

**BARACK OBAMA
EXPOSED!**

Barack Obama: EXPOSED!

Copyright ©2008 by HUMAN EVENTS. All rights reserved.

No excerpting or copying permitted without written consent.

Published by:

Eagle Publishing, Inc.

One Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.

Washington, D.C. 20001

1-888-467-4448

Website: www.humanevents.com

Table of Contents

<i>Ann Coulter</i>	Jonathan Livingston Obama	4
<i>Bill O'Reilly</i>	The Perils of Obama	6
<i>Mac Johnson</i>	Barack Obama: The Human Rorschach Blot	7
<i>Monica Crowley</i>	Who The Liberals Really Are	9
<i>Patrick J. Buchanan</i>	Playing by Obama's Rules	11
<i>Cal Thomas</i>	Obama the Inexperienced	13
<i>Walter E. Williams</i>	Is Obama Ready for America?	15
<i>Michael Reagan</i>	The Other Obama	16
<i>Robert Novak</i>	Obama: Flawed or Fantastic?	17
<i>Ann Coulter</i>	Dreams From My Father, Lame Excuses From My Grandfather	19
<i>Gary Bauer</i>	Obama's Controversial Views on Israel	21
<i>Ann Coulter</i>	Obama's Dimestore 'Mein Kampf'	23
<i>David Limbaugh</i>	Over the Top Barack	25
<i>Brent Bozell</i>	Barack Potatoe Obama?	27
<i>Robert Spencer</i>	How Would Iran Read Obama?	29

Jonathan Livingston Obama

I've caught Obama fever! Obamamania, Obamarama, Obama, Obama, Obama. (I just pray to God this is clean, renewable electricity I'm feeling.)

Only white guilt could explain the insanely hyperbolic descriptions of Obama's "eloquence." His speeches are a run-on string of embarrassing, sophomoric Hallmark bromides.

In announcing his candidacy, Obama confirmed that he believes in "the basic decency of the American people." And let the chips fall where they may!

Obama forthrightly decried "a smallness of our politics" — deftly slipping a sword into the sides of the smallness-in-politics advocates. (To his credit, he somehow avoided saying, "My fellow Americans, size does matter.")

He took a strong stand against the anti-hope crowd, saying: "There are those who don't believe in talking about hope." Take that, Hillary!

Most weirdly, he said: "I recognize there is a certain presumptuousness in this — a certain audacity — to this announcement."

What is so audacious about announcing that you're running for president? Any idiot can run for president. Dennis Kucinich is running for president. Until he was imprisoned, Lyndon LaRouche used to run for president constantly. John Kerry ran for president. Today, all you have to do is suggest a date by which U.S. forces in Iraq should surrender, and you're officially a Democratic candidate for president.

Obama made his announcement surrounded by hundreds of adoring Democratic voters. And those were just the reporters. There were about 400 more reporters at Obama's announcement than Mitt Romney's, who, by the way, is more likely to be sworn in as our next president than B. Hussein Obama.

Obama has locked up the Hollywood money. Even Miss America has endorsed Obama. (John "Two Americas" Edwards is still hoping for the other Miss America to endorse him.)

But Obama tells us he's brave for announcing that he's running for president. And if life gives you

lemons, make lemonade!

I don't want to say that Obama didn't say anything in his announcement, but afterward, even Jesse Jackson was asking, "What did he say?" There was one refreshing aspect to Obama's announcement: It was nice to see a man call a press conference to announce something other than he was the father of Anna Nicole Smith's baby.

B. Hussein Obama's announcement also included this gem: "I know that I haven't spent a lot of time learning the ways of Washington. But I've been there long enough to know that the ways of Washington must change." As long as Obama insists on using Hallmark card greetings in his speeches, he could at least get Jesse Jackson to help him with the rhyming.

If Obama's biggest asset is his inexperience, then if by the slightest chance he were elected and were to run for a second term, he will have to claim he didn't learn anything the first four years.

There was also this inspirational nugget: "Each and every time, a new generation has risen up and done what's needed to be done. Today we are called once more, and it is time for our generation to answer that call." Is this guy running for president or trying to get people to switch to a new long-distance provider?

He said that "we learned to disagree without being disagreeable." (There goes Howard Dean's endorsement.) This was an improvement on the first draft, which read, "It's nice to be important, but it's more important to be nice."

This guy's like the ANWR of trite political aphorisms. There's no telling exactly how many he's sitting on, but it could be in the billions.

Obama's famed eloquence reminds me of a book of platitudes I read about once called "Life Lessons." The book contained such inspiring thoughts as:

"When was the last time you really looked at the sea? Or smelled the morning? Touched a baby's hair? Really tasted and enjoyed food? Walked barefoot in the grass? Looked in the blue sky?" (When was the

last time you fantasized about dismembering the authors of a book of platitudes?)

I can't wait for Obama's inaugural address when he reveals that he loves long walks in the rain, sunsets, and fresh-baked cookies shaped like puppies.

The guy I feel sorry for is Harold Ford. The former representative from Tennessee is also black, a Democrat, about the same age as Obama, and is every bit as attractive. The difference is, when he talks, you don't fantasize about plunging knitting needles into your ears to stop the gusher of meaningless platitudes.

Ford ran as a Democrat in Republican Tennessee and almost won — and the press didn't knock out his opponent for him by unsealing sealed divorce records, as it did for B. Hussein Obama. Yet no one ever talks about Ford as the second coming of Cary Grant and Albert Einstein.

Maybe liberals aren't secret racists expunging vast stores of white guilt by hyperventilating over B. Hussein Obama. Maybe they're just running out of greeting card inscriptions.

Ann Coulter is Legal Affairs Correspondent for HUMAN EVENTS and author of High Crimes and Misdemeanors, Slander, How to Talk to a Liberal (If You Must), and most recently, Godless.

The Perils of Obama

Sen. Barack Obama seems to be a nice guy. I won't say he's "articulate," because some African Americans hear that word and take offense. In fact, I won't give the senator any compliments other than the nice guy description, just to be on the safe side.

Is there any question that we are living in an age of hypersensitivity? Some of that, of course, is justified. When Sen. Joe Biden described Obama as "clean," it was a verbal disaster, adjectival Armageddon. "Clean"? As opposed to what?

Some whites thought the reaction to Biden's remark was overblown, but consider this: If someone described me, an Irish-American, as a "sober thinker," surely most Irish folks would raise a collective eyebrow.

But when President Bush said Sen. Obama was articulate, I'll confess to thinking he was giving the guy a genuine compliment. I mean who knew some African-Americans would find the "a" word offensive? Many of us are still confused.

According to some columnists, if you label a black person "articulate," you are implying that other blacks are not. You are expressing surprise that an African-American can actually speak English well. And that's condescending, is it not?

Well, I guess it could be. But Mr. Bush's tone wasn't condescending at all. So I chalk this one up to mild paranoia and/or a victimization play.

Many of us know people of all races who are professional victims. They see slights everywhere. The world is against them, and if you live in the world, so are you. These people are tough to deal with. Anything you say to them can and will be used against you.

Few want to deal with this victim mentality, and that's the danger in this articulate controversy. I know some white people who don't know what to say to black Americans so they completely disengage. They don't want to offend, and they don't really understand the "rules," so they play it cautiously.

This is not a good thing for America. All respon-

sible citizens should be trying to break down racial and religious barriers and work together. But, believe me, there is fear in the marketplace—fear along racial lines.

None of this, of course, is Barack Obama's fault, but he may suffer because of it. On Jan. 17, a Rasmussen poll had him tied among Democrats with Hillary Clinton in the presidential sweepstakes. Two weeks later, Obama was behind Hillary by 14 points in the same poll.

