



APC JOURNAL

ANNOUNCEMENTS
NEWS ITEMS
ARTICLES
EVENTS



Vol 1 Issue 15 October 20, 2009

Editors: Robert Williams, Mike Dennin, and Rob Denham

IN THIS ISSUE

- MOONBATS ROUTED Reported by Robert Williams
- LIBERAL HYPOCRISY by Robert Denham
- REMOVING A CROSS by Robert Williams
- REAL-WORLD CHANGE Opinion by Robert Williams
- POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE A report and comment by Robert Williams
- BITS OF HUMOR caught by Robert Denham

~~~~~  

## MOONBATS ROUTED

It was a rout! On Saturday Oct. 10, 2009 at least 20 of us from the local chapters of American Patriot Council and Gathering of Eagles confronted a dozen Moonbats. We lined the highway on the side of the Pohakuloa Hawaii Island military training base 7,000 feet up on our volcanic mountain and our anti-military anti-American opposition lined up on the other side of the road. We were there from 8 AM to 2 PM. They only managed 10:30 AM to 1:00 PM. We had 26 American flags and one Canadian flag proudly flying the breeze and they had none. We did not use any threatening or bad language but we did ask them a lot of legitimate questions with a bullhorn and they sat gloomily on the ground without reply. We had a lady patriot wearing a Burka who used the bullhorn to harang the Moonbats about the oppressed women in the Middle East. We sang patriotic songs. The moonbats remained silent as stone. We got a lot of friendly honks and waves from passing traffic and the Moonbats got none. We got friendly salutes from military vehicles going in and out of the base and the Moonbats were ignored by the soldiers. I was tired but happy when I got home around 5 PM. It was a good day for our side and it was obvious the soldiers appreciated our overwhelming support.



Some of us hold ground at the main gate of the Pohakuloa Military training base on the Big Island of Hawaii while the rest confront the moonbats when they moved to a second gate after they were routed at this gate.



Me in the 1776 get-up and my 13-star Betsy Ross flag.

~~~~~  
 LIBERAL HYPOCRISY by Robert Denham

Conservatives desire things like increased individual liberties, smaller, less intrusive government, lower taxes, strong personal/national defense and pro-American foreign policy. Our opposites support, well, the opposite; and they say we're the whackos. It's amazing to me, how so many liberals I encounter in the editorial pages, for example, will be all "Jesus" this, and "God" that....yet, they'll blindly support a President who openly declares that America is not a Christian nation. Granted, we don't always agree with our political parties and leaders; however, fully 86% of Americans claim Christian beliefs of some kind, while less than 1%, for example, observe Islam.

Sounds to me like we're a pretty solid Christian country; majority rule used to mean something here. Obama gave lackluster lip service to, yet disassociated himself--and thusly the government--from the [National Day of Prayer](#), celebrated, by act of Congress, every year since 1952. This not only undercut the meaning of the observance, it also allowed him to preclude having to share dinner with leaders of the American Christian and Jewish clergy. Yet, despite dodging a traditional dinner with these people, he nonetheless graciously invited Muslim-American clerics, leaders and luminaries to the [White House](#) for a nice little first-ever Ramadan feast. We are continuously, exasperatedly, informed that "No! Obama is not a Muslim! He belonged to Rev. Wright's church for 20 years!" Please; he may indeed have attended a "Christian" church, but that angry body of "believers", with its manic, hate-filled, racist preacher, knows Jesus about as well as I know quantum physics.

Obama was also presented with a Koran, which I'm sure he accepted with proper reverence and awe. I ask: is it right that criticism of Obama is so often derided, simply, as "hate speech"? However, I suppose, from a certain perspective, that term could be accurate. I "hate" that there's this guy who's assumed the office of President; he repeatedly assures me that he's eligible for the job, yet steadfastly refuses to produce even the simplest of documents, to prove it. He's gone to extraordinary lengths, spent extraordinary sums, to avoid having to do so. I "hate" that, in under a year, his "transparent" administration has proven itself among the most corrupt, disingenuous, Constitution-bashing in history; the self-serving cronies selected for offices of power often pursue radical, even nutty, ideals and agendas, endangering the freedoms we enjoy.

