

The Liberal Thought Process Explained

While the current administration has certainly done some things with which many of us can find substantial fault (e.g., spend money like Democrats), I nevertheless believe we have been much better off with George W. Bush in the White House than we would have been with Al “hold your breath rather than exhale carbon dioxide” Gore, or John “I have no idea why every one under my command hated me” Kerry. In the current election cycle, of course, the oh-so-creative Democrats pin the “same as Bush,” or “Bush II,” or “McBush” label on Republican candidate John McCain in an effort to scare voters with the prospect of four or eight more years of continued Bush policies. That is unlikely, as I certainly expect John McCain to be his own man. But even though I would have changed a few things since the night Dan Rather decided to crown Al Gore while Floridians still had an hour or two left to vote, I have to admit that the last eight years haven’t been all that bad.

Granted, we would have been better off had civilian aircraft full of innocent passengers not been hijacked and flown into the World Trade Center and the Pentagon, but my recollection of the events of 9/11 tells me it was rabid Islamic terrorists who piloted those planes, not George W. Bush. (I offer as proof the claims of liberals who insist that Bush never actually showed up for pilot training in the Texas Air National Guard, but was off on a six-year drinking binge). And, of course, we could have avoided a war in the Middle East had the esteemed humanitarian Saddam Hussein and his fun-loving sons been overthrown by the people of Iraq, but that’s difficult to do when your thug-in-chief is killing you off by the tens of thousands with poison gas.

There will, of course, be no agreement from liberals here, but President Bush’s greatest accomplishment has been preventing another terrorist attack on American soil since 9/11. I don’t know about you, but I’m quite pleased with the Bush Administration’s performance in that regard. Further, the 9/11 attacks could have meant a total disaster for the economy, even to the extent of a major, nationwide panic and a massive depression. That did not happen - mostly because of quick action by the government in enacting tax cuts to keep the economy moving forward, wise actions by the Federal Reserve Board, and the rapid deployment of troops to Afghanistan to overthrow the Taliban and kill off a few thousand Al Qaeda members to let Americans know it was safe enough to go about their normal business activities. Most importantly, America survived 9/11 because we thought the President would take the required actions to defend our homeland without asking for pretty-please-permission from the United Nations. In short, our economy kept growing during these last eight years - despite an event that could easily have caused a depression rivaling that of the 1930s. Someone deserves credit for that, and that someone certainly isn’t Gore or Kerry.

To be sure, there have been problems in the mortgage industry and the housing market over the last year, but the Treasury Department took quick - some would say brilliant - action to make sure things would not get worse. And despite the media's continuous trashing of the economy, in a blatant effort to boost Obama's election prospects, it has

nevertheless done very well on the whole. We have not slipped into a recession, and growth remains positive (albeit weak).

Yes, there are a fair number of people who paid \$400,000 for houses that were barely worth \$300,000 and who are now struggling because they can't find suckers to buy them for \$450,000, but the blame for those unwise bets (which is what they were) belongs to them and not the President. And yes, gas prices spiked enough to remind people of Jimmy Carter's incompetence, but that's a world-wide situation that reflects the ever-increasing demand for oil by the entire world, and by China and India in particular. Do a little more drilling and prices will stabilize; prohibit or restrict drilling and pay more at the pump.

So, despite some bumps in the economic road, we're still going forward when we could have come to a complete stop, lost our brakes, and started to roll backward. (If Congress would remove some of the massive logs blocking the road ahead, we could accelerate more quickly.) Shifting metaphors, I think the economic sky is more or less firmly attached to the capitalist heavens, but the doomsayers continue to warn that the sky is falling. Those doomsayers are liberals, in general, and liberals in the media, in particular. Allowing for the fact that all liberals want Obama to beat McCain, it is understandable that they want the worst possible picture painted of the American economy as we head into the election. Voters who are relatively content typically tend not to want to rock the boat and elect someone new – especially when “new” means someone young and inexperienced, and whose philosophies and policies bear a striking resemblance to those of every 1960s Marxist activist. Still, there is a stunning vehemence with which liberals espouse their agenda; it's almost as if they actually believe some of their clap-trap. This should not go unexplained...

Why do so many liberals believe what they believe? The answer is that they never learned how to think. More specifically, simple-minded people lack imagination. Those who are simple-minded can readily point out what they see, when it's directly in front of them, but they have a difficult time comprehending what *could have been* but did not occur. If economic growth slows from four per cent to two per cent, for example, they immediately see dramatic failure in those numbers. But they miss the point that the two per cent might have been only one per cent (or even a negative one or two per cent) had the policies they preferred instead been in place.

