

# Eye on the World

## Feb. 4, 2012

This collection of news items is from the "Eye on the World" section of the Church of God Big Sandy's Web site, churchofgodbigandy.com. It was posted for the weekend of Feb. 4, 2012.

**Compiled by Dave Havir**

**Luke 21:34-36**—"But take heed to yourselves, lest your hearts be weighed down with carousing, drunkenness, and cares of this life, and that day come on you unexpectedly. For it will come as a snare on all those who dwell on the face of the whole earth. Watch therefore, and pray always that you may be counted worthy to escape all these things that will come to pass, and to stand before the Son of Man."



A Reuters article titled "Analysis: Iran Has Options Apart From Hormuz Block" was posted at jpost.com on Jan. 25, 2012.

It said: "Under pressure over its nuclear ambitions, Iran might never act on its threat to close the Strait of Hormuz but could retain enough tricks in its playbook to keep its enemies, shippers, and global markets on edge . . .

"Few intelligence, military and security experts contacted by Reuters either in or outside government, however, believe that is genuinely likely. Instead, they say, Iran's leaders will be looking for ways to harass enemies and cause disruption while falling short of triggering a massive US-led retaliation.

"Possible Iranian gambits include harrying tanker traffic in the Gulf with fast attack boats, seizing uninhabited Gulf islands claimed by other states, grabbing hostages from passing civilian or military ships, stoking trouble in Sunni Muslim-ruled Arab states with restive Shi'ite Muslim communities and orchestrating attacks on US forces in Afghanistan or elsewhere using militant 'proxies' such as Hezbollah.

"The risk inherent in all this, however, is that someone on either side miscalculates and triggers a full-blown conflict."

The article quoted Nikolas Gvosdev (professor at the US Naval War College in Rhode Island) as saying: "These scenarios make sense as likely actions falling short of actively blocking the Strait—but they will certainly raise tensions. Iran's goal in raising tensions in the Gulf may be to get other countries to put

pressure on the United States to show restraint (and) as a way to create some breathing room for Tehran to maneuver.”

The article later said: “Iran’s Revolutionary Guard plans more military exercises for February, sending more swarms of gunboats into international waters and showing off its anti-ship missile arsenal.

“That in itself could close some areas of the Gulf to shipping, as well as rattling neighbors and shipping firms.

“Iran’s 2007 capture of 15 British naval personnel proved hugely embarrassing for London. Tehran may be looking for similar ways to succeed in humbling Western powers without inflicting physical harm.

“Already, US and allied naval officers say their vessels are often shadowed by Iranian gunboats, and some worry that if matters escalate further those confrontations could intensify.”

The article quoted a senior Western naval officer as saying: “I think it’s unlikely to escalate—Iran has too much to lose . . . and our forces are too professional to let any kind of a localized event blow up into a larger conflict.

“If there is an incident, we will quickly get our forces into our respective corner, establish a defensive posture—albeit ready to go on the offensive if directed . . . and wait to see what Iran’s next move on the chessboard will be.”



An article by Craig Whitlock titled “Navy Wants Commando ‘Mothership’ in Middle East” was posted at [washingtonpost.com](http://washingtonpost.com) on Jan. 27, 2012.

It said: “The Pentagon is rushing to send a large floating base for commando teams to the Middle East as tensions rise with Iran, al-Qaeda in Yemen and Somali pirates, among other threats.

“In response to requests from U.S. Central Command, which oversees military operations in the Middle East, the Navy is converting an aging warship it had planned to decommission into a makeshift staging base for the commandos. Unofficially dubbed a ‘mothership,’ the floating base could accommodate smaller high-speed boats and helicopters commonly used by Navy SEALs, procurement documents show.”

It later said: “Lt. Cmdr. Mike Kafka, a spokesman for the Navy’s Fleet Forces Command, declined to elaborate on the floating base’s purpose or to say where, exactly, it will be deployed in the Middle East. Other Navy officials acknowledged that they were moving with unusual haste to complete the conversion and send the mothership to the region by early summer.

“Navy documents indicate that it could be headed to the Persian Gulf, where Iran has threatened to block the Strait of Hormuz, a crucial shipping route for much of the world’s oil supply. A market survey proposal from the Military Sealift Command, dated Dec. 22 and posted online, states that the floating base needed to be delivered to the Persian Gulf.”

It later said: "With a large naval base in Bahrain, and one or two aircraft carrier groups usually assigned to the region, the Navy has a substantial presence in the Persian Gulf and surrounding waters. Adding the mothership would do relatively little to bolster U.S. maritime power overall, but it could play an instrumental role in secretive commando missions offshore.

"The deployment of the floating base could also mark a return to maritime missions for SEAL teams, which for the past decade have spent most of their time on land in Iraq and Afghanistan.

"Other details of the project became public Tuesday when the Military Sealift Command posted a bid request to retrofit the USS *Ponce*, an amphibious transport docking ship, on a rush-order basis . . .

"The documents posted by the Military Sealift Command in December, however, specify that the mothership will be rebuilt so that it can also serve as a docking station for several small high-speed boats and helicopters commonly used by Navy SEAL teams."



An article by Adrian Blomfield titled "Iran Moving Closer to Stage Where It Will Be Too Late to Destroy Nuclear Facilities, Israel Warns" was posted at telegraph.co.uk on Jan. 27, 2012.

It said: "Reviving Western concerns that his government is still contemplating unilateral military action against Iran, Ehud Barak gave one of the clearest signs yet that Israel's support for new US and EU sanctions remains strictly limited."

The article quoted Mr. Barak at the World Economic Forum in Davos as saying: "We are determined to prevent Iran from turning nuclear. And even the American president and opinion leaders have said that no option should be removed from the table. It seems to us to be urgent, because the Iranians are deliberately drifting into what we call an immunity zone where practically no surgical operation could block them."

The article later said: "Although Israeli intelligence and military officials have privately spoken of Iran's nuclear programme entering a 'framework of immunity,' it is the first time that a senior figure in Benjamin Netanyahu's government has done so in public.