It is speculation, but all this word controversy stuff can't be helping Sen. Obama. For any candidate to be elected to high office, there has to be a certain comfort level with the folks. I don't know about you, but the articulation thing wasn't comfortable for me.

The solution here is for honorable people to give other people the benefit of the doubt. Sen. Biden made a mistake, but it was not born from malice. President Bush simply did nothing wrong. We have enough problems in this country without creating phantom annoyances. And that's about as articulate as I can be.

*Mr. O'Reilly is host of the Fox News show "The O'Reilly Factor" and author of *Who's Looking Out for You?**

Barack Obama: The Human Rorschach Blot

Barack Obama is like a small, shiny object. The easily fascinated can stare deeply into his blank sheen and see... their own reflections. He can be anything to anyone because he is nothing in particular. Yet listening to the leftstream media, one would have to conclude that the man is a multifaceted miracle.

He's a moderate. He's a third way. He's demographic fusion cuisine. He's a floor wax. He's a desert topping. He's everything you'd hoped for and whatever you need. That's the beauty of being unknown.

He's like that girl way over there at the other end of the bar — perfect, unknown, perfectly unknown, and improved mightily by distance and pent-up desire. Mentally, you're in love and three weeks into the relationship before you even make it halfway over to meet her.

Then you notice her eyes and think, “Man, which one do I look at when I speak, because they don't point in the same direction. And what's with the Adam's apple?” But at that point it's too late to turn around, because one of those eyes has seen you already. I think that's the way a lot of folks are going to feel about their Obamaphilia after a few months of campaigning have removed the gauze filter from his carefully blurred image.

If any of the fawning were asked to name his greatest accomplishment, could they name an accomplishment? Other than being elected to the Senate just two and a half years ago, and being simultaneously black and yet likeable to white folks, I mean.

For emphasis, let's examine a list of Obama's major accomplishments (so far):

1. Simultaneously black and yet likeable to white folks
2. Made the initials “B.O.” cool again
3. Good oral hygiene

That's it. He's the Wayne Brady of politics — everything white folks had been hoping for in at least one black person, the big payoff for all that tolerance and diversity babble. That may not be the politically correct thing to say, but it is an honest assessment of

exactly what pent-up desire is fueling Obamamania among his white, liberal fan base.

Obama's resume and record (even just a record of firm opinions on important issues) are so thin that I really believed that early media talk of his running for President was an affectionate nicety — like a manager saying of a favored intern, “You'll be running this corporation before the summer's over!”

Yet here we are, just a year after such talk began, and the intern has announced that he's putting his resume in for the position. Well, I'll alert human resources.

Allegedly, his appeal rests with his “inspiring” story. Lord knows he's told his story enough: in two books, uncounted speeches and interviews and occasionally in explanations of why the story in the books seems to differ from the facts. (Obama was telling the “literary” truth, rather than getting bogged down in the literal truth.) Come to think of it, I should add a fourth bullet point to my list of Obama's major accomplishments (so far):

4. Telling his own story

The man's Jesus and John the Baptist all rolled into one — the Messiah that foretells his own coming. But what, really, is so inspiring about his story? He is alleged to have overcome the odds — to have succeeded in the face of oppression. But to see “black” as a synonym for “oppressed” is just a stereotype (oh, and the rationale behind affirmative action laws). And we all know that stereotypes are wrong. I keep waiting for some real tale of the adversity he's faced and I have yet to hear it.

As far as I can tell, this is his inspiring story of success despite oppression:

He overcame the oppression of being born to a well-off middle class white woman and a Harvard Ph.D. father, then he overcame the oppression of attending private schools his entire life. His story took a dark turn toward further oppression when he was admitted to Columbia University and then — gasp — Harvard Law School — where he was

practically lynched into the position of President of the Law Review by an overwhelming majority. Nay, an oppressive majority. From there, his life has just been a Hell of accolade and accomplishment.

The Boston Globe this week cited as an example of his oppression that children at his private school sometimes made fun of his unusual name. Please excuse me if I don't rush off to a sit-in on his behalf. As a child named "Mac" entering elementary school right about the time of McDonald's famous "Big Mac Attack" campaign and "Big Mac" jingle ("two all beef patties, special sauce, lettuce, cheese, pickles and onions on a sesame seed bun" as I seem to recall), and who soon learned that Mac rhymes with "Quack!" and "Whack!" I would now like to announce my candidacy for the presidency of the United States based on my inspiring story. I still can't hear a quip about "special sauce" without thinking of the oppression of my fathers... or at least the Clinton administration. Get in line, crybaby.

The only real adversity I can find in his life is that his mother couldn't seem to stay married to the same man for much time and his father couldn't seem to marry just one woman at a time. And, again, if having a screwed up family is a primary political asset, we'll need to form a really long line. The only thing weirder than the average family would be a normal family.

Yet the CNN.com poll question for Saturday was "Does Barack Obama's life story inspire you?" (Surprisingly, most respondents said "No." So I am not alone in my underwhelming enthusiasm for the media darling.) If stories like Barack's are inspiring, then the field is plainly crowded with inspirational tales:

Mitt Romney: An eloquent son of a former governor of Michigan. Like Barack, he overcame his privileged background to become a successful politician. Although, if it's triumph over real adversity and prejudice that you want, consider that young Romney spent 30 months as a Mormon missionary in France! Now this is a man that has known struggle against the odds.

Joe Biden: Born to a used car salesman, he somehow found a talent for politics. He later overcame a devastating battle with congenital dihydrotestosterone-induced alopecia. Despite its ravages, Biden has bravely kept "plugging away" at politics ever since, chairing numerous televised hairings. Uh, I mean "hearings."

Tom Tancredo: Actually did come from a humble background, went to a humble school, became a public school teacher, married a public school teacher and yet went on to engineer a national political career. People don't like that story though, so let's focus on the fact that he was involved in public education and still became an unabashed conservative. Talk about overcoming oppression.

John Edwards: The son of a textile worker and a postal employee, grew up working class in rural North Carolina. He overcame this humble background to become a primping effete metrosexual millionaire trial lawyer. Perhaps picking leaders based on humble beginnings is not a foolproof system.

Dennis Kucinich: The son of an Ohio truck driver and a stay-at-home mom, Kucinich went on to overcome his obvious mental illness and the malnutrition of a vegetarian diet to become the member of Congress voted "most detached from world reality." Again, perhaps choosing leaders based on humble beginnings is not a foolproof system.

I could go on and on (and often do), but you get the idea. Barack Obama called his political aspirations "The Audacity of Hope," but really they're nothing so much as the audacity of hype.

Obama is just a human Rorschach Blot — a figure so devoid of definition and meaning that what his devotees see in him is more an insight into them than into him.

Mr. Johnson, a writer and medical researcher in Cambridge, MA., is a regular contributor to HUMAN EVENTS. His column generally appears on Tuesdays. Archives and additional material can be found at www.macjohnson.com.

Who The Liberals Really Are

When the Democrats tell you who they are, what they think, and what they intend to do, believe them. When they claim (with Oscar-worthy straight faces) they “support the troops,” their history — both past and recent betrays that vacuous claim.

Last week, Senator Barack Obama made his third big mistake, the result of a series of on-the-fly policy pronouncements. Mistake Number One was his statement that he’d move more aggressively into Pakistan if, as president, he had “actionable intelligence” about al Qaeda operating there. The statement itself was quite hawkish, so the mistake wasn’t on the policy, it was political: he ticked off his liberal base, which does not want escalated military action in Pakistan, or frankly, anywhere else. Mistake Number Two came when he tried to fix Mistake Number One: he said he’d take nuclear weapons “off the table.” This brought him back into the liberal lovenest, but just about everyone else thought it was “naïve and irresponsible.”

