

MICHAEL SAVAGE

#1 NEW YORK TIMES BESTSELLING AUTHOR

A close-up portrait of Michael Savage, a man with a grey goatee and a brown hat, wearing a grey suit jacket over a light green shirt. He is holding a large, red, distressed sign shaped like the map of the United States. The sign has the words "GOVERNMENT ZERO" written in large, white, block letters with a weathered, metallic texture. The background is a bright blue sky with wispy white clouds.

GOVERNMENT ZERO

NO BORDERS
NO LANGUAGE
NO CULTURE

GOVERNMENT ZERO

NO BORDERS, NO LANGUAGE,
NO CULTURE

MICHAEL
SAVAGE



CENTER
STREET

NEW YORK • NASHVILLE



[**Begin Reading**](#)

[Table of Contents](#)

[Newsletters](#)

[Copyright Page](#)

In accordance with the U.S. Copyright Act of 1976, the scanning, uploading, and electronic sharing of any part of this book without the permission of the publisher constitute unlawful piracy and theft of the author's intellectual property. If you would like to use material from the book (other than for review purposes), prior written permission must be obtained by contacting the publisher at permissions@hbgusa.com. Thank you for your support of the author's rights.

CHAPTER 1

Government Zero

What Is Government Zero?

There is a dance of death in the West and actual death in the Middle East, courtesy of the Islamofascists. Meanwhile, the Caesar in the White House entertains himself with a thousand sycophants, partying on behind closed doors as if the Islamofascist hand will not touch him. He thinks he's protected from this new plague, the Black Death of radical Islam.

We're facing something the West hasn't had to deal with since the wars of religion in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. When those religious wars ended in one place, they began in another. They lasted for over one hundred years.

The same thing is happening right now. The radical Muslims are on the warpath and they are against everyone else. They are against Muslims who are not as fanatical. They are against the members of all other religions. They think they are going to take us back to some pristine religious period in human history that never actually occurred.

It's all complete rubbish. These "faith warriors" live lower than the pigs they despise. They kidnap and rape eight-year-old girls and say the Quran authorizes it. They're not purists. They're killers. They're Nazis in head scarfs. They aren't leading a religious revival. They're trying to take us back to a state of barbarism that has been extinct for 1,200 years.

This is a barbaric revolution, and we have a man in the White House who denies its existence. Whether he chooses to acknowledge it or not, it's going to continue until someone puts a stop to it.

Jonathan Sacks called the fight against radical Islam the "defining conflict of the new generation."¹ He likened radical Islam to a starfish. When you cut off a spider's head, it dies. But when you cut off the leg of a starfish, the starfish can regenerate it. Radical political Islam is a starfish. If you defeat ISIS or al-Qaeda, they will merely come back under another name.²

Why would any government bring in unvetted Muslim immigrants at a time like this? It would seem that only an insane prince would do this to his country. But Obama is not insane. He's stoned. He's stoned on the orthodoxy of the progressive left. Obama and his supporters are drunk on the ideology. They think they're going to create a progressive utopia by continuing their attack on our Western values.

This is precisely how great civilizations of the past declined and eventually fell. They rejected the values that made them great and degenerated into narcissism and selfishness. They kept on partying until they were too weak to defend themselves. Then, the unthinkable happened. They fell.

We've all seen documentary evidence of the Islamofascist thugs in ISIS swinging sledgehammers at priceless artifacts they deem offensive to Islam. For one thousand years, these treasures of antiquity

survived wars, earthquakes, and other man-made disasters, but not the current disaster fundamentalist Islam. As the columns of ancient ruins fall and the faces of ancient kings and queens are slammed with sledgehammers, we watch in horror, our advanced military technology apparently powerless to stop these Islamic vandals.

But it is not our technology or our military that has failed to thwart this destruction of priceless treasures. No. Just as we stand idly by as young girls are kidnapped, raped, and sold into slavery, we are paralyzed not by a lack of technology, but by a lack of will. We have either zero leadership or leadership secretly enabling these crimes against humanity.

Closer to home, we are similarly paralyzed as this most evil of administrations swings its sledgehammers at our most revered institutions. A climate of fear grips the people as the sneaks in high places spy on us, sell us out to Red China in a secret trade deal, decimate our medical system, eviscerate our military leadership, evaporate our borders, erase our culture, and attack religion's basic tenets. Meanwhile, millions of illegal aliens pour over our southern border, bringing with them an unwillingness to assimilate into American culture, refusing even to speak English.

This is what I call Government Zero. We are supposed to be a nation where the government is "of the people, by the people, and for the people." Yet every poll shows this rogue government of sneaks and traitors seems to relish doing the opposite of the will of the people. It is a government of itself, by itself, and for itself, run by lobbyists.