"Israel's fears that it might soon be too late to launch military action were bolstered earlier this month when Iran announced that it had begun to enrich uranium at its Fordow plant, which is buried so deep within a mountain it may be impossible for Israeli warplanes or missiles to destroy.

"Mr Barak's ministry believes that once the bulk of uranium enrichment is carried out at Fordow, Iran will be in the immunity zone. Israel also reckons that Iran could be in a position to build a bomb within months, although US officials have been quoted as saying that Tehran will not be able to fit a nuclear warhead onto a missile for some years."



An Associated Press article by Nasser Karimi titled "Iran Says Oil Could Reach \$120 to \$150 Per Barrel" was posted at myway.com on Jan. 29, 2012.

It said: "The head of Iran's state oil company said Sunday that the price of crude will reach \$120 to \$150 per barrel, as officials in Tehran prepare to discuss a ban on crude sales to European Union countries in retaliation for an EU embargo.

"Head of the National Iranian Oil Company Ahmad Qalehbani also said that Tehran would expand its capacity to refine crude domestically, instead of selling it on international markets.

"The EU announced an embargo on Iranian oil last week to pressure Tehran on its controversial nuclear program.

"The embargo is set to go into effect in the summer, but Iran says that it may cut the flow of crude to Europe early.

"Iran says the EU accounts for only 18 percent of its output and that it can find new customers. It says the embargo will hurt the West more than Iran, in part by causing a spike in prices."

The article quoted Mr. Qalehbani as saying: "It seems we will witness prices from \$120 to \$150 in the future."

The article later said: "The price of benchmark U.S. crude on Friday [Jan. 27] was around \$99.56 per barrel . . .

"With some 3.5 million barrels of crude production, Iran is the second largest OPEC producer.

"Some 80 percent of the country's foreign revenue comes from exporting around 2.2 million barrels of oil per day."



An article by Abraham Rabinovich titled "High-Tech Israeli Drone Crashes on Test Flight" was posted at washingtontimes.com on Jan. 30, 2012.

It said: "A long-range Israeli drone capable of surveillance and bombing missions over Iran crashed Sunday near an Israeli air base during a test flight.

"The Heron TP unmanned aircraft can stay aloft for 40 hours and has a range of 4,600 miles, the Israeli air force said. The distance between Iran and Israel is about 1,000 miles."

It later said: "The Israeli military's most advanced drone has a wingspan of 85 feet, nearly that of a Boeing 737, and a payload capacity of 2,200 pounds. It was developed by Israel Aerospace Industries.

“Known as the Eitan in Israel, the drone has platforms for surveillance equipment and for firing rockets, and can be used in a variety of missions such as aerial refueling, jamming communications and relaying ground control in Israel to manned aircraft over a distant target.

“Israeli officials reportedly have been considering a military strike on Iran to prevent the Islamic republic from making an atomic weapon, and the Eitan, which soars as high as 40,000 feet, would likely play a key role in an attack.

“According to press accounts, the drone was used in a 2009 airstrike in Sudan against a Gaza-bound convoy carrying Iranian arms destined for the Hamas militant group.

“The drone also is used reconnaissance missions over Lebanon and along the Egyptian border and to protect against sabotage of Israel’s offshore natural gas installations.

“Gen. Nehushtan said 25 percent of the air force’s mission are carried out by drones.

“A squadron of Eitans was inaugurated in December 2010 and is scheduled to become operational in coming weeks.”



An article by Greg Miller titled “Iran, Perceiving Threat From West, Willing to Attack on U.S. Soil, U.S. Intelligence Report Finds” was posted at [washingtonpost.com](http://washingtonpost.com) on Jan. 31, 2012.

It said: “An assessment by U.S. spy agencies concludes that Iran is prepared to launch terrorist attacks inside the United States, highlighting new risks as the Obama administration escalates pressure on Tehran to halt its alleged pursuit of an atomic bomb.

“In congressional testimony Tuesday, U.S. intelligence officials indicated that Iran has crossed a threshold in its adversarial relationship with the United States. While Iran has long been linked to attacks on American targets overseas, U.S. officials said they see troubling significance in Tehran’s alleged role in a plot to assassinate the Saudi ambassador in Washington last year.

“U.S. officials said they have seen no intelligence to indicate that Iran is actively plotting attacks on U.S. soil.”

The article quoted James R. Clapper Jr. (director of National Intelligence) as saying: “[The thwarted plot] shows that some Iranian officials—probably including Supreme Leader Ali Khamenei—have changed their calculus and are now more willing to conduct an attack in the United States in response to real or perceived U.S. actions that threaten the regime.”

It later said: “The group’s affiliate in Yemen continues to be seen as the most likely source of plots targeting the United States. But the death of U.S.-born cleric Anwar al-Awlaki in a CIA drone strike in Yemen last year has at least

temporarily eroded the affiliate's ability to mount international attacks, officials said."



An Associated Press article titled "Iran Launches Spanish TV Channel" was posted at guardian.co.uk on Jan. 31, 2012.

It said: "Iran's president, Mahmoud Ahmadinejad, has officially launched a Spanish-language satellite TV channel, saying it would deal a blow to 'dominance seekers'—remarks that were an apparent dig at the US and the west.

"Iran's broadcasting company said Hispan TV, the first Spanish-language channel airing from the Middle East, will broadcast news, documentaries, movies and Iranian films 24 hours a day.

"The launch is Tehran's latest effort to reach out to friendly governments in Latin America and follows Ahmadinejad's tour of the region earlier in January, which included stops in Cuba and visits to Venezuela, Nicaragua and Ecuador."

It later said: "Iran's state TV said the channel, which had been on air on a trial basis since October with a 16-hour daily programme, will target millions of Spanish-speaking people throughout the world."

It later said: "Iran broadcasts daily in five other foreign languages, including in English through state-run Press TV and in Arabic via al-Alam TV."