Then came the Third Big Mistake. He was asked about U.S. efforts in Afghanistan, and he said this: “We’ve got to get the job done there. And that requires us to have enough troops so that we’re not *just air-raiding villages and killing civilians*, which is causing enormous problems there.”

Throwing American troops down the stairs. It may have been the first time Obama has done it, but it’s not the first time his party has.

Another liberal Junior Senator repeatedly made wild accusations about the conduct of the American military in a different war:

“... they had personally raped, cut off ears, cut off heads, taped wires from portable telephones to human genitals and turned up the power, cut off limbs, blown up bodies, randomly shot at civilians, razed villages in fashion reminiscent of Genghis Khan, shot cattle and dogs for fun, poisoned food stocks, and generally ravaged the countryside of South Vietnam in addition to the normal ravage of war, and the normal and very particular ravaging

which is done by the applied bombing power of this country.”

The year was 1971, the war was Vietnam, and the man was an aspiring politician (and president) named John Kerry.

The routine was the same: Accusing U.S. troops of widespread barbaric acts. Equating them with the savage beasts they were fighting. Essentially saying that they are no better than the enemies trying to kill them — and us.

Where else have you heard a similar tune recently? In the pages of *The New Republic*, a left-leaning publication, that ran columns from Iraq, written by an anonymous soldier, called “Baghdad Diarist.” In these columns, the soldier accused his fellow troops of “mocking and sexually harassing a woman whose face had been marred by an I.E.D.” and “one soldier of wearing part of an Iraqi boy’s skull under his helmet,” among other things.

The Weekly Standard raised some serious questions about those “reports,” forcing *The New Republic* to identify the writer as Pvt. Scott Thomas Beauchamp. The military then did its own thorough investigation and found that the allegations made by Beauchamp were “false.” Beauchamp himself signed statements recanting the stories as “exaggerations and falsehoods.”

It doesn’t take Sherlock Holmes to see an ugly pattern here. Liberals with a predilection for slanderously and maliciously skewering American troops in order to further their own agendas.

This is who the liberals are. This is what they believe. These are the “values” they would bring if they win the presidency and hence, the role of commander-in-chief.

At least Senator Hillary Clinton was smart enough to “decline to comment” on Obama’s remark about our troops in Afghanistan. But remember: she and Bill slashed military budgets when they were president the first time around. During his draft evasion days, he was on record as saying he “loathed” the

military. He was accused of using the military during times of personal political crisis, and only from politically safe heights of 30,000 feet.

John Kerry, 1971. Bill and Hillary Clinton, 1992-2000. Harry “the war is lost” Reid, 2007. The New Republic, a few months ago. Barack Obama, last week. They are all cut from the same cloth, singing the same refrain. And despite their self-serving and empty rhetoric to the contrary, it isn’t about “supporting the troops.”

Monica Crowley, Ph.D., is a nationally syndicated radio host and television commentator. She has also written for The New Yorker, The Wall Street Journal, The Los Angeles Times, The Baltimore Sun and The New York Post. www.monicamemo.com.

Playing by Obama's Rules

To observe Democrats, savaging one of their heroines, is to understand why the party is unready to rule.

Consider: At the 1984 Democratic convention in San Francisco, an unknown member of Congress was vaulted into history by being chosen the first woman ever to run on a national party ticket.

Geraldine Ferraro became a household name. And though the Mondale-Ferraro ticket went down to a 49-state defeat, “Gerry” became an icon to Democratic women.

This week, however, after being subjected for 48 hours to accusations of divisiveness by Barack Obama, and racism by his agents and auxiliaries in the media, Ferraro resigned from Clinton's campaign. What had she said to send the Obamaites into paroxysms of rage?

She stated an obvious truth: Had Barack not been a black male, he probably would not be the front-runner for the nomination.

Here are the words that sent her to the scaffold.

“If Obama was a white man he would not be in this position. And if he was a woman (of any color) he would not be in this position. He happens to be very lucky to be who he is. And the country is caught up with the concept.”

Note that Ferraro did not say race was the only reason Barack was succeeding. She simply said that being an African-American has been as indispensable to his success as her being a woman was to her success in 1984. Had my name been “Gerald” rather than Geraldine, I would not have been on the '84 ticket, Ferraro conceded.

In calling her comments racist, Barack's retinue is asserting that his race has nothing to do with his success, even implying that it is racist to suggest it. This is preposterous. What Geraldine Ferraro said is palpably true, and everyone knows it.

Was the fact that Barack is black irrelevant to the party's decision to give a state senator the keynote address at the 2004 convention? Did Barack's being

African-American have nothing to do with his running up 91 percent of the black vote in Mississippi on Tuesday?

Did Barack's being black have nothing to do with the decision of civil rights legend John Lewis to dump Hillary and endorse him, though Lewis talks of how his constituents do not want to lose this first great opportunity to have an African-American president?

Can political analysts explain why Barack will sweep Philly in the Pennsylvania primary, though Hillary has the backing of the African-American mayor and Gov. Ed Rendell, without referring to Barack's ethnic appeal to black voters?

What else explains why the mainstream media are going so ga-ga over Obama they are being satirized on “Saturday Night Live”?

Barack Obama has a chance of being the first black president. And holding out that special hope has been crucial to his candidacy. To deny this is self-delusion — or deceit. Nor is this unusual. John F. Kennedy would not have gotten 78 percent of the Catholic vote had he not been Catholic. Hillary would not have rolled up those margins among white women in New Hampshire had she not been a sister in trouble. Mitt Romney would not have swept Utah and flamed out in Dixie were he not a Mormon. Mike Huckabee would not have marched triumphantly through the Bible Belt were he not a Baptist preacher and evangelical Christian. All politics is tribal.

The first campaign this writer ever covered was the New York mayoral race of 1961. Republicans stitched together the legendary ticket of Lefkowitz, Fino and Gilhooley, to touch three ethnic bases. Folks laughed. No one would have professed moral outrage had anyone suggested they were appealing to, or even pandering to, the Jewish, Italian and Irish voters of New York. People were more honest then.

Obama's agents suggest that Ferraro deliberately injected race into the campaign. But this, too, is ridiculous. Her quote came in an interview with the

Daily Breeze of Torrance, Calif., not “Meet the Press.”

The attack on Ferraro comes out of a conscious strategy of the Obama campaign — to seek immunity from attack by smearing any and all attackers as having racist motives. When Bill Clinton dismissed Obama’s claim to have been consistently antiwar as a “fairy tale,” and twinned Obama’s victory in South Carolina with Jesse Jackson’s, his statements were described as tinged with racism.

Early this week, Harvard Professor Orlando Patterson’s sensitive nostrils sniffed out racism in Hillary’s Red Phone ad, as there were no blacks in it. Patterson said it reminded him of D.W. Griffith’s pro-KKK “Birth of a Nation,” a 1915 film.

What Barack’s allies seem to be demanding is immunity, a special exemption from political attack, because he is African-American. And those who go after him are to be brought up on charges of racism, as has Bill Clinton, Ed Rendell and now Geraldine Ferraro.

Hillary, hoping to appease Barack’s constituency, is ceding the point. Will the Republican Party and the right do the same? Play by Obama rules, and you lose to Obama.

Mr. Buchanan is a nationally syndicated columnist and author of The Death of the West, The Great Betrayal, A Republic, Not an Empire and Where the Right Went Wrong.

