Halal Recipe Network."*

Obama: *"You see, that's why America needed a return to the fairness doctrine. You can't just let right-wing ideologues on the airwaves, spreading lies about the accomplishments of the fine team I have assembled. Now, it may be true that the net number of employed Americans is down by seven million from where it was two years ago. But remember that I pledged to create or save 3.5 million jobs. Had it not been for my stimulus bill - had we continued with the failed policies of the past - the number of employed Americans would have decreased by 13.5 million. Because the number dropped by only seven million, that proves I actually saved 6.5 million jobs."*

There is no way to prove how many jobs are *saved or created*, it is only possible to identify whether the total number of employed Americans goes up or goes down, and by how much. If an industry lays off 50,000 workers, how does one prove Obama is lying if he says, "Well, they *would have* laid off 60,000 had we *not* passed the stimulus package, so I saved 10,000 jobs!"

The Obama jobs pledge is like promising yourself that you will "save for retirement." If, after one year, you've set aside only \$50 you haven't accomplished much. Yet you can honestly say you did "save for retirement." Alternatively, promising to save a specific amount by a specific date doesn't let you off the hook - which is why most people don't make themselves such promises. *"I promise to cut down on smoking"* is not the same as *"I promise to never have another cigarette after I finish this pack."*

*"I promise to save or create 3.5 million jobs within two years"* is a meaningless pledge *because success or failure can't be proven*. But it makes a good sound bite. And it makes people think Obama can fulfill his promise because he sounds so confident. Of course, it's difficult not to sound confident when promising the equivalent of, *"I pledge to you that the sun will rise in the east for all four years of my first term."* That is why it pays to read Obama's remarks rather than just listening to them. The ear does not always recognize what the eye catches. The ear can be swayed by emotion, while the eye is more connected to logic. The speech that sounds impressive when delivered may be dull and sophomoric - and full of lies - when read.

Even if his economic programs are abject failures (which they most assuredly will be), Obama can say that he fulfilled his promise. *But it will still be interesting to see how he words his answer...*

Don Fredrick  
February 14, 2009  
Copyright 2009, Don Fredrick