An article by Barak Ravid titled "Mossad Chief Holds Secret U.S. meetings on Iran Nuclear Threat, Senate Panel Reveals" was posted at haaretz.com on Jan. 31, 2012.

It said: "Mossad chief Tamir Pardo held secret talks with top U.S. officials in recent days, cursory comments made during a public Senate hearing indicated on Tuesday . . .

"The clandestine Washington visit was exposed during a hearing of the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, which was participated by CIA Director David Petraeus, Director of National Intelligence James Clapper, and Dianne Feinstein, who chairs the Senate panel.

"During the meeting, Feinstein asked Clapper whether or not Israel intended to strike Iran's nuclear facilities, with the top U.S. intelligence official answering that he would rather discuss the issue behind closed doors.

"Feinstein then indicated that she had met Mossad chief Pardo earlier in the week in Washington, with Petraeus adding that he too met Pardo and cited what he called Israel's growing concern over Iran's nuclear ambitions.

"The CIA chief also said that it was important to note that Israel considered a nuclear Iran as an existential threat.

"The entire exchange was broadcasted live on American television."



An article by Barak Ravid titled "Israel Vice PM: Military Strike Can Hit All of Iran's Nuclear Facilities" was posted at [haaretz.com](http://haaretz.com) on Feb. 2, 2012.

It said: "All of Iran's nuclear faculties are vulnerable to a military strike, Vice Prime Minister and Strategic Affairs Minister Moshe Ya'alon said on Thursday, calling the potential of a nuclear Iran a 'nightmare to the free world.'

"At the closing day of the Herzliya Conference, Ya'alon referred to the many tools at the international community's disposal that could serve to slow down or stop Iran's advancement toward nuclear weapons capability: international pressure, economic sanctions, support of Iranian opposition, and military actions."

The article quoted Mr. Ya'alon as saying: "The West has the ability to strike, but as long as Iran isn't convinced that there's a determination to follow through with it, they'll continue with their manipulations.

"The Iranians believe that a determination isn't still there, both in regards to military action and in regards to sanctions. Any facility protected by humans can be infiltrated by humans. It's possible to strike all Iran's facilities, and I say that out of my experience as IDF chief of staff."

The article later said: "The vice PM's comments seem to counter reported remarks by U.S. defense officials quoted last week by *The Wall Street Journal*, according to which the Pentagon was not in possession of conventional arms strong enough to destroy all of Iran's nuclear facilities."

The article quoted Mr. Ya'alon as saying: "The Iranian threat is not a case of Iran vs. Israel. Israel has never declared war on Iran, but the Khomeinistic regime has declared total war on the States of Israel's very existence."

The article later said: "Ya'alon's comments came after, earlier Thursday, Military Intelligence Chief Major General Aviv Kochavi said that Iran's ability to obtain nuclear weapons was solely dependent on the will of Iranian Supreme Leader Ayatollah Ali Khamenei, adding that Israel was threatened by about 200,000 missiles at any given time."



An article titled "Critics of Capitalism Call Global Protest in June" was posted at [breitbart.com](http://breitbart.com) on Jan. 29, 2012.

It said: "Thousands of critics of capitalism meeting in Brazil called Sunday for a worldwide protest in June to press for concrete steps to tackle the global economic crisis.

"The World Social Forum wrapped up a five-day meeting in this southern Brazilian city, urging citizens to 'take to the streets on June 5' for the global action, which would be in support of social and environmental justice.

"The forum also announced a 'people's summit' of social movements to be held in parallel with the high-level UN conference on sustainable development scheduled next June 20-22 in Rio."



An article by Paul Wilson titled "Magazine Calls Occupiers to Come to Chicago in 'Tradition' of 1968 Rioters" was posted at [cnsnews.com](http://cnsnews.com) on Jan. 27, 2012.

It said: "*Adbusters*, the radical, Vancouver-based anti-consumerist magazine, credited by many media outlets for launching the Occupy Wall Street protests, has put out an ad calling for 50,000 protestors to 'Occupy' the G8 summit in May.

"The *Adbusters* ad shows a picture of policemen beating up a defenseless protestor, and comes with the caption: 'In the Tradition of the Chicago 8.'

"The Chicago 8 were radicals who incited riots in Chicago during the 1968 Democratic convention. The 1968 convention unrest became so legendary that the band Crosby, Stills, Nash (and Young) wrote a song about it called "Chicago." The 'tradition' of the Chicago 8 included calling for displays of public fornication and attacking police."

The article quoted an official statement of *Adbusters* as saying: "On May 1, 50,000 people from all over the world will flock to Chicago, set up tents, kitchens, peaceful barricades and #OCCUPYCHICAGO for a month. With a bit of luck, we'll pull off the biggest multinational occupation of a summit meeting the world has ever seen."

The article later said: "The ad threatens to shut down the economy if their demands are not met.

The article quoted the ad as saying: "And if they don't listen . . . if they ignore us and put our demands on the back burner like they've done so many times before . . . then, with Gandhian ferocity, we'll flashmob the streets, shut down stock exchanges, campuses, corporate headquarters and cities across the globe . . . we'll make the price of doing business as usual too much to bear."

The article later said: "So the same group that called for the Occupy Wall Street protests in the first place is now calling for protestors to shut down the entire economic system of a city if their demands are not met, in the tradition of people who brought us the 1968 Democratic convention riots."



An article by Janet Daley titled "Barack Obama Is Trying to Make the US a More Socialist State" was posted at [telegraph.co.uk](http://telegraph.co.uk) on Jan. 28, 2012. Following are excerpts of the article.

---

What was it everybody used to say about the United States? Look at what's happening over there and you will see our future. Whatever Americans are doing now, we will be catching up with them in another 10 years or so. In popular culture or political rhetoric, America led the fashion and we tagged along behind.