You know, frantic angry liberals spent 8 years, accusing Bush of everything but being Jack the Ripper. Yet, here's Obama, a man who is clearly--obviously--gaming the system, and the liberals don't care. Obama--unconstitutionally--annexes banks, private industries, etc., and they don't care. His 30-odd "czars" are utterly disallowed by the Constitution, and they don't care. Since 2001, they've yelled "Bush mismanaged the war!" General McChrystal, commander in [Afghanistan](#), hadn't heard from Obama in 70 days. How's that for a strong Commander-in Chief? The liberals don't care. The war, our economy, [Iran's](#) missiles, even Obama's floundering health care bills, seem less important than bringing the Olympics to Chicago. The liberals don't care. I "hate" that no one in authority seems concerned about any of this.

And now, as with any setback, they're blaming Bush for the Dear Leader's failure to con the Olympic Committee. Seems the stench created by the Bush Administration lingers still, generating continuing hatred for America. Obama apparently thought he'd go over there, smile, wave a little bit, and come home with a contract Chicago couldn't afford to fulfill, anyway. Well, he was

wrong.

If only Obama had had time to make them love us again. Will this guy ever be blamed for anything? Or even take responsibility for his own shortcomings and failures? Does he even know he has any of these? Did you know he even used a teleprompter in Copenhagen? Admittedly now, Bush tap-danced around the Constitution--mostly in the name of national defense, as many Presidents have. What's Obama's excuse, for disregarding it entirely? Where's their outrage, now? The hypocrisy is palpable.

You know, I find it irritating how Democrats regularly get away with their sleaziness and disregard for decorum; Republicans, however, are castigated for every remotely questionable act. To the liberal mass-media, this is "fairness", and "objectivity", and when we complain about it, we're being disingenuous, and/or just whining, because as we all know there is NO media preference. However, if this depthless wellspring of blatantly negligent--even malfeasant--media favoritism were reversed, they'd tire of it, too. Rapidly. In a 2008 letter to the editor, I predicted that if Obama were elected, criticism of him and/or his policies would be repressed; his critics would be smeared, labeled as racist. My friends, welcome to the Future. Thanks to New York Times columnist Maureen Dowd, anyone disagreeing with The One can now be simply dismissed as racist, their opinions therefore contemptible.

Dowd wrote that when Senator Joe Wilson shouted "you lie!" upon hearing--during Obama's deception-laced health care speech--that illegals wouldn't be covered, the "unspoken" word (she) heard was "boy". In other words, Dowd--with typical elitist liberal lack of scruples--twisted Wilson's astute observation into a racist statement; "you lie, boy!" Other media liberals and politicians quickly piled on; even Jimmy Carter---who, I might point out, ran for Georgia governor on a racist, segregationist platform---chimed in. They all know these charges of racism are ridiculously false; but, it's fine. But after all, they're fibbing for the Little Guy! Right?

One thing I find a little scary is how easily, how willingly, these people were misled. How easily they were convinced that Wilson actually did, in fact, say this racist thing. I was on [Bill Maher's](#) Facebook page; I often go there to stir up the liberals. Maher's status said that Wilson had "raised two million dollars. That's a lot of cheese for a cracker." The libs were mindlessly eating it up, many commenting scathingly on Wilson's shameful "racism", others simply agreeing with and "atta-boying" Maher. I was the only one I saw who mentioned the fact that it was all just a fallacy; a misleading idea based on the erroneous, apocryphal musings of a newspaper columnist. I was all but simply dismissed.

I mean, Wilson, obviously, said no such thing; however, that's clearly irrelevant to the liberal/Democrat Mass-Media Propaganda Ministry and their masses of deliberately obtuse zombies. Speaking of obtuse zombies, one guy was still railing against Bush not closing the borders, because of his "buddies in big business" who like the "cheap labor". Now, I might not be the brightest bulb in the chandelier, but even I couldn't resist that opening. I heartily agreed that indeed, that was probably the reason (I mean, let's face it...), but asked when Obama had taken care of closing the borders. I said that I must've somehow missed him rushing to do so. Anyone else catch it? In the liberal-leaning world, Joe Wilson is now cast as a Grand Dragon of the Ku Klux Klan, and those supporting him are hiding white robes and hoods, and probably have a gasoline-soaked cross in the garage, all ready to go. Now understand --- the Democrats frequently jeered Bush during similar speeches. The Dems however, were hailed in the Press for "speaking truth to Power".