Obama the Inexperienced

While the Rev. Jeremiah Wright continues to play out in sound bites on cable TV and talk radio, it isn't Wright who might be president. It is Barack Obama who wants that job. Rev. Wright is consistent in his preaching that America bore some responsibility for the 9/11 attacks and in his conspiratorial lunacy about "how the government lied about inventing the HIV virus as a means of genocide against people of color," but Obama has been inconsistent in what he has said about issues that will have a far greater impact than the outrage produced by his former pastor.

I am all for a post-racial, nonpolarized society, but Obama has yet to detail how that would work and on which issues he is willing to move toward the center from positions any reasonable observer would have to describe as far-left, even radical.

On Fox News Sunday, Chris Wallace tried to get Obama to say where he might find common ground with Republicans when he asked him: "Can you name a hot-button issue where you would be willing to buck the Democratic Party line and say, 'You know what? Republicans have a better idea here.'" Obama offered regulation and charter schools, not exactly hot-button issues. Moving away from his vote against banning partial-birth abortion, as other Democrats have done, would have been a good hot-button issue on which he might have compromised, but abortion is the unholy grail of the left and no Democrat can get the presidential nomination unless he (or she) buys the entire abortion package.

Obama has the right attitude, as in, "My goal is to get us out of this polarizing debate where we're always trying to score cheap political points and actually get things done." That's admirable, so let's examine a few of the things Obama says he would like to do.

On the war, Obama said on Fox, "I will listen to Gen. (David) Petraeus, given the experience that he's accumulated over the last several years. It would be stupid of me to ignore what he has to say." Admirable. But in testimony last September before

the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, of which Obama is a member, Gen. Petraeus said, "I believe Iraq's problems will require a long-term effort." The day after Petraeus' testimony, Obama called for the U.S. to "Immediately begin to remove our combat troops from Iraq." Which is it, immediate, or heeding Gen. Petraeus and his long-term approach for bringing stability to Iraq?

On Fox, Obama said he would raise capital gains taxes to no more than 20 percent. But on March 27, Obama told CNBC's Maria Bartiromo he would raise capital gains taxes to 28 percent. Obama said his goal is to "create additional revenue." But as The Wall Street Journal noted in an editorial recently, lower capital gains taxes have, in fact, historically produced more tax revenue while higher capital gains taxes bring in less, as people are less willing to sell stocks because it will cost them more in taxes.

What about payroll taxes? On Fox, Obama said he's for raising them on Americans earning more than \$102,000 annually. But just two weeks ago, Obama said he wouldn't raise taxes on anyone making less than \$200,000. When asked by ABC's George Stephanopoulos during the Philadelphia debate with Hillary Clinton if he would pledge not to raise taxes on the middle class, Obama responded, "I not only have pledged not to raise their taxes, I've been the first candidate in this race to specifically say I would cut their taxes." Again, which is it?

Obama's view of government is classic liberal paternalism: "... what (the American people) are looking for is somebody who can solve their problems ... who will tell them the truth about how we're going to bring down gas prices, how we're going to bring back jobs," he told Wallace.

No president can solve my problems, or bring down gas prices (those are set by market forces) or create jobs, other than more government jobs. In all of Obama's impressive rhetorical skills, there is nothing about the role of the individual, only the role of big government. His uncertainty and inconsistency

on issues ranging from war to taxes reveal his inexperience and youthful stumbling, two qualities that make him unprepared to be president.

And now we return to our regularly scheduled program of the rantings of Rev. Wright.

*Mr. Thomas is America's most widely syndicated op-ed columnist. He is a commentator/analyst for the Fox News Channel and appears weekly as a panelist on "Fox News Watch," and an author of 10 books, including *Blinded by Might: Why the Religious Right Can't Save America* (HarperCollins/Zonderwan). His latest is, *The Wit and Wisdom of Cal Thomas*. Contact him at CalThomas@tribune.com.*

Is Obama Ready for America?

Some pundits ask whether America is ready for Obama. The much more important question is whether Obama is ready for America and even more important is whether black people can afford Obama. Let's look at it in the context of a historical tidbit.

In 1947, Jackie Robinson, signing a contract with the Brooklyn Dodgers, broke the color barrier in major league baseball. He encountered open racist taunts and slurs from fans, opposing team players and even some players on his own team. Despite that, his first year batting average was .297. He led the National League in stolen bases and won the first-ever Rookie of the Year Award. Without question, Jackie Robinson was an exceptional player. There's no sense of justice that should require that a player be as good as Jackie Robinson in order to be a rookie in the major leagues but the hard fact of the matter, as a first black player, he had to be.

In 1947, black people could not afford a stubble bum baseball player. By contrast, today black people can afford stubble bum black baseball players. The simple reason is that as a result of the excellence of Jackie Robinson, as well those who immediately followed him such as Satchel Paige, Don Newcombe, Larry Doby and Roy Campanella, there's no one in his right mind, who might watch the incompetence of a particular black player, who can say, "Those blacks can't play baseball." Whether we like it or not, whether for good reason or bad reason, people make stereotypes and stereotypes can have effects.

For the nation and for black people, the first black president should be the caliber of a Jackie Robinson and Barack Obama is not. Barack Obama has charisma and charm but in terms of character, values and understanding, he is no Jackie Robinson. By now, many Americans have heard the racist and anti-American tirades of Obama's minister and spiritual counselor. There's no way that Obama could have been a 20-year member of the Rev. Jeremiah Wright's church and not been aware of his statements.

Wright's racist and anti-American ideas are by no means unique. They are the ideas of many leftist professors and taught to our young people. The basic difference between Sen. Obama, Wright and leftist professors is simply a matter of style and language. His Philadelphia speech demonstrated his clever style where he merely changed the subject. The controversy was not about race. It was about his longtime association with such a hater and whether he shared the Reverend's vision.

Obama's success is truly a remarkable commentary on the goodness of Americans and how far we've come in resolving matters of race. I'm 72 years old. For almost all of my life, a black having a real chance at becoming the president of the United States was at best a pipe dream. Obama has convincingly won primaries in states with insignificant black populations. As such, it further confirms what I've often said: The civil rights struggle in America is over and it's won. At one time black Americans did not have the constitutional guarantees enjoyed by white Americans; now we do. The fact that the civil rights struggle is over and won does not mean that there are not major problems confronting many members of the black community but they are not civil rights problems and have little or nothing to do with racial discrimination.

While not every single vestige of racial discrimination has disappeared, Obama and the Rev. Wright are absolutely wrong in suggesting that racial discrimination is anywhere near the major problem confronting a large segment of the black community. The major problems are: family breakdown, illegitimacy, fraudulent education and a high rate of criminality. To confront these problems, that are not the fault of the larger society, requires political courage and that's an attribute that Obama and most other politicians lack.

Dr. Williams is a nationally syndicated columnist, former chairman of the economics department at George Mason University, and author of More Liberty Means Less Government.

BY MICHAEL REAGAN

The Other Obama

Here we go again. After being subjected to eight years of the collegial presidency of Bill and Hillary, when we were told that when we got Bill we got Hillary as a bonus, it looks as if we are facing another twofer: Barack and Michelle.

Effete liberal Democrats are all but canonizing Barack Obama, who they see as one of their own — cool, detached, impressively intellectual — all in all what Pat Buchanan described as something fresh out of the faculty lounge, where lofty thoughts abound and contempt for the great unwashed is hardly concealed.

That may be an apt description, implying that the Barack Obama who scorned ordinary folks in small towns who, he sneered, cling to such lower-class crutches as religion and guns, is above the distractions of the madding crowd.

It does not, however, fit the other half of the new twofer, Michelle Obama, who far from being above it all is down there in the trenches acting like the flame-throwing liberal activist she is. To know her is to know what her husband really believes.