Well, so much for that. Barack Obama is now putting the United States squarely a decade behind Britain. Listening to the President's State of the Union message last week was like a surreal visit to our own recent past: there were, almost word for word, all those interminable Gordon Brown Budgets that preached "fairness" while listing endless new ways in which central government would intervene in every form of economic activity.

Later, in a television interview, Mr Obama described his programme of using higher taxes on the wealthy to bankroll new government spending as "a recipe for a fair, sound approach to deficit reduction and rebuilding this country." To which we who come from the future can only shout, "Noo-o, go back! Don't come down this road!"

As we try desperately to extricate ourselves from the consequences of that philosophy, which sounds so eminently reasonable ("giving everybody a fair share," the President called it), we could tell America a thing or two—if it would only listen.

Human beings are so much more complicated than this childlike conception of fairness assumes. When government takes away an ever larger proportion of the wealth which entrepreneurial activity creates and attempts to distribute it "fairly" (that is to say, evenly) throughout society in the form of welfare programmes and public spending projects, the effects are much, much more complex and perverse than a simple financial equation would suggest.

It is probably obvious that the people from whom the wealth is taken will become less willing to incur the risks that entrepreneurial investment involves—and so will produce less wealth, and thus less tax revenue. But more surprising, perhaps, are the damaging changes that take place in the beneficiaries of this "fairness" and the permanent effect this has on the balance of power between government and the people.

There is, it turns out, a huge difference between being provided with a livelihood and feeling that you have earned it. The assumption that all the wealth that individuals create belongs, by moral right, to the state, to spend on benefits or phoney job creation schemes (sorry, public infrastructure projects), is proving phenomenally difficult to expunge in Britain, so ineradicably has it embedded itself in the public consciousness.

In the US, it has had only odd historical moments of favour (Roosevelt's New Deal, Lyndon Johnson's "Great Society"), which have been beaten back consistently by the dynamism of a country that sees its existential purpose as being to foster and promote individual achievement and self-belief.

It is bizarre that Obama should be regarded (or should regard himself) as a kind of European who is trying to bring a sophisticated kind of socialism to American economic life, complete with government-run health care and “fair” (high) taxes on the wealthy.

If his European credentials were up to date, he would know that this was precisely the social model that is causing the EU to implode, and whose hopeless contradictions the best economic minds on the Continent are attempting, unsuccessfully, to resolve.

A vendetta against the “wealthy” is one of Obama’s favourite themes, and it strikes a peculiarly familiar note. Back here, Nick Clegg is arguing (rightly) that a tax cut for the lower paid should be accelerated on both moral and economic grounds—because people are struggling, and because allowing them to keep and spend more of their earnings would stimulate growth. But he wants to balance this with a wealth tax or some such penalty on “the rich.”

Both Obama and Clegg, by an extraordinary coincidence, used the same semantic trick to try to prove the injustice of their present tax systems. In his State of the Union address, the President slipped subliminally from the fact that his likely presidential opponent Mitt Romney paid tax at a lower rate (because his income came from profits and dividends which were taxed as capital gains) than his secretary (who would have paid income tax), to the claim that Mr Romney paid less tax than his secretary.

Mr Clegg made exactly the same charge against a putative hedge fund manager who “paid less tax” than his cleaner, neatly obscuring the fact that it was the rate of tax that was lower, not the amount which was paid. Needless to say, both Mr Romney and the imagined hedge-fund manager pay vastly more tax than their respective secretaries and cleaners. (The top 1 per cent of earners pay nearly a third of all federal taxes in the US.)

So what does this kind of verbal trick tell us about the honesty—or the desperation—of this argument? At the very least, it is crass populism designed to provoke a particularly counterproductive form of class resentment. What is needed here and in the US are tax cuts for the many, not the few, to adapt Mr Brown, and less demonising of the sorts of people who are able to invest and create the real wealth that will be our only chance for economic salvation.

Obama is clearly living the Left-liberal dream, which still survives in small pockets of American life. He wants to import the democratic socialism that Europe embraced after the war, which was, for European cultural reasons, imbued with aristocratic paternalism and Marxist notions of bourgeois guilt. But neither of these things are part of the American historical experience.

The Left-wing intellectuals, including Obama himself, who adopt this language are talking dangerously uninformed rubbish: if democratic socialism was ever a solution to Europe’s problems (and the present crisis is making that seem less and less likely), it is certainly not an answer to any question that Americans are likely to ask.

The United States is a country that was invented to allow people to be free of domination or persecution by the state. Its constitution and political institutions are specifically designed to prevent the federal government from oppressing the rights, or undermining the sense of responsibility, of the individual citizen.

If it ceases to stand by that principle, then it will suffer a catastrophic loss of purpose and identity—as well as making a quite remarkably stupid and unnecessary mistake.



An editorial by George Will titled “Obama to the Nation: Onward Civilian Soldiers” was posted at [jewishworldreview.com](http://jewishworldreview.com) on Jan. 28, 2012. Following is the article.

---

War, said James Madison, is “the true nurse of executive aggrandizement.” Randolph Bourne, the radical essayist killed by the influenza unleashed by World War I, warned, “War is the health of the state.” Hence Barack Obama’s State of the Union hymn: Onward civilian soldiers, marching as to war.

Obama, an unfettered executive wielding a swollen state, began and ended his address by celebrating the armed forces. They are not “consumed with personal ambition,” they “work together” and “focus on the mission at hand” and do not “obsess over their differences.” Americans should emulate troops “marching into battle,” who “rise or fall as one unit.”

Well. The armed services’ ethos, although noble, is not a template for civilian society, unless the aspiration is to extinguish politics. People marching in serried ranks, fused into a solid mass by the heat of martial ardor, proceeding in lock step, shoulder to shoulder, obedient to orders from a commanding officer—this is a recurring dream of progressives eager to dispense with tiresome persuasion and untidy dissension in a free, tumultuous society.

Progressive presidents use martial language as a way of encouraging Americans to confuse civilian politics with military exertions, thereby circumventing an impediment to progressive aspirations—the Constitution and the patience it demands. As a young professor, Woodrow Wilson had lamented that America’s political parties “are like armies without officers.”