In short, Government Zero is absolute, unchecked government power and zero representation of the people. It doesn't exist to promote conservative or liberal principles. It is not pro-immigration or anti-immigration. It is not capitalist or socialist. It is not religious or atheist. Those are all just means to its end.

Its end is its own preservation and growth. This is by no means a new concept. Most governments throughout history have exploited those they ruled for the benefit of those who controlled them. Before the birth of the American republic, Government Zero was the rule, not the exception.

That was what made the United States a great experiment. When the founders wrote the words "We the People," they flipped the distribution of power that had existed for thousands of years upside down. They put most of the power in the hands of the people and reserved very little for the government. The government was heavily regulated, and the people were largely free. The government was servant and the people its master.

It was no coincidence that the American people flourished under this scenario. The free society allowed them to pursue their happiness in a largely free market and realize exponential economic and cultural growth. The government served the interests of the people, not because it was good in and of itself, but because it was restrained and ruled by the people.

After over one hundred years of progressive assault, that relationship has reversed. Government has become the master and the people its servant. The people are restrained and the government is free to do anything it wants. The government is all-powerful and the people are powerless. The government is secret and the people have no privacy.

It's a watershed moment in American history, but again, it's nothing new. It's America reverting back to the bondage that has defined most of human history.

If that sounds somewhat abstract, I'll bring it home for you. The government can act in its own interests only by acting against yours. It can grow richer only by making you poorer. It can expand its activity only by limiting your freedom. It can ensure its own safety only by threatening yours.

That's why the government is attacking everything that makes the world livable for the rest of us. It is attacking free enterprise, because it needs higher taxes and more regulation to expand its wealth.

and power. It is promoting open borders, because immigrants from socialist or Islamic countries don't share our traditions of individual liberty and limited government. It wages a war on police, because civil unrest allows it to exercise more centralized power or even martial law, eventually with a federal police force answering only to the kings and queens of government. It attacks freedom of speech because dissent is like kryptonite to an all-powerful government.

It attacks religion, perverting its very meaning, in order to replace what Karl Marx called "the opium of the masses" with an all-powerful central government becoming the new heroin of the masses. We are well on the road to replacing the former Soviet system with an emerging USSA, the United Soviet States of America.

Thomas Paine wrote,

*Society in every state is a blessing, but government even in its best state is but a necessary evil; in its worst state an intolerable one; for when we suffer, or are exposed to the same miseries by a government, which we might expect in a country without government, our calamity is heightened by reflecting that we furnish the means by which we suffer.*³

That couldn't be truer today, when we fund not only the government itself through our taxes, but also the government employee unions which continue to make the government itself bigger and more oppressive. AFSCME, the largest trade union for public employees in the United States, gave over \$60 million "to politicians, lobbyists and activist groups, according to 2014 federal reports obtained by Watchdog.org."⁴

If your intuition tells you most of this money went to Democratic politicians or left-wing advocacy groups and lobbyists, your intuition is correct. It's just one more way Government Zero feeds itself by draining our economic lifeblood.

[Out of the Frying Pan](#)

The good news is this disastrous presidency will finally come to an end in a little over a year. The bad news is we could jump out of the frying pan and into the fire, with the Arsonist in charge of the whole country. President Hillary Clinton would be even worse than Barack Obama. She has all of the anti-American, socialist credentials Obama has, along with a strength and toughness he lacks. That means she'd be even more effective for the wrong side.

Meanwhile, Clinton's Democratic rivals are gaining traction with the loser segment of the electorate, preaching a message identical to that delivered by the 1930s street-corner communists of New York's Lower East Side. Unfortunately, they can't be dismissed, because the loser segment is growing rapidly in a rigged economic system, with massive welfare and an unlimited immigration of have-nots.

New York's Leninist mayor Bill de Blasio has released a thirteen-point national "Progressive Agenda" that some call the liberal answer to the 1990s Republican Contract with America. The agenda is virtually indistinguishable from the policy platforms of the Socialist Party USA and Communist Party USA, both of which have nearly identical versions of the points on their websites.

Even if Clinton survives her primary challenges, she will have been dragged even further left than she was to start with. She's already changed her position on gay marriage and joined Obama's war on

police, along with rejecting the tough immigration policies implemented during her own husband's presidency.⁵ She's counting on the same voter coalition that put Obama in the White House twice to sweep her to victory, meaning no position she takes can be too far left.

The vast majority of Americans completely oppose this emerging Sovietization. If the 2018 midterm elections were any indication, more and more Americans are waking up to the very real threat posed by this demonic progressive movement. If you are reading this book, you are probably one of those American patriots desperate to save this nation from ruin.

Unfortunately, elections may not be enough. With an imperial presidency on one side and no real opposition party on the other, there is little use in throwing out the Democrats and replacing them with progressives from another party. We gave Republicans control of the White House, Senate, and House of Representatives for six years in the last decade. What did we get?