As I have told my listeners of my radio show, if you want to understand how Barack Obama uncomplainingly sat through all those fire-breathing sermons without so much as stirring uncomfortably you need to understand the way husbands and wives practice their religion these days.

The men in the pews for the most part are passive, while the wives tend to be passionate. In most cases husbands are there because their wives have dragged them there. Chances are that while the women sit in rapt attention to the words of their pastor, the husbands are snoozing, blissfully unaware of what the reverend is preaching.

From what we've heard from Mrs. Obama she was paying close attention to the Reverend Mr. Wright, eating up his fiery words and probably enthusiastically nodding agreement as he blamed whitey for inventing AIDS to kill blacks as Barack dozed beside her, wondering when the Reverend Wright was going to shut up.

Barack is now wide awake, and for the next seven months he's going to continue to be faced with explaining why he remained silent while his pastor ranted in

the pulpit. And insisting that during his presence in the pews the Reverend Wright never once acted like Reverend Wright just won't wash. Poor Barack, how can he admit that he didn't hear any of that rabble-rousing rhetoric because he slept through all 20 years of it?

If you want to find the culprit here, turn to Michelle. I'm willing to bet she heard every word of the Reverend Wright's inflammatory sermons, swallowed them whole, and seethed in anger over White America's wretched mistreatment of her fellow black Americans as described by her pastor.

Nowadays she's playing the role of dutiful wife and doting mother, but every once in a while her anger surfaces as it did most famously when she told a group in Milwaukee, "For the first time in my adult life, I am proud of my country because it feels like hope is making a comeback."

Just what is hope in Michelle Obama's lexicon?

Why it's nobody other than the man she shared a pew with for 20 years, her husband, who she brags "is one of the smartest people you will ever encounter who will deign [i.e. "lower himself"] to enter this messy thing called politics."

"We have lost the understanding that in a democracy, we have a mutual obligation to one another — that we cannot measure the greatness of our society by the strongest and richest of us, but we have to measure our greatness by the least of these," she says.

"That we have to compromise and sacrifice for one another in order to get things done. That is why I am here, because Barack Obama is the only person in this who understands that. That before we can work on the problems, we have to fix our souls. Our souls are broken in this nation."

Barack Obama, our sole hope — the cobbler who'll mend our poor broken souls. With, of course, the help of his wife Michelle.

Mr. Reagan is a syndicated radio talk-show host, author of Twice Adopted (Broadman & Holman Publishers) and The City on a Hill, and the son of former President Ronald Reagan.

BY ROBERT NOVAK

Obama: Flawed or Fantastic?

Buyer's remorse was beginning to afflict supporters of Barack Obama before a recent primary election returns showed he had delivered a knockout punch against Hillary Clinton. The young orator who had seemed so fantastic beginning with his 2007 Jefferson-Jackson dinner speech in Iowa disappointed even his own advisers over the past two weeks, and old party hands mourned that they were stuck with a flawed candidate.

The whipping Obama gave Clinton in North Carolina and his near miss in Indiana transformed that impression. The candidate who delivered the victory speech in Raleigh, N.C., was the Obama of Des Moines, bearing no resemblance to the gloomy, uneasy candidate who had seemed unable to effectively deal with bumps in the campaign road. Returning to his eloquent call for unity, the victorious Obama in advance dismissed Republican criticism of his ideology or his past as the same old partisan bickering that the people hate.

John McCain as the Republican candidate does not like that kind of campaigning, either. But a gentlemanly contest between the old war hero from out of the past and the new advocate of reform from the future probably would guarantee Democratic takeover of the White House. The Republican Party, suffering from public disrepute, faces major Democratic gains in each house of Congress — leaving the defeat of Obama as the sole GOP hope for 2008.

Republicans were cheered and Democrats distressed by an inexperienced Obama's ineptitude in handled adversity the past month. The new Republican consensus considered Obama the weaker of the two Democratic candidates. Indeed, Hillary Clinton had finally shaken off pretensions of entitlement and consigned Bill Clinton to rural America, raising speculation that she would decisively carry Indiana and threaten Obama in North Carolina. Clinton's failure Tuesday was a product of demographics rather than Obama's campaign skill. Consistently winning over 90 percent of the African-American vote, Obama is

unbeatable in a primary where the black electorate is as large as North Carolina's (half the registered Democratic vote there). Indiana differed from seemingly similar Ohio and Pennsylvania, where Clinton scored big wins, because it borders Obama's state of Illinois, with many voters in the Chicago media market.

As the clear winner and the presumptive nominee, Obama in Raleigh Tuesday unveiled his general election strategy. Dismissing McCain's "ideas" as "nothing more than the failed policies of the past," Obama denounced what he called the Republican campaign plan: "Yes, we know what's coming. ... We've already seen it, the same names and labels they always pin on everyone who doesn't agree with all their ideas."

Thus, Obama seems to be ruling out not only discussion of his 20-year association with the Rev. Jeremiah Wright but also any identification of the Democratic presidential candidate as "liberal" or as an advocate of higher taxes, higher domestic spending, abortion rights and gun control. These issues appear to be included in what Obama at Raleigh called "attempts to play on our fears and exploit our differences."

The test of Obama's strategy may be his friendship with and support from William Ayers, an unrepentant member of the Weatherman terrorist underground of the 1960s. Instead of totally disavowing Ayers as he belatedly did his former pastor Wright, Obama potentially deepened his problem by referring to Ayers as just a college professor — "a guy who lives in my neighborhood." He then compared their relationship with his friendship with conservative Republican Sen. Tom Coburn, as he had compared Wright's racism with his white grandmother's.

Democrats abhor bringing up what Obama calls Ayers' "detestable acts 40 years ago," but it will be brought into the public arena even if it is not McCain's style of politics. A photo of Ayers stomping on the American flag in 2001 has been all over the Internet this week. That was the year Obama accepted a \$200 political contribution from Ayers

and the year in which the former Weatherman said: “I don’t regret setting bombs. I feel we didn’t do enough.”

While McCain will demand no response from Obama, others will. How the prospective nominee handles this in the future will help define whether he is seen as flawed or fantastic in the long campaign ahead.

Mr. Novak is a syndicated columnist and editor of the Evans-Novak Political Report, a political newsletter he founded in 1967 with Rowland Evans.

Dreams From My Father, Lame Excuses From My Grandfather

Since a Chinese graduate student at Columbia University, Minghui Yu, was killed recently when black youths violently set upon him, sending him running into traffic to escape, I think B. Hussein Obama ought to start referring to the mind-set of the “typical Asian person.”

As of Wednesday, police had no motive for the attack, and witnesses said they heard no demand for money or anything else. The Associated Press reports that the assailant simply said to his friend, “Watch what I do to this guy” before punching Yu.

Meanwhile, let’s revisit the story about Obama’s grandmother being guilty of thinking like a “typical white person.” As recounted in Obama’s autobiography, the only evidence that his grandmother feared black men comes from Obama’s good-for-nothing, chronically unemployed white grandfather, who accuses Grandma of racism as his third excuse not to get dressed and drive her to work.

His grandmother wanted a ride to work at 6:30 in the morning because, the day before, she had been aggressively solicited by a homeless man at the bus stop. On her account, the panhandler “was very aggressive, Barry. Very aggressive. I gave him a dollar and he kept asking. If the bus hadn’t come, I think he might have hit me over the head.”

Even Obama’s shiftless grandfather didn’t play the race card until pretty far into the argument over whether he would drive Grandma to work. First, the good-for-nothing grandfather told Obama that Grandma was just trying to guilt him into driving her, saying, “(S)he just wants me to feel bad.”