The most theoretically inclined of progressive politicians, Wilson was the first president to criticize America’s founding. This he did thoroughly, rejecting the Madisonian system of checks and balances—the separation of powers, a crucial component of limited government—because it makes a government that cannot be wielded efficiently by a strong executive.

Franklin Roosevelt agreed. He complained about “the three-horse team of the American system”: “If one horse lies down in the traces or plunges off in another direction, the field will not be plowed.” And progressive plowing takes

precedence over constitutional equipoise among the three branches of government. Hence FDR's attempt to break the Supreme Court to his will by enlarging it.

In his first inaugural address, FDR demanded "broad executive power to wage a war against the emergency, as great as the power that would be given to me if we were in fact invaded by a foreign foe." He said Americans must "move as a trained and loyal army" with "a unity of duty hitherto evoked only in time of armed strife."

The next day, addressing the American Legion, Roosevelt said it was "a mistake to assume that the virtues of war differ essentially from the virtues of peace." In such a time, dissent is disloyalty.

Yearnings for a command society were common and respectable then.

- *Commonweal*, a magazine for liberal Catholics, said that Roosevelt should have "the powers of a virtual dictatorship to reorganize the government."

- Walter Lippmann, then America's preeminent columnist, said: "A mild species of dictatorship will help us over the roughest spots in the road ahead."

- *The New York Daily News*, then the nation's largest-circulation newspaper, cheerfully editorialized: "A lot of us have been asking for a dictator. Now we have one . . . It is Roosevelt . . . Dictatorship in crises was ancient Rome's best era."

- *The New York Herald Tribune* titled an editorial "For Dictatorship if Necessary."

Obama, aspiring to command civilian life, has said that in reforming health care, he would have preferred an "elegant, academically approved" plan without "legislative fingerprints on it" but "unfortunately" he had to conduct "negotiations with a lot of different people."

His campaign mantra "We can't wait!" expresses progressivism's impatience with our constitutional system of concurrent majorities.

To enact and execute federal laws under Madison's institutional architecture requires three, and sometimes more, such majorities. There must be majorities in the House and Senate, each body having distinctive constituencies and electoral rhythms. The law must be affirmed by the president, who has a distinctive electoral base and election schedule. Supermajorities in both houses of Congress are required to override presidential vetoes. And a Supreme Court majority is required to sustain laws against constitutional challenges.

"We can't wait!" exclaims Obama, who makes recess appointments when the Senate is not in recess, multiplies "czars" to further nullify the Senate's constitutional prerogative to advise and consent, and creates agencies (e.g., Obamacare's Independent Payment Advisory Board and Dodd-Frank's Consumer Financial Protection Bureau) untethered from legislative accountability.

Like other progressive presidents fond of military metaphors, he rejects the patience of politics required by the Constitution he has sworn to uphold.



An article by Dave Eberhart titled "Soros: Romney 'Not Much Difference' " was posted at [newsmax.com](http://newsmax.com) on Jan. 28, 2012.

It said: "Billionaire financier George Soros thinks that, if Mitt Romney wins the presidency, there will be 'little difference' between him and Barack Obama in the White House.

"Soros offered the reassuring news to liberals across Europe during an interview this week in Davos, Switzerland.

"As policymakers from Hong Kong to Canada pressed Greece and its creditors to strike a deal to cut the nation's debt, Soros pressed in on GOP presidential candidate Romney."

The article quoted Mr. Soros as saying: "Well, look, either you'll have an extremist conservative, be it Gingrich or Santorum, in which case I think it will make a big difference which of the two comes in.

"If it's between Obama and Romney, there isn't all that much difference except for the crowd that they bring with them. Romney would have to take Gingrich or Santorum as a vice president and you probably have some pretty extreme candidates for the Supreme Court.

"So it won't be that great a difference [if Romney becomes president]."



An article by Ebben Raves titled "The Mask Is Off" was posted at [american-thinker.com](http://american-thinker.com) on Jan.29, 2012. Following are excerpts of the article.

---

Last Thursday [Jan. 26] will be remembered as the day the Republican establishment unveiled its true face. We know they've just been inside the beltway too long. We expect their informed opinion to tilt in whatever direction keeps them on the cocktail circuit. That's why many of us don't pay a whole lot of attention to them.

But to bring out John McCain and Bob Dole to give us advice on picking presidential candidates and have who we thought were "our" pundits treat it as gospel? Next they will tell us ObamaCare is not so bad. Oh, wait, they're already priming that pump.

Let's face it, Reagan was an aberration. Before and since, can anyone truthfully say that the party has gone to the mat for conservative, Tea Party values? Or has it been just lip service?

Why is it always that when we seem to be inside the twenty [a football analogy] on an issue that matters, such as cutting the size of government and

holding it accountable, we can never score? Newt tried somewhat in the nineties, but was stabbed in the back by his own party.

What happened when the Republicans had both houses and the presidency? What happened to the House of Representatives the Tea Party put in office in 2010? Excuses. There always has been and there always will be excuses.

That brings us to this election cycle. Mitt Romney is the establishment's man. Never mind that Romney has never done anything conservative. Never mind that it is leaking out that he probably won't get rid of ObamaCare, the issue that gave Republicans the House in 2010.

Never mind that his biggest qualification is that he is a businessman. So is George Soros. Pretty much the same kind of business, too. Woe on to anyone who is a threat to the status quo that challenges him, though. They will be attacked with a fervor never unleashed on a Democratic opponent.

Now, why is that? As always, money and power. And, as Ayn Rand told us, the biggest pile of either resides in Washington, DC.

For the Republican and Democratic establishment and their lackeys, it has never been about principles or the middle class. It has always been about saying or doing whatever it takes to feed at the public trough.

Anyone who gets in their way or dares to shrink the trough will be destroyed. Those at the trough do share with each other, though. How often do you see anyone from either party suffer consequences from fleecing the taxpayer?



