

## Obama Myths and Talking Points

### Part II: “Republican candidates are Trying to ‘out rightwing’ (whatever that means) each other”:

I have serious doubts that Obama pawn and Democratic Chair Debbie Wasserman Schultz even knows where the term “right wing” comes from (answer: from the seating arrangements in parliament during the French revolution) or what it actually means (answer: the political philosophy that privileges social order in civilization with roots in tradition).

Clearly, by the way that she and the rest of the obamanites use the term, they either have no clue or (more likely) use it incorrectly in yet another effort to confuse people and advance their ideological ad hominem attacks.

So if you are one of the few people that still believe in Obama that remain out there, what is the flagrant action to take according to their M.O. book? Up the ante and beef-up the term of course!

Have their Chair come up with a made-up word like “*out-rightwing*” and try to push it into the airwaves hoping it will stick and will become the new talking point or the new Republican label.

In any case and to their dismay, what this individual and her minions are actually and inadvertently saying is that the Republican candidates are battling to see who is more Conservative. Indeed, they are. As they should.

And although being Conservative is something worse than a mortal sin in an *Obama alternative universe*, the fact of the matter is that Conservatism is a virtue, a philosophy that as the origin of the term “right wing” indicates, means nothing more than the pursuit of social order and prosperity with roots in proven and tested traditions like individual growth, freedom, and a non-intrusive government.

It should come as no surprise then than the Democratic Chair’s biggest frustration is that this utterly obtuse and made-up verb (“out rightwing”) actually failed to gain any traction. Maybe because most obamanites did not understand this dense term to begin with; or maybe because it just makes absolutely no sense.

Predictably however, the fact that she did not get anywhere with her talking point did not deter Wasserman Schultz from babbling it over, and over, and over again in every single forum that gave her a forum. The night of the Iowa straw poll, I must have heard her speak this nonsense no less than 10 times. Always falling flat.

The paradox was that unbeknownst to her, she actually had a point: Republican candidates were indeed trying to show in the Iowa debate who had the better Conservative credentials.

The difference between reality and her intentions, however, is that Conservative ideals just so happen to be particularly important and beneficial in times like these where oBLAMEconomics have us on the brink of a double-dip recession.

Yes, Republican candidates were battling to assert themselves as true Conservatives. This is the reason why they spoke about being for a small, limited, but efficient government; being for limited and smart public spending, for reducing our exploding national debt; for decreasing the ballooning public deficit; and for balancing the currently obese budgets that the Obama administration presents every year.

Democrats did not take long to start screaming things like: How radical! How extreme! No. rather, how out-of-touch them Democrats are and how little do they know about the economy and about the policies and actions that will promote job creation and return our nation to a state of fiscal prudence and responsibility.

And sure, the Republican candidates also spoke about being in favor of moral and family values; about the pride of being an American and believing in the exceptionalism of this nation of ours; they affirmed their belief in Rule of Law and in the Constitution of the United States and its role as the Law of the Land.

In these terms, the Republican candidates did battle among themselves to try and demonstrate who is the most Conservative; who reflects better those same values that President Reagan showcased during one of the periods of highest American pride, prosperity, and success.

Yes, they all wanted to show a clear contrast between Conservative Republicans and Liberal Democrats who would rather see the government spending away our destiny, who would rather see our debt reaching unmanageable levels, or our nation turn into a “nanny state” with freebies for all. What a contrast between responsible Republican Conservatives and Democrat Liberals who would like nothing better than to see a new generation of Americans dependent on their government and allowing it to take over their freedom, all in exchange for releasing these same people from any kind of personal responsibility.

Looking at this contrast, any sensible person would choose Republican Conservatism (or as Wasserman Schultz would put it: “rightwingism”) over a protectionist Democratic Liberalism any day.

To be sure, the Obama playbook will continue to ignore these truths, will keep pushing for the distortion of the facts and the manipulation of public opinion, and the Orwellian Obamaspeak (eerily similar to 1984’s doublespeak) will continue.

Liberal Democrats will continue to paint conservatism as the root of all evil, as extremism, and will even continue to push the boundaries of decency (and actually break them) by labeling Conservatives as “terrorists”. We should not be surprised. At this point we should be used to these strategies and immune to their slander.

## **Some Background:**

Obama we already know, can and does run some of the dirtiest campaigns ever seen in politics. To his credit, he masters these tactics like few others and he appears to succeed in making millions of people believe that he is actually playing fair when in fact he is doing the complete opposite behind the screen and under the table.

Just three short years ago we saw him obliterate even the most respected of his Democratic contenders in the primaries, we saw him use dirty tactics and attacks often times executed by others, by his team of minions, but always under his careful watch and command.

We saw him later during the campaign for the general election making the character assassination of his opponents his main strategy. We were witnesses of Obama using all types of tools to do the highest possible damage to any opponent that dared to challenge his “right to become The One”; from spending more than \$600 million on everything from Greek column stages, to mock presidential lecterns, to putting together entire armies of loyalists who operated under the lure of a couple of slogans. We saw him using (and abusing) the slobbering media to spread lies and misinformation and to distort facts and manipulate public opinion.

This time will be no different. In fact, it will be worse.

Why? Because Obama has absolutely no record (unless you count a dismal one) to run on.

We already learned about that leak reported by Politico where his team envisions a strategy of personal attacks (“killing Romney”) and promotion of hate and further national divisionism.

Obama, the person that will say and do anything to get reelected (except do the job he was elected to do as president) will once again hit the pavement with “pretty sounding speeches”, will play the victim, will blame everything and everybody for his failures, and will assemble a team of drones to attack from behind (and below the belt) while he pretends to remain above the fray.

Yes, he still counts on that 39% of people that still believe what he says and still think that he is the second coming of their Lord and Savior. He still trusts that the media will continue to amplify his message, minimize (or outright hide and ignore) his mistakes and failures, and to play along by becoming echo chambers of his demagoguery as well as faithful spreaders of Thy Word.

He will be labeled again as “The One”, and will continue to find zombie followers that will laugh at his insults disguised as puns; he will be the same flashy yet empty suit that we saw in 2008 sail through the elections with droves of Kool-Aid drinkers behind him.

And he will continue to use the “lie and distort” strategy that he so skillfully plays with his collection of talking points and wisecracks.

What he is not counting on, and here is where YOU play a key role, is that now, this time around, us Conservatives actually DO have his own dismal record to show, to offer as evidence, to expose his ineptitude, and to counteract his showmanship and passive aggressiveness.

He is not counting on us Conservatives deciphering his talking points and exposing them for the fraud he is. So lets just get out and do our part and instead of “spreading the wealth around” lets spread the truth around. Shall we?