This is a liberal Democrat administration and we all know how very open they are. So permissive and tolerant. Therefore, non-cooperation is an unpardonable sin. So again we see, facts are often utterly meaningless to liberals; especially when there are lippy Republicans to ruthlessly silence and destroy. These things only reinforce the contention that the media is indeed terribly biased. Unfortunately, there are too many deliberately self-deluding people out there; those misguidedly believing that Barry Obama, Kenyan-nurtured Communist, and his fellow-travelers in the Congress and Senate, honestly care anything about "We, the People", or truly have our nation's best interests at heart. Wake up, America; there are weasels in the henhouse. Obama told David Letterman that there's been "too little government...(and)...regulation". Yes; big, overarching government always knows best! Just ask the former Soviet Union and former Nazi Germany.

Obama and his radical, left-wing cronies detest everything America has traditionally embodied since 1776. They advocate policies which would vastly increase governmental influence, further intrude upon personal freedoms, and totally bankrupt the nation. They work to undermine and destroy the Founding Father's system, and our standing in the world. Obama sides with our enemies. He travels the world, apologizing for our existence. By abandoning the "missile shield", he's also abandoned our allies Poland and [Czechoslovakia](#), to whatever fate Iran's Ahmedinejad and [Vladimir Putin](#), Russia's ex-KGB Godfather have for them. Obama seems okay with nuke-building Iran-- in spite of Iran repeatedly promising to obliterate Israel. Although, Obama did recently put

Iran "on notice". I'm sure they're quaking with fear. Obama's buddy, Venezuela's Commie boss Hugo Chavez is--with Russia's assistance--building a nuclear plant "for peaceful purposes of energy production". Isn't that why Iran wanted one, too? Iran and Venezuela; two countries ruled by ambitious tyrants. Both, sitting on oceans of oil, and they need nuclear power?