Next, he complained about his non-work routine being disrupted, saying: “She’s been catching the bus ever since she started at the bank. ... And now, just because she gets pestered a little, she wants to change everything!”

Only after Obama had offered to drive his grandmother to work himself and it was becoming increasingly clear what a selfish lout the grandfather was, did Grandpa produce his trump card. The reason he

wouldn’t get his lazy butt dressed and drive Grandma to work was... she was a racist!

As Obama recounts it, on Grandpa’s third try at an excuse, he told Obama: “You know why she’s so scared this time? I’ll tell you why. Before you came in, she told me the fella was black. That’s the real reason she’s bothered. And I just don’t think that’s right.” So I guess I’ll be heading back to the sack now!

That makes sense. It certainly never bothers me when crazy white people harass and threaten me.

This is Obama’s own account of what happened, which — as anyone can see — consisted of his slacker grandfather making a series of excuses to avoid having to drive the sole bread-earner in the family to work.

But Obama says, “The words were like a fist in my stomach, and I wobbled to regain my composure.” (It was as if he had been punched by an aggressive panhandler at a bus stop!) And not because his grandfather’s sorry excuse reminded him that he came from a long line of callow, worthless men, both black and white.

No, Obama swallowed his grandfather’s pathetic excuse hook, line and sinker, leading Obama to a reverie about his grandparents: “I knew that men who might easily have been my brothers could still inspire their rawest fears.” That’s true — assuming his brothers and sisters were menacing people at bus stops.

How deranged would you have to be to cite this incident as evidence that your grandmother thought like a “typical white person” — as opposed to your grandfather being worthless and lazy? For those keeping score, Obama is aghast at his grandmother’s alleged racism, but had no problem with Jeremiah Wright’s manifest racism.

If Obama is sent reeling by the mere words of an elderly white woman, how is he going to negotiate with a guy like Mahmoud Ahmadinejad? What if Ahmadinejad calls him “booger-face”? Will he run

crying from the table?

Your grandmother wasn't a racist, Barack. Your grandpa was just a loser. Can we wrap up our national conversation about race now? I think we'd like to move onto questions about your stupid plan to hold talks with Iran.

Ann Coulter is Legal Affairs Correspondent for HUMAN EVENTS and author of High Crimes and Misdemeanors, Slander, How to Talk to a Liberal (If You Must), Godless, and most recently, If Democrats Had Any Brains, They'd Be Republicans.

Obama's Controversial Views on Israel

For those of us with access to the Internet, it's been difficult to miss the circulating e-mails claiming that Barack Obama attended a Madrassa (an Islamic school) as a child in Indonesia. Or perhaps the one informing us that Obama's middle name is Hussein. Then there's the Internet allegation that Obama is really a "secret Muslim."

Innuendo about Barack Obama's faith and upbringing often dominate discussions regarding how the likely Democratic presidential nominee might conduct his foreign policy. That's a shame, because it distracts us from more legitimate and far deeper concerns over Obama's relationship not with Islam but with Israel, the principal rhetorical and military target of that religion's most extreme adherents.

Of course, as with Obama's remarks on many issues, it's easy to cherry-pick a few of his statements about Israel that make it seem as if a President Obama would be a loyal friend of the beleaguered state. Such as when he says, "peace through security is the only way for Israel" and "when I am president, the United States will stand shoulder to shoulder with Israel."

What's not to like, right? Well, a more thorough examination of Obama's statements, his background and previous associations and, most importantly, his would-be foreign policy team reveals a far different reality — one that has caused many supporters of Israel, including me, to worry about what an Obama presidency might do to the long-term support for the Jewish State.

First off, Obama demonstrates a deep misunderstanding of the Middle East when he calls for the immediate removal of American forces from Iraq, which would expose Iraq to worse ethnic bloodshed and embolden the enemies of Israel and the United States. Senator Obama also voted against legislation to place the Iranian Revolutionary Guard on the list of terrorist organizations and criticizes Hillary Clinton for voting in favor of the legislation, which passed with the support of over three-quarters of the

Senate. He has also pledged to meet without preconditions with Iran's Holocaust-denying leader, Ahmadinejad.

Just as disturbing are Obama's statements about the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, which include: "Nobody has suffered more than the Palestinian people" and the clueless remark that "the Israeli government must make difficult concessions for the peace process to restart."

These troubling statements caused my friend and former Israeli Ambassador to the U.S. Danny Ayalon to ask in a recent op-ed, "Who are you, Barack Obama?" Ayalon wrote that after meeting with Obama on two occasions, he was "left with the impression that [Obama] was not entirely forthright with his thinking [about Israel]."

Ayalon's skepticism no doubt stems from the fact that Obama's more recent pro-Israel statements do not square with his past sympathy for Palestinian radicals. Anti-Israel activist Ali Abunimah claims to know Obama well and to have met him at several pro-Palestinian events in Chicago when Obama was an Illinois state senator. In an article, Abunimah lamented that "Obama used to be very comfortable speaking up for and being associated with Palestinian rights and opposing the Israeli occupation." "Obama's about-face is not surprising," Abunimah insisted, "He is merely doing what he think is necessary to get elected and he will continue doing it as long as it keeps him in power."

Then there's Obama's church, Trinity United Church of Christ, whose anti-Semitism is now well known. Among many anti-Semitic documents that the church has published on its website is a letter that alleges Israeli "genocide" and "ethnic cleansing" of Palestinians and claims that Israelis "worked on an ethnic bomb that kills blacks and Arabs." Trinity's former pastor, Rev. Jeremiah Wright, who Obama has described as a "spiritual mentor," gave anti-Semite Louis Farrakhan an award for being a leader who "truly epitomized greatness."

Wright even traveled to meet with Libyan terrorist leader Muammar al-Gaddafi and has compared conditions in Israel to the apartheid of South Africa. Of course, you won't hear much from Wright these days. As Wright told PBS last year, he understands that Obama must keep his distance because "he can't afford the Jewish support to wane or start questioning his allegiance to Israel."

But nothing should concern Israel supporters as much as Obama's foreign policy team, which consists of the likes of Zbigniew Brzezinski, a remnant of the administration of President Jimmy Carter, who, like Rev. Wright, calls Israel an apartheid state. Brzezinski, Carter's national security advisor, has long held anti-Israel views and supports open dialogue with the terrorist group Hamas. Other top foreign policy advisors with avowed hostility toward Israel include Susan Rice and Robert Malley.

Most recently, it was revealed that Obama military advisor and national campaign co-chairman Merrill "Tony" McPeak has a long history of criticizing Israel and in 2003 alleged that American Middle East policy is being controlled by Jews at the expense of American interests in the Middle East. During the interview with the Oregonian, McPeak was asked why there was a lack of action in the Israeli-Palestinian peace process. He responded, "New York City. Miami. We have a large vote — vote, here in favor of Israel. And no politician wants to run against it."

What's most worrying about Obama's foreign policy team is that given the candidate's extreme lack of foreign policy experience (he once declared that the four years he spent living in Indonesia as a child give him credibility on the world stage), one would expect Obama to lean heavily on it for advice. That's something that should concern anyone who understands the value of supporting America's only reliable ally from a region in which we are engaged in two wars.

Mr. Bauer, a 2000 candidate for president, is chairman of Campaign for Working Families and president of American Values.

Obama's Dimestore 'Mein Kampf'

If characters from "The Hills" were to emote about Lrace, I imagine it would sound like B. Hussein Obama's autobiography, "Dreams From My Father."

Has anybody read this book? Inasmuch as the book reveals Obama to be a flabbergasting lunatic, I gather the answer is no. Obama is about to be our next president: You might want to take a peek. If only people had read "Mein Kampf" ...

