

LIBERAL ELITISM, THE ARROGANCE OF POWER, AND SOCIALIST POLICIES: THE KIND OF "HOPE AND CHANGE" NOT WANTED BY AMERICANS

By: Anthony J. Sacco, Sr.

CHEYENNE – Only a few days to go before the mid-term election. President Obama's job approval rating has again slipped; this week only 42% of Americans think he's doing a good job. That's down another 2% from September. 50% of the people disapprove, up 2% over the same time frame. And it's even worse for him in states like West Virginia, where he has an approval rating of 29% according to a Fox News Poll, and a disapproval rating of 65%. Nationwide, these are not just people who philosophically disagree with the direction in which he is taking the country, but people from all walks of life who've been hurt by his misguided policies.

This week brought more bad news for the President and his Democrat Administration. According to a new Gallup poll, the number of people out of work has again topped the 10% level. Unemployment, as measured by Gallup was at 10.0% in mid-October, essentially the same as the 10.1% at the end of September and up sharply from 9.4% in mid-September and 9.3% at the end of August. If every 1% equals a million people out of work. That's a helluva lot of people hunting for jobs. As a woman friend of mine recently commented, "Never in my lifetime have I known so many people out of work."

Yet radical liberals such as Mr. Obama and his supporters blindly ignore the fact that it is their party's Socialist policies aimed at businesses, small and large, that have caused the loss of so many jobs across the country.

The President's refusal to make permanent the tax cuts enacted for everyone during George W. Bush's Administration, and his continual insistence that he has not raised taxes on middle and lower tax groups, even though our take-home pay reflects the opposite, is primarily what has led to these high unemployment numbers. Businesses cannot add jobs and spend money on modernization programs when faced with such uncertainty.

What is it that makes Mr. Obama and his radical liberal supporters so blind to the detrimental effects of their policies? Not having a good answer to this question, I decided to look into the problem.

It is not a good idea to approach a liberal to learn anything about liberals. Why? Because when confronted, liberals tend to shout and demagogue; sort of like the Arabs, who work themselves up emotionally until they're in a frenzy, and reeling off inanities: "Bush lied, kids died! All whites are racists! All Republicans are fascists! Down with Big Business! Down with Small Business! George Bush was ignorant! Dick Cheney was ignorant! Sarah Palin is ignorant! Rush Limbaugh is fat AND ignorant! Fire . . . (insert a name, any name as long as the person is a Republican – or a Conservative)."

According to Ann Coulter in her book, *How to Talk to A Liberal (if you must)*, "If you can somehow force a liberal into a point-counterpoint argument, his retorts will bear no relation to what you said – unless you were, in fact, talking about your looks, your age, your weight, your personal obsessions, or whether you are a fascist. In the famous liberal two-step, they leap from one idiotic point to the next, so you can never nail them. It's like arguing with someone with Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ASHD)."

Fortunately for the rest of us, most of these liberals do not have full time jobs, eventually tire and return to their parents' homes, where they can sleep 'till noon every

day and when they get up, castigate Mom, if she's home and not out working to support them, for being, well, in their words, ignorant.

Many liberals take things even further: after two years of Democrat control over the White House and both Houses of Congress, they're still lashing out at Mr. Bush, claiming that he and the Republicans caused "a huge mess" and it is Mr. Obama who has "at least started" to clean it up. Are they correct? No. Of course the Republican Administration under George W. Bush was not perfect. The failure to heed our call to shut down the borders to illegal immigrants, and way too many earmarks (read too much pork barrel spending) approved by Congress, are just two issues that earned them a bad grade. But consider these few facts: when George Bush left office, the unemployment rate was 4.6 percent; the Dow closed at 12,621.77 that day; the Gross Domestic Product (GDP) for the previous quarter was 3.5%. January 3, 2007 was the day the Democrats took over the House and the Senate. Prior to that, a record had been set of 52 straight weeks of job *growth*. And although he did raise the annual budget considerably, much of the spending went to creation and operation of the Department of Homeland Security. The rest was spent on social programs demanded by liberals and of which they approve.