We've elected the enemy. Up-'n'-at'em Americait's getting late!

~~~~~  
 CONSTITUTIONAL IMPLICATIONS OF REMOVING A CROSS by Robert Williams

Article I Section 1 of the Constitution says, "All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives."

For the First Amendment, I have put in parentheses the dictionary equivalents of "respecting" and "establishment" in order to clarify meaning. Clarified by the dictionary, the First Amendment says, "Congress shall make no law respecting (with regard to, concerning) an establishment (founding, or formation of, or an existing organization, or a public institution) of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof..." This is commonly referred to as the "establishment clause"

To me, these two parts of the Constitution are clear as crystal, and they make no mention of "separation of Church and State", --- which expression was first used by Jefferson in personal correspondence, not in legislation of any sort. Neither does the Constitution mention the prohibition of religious symbols or writings on government property. What it does prohibit is any sort of injunctions against the free exercise of religion. In my opinion "free exercise" includes public places and all federal lands and parks because such places belong to the people and are maintained by taxes. These places are NOT the personal property of judges or congressmen or organizations such as the ACLU.

Over 80 percent of Americans are Christian. The right to use a cross as a headstone in a national cemetery, preach in a public park, have a nativity scene on the Capitol steps, say "merry Xmas", have the word "God" on money, etc. should be defended both as the majority will and because contrary to the ACLU, the First Amendment clearly says that congress cannot prohibit the free exercise of religion --- and the establishment clause separates Church and State in only a single way, by prohibiting congress from creating a state religion. In my view, allowing religious symbols in government and public places IS NOT CREATING A RELIGION, IT IS MERELY PROMOTING THE "FREE EXERCISE THEREOF".

If Muslims are allowed to have prayers in public places as they were on 9-25-09 then how can American Christians be prohibited from expressing their religion with symbols and prayers in public places?

The cross is a Christian symbol. It should be respected as the symbol of choice for over 80 percent of the nation and since the majority is supposed to rule, the very small minorities that may be offended by this symbol are free not to look at it, --- BUT THESE MINORITIES SHOULD NOT BE ALLOWED TO DEMAND ITS REMOVAL AGAINST MAJORITY WILL. Therefor I believe suing to remove crosses from such places as national graveyards, or the Ten Commandments from a courthouse lobby, is contrary to the Constitution and should be disallowed because there is no Constitutional basis to support such a suit. In fact, Article I of the Constitution clearly states that judges and organizations such as the ACLU cannot make laws. Only congress can make laws --- and only if those laws are Constitutional, or if a Constitutional Amendment is first ratified to suit the desired law.

For an organization such as the ACLU to pretend there is Constitutional law behind their efforts to remove religious symbols from public places, they have to give the First Amendment a meaning that to me is not there. They have to pretend by some contortion of plain words that the First Amendment "implies" the separation of church and state in such a manner as to prohibit religious symbols or writings or prayers in public. That is a pretty far stretch. But of course lawyers are good at stretching the truth beyond all recognition and the Supreme Court could rule against my views as it did when it contorted burning the flag into free speech instead of an act. I have often wondered if the Supreme Court would consider urinating in public as "free speech".

On October 7th. 2009 the Supreme Court is scheduled to hear the case of Salazar v. Buono. The plaintiff Buono, a former National Park Service employee contends a cross should not be on government land. Salazar disagrees and defends the right to have a cross on government land. Below is a brief summary of what has transpired to date.

1934- In memorial to fallen troops, World War One veterans erect a cross on Sunrise Rock in the CA Mojave desert.

1999 (65 years later ) - National Park Service (NPS) indicates it intends to remove the cross.

2001- Congress prohibits NPS from using federal funds to remove the cross and with the aid of the ACLU Buono files suit to have

the cross removed.

2002-Congress tries to swap the cross and its surrounding one acre for 5 acres of private land to be donated by the cross caretakers, Mr. and Mrs. Henry Sandoz. Congress authorizes this transfer as well as a subsequent transfer from Mr. Sandoz to the Veterans of Foreign Wars (VFW).

2004- The Ninth Circuit court of Appeals rules that congress cannot cure an establishment clause violation by transferring land in part because the U.S. District Court for central CA had already ruled the cross unconstitutional and ordered its removal. The case ends up on the the Supreme Court docket. NOTE: I think it's incredible that any court would find having a cross erected not by the government but by private people on the people's land is a "violation of the establishment clause" instead of the "free exercise" of religion and of respect. By what twisted thinking and lawyers' tricks could they arrive at that conclusion? Certainly not by my own kind of plain-spoken reading of the Constitution!

It is important to realize this is a landmark Supreme Court case. Many other similar cases and the very destiny of how our nation views these matters is at stake. Will the over 80 percent majority of Christians and sympathetic secular organizations prevail as they should by the majority rule principle and by the proper reading of the Constitution pointed out above? The American Legion and the VFW and other patriotic and religious organizations support the preservation of the memorial and its cross.

It is not my place to urge the reader in any direction, but if you also support the preservation of this cross honoring the fallen of WWI, and do not wish to see the probable fallout of removing crosses from all military graves on the people's lands, then I hope you will write letters to the Supreme Court Justices and to your representatives in congress.

The Justices do not have e-mail addresses, but you can write to them at:

Justice (or Chief Justice) (Justice's Full Name)  
Supreme Court of the United States  
One First Street N.E.  
Washington, DC 20543

John G. Roberts - Chief Justice  
John Paul Stevens --- Samuel A. Alito, Jr. --- Antonin Scalia --- Anthony Kennedy  
Clarence Thomas --- Ruth Bader Ginsburg --- Stephen Breyer --- Sonia Sotomayor  
~~~~~

REAL-WORLD CHANGE an opinion by Robert Williams

During the 2008 political campaign the keyword was "change" but specifics were carefully left out. Only in general was it indicated that the "mistake" of war in Iraq would be unilaterally shut down and our leaders would be talking to enemies without preconditions. Other generalities included more "leveling of income" and less rewards for entrepreneurs. We were told we would all be expected to "share the pain" but left without much hint as to what pain. Except to blame the previous administration for every perceived or real ill in the past and future, not much was said about the changes that had already taken place nor the part the majority in congress had played in these changes.

Now that we know more specifics about the intents and priorities and strategies of the current congress and administration, I believe it is time to fill in some of what they still don't seem to recognize. I'm talking about some "inconvenient truths" such as the truth about the "surge", a real-world change that brought success in Iraq prior to the current administration. I'm talking about the critical role of Pakistan hindering our efforts in Afghanistan. Little has been admitted concerning the causes of continuing terror and the really big cultural changes that all administrations and congresses have failed to recognize or deal with. Changes that have profound impact on our American way of life, our expectations, our hopes, dreams, and the future prospects for our children and grand children.

