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 proved 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 unbeknown 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 oBLAMEonomics 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: “righwingism”) 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.