I'll tell you what we didn't get. We didn't get an iota of protection of our borders, language, or culture. We didn't get smaller government or freer markets. We didn't get less federal spending. We didn't get a sensible foreign policy that places the interests of the American people first. We didn't get any improvement in immigration policy or even a good-faith effort to stem the tide of illegal immigration. At best, we got less rapidly progressive progressivism.

Can 2016 be different? It's hard to make that case. The very real prospect of a liberal Republican president, Senate Majority Leader Mitch McConnell, and Speaker of the House John Boehner will maintain one-party rule.

Jeb Bush couldn't be clearer on his noncommitment to our borders, language, and culture. He's pro-Common Core. He's not only come out publicly for amnesty for illegals, he's *rebuked* fellow Republicans, including Donald Trump, for respecting the wishes of their supporters and opposing it. In his opinion, Republican presidential candidates should instead try to educate us poor rubes on how mistaken we are to ask the federal government to fulfill its primary objective: to defend America's borders.

Just to ensure there is no mistaking where he stands, Bush released a video on May 5 in which he commemorated Cinco de Mayo and extolled the great contributions of Mexican-Americans to the United States. He delivered the message personally on camera, *in Spanish*.⁷

Meanwhile, big-government conservatives McConnell and Boehner both defeated conservative movements to oust them from leadership in their respective houses in Congress. Upon retaining his Speakership, Boehner gave Nancy Pelosi an awkward bear hug and a kiss.⁸ He then purged the newly elected, authentic conservatives by removing them from key committees and cutting off their funding. This was a tactic right out of the Soviet government master plan.

[Supreme Zero](#)

As we found out this past summer, we can't count on the Supreme Court to represent us, either. The Court is supposed to uphold the Constitution as the will of the people in the long-term, even when the people's representatives make mistakes in the short-term.

Instead, the Court trampled on the Constitution, the will of the people, and basic logic in its two landmark decisions in June. It decided it could rewrite legislation in upholding Obamacare,⁹ just ignoring the very intentional stipulation that subsidies for health insurance premiums be paid only to recipients who purchased their insurance from an exchange "established by the state." Thirty-s

states had refused to establish such exchanges. The Court ruled the subsidies should be paid in those states anyway.

Don't let the media convince you this was all over a simple legislative oversight. That's a lie. The designers of Obamacare intentionally put that stipulation in to coerce the states into setting up the exchanges.¹⁰ They believed the states could be bought off with the subsidies. They were wrong.

Refusing to establish exchanges was a clear rejection of Obamacare by the overwhelming majority of state governments. That was their only recourse in rejecting a terrible law that had passed Congress without a single Republican vote.

So Justice Roberts was not defending democracy when he threw the rule of law and basic logic out of the window in upholding the Obamacare subsidies in states that had intentionally rejected them. It was just more of the same Government Zero we get from the president and Congress.

Just a day later, the Court ruled state laws prohibiting gay marriage were unconstitutional, again overriding the wishes of the people and trampling upon the principle of constitutional government. Justice Kennedy issued what Justice Scalia called in dissent "an opinion lacking even a thin veneer of law."¹¹ Somehow, Kennedy imagined the ratifiers of the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution extended equal protection of the law to homosexuals seeking to get married, even though homosexuality was illegal in every state at the time.

This is where we are. We have three branches of government that are not only supposed to check each other with their separate powers, but limit themselves to the powers delegated to them in the Constitution. They do neither. Instead, they join together in looting our wealth, trampling our liberties, and destroying our culture at the behests of special interests and their lobbyists.

[The Progressive-Islamist Takeover](#)

Progressives have long waged a war on religion as part of their Marxist agenda for an atheist, socialist state. To get there, they believe they have to tear down and destroy everything that defines Western Civilization as it is. They share that vision with the unlikeliest of conceivable allies: the radical Islamists.

What is happening in America right now can only be described as a Progressive-Islamist takeover. It may be hard for most people to imagine how committed atheists could possibly be working with committed religious fanatics. Both groups would mercilessly exterminate the other under the right circumstances. We've seen how communist countries have treated religious people in the past, and we can see how the Islamofascists treat the subgroups who make up the progressive movement today. Those who don't swear allegiance to their brand of extremist Islam are killed or exiled. Homosexuals are thrown off rooftops. Opponents are beheaded or burned alive.

Yet, everywhere we look, we see American progressives defending Islam. They make excuses for radical Islam's atrocities while branding anyone who criticizes them as bigots. They hold conferences on terrorism and exclude anyone who might talk about the threat of radical Islamist sleeper cells within our borders, while focusing on the "threat" from American Christians, conservatives, and patriots instead.