DYNAMICS OF POPULATION GROWTH

Our Planet Earth is not flat and infinite but rather round and limited to a fixed diameter. Space exploration has proven that we cannot depend on moving elsewhere. Our planet cannot pack every square mile of ocean and land with elbow-to-elbow human population. A certain amount of space is absolutely required for creating food and fresh water and fresh air; three basics our bodies cannot do without. There have already been undeniable adverse consequences of overpopulation. The good news is that most Western countries are now either maintaining a zero population growth or somewhat below. Muslim populations however, continue to exceed zero population growth by quite a margin. The bad news is that in the Muslim world the extremists are still in charge, which bodes ill if Muslims become the largest segment of world population. More and more European countries are

importing Muslims and letting them expand without assimilating their host's culture of non-aggressive ideals. A demographic bomb with an uncertain fuse.

We the people must insist this does not happen to our country and we must encourage Europeans to rethink their dangerously failed policies.

EVOLUTION OF BUSINESS MODELS

The public has always wanted the highest quality at the lowest price. In a free enterprise system it is competition to produce quality at a low price that sharpens ingenuity and promotes a better standard of living for all. That much hasn't changed. What has changed radically is the manner of production and distribution. Where once a company produced most or all of the components involved in a product such as a computer, industry has swung ever more towards outsourcing. A company such as Hewlett Packard may put their brand name on a system and own a few general patents but a major portion of the parts such as hard drives, monitor screens, keyboards, modems, etc. are provided by other companies. Due to the universal availability and speed of the modern Internet some companies have even outsourced their call centers to places such as Bangladesh or India. Why has this "fracturing" happened? Because it turned out to be the cheapest way to produce acceptable consumer goods at competitive prices once Asia recovered from WWII and took advantage of their own cheaper labor.

In this kind of business world it is pretty difficult for American companies to survive tariff wars with other countries. There is too much inter-dependency. In fact, even smaller companies have become fractured and outsource some of their own production components to others. And, as mentioned before an increasing amount of component outsourcing if not the entire product is now going to China. Welcome to the "new order".

THE CONUNDRUM OF BEING TIED TO CHINA'S APRON STRINGS

When more realistic leaders of China took over from the ideological fanatics they saved China from ruin and set it on a path to world recognition via economic power. The fanatics had moved millions of people from the cities to the farms. The more down-to-earth pragmatists reversed this movement and introduced modern entrepreneurial capitalism which achieved in a few decades what emperors and then communist fanatics had not achieved in centuries. But to keep their economy booming they are almost totally reliant on manufacturing and selling to the U.S. and the rest of the world. China has a gigantic population. Keeping so many of them manufacturing requires enormous resources ---- oil being the main one. This will significantly affect the global resource markets and in turn our own economy.

Starting with the Volkswagon, we have already lost a large portion of our auto industry to foreign companies. Now China has announced a reasonably-priced plug-in hybrid sedan. This could further erode the American car industry because our unions still cannot withstand the pressure of low Chinese wages. If we impose tariffs on Chinese cars it will only hurt us more in the end because we no longer have the robust self-sufficiency we were once famous for.

While China favors manufacturing, Americans favor high union wages and low product prices. To maintain its new-found economic ascendancy, China has to keep selling to us or they will suffer a significant loss of living standard and thus confidence in their leadership. In turn, we have to keep buying from them at low prices to keep our own standard of living what we want it to be. Now add to that the burgeoning American National debt owed to China, and you get another destabilizing economic bomb with an uncertain fuse. The chances of reducing this dangerous American National debt do not look good with the unrestrained borrowing and spending that has become so popular of late with American governments.

We the people must consistently insist that our Congress curb its out-of-control spending and steadily pay down the National debt. Is it so tough to stop giving free services of all kinds to illegal immigrants? Is it so tough to give welfare aid only to those who truly can't make it on their own? (I'm talking basic life sustenance here, not cell phones and high definition TVs). Is it so tough to let union-dominated car industries go bankrupt so the overly greedy unions and vastly over-compensated CEOs begin to realize what life is all about? Is it so tough to use some down-home common sense instead of bloated personal ambition and the wallowing in perks and luxuries of our self-indulgent congressmen and senators? Is it too much to expect some real leadership from officials who could set an example of frugality themselves so that the country would be more willing to follow? Is it really so tough to sincerely pare government waste? Well, I'm sure you can think of many more examples.