An article by Ann Coulter titled "Three Cheers for Romneycare" was posted at [anncoulter.com](http://anncoulter.com) on Feb. 1, 2012.

It said: "Because both Obamacare and Romneycare concern the same general topic—health care—and can be nicknamed (politician's name plus 'care'), Romney's health care bill is suddenly perceived as virtually the same thing as the widely detested Obamacare."



Two videos and an article by William A. Jacobson titled "The Only Thing Ann Coulter Loves More Than Chris Christie is Romneycare" was posted at [legalinsurrection.com](http://legalinsurrection.com) on Feb. 1, 2012.

It said: "The argument [Ann Coulter's 'Three Cheers for Romneycare'] really is a masterpiece of deflection, blaming everyone but the author (Romney) for the failure Romneycare has become, and running red herrings across the path . . .

"Mark Levin has a brilliant takedown of Coulter's arguments."

The article gave a video link to the Mark Levin radio show and another video link to comments that Ms. Coulter had previously made in criticizing Romneycare.



An editorial by C. Edmund Wright titled “Mitt’s Scorched Earth Win” was posted at americanthinker.com on Feb. 1, 2012. Following are excerpts from the article.

---

While Mitt Romney may have taken a step closer to the nomination Tuesday in Florida, the scorched earth he leaves behind tells me he took a few steps further away from the White House—and what’s more, he knows it.

No man who really thinks he has a chance at occupying the Oval Office would ever find it necessary to use 99 percent—yes, that’s right, 99 percent—of his own massive advertising budget to tear down his chief opponent.

I’m not talking about Super PAC ads and I’m not even factoring in the mega bucks’ worth of anti-Gingrich publicity provided by the establishment media. No, I am talking only about the rich Romney Campaign advertising budget for Florida. You know, the “I’m Mitt Romney and I approved this message” budget.

And you read the figures right. Ninety-nine pennies out of every ad dollar these folks spent was invested in the destruction of Newt Gingrich. With so little to brag about apparently, one penny per buck was used in a positive way. And, to add insult to injury, Romney and his campaign operatives found it necessary to go around claiming that they were merely responding to Gingrich’s efforts.

So, Mitt, congratulations. You have just won the shallowest and most negative and destructive victory in modern American politics.

Overall, some 68 percent of all advertising by all candidates and PACs in Florida was aimed at Newt. In total, Mitt and his PACs outspend Newt and his PAC’s 6 to 1. Yes, six to one.

The scorched earth of Florida will in no way, shape or form resemble any other state, let alone the general election. The carpet bombing of Iowa and Florida would simply cost way too much money to duplicate nationally. Further, the media support will not be there against Obama either.

In other words, Mitt won Florida and New Hampshire, but he showed in both states that he is totally unprepared to take on Obama.



An article by Paul Bedard titled “Obama Warns of Fall Romney ‘Smear’ Machine” was posted at washingtonexaminer.com on Feb. 1, 2012.

It said: "The Obama-Biden reelection campaign, which just announced it banked \$224 million in 2011, is stepping up fundraising as it steels for an expected fall 'smear' machine from GOP front-runner Mitt Romney.

"In an email to supporters this morning, Obama campaign manager Jim Messina warned that the Republicans will have a fat bank account to tap for negative ads, something both Romney and Newt Gingrich did in Florida."

The article quoted Mr. Messina as writing: "They're going to try to spend and smear their way to the White House . . . I'm not going to beat around the bush. Take a look at these numbers from Florida and then chip in \$3 or more to support a much different kind of presidential campaign."

The article listed the following three pieces of information.

- \$15.3 million: How much money Mitt Romney and his backers spent in the state (compared to \$3.4 million spent by Newt Gingrich and his groups).
- 13,000: The number of advertisements put on the air on Mitt's behalf as of mid-week last week. Newt had about 200.
- 92: The percentage of these ads that were negative.

The article continued to quote Mr. Messina as writing: "That's ugly, and it tells us a lot about what to expect from Romney, or whoever wins the Republican nomination. They're going to try to spend and smear their way to the White House. These super PACs can dominate the airwaves, but what they can't do is mobilize volunteers on the ground.

"We're doing this the right way—will you help?"

"Thanks, Jim Messina

"Campaign Manager, Obama for America"



A video and excerpted article titled "Sen. Reid: 'I'm Happy I've Done Earmarks All My Career'" were posted at [realclearpolitics.com](http://realclearpolitics.com) on Feb. 1, 2012.

The article quoted Harry Reid (Democratic Senator from Nevada) as saying: "I've done earmarks all my career, and I'm happy I've done earmarks all my career. They've helped my state, and they've helped different projects around the country."



A video and an article by Elizabeth Harrington titled "Pelosi: Girl Scouts' Relationship With Planned Parenthood 'Very Valuable'" were posted at [cnsnews.com](http://cnsnews.com) on Feb. 1, 2012.

It said: "House Minority Leader Nancy Pelosi (D-Calif.) said Planned Parenthood's relationship with the Girl Scouts of America is 'very valuable,' Wednes-

day, at a congressional reception to commemorate the 100 year anniversary of the organization for young girls.

"Rep. Pelosi was featured at the reception with a group of female government leaders to promote the Girl Scouts' new initiative 'To Get Her There,' which seeks to create 'gender balanced leadership' in one generation."

The article quoted a question of Ms. Pelosi: "The Girl Scouts has had some ties to Planned Parenthood, do you think that's a valuable relationship to have working together?"

The article quoted Ms. Pelosi as replying: "The Girl Scouts have relationships with many organizations. And, yes, I think they are all very valuable."

The article later said: "The Girl Scouts have been linked to the nation's largest abortion provider in the past. In 2010, a panel sponsored by the Girl Scouts USA at the United Nations Commission featured a Planned Parenthood pamphlet called 'Healthy, Happy and Hot,' according to published reports."