Nearly every page — save the ones dedicated to cataloguing the mundane details of his life — is bristling with anger at some imputed racist incident. The last time I heard this much race-baiting invective I was ... in my usual front-row pew, as I am every Sunday morning, at Trinity United Church of Christ in Chicago.

Obama tells a story about taking two white friends from the high school basketball team to a "black party." Despite their deep-seated, unconscious hatred of blacks, the friends readily accepted. At the party, they managed not to scream the N-word, but instead "made some small talk, took a couple of the girls out on the dance floor."

But with his racial hair-trigger, Obama sensed the whites were not comfortable because "they kept smiling a lot." And then, in an incident reminiscent of the darkest days of the Jim Crow South ... they asked to leave after spending only about an hour at the party! It was practically an etiquette lynching!

In the car on the way home, one of the friends empathizes with Obama, saying: "You know, man, that really taught me something. I mean, I can see how it must be tough for you and Ray sometimes, at school parties ... being the only black guys and all."

And thus Obama felt the cruel lash of racism! He actually writes that his response to his friend's perfectly lovely remark was: "A part of me wanted to punch him right there."

Listen, I don't want anybody telling Obama about Bill Clinton's "I feel your pain" line.

Wanting to punch his white friend in the stomach was the introductory anecdote to a full-page psy-

chotic rant about living by "the white man's rules." (One rule he missed was: "Never punch out your empathetic white friend after dragging him to a crappy all-black party.")

Obama's gaseous disquisition on the "white man's rules" leads to this charming crescendo: "Should you refuse this defeat and lash out at your captors, they would have a name for that, too, a name that could cage you just as good. Paranoid. Militant. Violent. Nigger."

For those of you in the "When is Obama gonna play the 'N-word' card?" pool, the winner is ... Page 85! Congratulations!

When his mother expresses concern about Obama's high school friend being busted for drugs, Obama says he patted his mother's hand and told her not to worry.

This, too, prompted Obama to share with his readers a life lesson on how to handle white people: "It was usually an effective tactic, another one of those tricks I had learned: People were satisfied so long as you were courteous and smiled and made no sudden moves. They were more than satisfied, they were relieved — such a pleasant surprise to find a well-mannered young black man who didn't seem angry all the time."

First of all, I note that this technique seems to be the basis of Obama's entire presidential campaign. But moreover — he was talking about his own mother! As Obama says: "Any distinction between good and bad whites held negligible meaning." Say, do you think a white person who said that about blacks would be a leading presidential candidate?

The man is stark bonkersville.

He says the reason black people keep to themselves is that it's "easier than spending all your time mad or trying to guess whatever it was that white folks were thinking about you."

Here's a little inside scoop about white people: We're not thinking about you. Especially WASPs. We think everybody is inferior, and we are perfectly

charming about it.

In college, Obama explains to a girl why he was reading Joseph Conrad's 1902 classic, "Heart of Darkness": "I read the book to help me understand just what it is that makes white people so afraid. Their demons. The way ideas get twisted around. I helps me understand how people learn to hate."

By contrast, Malcolm X's autobiography "spoke" to Obama. One line in particular "stayed with me," he says. "He spoke of a wish he'd once had, the wish that the white blood that ran through him, there by an act of violence, might somehow be expunged."

Forget Rev. Jeremiah Wright — Wright is Booker T. Washington compared to this guy.

Ann Coulter is Legal Affairs Correspondent for HUMAN EVENTS and author of High Crimes and Misdemeanors, Slander, How to Talk to a Liberal (If You Must), Godless, and most recently, If Democrats Had Any Brains, They'd Be Republicans.

Over the Top Barack

Based on Barack Obama's hysterical, paranoid reaction to President Bush's remarks to the Israeli Knesset condemning the practice of appeasing terrorists, one might infer Obama was lying in wait for just such an opportunity to capture some national security street cred.

After all, Democrats begin any presidential race with a national security credibility deficit, and this one should be no different, notwithstanding the unpopularity of the Iraq war. Democrats like to think they gained congressional seats in 2006 because of the war, but a better read is that Republicans did themselves in through reckless spending, scandals and other abandonment of conservative principles.

Despite his puffed-up posturing, Obama probably recognizes this, as well. Otherwise, why would he have lashed out so nastily at both Mr. Bush (and Sen. McCain) for assuring our closest Middle Eastern ally that we would stand by it?

Obama was so sure Bush's remarks were aimed at him that he shed his nice-guy facade and gave the nation a little glimpse of his inner anger. For those who insist Obama is all sweet and light, I challenge you to listen to his tantrums in response to the president's non-attack.

Obama shouted: "I'm a strong believer in bipartisan foreign policy, but that cause is not served with dishonest, divisive attacks of the sort that we've seen out of George Bush and John McCain over the last couple days. They aren't telling you the truth."

Let me ask you: Where does Barack Obama get off proclaiming himself the high arbiter of civility and bipartisanship while he is engaged in a sputtering tirade of abject incivility and partisanship? Obama apparently expects us to assess his civility not on the basis of his conduct, but solely on the strength of his distorted self-description.

Like so many other liberals, Obama exempts himself from behavioral accountability through identification with liberal policies, which confer upon him the irrefutable presumption that he is kind and com-

passionate. But those not subject to the self-deluding spell of liberalism or Obamaphilia will not be fooled by such hypocrisy. They will judge Obama's claim to civility not on his self-elevating but empty words, but on his self-damning, nasty ones.

Obama's joining with other Democrats to bear false witness against President Bush is a perfect example of the type of incivility for which he disingenuously excoriates President Bush.

Obama also decried the president's remarks as "exactly the kind of appalling attack that's divided our country and alienated us from the rest of the world."

No, Sen. Obama, what have divided this country and alienated us from the rest of the world are the nonstop Democratic assaults against President Bush — assaults that you not only did not condemn as uncivil, dishonest and divisive but also have embraced and echoed.

What has placed America in a falsely negative light to the world is the Democratic chorus of lies that President Bush misled us into war in Iraq; that he is responsible for the killing of hundreds of thousands of Iraqi civilians; that the United States is torturing and otherwise violating the "rights" of our enemy prisoners at Guantanamo Bay; that this very detention center is comparable to a Soviet Gulag or Nazi prison camp; that the Bush government is spying on its own citizens; that America, because of its corporate greed, refuses to lead the world against apocalyptic global warming; and that the heartland of America is inhabited by jingoistic, imperialistic, intolerant, homophobic, xenophobic, racist and reality-challenged Bible-thumpers.

President Bush is not guilty of leveling a partisan attack against Barack Obama in Israel. But if he were to change course after seven long years on the receiving end and start returning cheap shots at Democrats, say, at the rate of 10 per day for the remainder of his term, he still would be behind Democrats in this department by a sizeable multiple. Truly, it amazes

me how civil, composed and un-reciprocal President Bush has been in the face of this incessant barrage of partisan vitriol.

Shame on Barack Obama for falsely accusing the president of behavior he and his party have perfected through meticulous practice. Shame on him for pretending that he offers bipartisanship when his actual record is one of extreme liberalism and is strikingly bereft of aisle crossing or compromise. Shame on him for defining bipartisanship and civility, in effect, as acquiescing to his dictates.

Obama likens his own foreign policy approach to that of Presidents Kennedy and Reagan, but reality places him closer to George McGovern or Michael Dukakis. But there is a method to his madness. He has assumed the offense against his Republican rivals to divert our attention from his demonstrable lack of toughness in the war on terror.

Mr. Limbaugh is a nationally syndicated columnist and author of Bankrupt: The Moral and Intellectual Bankruptcy of Today's Democratic Party, Absolute Power and Persecution.