THE IMPACT OF TERRORISM RE-VISITED

Some time during the 15th and 16th centuries Judaism and Christianity adjusted to the rise of science and the individualism of personal free enterprise. Islam did not. As a result the Islamic empires that had flourished by brute force and slavery decayed into ignorance and poverty while the Judeo-Christian countries saw a great renaissance of art, engineering, human rights and the improvement of living standards.

Muslims remained bitter, but did little to improve their own condition until oil was discovered in the Middle East. The intolerant nature of 7th-century Islam itself and its general failure to reconcile with the modern world made it relatively easy for the power elite in that religion to emphasize orthodox Islam (often called "radical" Islam by the West) and take charge of an oil-financed resurgence of their ancient conquest-of-the-world-is-mandatory mind-set. There are some Muslims that have no heart for such battle and have privately managed to adjust their religious beliefs to accept modern ideas of non-aggression and democracy. In spite of much criticism about the war in Iraq, coalition forces seem to have finally achieved enough security that the Iraqi secular government now has a constitution worthy of the name and enough control for tamping down the activities of a remnant terrorist movement in order to give Iraqi Muslim "moderates" a chance.

Considering the odds, this is nothing short of a miraculous accomplishment. Yet there isn't even grudging recognition of this in the press, or the administration, or congress. Incredibly, there is instead a Homeland Security attitude that our veterans must be watched for potentially becoming "domestic terrorists". Among the written criteria for suspicion are such characteristics as disagreement with the government or supporting the rights of citizens to bear arms. Our veterans are to be suspect for supporting the very constitutional rights they risked their lives to protect? What kind of utter insanity have our so-called "leaders" come to? Is this the kind of "change" our voters really expected and wanted?

Because of Pakistani dichotomy of both aiding and fighting terrorism, the situation in Afghanistan has worsened. But the West still has a chance there if determined enough. We can all hope that a similar determination will eventually let reform from within succeed in Iran. But in order to win we must learn from our lessons so far. 9/11 taught us that a small number of people can kill a large number of people very suddenly even without vast uniformed armies and sophisticated weapons. The roadside bombs and the suicide bomber showed us that dedicated fanatics who blend into the neighborhood can do a great deal of damage with simple devices. Even the best intelligence will not prevent every attack. Because the terrorists are indistinguishable from non-combatants and often live in their homes, the task of ferreting them out for targeting with modern weapons is very difficult without causing unwanted casualties of women and children.

Too much "collateral damage" is unacceptable to the politicians and much of the populations of the West. We have to wait for the populations of infected countries to get fed up with the indiscriminate brutality of the extremists and rat on them. We are not used to such patience and endurance. For the West to field enough soldiers, make every soldier a diplomat and a humanitarian community leader, and endure all this for decades at great expense and mounting loss of life is also more or less unacceptable to Western politicians and many Western citizens.