The article quoted a portion of the pamphlet. Much of the material about sexual acts was very descriptive and thereby not included in this synopsis.

The article quoted the pamphlet as saying: "There is no right or wrong way to have sex. Just have fun, explore and be yourself!"



An editorial by Michelle Malkin titled "First, They Came for the Catholics" was posted at [jewishworldreview.com](http://jewishworldreview.com) on Feb.1, 2012. Following is the article.

---

President Obama and his radical feminist enforcers have had it in for Catholic medical providers from the get-go. It's about time all people of faith fought back against this unprecedented encroachment on religious liberty. First they came for the Catholics. Who's next?

This weekend, Catholic bishops informed parishioners of the recent White House edict forcing religious hospitals, schools, charities, and other health and social service providers to provide "free" abortifacient pills, sterilizations, and contraception on demand in their insurance plans—even if it violates their moral consciences and teachings of their churches.

NARAL, NOW, *Ms.* magazine, and the Feminist Majority Foundation all cheered the administration's abuse of the Obamacare law to ram abortion down pro-life medical professionals' throats. Femme dinosaur Eleanor Smeal gloated over the news that the administration had rejected church officials' pleas for compromises: "At last," she exulted, the Left's goal of "no-cost birth control" for all had been achieved.

As always, tolerance is a one-way street in the Age of Obama. "Choice" is in the eye (and iron fist) of the First Amendment usurper.

Like the rising number of states who have revolted against the individual health care care mandate at the ballot box and in the courts, targeted Catholics have risen up against the Obamacare regime. Arlington (Va.) Bishop Paul Loverde didn't mince words, calling the U.S. Department Health and Human Services order "a direct attack against religious liberty. This ill-considered policy comprises a truly radical break with the liberties that have underpinned our nation since its founding." Several bishops vowed publicly to fight the mandate.

Bishop Alexander Sample of Marquette, Michigan, asserted plainly: "We cannot—we will not—comply with this unjust law."

It's not just rabid right-wing politicians defying the Obama machine. Pro-life Democratic Sen. Bob Casey of Pennsylvania denounced the "wrong decision." Left-leaning Bishop Robert Lynch threatened "civil disobedience" in St. Petersburg, Florida, over the power grab. Lefty *Washington Post* columnist E.J. Dionne wrote that Obama "botched" the controversy and "threw his progressive Catholic allies under the bus" by refusing to "balance the competing liberty interests here."

White House press secretary Jay Carney blithely denied on Tuesday that "there are any constitutional rights issues" involved in the brewing battle. Yet the Shut Up and Hand Out Abortion Pills order undermines a unanimous Supreme Court ruling issued just last week upholding a religious employer's right to determine whom to hire and fire. And two private colleges have filed federal suits against the government to overturn the unconstitutional abortion coverage decree.

Hannah Smith, senior counsel at the non-profit law firm, the Becket Fund, which is representing the schools boiled it down for Bloomberg News: "This is not really about access to contraception. The mandate is about forcing these religious groups to pay for it against their beliefs."

How did we get here? The first salvo came in December 2010, when the American Civil Liberties Union pushed HHS and its Planned Parenthood-championing secretary, Kathleen "The Shredder" Sebelius, to force Catholic hospitals to perform abortions in violation of their core moral commitment to protecting the lives of the unborn.

The ACLU called for a litigious fishing expedition against Catholic hospitals nationwide that refuse to provide "emergency" contraception and abortions to women. In their sights: devout Phoenix Catholic Bishop Thomas Olmsted, who revoked the Catholic status of a rogue hospital that performed several direct abortions, provided birth control pills and presided over sterilizations against the church's ethical and religious directives for health care.

ACLU and the feminists have joined with Obama to threaten and sabotage the First Amendment rights of religious-based health care entities. The agenda is not increased "access" to health care services. The ultimate goal is to shut down health care providers—Catholic health care institutions employ about

540,000 full-time workers and 240,000 part-time workers—whose religious views cannot be tolerated by secular zealots and radical social engineers.

Is it any surprise their counterparts in the “Occupy” movement have moved from protesting “Wall Street” to harassing pro-life marchers in Washington, D.C., and hurling condoms at Catholic school girls in Rhode Island?

Birds of a lawless, bigoted feather bully together.



A video and excerpted comments titled “Brian Williams Points Finger at Bush in 2006 Interview” were posted at [realclearpolitics.com](http://realclearpolitics.com) on Jan. 29, 2012.

It said: “Last week it was all the outrage that Republican Arizona Governor Jan Brewer pointed her finger at President Obama. Some pundits, including Bill Maher, said this incident was unprecedented. It turns out that is not true.

“In an August 2006 interview of then President George W. Bush, the anchor of NBC’s *Nightly News* Brian Williams pointed his finger in the former Commander in Chief’s face several times.”



An editorial by M. Catharine Evans titled “Are Big Media Covering Up Fast and Furious?” was posted at [americanthinker.com](http://americanthinker.com) on Feb. 1, 2012. Following are excerpts of the article.

---

Where was the public outcry for justice when Border Patrol Agent Brian Terry bled to death at the hands of a drug cartel in cahoots with the U.S. government? It happened in the Peck Canyon corridor northwest of Nogales, Arizona—nowhere. The general public didn’t hear about it.

It’s been one year and two months since agent Terry died. Within weeks of his demise, his shocking murder would illuminate a bizarre and murderous government plot to run guns, lots of guns—over 2,000 guns—into the hands of the Sinaloa drug cartel.

Members of Sinaloa were behind 19,097 murders in Mexico between 2006 and 2010. But that didn’t stop the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives in conjunction with the U.S. attorney’s office in Arizona from initiating a program in 2009 that would add at least 300 more dead bodies to that sobering pile of human remains south of the border.

Within 24 hours of Terry’s death, officials had traced two AK-47s to an ATF Phoenix-based operation dubbed Fast and Furious.