Similarly, liberals can readily "see" the benefits of a so-called “environmentally friendly” automobile that runs on electricity, and thus requires no on-board supply of fossil fuel, but they neglect to “see” the fossil fuels burned at the power plant to create the electricity for re-charging the vehicle every night. They immediately and enthusiastically accept the idea of a hydrogen-powered car that emits only water vapor, but never stop to ask how hydrogen is produced. (Ask your liberal/”green” friends where hydrogen comes from. The answer: steam is mixed with methane and a catalyst to release hydrogen, with carbon dioxide, their infamous greenhouse gas, as a by-product.)

People who can see both the immediate *and* the long-term effects of policies and actions tend to be conservatives, while those who see only the short-term effects and then immediately stop their thought processes tend to be liberals. (If you disagree with that last sentence, just consider any major proposal made by Obama, Nancy Pelosi, or Harry Reid.)

Even in their “backward thinking,” liberals leave a lot to be desired. They look at unwanted pregnancies, for example, and believe unrestricted, federally-funded abortions are the answer. It doesn’t occur to them to suggest that 14-year old girls should not be having sex (“protected” or not). And in discussing the spread of AIDS, the liberals focus on finding a cure, when prevention is the more important side of the equation. To a liberal, “Pass out free needles” to drug users is preferable to, “Don’t shoot drugs into your veins,” and “find a cure for AIDS” is preferable to, “Don’t have sex with a stranger you just met in a gay bar.” (Heaven forbid anyone should suggest restricting someone’s “lifestyle choice.”) Even liberal math is fuzzy. They look at the spread of AIDS and sound the alarm that, “at that rate, everyone in the world will someday have AIDS; we’re all at risk!” No, those who engage in promiscuous sex and intravenous drug use are at risk; the rest of us are not. (This is not to suggest that a cure for AIDS should not be sought, but when arsonists are setting fires across the city, finding and stopping the arsonists may be a better use of manpower than manufacturing additional fire hoses.)

The liberal thought process is grossly undeveloped. Thus Obama, like most liberal candidates, gets votes simply because complicated issues require thinking things through to the end, and the voters who are too lazy to do so simply accept the easiest proposal of either candidate. (“Short of cash for gas? We’ll simply take some of ExxonMobil’s profits and give you \$1,000!”)

If you have not yet been persuaded by my argument, consider just a few issues where the liberal position is short-sighted:

Minimum Wage Increases: If you promise everyone who’s getting \$7.00 per hour an increase to \$8.00 per hour, they’re happy and will vote for you. (*That’s what the liberals see.*)

But the people making \$8.00 per hour then want \$9.00 per hour, and the \$9.00 wage-earners demand \$10.00 per hour, and so on. Eventually, many – but not all – workers get wage increases. (Not all businesses can afford to pass on the added costs.) Some people lose their jobs. (A small company with three janitors gives two of them a raise and fires the third.) Prices go up across the nation, because businesses can’t print money and have to pass on the increased wage costs. People living on fixed incomes (typically the elderly poor, and the unemployed) are faced with higher prices, but because they receive no wages they obviously get no wage increase. (*That’s what the liberals don’t see.*)

Raising the Minimum Wage has one more effect that isn’t obvious to everyone: the federal government takes in billions more in Social Security taxes, paid by deductions from worker paychecks and matching employer-paid taxes (which are passed on to the

consumer in the form of higher prices). This additional tax revenue is, of course, seen by legislators – who promptly spend it on pork, rather than deposit it in the Social Security Trust Fund.

Capital Gains Tax Increases: Raise the Capital Gains Tax and receive additional tax revenue. *(That's what the liberals see.)*

Because most people aren't eager to give the federal government any more of their hard-earned money than they have to, they respond to a capital gains tax increase by *not liquidating their capital*, thus resulting in the payment of *zero* capital gains taxes. (Why this should not be obvious to everyone is beyond my comprehension.) Consider someone who has invested in the stock market and who wants to sell some of his stocks in order to start a new business. The current capital gains tax is 15 per cent. He sells the stock, pays the 15 per cent tax on his gains, and uses the remainder to start his new business. Even better for the economy, he has plans to hire several people to work for his new company.