Nevertheless there is only one way our military can lose, and that is lack of wise leadership and enduring home support. We citizens and veterans must see to it such lack does not happen. We the people must hold a reluctant congress and administration accountable by constantly holding their feet to the fire and we must take every opportunity to show our military how much we appreciate their efforts and sacrifices on our behalf.

~~~~~

POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE a report and comment by Robert Williams

The following are some cogent excerpts from an article "Is America a city on a hill or a country in decline?" by Jean Kaufman, a writer with degrees in law and family therapy, who blogs at neo-neocon. I make a personal comment at the bottom of the excerpts. The full 10/07/09 article is well worth reading at: <http://www.weeklystandard.com/Content/Public/Articles/000/000/017/049ykkgx.asp>

SELECTED QUOTES FROM KAUFMAN'S ARTICLE

1974, Ronald Reagan: "Somehow America has bred a kindliness into our people unmatched anywhere...We are not a sick society. A sick society could not produce the men that set foot on the moon..."

2001, Obama radio interview: "The original Constitution ... is an imperfect document, and I think it is a document that reflects some deep flaws in American culture, the Colonial culture nascent at that time. ... I think we can say that the Constitution reflected an enormous blind spot in this culture that carries on until this day, and that the Framers had that same blind spot. I don't think the two views are contradictory, to say that it was a remarkable political document that paved the way for where we are now, and to say that it also reflected the fundamental flaw of this country that continues to this day."

" ..... (Reagans) speeches expressed with deep conviction his love for this country, his belief in its special destiny, and his respect for its position as world leader for good rather than ill ...."

" .... (Obama ) inspires a very different group of people with a very different vision of America."

".....(Obama) sees it as a nation conceived in original sin, one that has gone on to commit offenses against the world for which it must now atone. And Obama views himself as the special instrument through which America can finally purify herself, join the world of other nations as an equal rather than a leader, and go forth and sin no more.

".....You might say that Reagan believed in American exceptionalism, whereas Obama believes in Obama's exceptionalism".

".....He promised change, yes; but the very first change would be the fact that he--Barack Obama, an African-American man--had been elected president. If slavery was, and in some sense (according to Obama) still is, America's original sin, and if the Civil War wasn't enough to undo that fundamental flaw, then Obama's election would be a sign that America had finally taken a decisive step to purge itself of that sin".

"..... The second step would be confession. And there were many other sins as well for which America must begin to atone. That is why Obama proceeded to go on a worldwide tour early in his presidency, apologizing to nation after nation for America's manifold sins of hubris and exceptionalism, militarism and imperialism, greed and excess. These were the many ways in which Obama and his fellow leftists have reframed American exceptionalism as American tyranny.

".... The redistribution of income is only fair and moral, since taxing the rich will punish them for their greed; and cap and trade will be the penalty for having used more than our fair share of resources. Foreign policy is a major mechanism by which this country will be made level with other countries--just one nation among the rest, stripped of much of its power and its weaponry.

".....Seen in this light, Michelle Obama's most well-known utterances during the campaign--about how Americans are 'just downright mean,' that Obama's nomination marked the first time in her adult life that she's been really proud of her country, and that her husband has come to help Americans heal their broken souls--fit perfectly into this picture. She--and her husband--see Americans in precisely the terms Reagan explicitly rejected: mean rather than kindly, denizens of a sick society in need of spiritual and moral healing, with the Obamas showing the way to redemption".

"..... Obama is not merely observing a downward trend and trying to shepherd this nation through the process. He believes such a downward direction is the morally proper one for America and Americans, the only way we can be forgiven our manifold sins and emerge purified through humility and sacrifice".

"..... Obama also believes that he is the special instrument by which the nation can accomplish this transformation. That, more than any specific policy on any specific issue, is the goal of Obama's presidency: the shriving and humbling of America. That is what Obama means by "fundamental change."

## MY PERSONAL COMMENTS

To say that I agree with Jean Kaufman's analysis and disagree vehemently with Obama's outlook is an understatement. I have always fully agreed that some American colonists who espoused Christianity yet imitated the slavery of Africans by Arabs was hypocrisy. Part of what makes us a great nation is that we corrected that in a civil war and went on to eradicate most of the lingering prejudice after that war. Some humans will always have prejudices, but it is clear that a very large majority of white Americans are no longer race prejudiced. By contrast, large population majorities of Islamic countries remain viciously prejudiced against non-Muslims.

As far as kindness and generosity goes we liberated Europe from tyranny twice and have helped smaller countries gain freedom as well. We have always been generous in times of natural disasters wherever they occur. Making a profit on goods people want is not greed. All my working life I have been involved at various levels of corporate America. Only rarely did I encounter real greed or crookedness.

By contrast, during my 16 years in the Orient I found fraud, corruption, and greed the norm rather than the exception. I also found that large numbers of American missionaries funded by the American private sector dedicated their lives to alleviating poverty, disease, and built-in prejudices of disadvantaged Asians. Though smaller in number, I found American business men for the most part conducting themselves not as "exploiters" of native populations but as buyers of native goods and providers of local jobs as well as American products. How do I know this? It is a matter of record that I am the son of two American Methodist missionaries who gave 45 years of service to Korea, Japan, and India. I grew up knowing native languages and so was able to converse with them in their own terms.

AMERICA IS STILL THE BEST HOPE FOR THE WORLD. LET'S KEEP IT THAT WAY !

~~~~~

BITS OF HUMOR caught by Robert Denham



For another snicker, try:

http://www.cracked.com/article/116_5-facts-about-woodstock-hippies-dont-want-you-to-know/