Soon bloggers at sites like [cleanupatf](http://cleanupatf.com), [sipsey street irregulars](http://sipseystreetirregulars.com), and *Washington Examiner* were joining forces to blow the lid off a mindless, deadly pro-

gram that had collapsed into a destructive free-for-all. As ATF whistle-blowers like John Dodson came forward with reports of illegal gun-buying, untraceable weapons, threats of demotion by power-crazed superiors, and their futile efforts to stop the Fast and Furious madness until Terry's death, mainstream editorial boards across the country failed to report the story.

Not since Lenin gathered his fellow Bolsheviks together in 1912 at the Prague conference to plan the publication of *Pravda* has there been such an all-out effort to quash facts that out in the open might bring down Attorney General Eric Holder and the whole Obama administration.

### **Parsing the Spin**

Last November, Dennis Wagner of *The Arizona Republic* wrote a chronological exposé of the Fast and Furious scandal. But he put a fancy spin on his article which illustrates perfectly how a Big Lie can emerge from a kernel of truth told with bad intent.

- The once-obscure case in Phoenix blew into a national controversy, putting a giant bull's-eye on President Barack Obama and the Justice Department.

Wow. You see, it's not about the real victims. Poor President Obama and Attorney General Eric Holder must be protected from those gun-nuts (like Palin) marking maps with bulls-eyes everywhere.

- Cartels, which operate like quasi-military outfits, were well-armed before Fast and Furious. It is impossible to say whether the flow of guns into Mexico increased because of the gun-walking case or has diminished in the aftermath.

Here's a reporter toeing the party line. The message to non-elite readers from hoity-toity Wagner: What I'm saying is tantamount to nihilism, but you won't get it; you'll only think to yourself, yes, drug cartels are armed to the teeth—a few more weapons wouldn't make a difference. Of course, now the reader is free to commit all kinds of atrocities because, heck, in our violent culture, someone will die anyway.

- Firearms were allowed into Mexico during two earlier operations, including a 2006-07 Tucson case known as Operation Wide Receiver. Those investigations were carried out quietly during the George W. Bush administration, without public controversy.

Translation: Bush and Gonzalez started it (falsification), so it is OK for Obama's ATF to murder Mexican civilians and U.S. Border Patrol agents.

"Cover-ups often are worse than what you are trying to cover up," states Wilson. I wonder if Zapata's or Terry's parents would agree.

### **Putting the Shoe on the Other Foot**

In addition to slanting the truth, the gung-ho press has no problem doing unto others what they would not have done to them.

Flashback.

**2002**—Attorney General John Ashcroft and the forced covering of Lady Justice's breasts in the DoJ's Great Hall created such a stir in the leftist press that the story was news for weeks.

**2007**—Ashcroft's successor, Alberto Gonzalez, fared even worse; the media firestorm became so intense that he finally resigned for his part in the firing of eight U.S. attorneys general. A *New York Times* editorial depicted Gonzalez as a "consigliere to Bush's imperial presidency" and pummeled him for "abandoning his duties as guardian of election integrity and voting rights."

Even Senator Obama, appearing on *Larry King Live* in the same year, called for Gonzalez's resignation, accusing him of being a "president's attorney," not the "people's attorney." Obama told King that "part of the role of the attorney general is to say to the executive branch these are the limits of your power, here's the things you can't do."

The audacious junior senator from Illinois chastised Gonzalez, indirectly, for carrying out "political vendettas" ordered by the White House. Obama described Bush's AG as an "attorney general who saw himself as enabler of the administration as opposed to somebody who was actually trying to look out for the American people's interest . . . for that reason I think it's time for him to step down . . . and for another attorney general who can exercise some independence" to be appointed. King sat spellbound.

Then there's John Mitchell, the only attorney general to go to prison on charges of obstruction of justice, conspiracy, and lying under oath. A Nixon loyalist till the end, Mitchell's involvement in the Watergate break-in, which involved photographing documents, planting microphones, payouts, and an eventual cover-up, landed him lots of bad press and a 19-month stint in a minimum-security facility in Alabama.

Sans murders of innocent federal agents and civilians, *The Washington Post* played out the Watergate scandal until 25 defendants were charged with various crimes.

Too bad that agents Brian Terry, Jaime Zapata, and hundreds of Mexican civilians, with "more to come" according to Holder, didn't die under a Republican administration. The wheels of justice grind down to a full stop when Democrats circle the wagons.

*The Washington Post*, *The New York Times*, *The New York Daily News*, *The Chicago Tribune*, MSNBC, CNN, ABC, NBC, CBS, Reuters, The Associated Press, and countless others along with their political backers routinely characterize the Fast and Furious murders as part of "a botched ATF sting operation that went awry," "an ill-conceived operation," "a witch hunt," "political fodder," "deeply flawed," "horrible screw-up," "bad judgment," and a "Republican red herring."

Various big media outlets that ran 120 stories of Herman Cain's alleged sexual dalliances from November 2 to November 15 didn't see a need to enlight-

en the masses about Fast and Furious. The number of times "F and F" was mentioned in the same time span? One.

Are informed journalists who remain silent in the face of evil culpable for sins of omission? Are journalists who intentionally subvert truth and invert facts, allowing corrupt government officials to ride roughshod over the rule of law, complicit in the very crimes they're covering up?



***Isaiah 55:6-11***—"Seek the LORD while He may be found, call upon Him while He is near. Let the wicked forsake his way, and the unrighteous man his thoughts; let him return to the LORD, and He will have mercy on him; and to our God, for He will abundantly pardon. 'For My thoughts are not your thoughts, nor are your ways My ways,' says the LORD. For as the heavens are higher than the earth, so are My ways higher than your ways, and My thoughts than your thoughts. For as the rain comes down, and the snow from heaven, and do not return there, but water the earth, and make it bring forth and bud, that it may give seed to the sower and bread to the eater, so shall My word be that goes forth from My mouth; it shall not return to Me void, but it shall accomplish what I please, and it shall prosper in the thing for which I sent it."