Maybe Democrats might want to reconsider. What has happened since Mr. Bush left office is actually a "Democrat "mess. Those statistics are enough to make us all wish for a return to "the good ol' days" of Bush II.

So what makes liberals tick? In a recent article, William A. Borst, Ph.D, wrote: "The term 'liberal elite' describes people, often well-educated, wealthy members of a left-leaning group whose wide influence is vastly disproportionate to their numbers. In less than two years Obama, members of his Cabinet, and auxiliary czars have demonstrated an ugly sense of superiority that has characterized the left for generations. They exude what the late Senator from Arkansas, William J. Fulbright called 'the arrogance of power.'" I think this accurately describes our President.

Mr. Borst goes on to say: "During the 2008 campaign in San Francisco, Obama noted that 'decades of dissatisfaction with Washington's unfulfilled promises had left many Americans bitter and clinging to their guns or religion or antipathy toward people who aren't like them or anti-immigrant sentiment or anti-trade sentiment as a way to express their frustration.' Later, there was his snide remark that the people should be thanking him for raising their taxes . . ."

I like this description by Mr. Borst: "Nothing better illustrates Obama's elitist attitude than his antipathy toward the Tea Party Movement and the election of Scott Brown to fill the vacancy left by the death of Senator Ted Kennedy of Massachusetts. The Obama regime erroneously interpreted Brown's election as just another angry reaction against all incumbents because of the failures of the Bush Administration."

Mr. Obama failed to see that it is voter concern over his own tyrannical policies, even in liberal Massachusetts where he should be garnering lots of support, which birthed the Tea Party Movement. That's arrogance.

To illustrate further the points of "liberal elitism" and "liberal arrogance," here are a few quotes from a liberal, exercising his "First amendment Right" by commenting on an article on MSNBC's home page a few days ago. I found this during one of my forays into the la-la land of radical left ideologues and demagogues. KEVIN S, who I assume is an ordinary Democrat voter, was responding to another commenter who disagreed with something he'd previously said:

"... everyone with good sense voted for the right person..." Congrats to Kevin S!

In just that one line, he denigrated and insulted almost half of the American public; all those who voted for the *other* candidate. Guess I should thank him for demonstrating a clear example of typical liberal arrogance, thinking they're superior to others.

Kevin S then went on at some length, extolling former Democrat President, Bill Clinton's eight years in office. He ignored the facts, as liberals often do, that during those years we had to put up with a man in the White House who thoroughly disgraced his office and violated the trust placed in him by the public, and with the help of people like leading homosexual Congressman Barney Frank, gave us governmental regulations forcing Fanny Mae, Freddy Mac, and private banks to make substandard loans to people who could not afford to pay them back □ in other words, continuing erroneous policies begun during the Carter Administration, what Democrats now call "*the banking crisis.*" And, he ignores the fact that for four of those Clinton years, Republicans acted under the Contract with America, but had to drag Mr. Clinton kicking and screaming, to balance the federal budget.

Not satisfied that he'd made enough of a point, Kevin S then resorted to an old, tried and true liberal method of arguing: *the Ad Hominem attack*; a personal attack on the one who disagrees with you, rather than merely countering his arguments. Here's what he said to the unfortunate blogger:

"... your wife more than likely would rather be Billy's mistress than your wife." See what I'm saying? What a low blow! And that kind of thing has been typical of liberals like Kevin S and others for many, many years.

Here's another quote, this one from a radical liberal about Sara Palin. A disagreement between three people had just taken place, over whether Sara Palin is intelligent and articulate or not:

"Articulate seems to be the point of contention here. Palin as charismatic, yes. Articulate? I'm not sure. But that's ok, because she's not supposed to be that articulate. The right has to stick to the argument that there is a great deal of fault with intellectualism. (correct?) If Palin started sounding too . . . coherent and educated, she'd fall in the poll numbers. I'm betting."