Barack Potatoe Obama?

Imagine that John McCain named a young running mate to campaign with him, and this national rookie suggested America had 58 states, repeatedly used the wrong names for the cities he was visiting, and honored a Memorial Day crowd by acknowledging the “fallen heroes” who were present, somehow alive and standing in the audience. How long would it take for the national media to see another Dan Quayle caricature? Let’s raise the stakes. What if it was the GOP presidential candidate making these thoroughly ridiculous comments? This scenario is very real, except it isn’t McCain. It’s the other fellow.

ABC reporter Jake Tapper follows politicians around for a living. On his blog, he suggested Barack Obama has a problem: “The man has been a one-man gaffe machine.”

In Sunrise, Fla., Obama said, “How’s it going, Sunshine?” He did the same thing in Sioux Falls, S.D., calling it “Sioux City.” Some of his geographic struggles seem calculated. When asked why Hillary Clinton trounced him in Kentucky, Obama claimed “I’m not very well known in that part of the country ... Sen. Clinton, I think, is much better known, coming from a nearby state of Arkansas. So it’s not surprising that she would have an advantage in some of those states in the middle.” But Obama’s home state of Illinois is more than “near” Kentucky — it borders Kentucky.

In Oregon, there was a doozy. Obama said of his long campaign, “I’ve been in 57 states, I think, one left to go.” No one in the press made much of this. As former ABC political reporter Marc Ambinder, now with the Atlantic Monthly magazine, admitted: “But if John McCain did this — if he mistakenly said he’d visited 57 states — the media would be all up in his grill, accusing him of a senior moment.” If you doubt him, remember how most media outlets noted, then underlined McCain’s error about al-Qaeda being trained and funded by Iran.

In New Mexico, Obama suggested he was like a young Haley Joel Osment in “The Sixth Sense,” with

the ability to see dead people: “On this Memorial Day, as our nation honors its unbroken line of fallen heroes — and I see many of them in the audience here today — our sense of patriotism is particularly strong.” Fallen heroes in the audience? Is this Barack Potatoe Obama? This is precisely the kind of misstatement that Dan Quayle-bashers would run ad infinitum.

But there have also been gaffes on more serious matters. ABC found that campaigning in Rush Limbaugh’s hometown of Cape Girardeau, Mo., Obama argued that our military’s Arabic translators in Iraq are needed in Afghanistan: “We only have a certain number of them and if they are all in Iraq, then it’s harder for us to use them in Afghanistan,” he claimed. But Afghans don’t speak Arabic; they speak several other languages. That’s a lot like McCain’s gaffe — except for the degree of media attention, which in the Democrat’s case was virtually nonexistent.

McCain also would have enjoyed more media focus on Obama’s completely muddled analysis of South America last week. He told the Orlando Sentinel on Thursday that he would meet with Chavez to discuss “the fermentation of anti-American sentiment in Latin America, his support of FARC in Colombia and other issues he would want to talk about.” But on Friday in Miami, he insisted any country supporting the Marxist guerrillas of FARC should suffer “regional isolation.” This left Obama advisers scrambling to suggest that these two opposing statements can somehow be put together, that he can meet Chavez and isolate him at the same time.

Sometimes, Obama invents Bosnia-sniper-style whoppers about his personal history. In Selma, Ala., Obama claimed that the spirit of hope derived from the civil rights protests in Selma in 1965 inspired his birth — when he was born in 1961. He also has inaccurately claimed that the Kennedys funded his Kenyan father’s trip to America in 1959.

While he was making boo-boos in New Mexico

on Memorial Day, Obama also (according to CBS reporter/blogger Maria Gavrilovic) talked about post-traumatic stress disorder by claiming he had an uncle “who was part of the American brigade that helped to liberate Auschwitz,” and then came home and spent six months in an attic. Gavrilovic didn’t note that the prisoners at Auschwitz were liberated by the Red Army. Obama earlier made the claim on his campaign site that his grandfather knew American troops who liberated Auschwitz and Treblinka (also liberated by the Red Army).

Everyone should grant these candidates a little room for error in the long slog of presidential campaigning. But what about some balance? The same national media that turned Dan Quayle’s name into an instant joke are now working over time to present Obama as Captain Competent.

How Would Iran Read Obama?

Reeling from President Bush's criticism of the proposition that we should negotiate with terrorists, "as if some ingenious argument will persuade them they have been wrong all along," Barack Obama was at first indignant, declaring: "George Bush knows that I have never supported engagement with terrorists." But apparently he doesn't consider Iran, for all the genocidal bellicosity of its President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad, a terrorist state: on Monday he reaffirmed that he would indeed sit down with the leaders of Iran (as well as with those of Cuba and Venezuela), and that no one should be disturbed by this, since these countries "don't pose a serious threat to us the way the Soviet Union posed a threat to us."

And speaking specifically about Iran, the presumptive Democratic nominee continued: "If Iran ever tried to pose a serious threat to us, they wouldn't stand a chance. And we should use that position of strength that we have to be bold enough to go ahead and listen. That doesn't mean we agree with them on everything. We might not compromise on any issues, but at least, we should find out other areas of potential common interest, and we can reduce some of the tensions that has caused us so many problems around the world."

Yes, he really said that "we should find out other areas of potential common interest." He didn't explain what these might be, but here John McCain's comment was particularly apposite. "It shows naivete and inexperience and lack of judgment," observed the GOP standard-bearer, "to say that he wants to sit down across the table from an individual who leads a country that says that Israel is a 'stinking corpse,' that is dedicated to the extinction of the state of Israel. My question is, what does he want to talk about?"

That's not all. Obama is apparently not aware that Ahmadinejad has made it clear that he is in no mood to sit down with Americans unless the Americans know their place. "The American administration," he said in 2006, "is still dreaming of returning the Iranian people 30 years backwards. As long as America has this dream, these [relations] will not happen."

What should America do instead? "They should wake up from this dream and see the facts. They should change their behavior and mend their ways. They should take a fair position. We have told them what they have to do, and if they do it, there will be no problem as far as we are concerned."

"We have told them what they have to do, and if they do it, there will be no problem as far as we are concerned"! As if that weren't clear enough, he warned America and its allies that "if you want to have good relations with the Iranian people in the future, you should acknowledge the right and the might of the Iranian people, and you should bow and surrender to the might of the Iranian people. If you do not accept this, the Iranian people will force you to bow and surrender."

Would Iran's Thug-In-Chief regard Obama's invitation to sit down and chat as a sign that he was willing to "bow and surrender"? There is no reason to think he would regard it in any other way. Islamic law stipulates that Islamic forces may only ask for a truce with the enemy under two conditions: if they have a reasonable expectation that the enemy may convert to Islam, or — more commonly — if the Muslims are weak and need to buy some time to recover their strength to fight again more effectively. With this understanding, the Iranian mullahs might be forgiven for assuming that if Obama is coming to them hat-in-hand, he must be weak. Given Ahmadinejad's oft-repeated declarations that Israel will soon cease to exist (it was only last week that he said that it was "on its way to annihilation"), weakness might not be the wisest thing to project to them at this point.

Unless, of course, the bright new President Obama is prepared to deal with a nuclear mushroom cloud over Tel Aviv. That will certainly give him and Ahmadinejad plenty to talk about.

Mr. Spencer is director of Jihad Watch and author of The Politically Incorrect Guide to Islam (and the Crusades), The Truth About Muhammad and Religion of Peace? (all from Regnery — a HUMAN EVENTS sister company).

Human Events

The National Conservative Weekly

One Massachusetts Avenue, N.W. • Washington, D.C. 20001

1-888-467-4448 • www.HumanEvents.com