But the capital gains tax is raised to 28 per cent by a greedy Congress. Following the same scenario, the owner of the stock sells some to start his new business, after first paying 28 per cent in capital gains taxes. *(That's what the liberals see.)* But wait - in this new scenario our enterprising American with an idea for a new business decides the cost of paying that higher tax is so great that it isn't worth cashing in his stocks. After all, there's no guarantee his new business will succeed, so why risk a stunning *28 per cent* of his assets? The result of the tax increase is that his stocks are *not* sold, the government receives *nothing* in capital gains taxes, and *no one* gets a job in the new business because it was never started. *(That's what the liberals don't see.)*

Dividend Tax Increases: Soak the rich by raising the dividend tax from 15 per cent to 39.6 per cent, in order to receive additional revenues. *(That's what the liberals see.)*

But let's not forget that millions of retired Americans who are not wealthy have stocks they have owned for decades, and they depend on the dividends from those stocks to fund their day-to-day retirement expenses. Even if the candidate promises not to raise *income* taxes on retirees in the lower tax brackets, raising the tax on *dividends* hurts millions of elderly people. *(That's what the liberals don't see... or neglect to mention.)*

Regulations on Businesses: Bureaucrats enact a dandy new regulation on all businesses that have 50 or more employees. *(That's what the liberals see.)*

Owners of businesses with 49 or fewer employees do their best *not* to hire additional employees, to avoid being burdened with the costs of the new regulations. *(That's what the liberals don't see.)*

Make it easy to sue employers for firing minority employees: Because it's not fair to fire someone because of race, sex, or age, make it easy to file lawsuits against employers who fire members of minorities, in order to discourage discriminatory firings. *(That's what the liberals see.)*

The owner of a business knows that if he fires a young, white, male who turned out to be a terrible employee, he will never see that employee again. The businessman also knows that the cost of possibly firing someone in the future must be factored into every hiring decision. He knows that if he fires someone who is black, Hispanic, old, disabled, or female (if he or she turns out to be a terrible employee), he may very well see that person in court. In the interest of protecting his business from possible frivolous discrimination lawsuits, therefore, the businessman does his best to avoid hiring anyone with a minority status. *(This is what the liberals don't see.)*

Outlaw Pre-Existing Illness Clauses in Health Insurance Policies: If someone is sick it isn't his or her fault, so it seems fair to prohibit insurance companies from not covering pre-existing conditions. *(That's what the liberals see.)*

If an insurance company is required by law to sell you a policy if you walk in the door with an existing illness, the average person will simply not buy a policy until he or she gets sick. Why buy a health insurance policy "just in case" you get cancer? Instead, just wait and see. If you remain healthy, you've saved the cost of the monthly premiums. If you get cancer (or diabetes or heart disease), you can then take out a policy and the insurer will be prohibited from turning you down. In such a scenario, health insurers will quickly go out of business, and no one will have insurance. *(That's what the liberals don't see.)*

Russia invades Georgia: Do nothing but make a few meaningless comments about the commitment to democracy and peace in the region. Do not incur the wrath of Russia because, after all, who cares about the people of Georgia? *(That's what the liberals see.)*

After Russia examines the weak response of the West to its invasion of Georgia, it decides it will invade the Ukraine if the next election in the United States places in the White House a weak-kneed American apologist. Depending on the response to that Ukraine invasion, it may choose to flex its muscles even more. *(That's what the liberals don't see.)*

By now you see the problem with how the liberal mind works (or fails to work). Think Bill Clinton and Monica Lewinsky (short-term pleasure, long-range impeachment problems), Al Gore (bio-fuel now, higher food prices tomorrow), John Edwards and his gal-pal (short-term pleasure, long-range rot in Hell), or Michael Moore and Ed Asner (well, let's not think of them).

Astute readers can no doubt come up with hundreds of examples where liberals believe something to be a good idea when, after you consider the long-term effects, it is not only a terrible plan, it often works against its original intentions. This failure to see the long-range effects is a continual thread running through liberal policies and actions. One cannot help but ask, "What's wrong with these people?" To a great extent it is the result of having been spoiled as a child, where every need was instantly gratified, where mommy and daddy indulged every whim, where university tuition was paid for by

someone else, and where a “real job” with balance sheets and hard work was never required. If you are raised in an environment where you never have to wait for anything and where you rarely have to do any long-range planning, the natural result may be that you simply never learned there is such a thing as long-range effects.

Of course, I’m not a trained psychologist; it may simply be that liberals are stupid...

Don Fredrick

August 15, 2008