Here, in addition to *the Ad Hominem Attack*, we see another tactic of liberals – attempting to frame Conservative positions in ways that are not only inaccurate but tend to portray those who hold them as "ignorant" while managing to attack a fine Conservative woman, portraying her as not articulate because "she's not supposed to be."

Democrats have been attacking the Tea Party Movement for almost two years, Recently, Democrat candidates have been trying to cast it as an "extreme fringe group" rather than the grass roots movement of fed-up voters that it is. Here's a quote from a blogger in the opposite camp:

"I am a member of the Tea Party, and I resent you . . . promoting the myth that the Tea Party is racist and ignorant. For once, Americans from all walks of life and all levels of society have stood up and petitioned their government for redress of grievances (see the 1st amendment), and you are so quick to jump on a bandwagon to malign us without doing your own investigation into what the tea party movement really is about . . ."

Three weeks ago, in my article, *Hope and Change? Well, Yes, But The Shoe's on The Other Foot This Time*, <http://newsflavor.com/opinions/hope-and-change-well-yes-but-the-shoes-on-the-other-foot-this-time/> I wrote:

"With less than five weeks remaining before the mid-term

elections, the Democrat Party appears desperate. That desperation is not without cause. Its standard bearer, President Barack Hussein Obama, has performed so poorly during his first term in office that he has become an embarrassment to them; so much so that many of them do not want to be seen with him."

"That's true. The President has been forced to take to the hustings alone, trying to save the campaigns of liberal Democrat Senators in the states of Washington, California, Nevada, and Wisconsin. All these states, with the possible exception of Nevada, are blue states, and the fact that polls show Democrat Senators there are in trouble is a sure sign that his party is playing defense.

Meanwhile some liberal Democrat candidates have trotted out tired old Bill Clinton to campaign for them. You recall Bill "everybody lies about sex" Clinton, our "first black President" according to Maya Angelou, the elitist poet whose brain seems to have become addled in her later years. He's the guy who went on TV when the Monica Lewinsky affair was first made public, wagged his at the American people, and lied, "I did not have sex with that woman." He's the guy who lied under oath in a deposition taken in a court proceeding, *Jones v. Clinton*, and was fined \$90,000 by the trial judge. He's the first President of the United States to ever be charged with Contempt of Court. And, he's the guy whose credibility is exactly zero, unless you're a radical liberal, a left-leaning Ideologue, or a Democrat voter with a short memory. According to recent polls, even *this* man, with all his baggage, is thought more likely than the President to sway votes for the Democrats.

On Sunday, October 24, 2010. Democrat National Committee (DNC) Chairman, Tim Kaine conceded that his party faces big losses, although he expressed hope that the losses might not be as large as predicted. There is some, although not much, evidence to support his comments. But liberal elitism, the arrogance of power displayed by the Obama Administration and other left-leaning Democrats, and the imposition of Socialist policies on the people of this country, are a few of the reasons why I'm predicting that liberal Democrats will lose and lose big in just a few days.

That many now recognize this, even if Obama and his liberal Democrat allies do not, is shown by this recent comment from Emmett Tyrell in the *American Spectator*: "Socialism is another of the 'gods' that have failed." (His phrase references a brilliant exposè of Communism written and edited in 1950 by Richard Crossman). "If you balk at my use of the word socialism, how about I say liberalism is another of the 'gods' that have failed? What's astonishing is precisely how extreme liberalism practiced by Obama has been. It has failed. Liberals do not realize it but the majority of Americans do. And it is that majority which will need to deal with the mess they have caused."

On November 2, 2010, hopefully we will begin.

Anthony Joseph Sacco, Sr., a writer, licensed private investigator, author of two novels, The China Connection, and Little Sister Lost, and a biography, Echoes in the Wind, holds degrees from Loyola University Maryland and the University of Maryland Law School. His articles have appeared in the Washington Times, Baltimore Sun, Voices for the Unborn, the Catholic Review, WREN Magazine, TRIOND, and the Wyoming Catholic Register. E-mail him at anthonyjsacco@hotmail.com, and visit his website at <http://www.saccoservices.com>.