They support Obama in bringing in hundreds of thousands of Muslims as refugees with no way of screening them as potential members of ISIS or al-Qaeda, even as those groups boast of infiltrating the U.S. in this very manner.

I'm not talking about a conscious conspiracy between the two groups, per se. They are more like kindred spirits. They may not have the same vision for what society should look like when they're finished with it, but they share the belief that American society as it is today must be destroyed. That's the linkage. Remember, the driving principle of the 1960s radicals was, "Bring it all down on our man!"

Both groups also believe in absolute, autocratic rule over the people. They both want to run every aspect of your life. The progressives may be atheists and the Islamofascists religious fanatics, but they both want to take away your *freedom* of religion. They also want to take away your economic freedom. If you haven't noticed, every Islamic nation has a socialist economy. That's because socialism and autocracy are one and the same.

If a Progressive-Islamic takeover sounds unbelievable to you, I'm not surprised. The media continues to bend over backward to support a president who will not even say the word "Islamic" when he talks about the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria. They call themselves Islamic, but the president says they aren't.

The progressives claim the president avoids saying "Islamic" so as not to offend his Muslim allies in fighting the extremists. That's very convenient. It also just happens to obscure the truth in every public statement he makes about what the Islamofascists are doing. Those not keenly aware of what's going on would never suspect that we are fighting maniacs who commit their atrocities in the name of Islam.

The president's newspeak fits neatly into a much larger pattern. In every conceivable space, from immigration policy, to law enforcement, to education, to social policy, to the military, Islam is accommodated and defended.

Left-wing magazines print completely false stories about university campus rapes, while ISIS forces eight-year-old girls to marry if they're Muslim and become sex slaves if they aren't. Where's the feminist outrage over these atrocities? Why aren't gay activists marching in the streets over ISIS throwing homosexuals off rooftops?

They're too busy trying to put Christian bakeries and pizzerias out of business for not wanting to participate in their weddings.

President Obama has refused to curb illegal immigration through our southern border or to deport illegals once they're caught, in violation of his oath of office. But illegal immigrants from Central and South America are not the biggest immigration threat facing us. Much more dangerous are the hundreds of thousands of Muslims this administration has brought in through its refugee program from war-torn Muslim countries like Somalia and Syria.

What possible reason could there be for admitting more Muslim refugees than Christian, when Christians are being slaughtered by the thousands in the new Holocaust in the Middle East and elsewhere? Why bring in people among whom are those sworn to kill us and leave those being killed to fend for themselves?

One reason nothing is being done about this new Holocaust is that the government-media complex won't admit it exists. Time and again, the president has ignored or downplayed the atrocities committed by the Islamofascists, referring to them as "zealots" adhering to some unknown ideology. The media virtually never calls him on this, but they are quick to yell "Islamophobia" the minute anyone criticizes even the most brutal violence perpetrated in the name of that religion.

At the same time, the president has pursued a disastrous deal with Iran that both Israel and our traditional Sunni Arab allies have condemned. When Israeli prime minister Benjamin Netanyahu heroically spoke out against it to the U.S. Congress, Obama snubbed his visit under the pretense

neutrality toward the Israeli elections, while sending hundreds of operatives to Israel to try to thwart Netanyahu's reelection.

The administration not only claims it is committed to defeating ISIS, but that its alliance with Iranian-backed Shiite militias is winning the war and has the Islamic State contained and on the defensive. Yet, the day after the administration tried to intimidate the media into reporting more favorably about the war, ISIS captured the strategically important city of Ramadi. After the vermin ISIS blew up portions of the magnificent ancient temples of Palmyra, what happened? Did you even read about this atrocity against world civilization?

Just a few days after that, the president gave a commencement speech at the U.S. Coast Guard Academy in Connecticut, during which he told them the greatest security threat they'll face is climate change!¹²

Is it all coincidence? I'll let you be the judge of that. All I can do is present the facts and the most objective interpretation of them I can give you. But I'm going to challenge you to look a little deeper than the talking points Obama's sorority or the Republican nonopposition leadership throw at you. What might have seemed like isolated news events the first time you heard them form an unmistakable pattern.

[Vain and Aspiring Men and Women](#)

Samuel Adams once wrote, "If ever the Time should come, when vain & aspiring Men shall possess the highest Seats in Government, our Country will stand in Need of its experienced Patriots to prevent its Ruin."¹³

I believe that time has come. We are going to need every patriot taking a stand to stop the relentless attack on our nation, both from within and without.

Recent polls show a leftward shift in America,¹⁴ with more people identifying as liberal. Why is this happening? Because not a single Establishment Republican has articulated what a nationalist is and why a nationalist movement is necessary to save our identity as a nation. Those moving leftward are following George Orwell's satirical adage, "Freedom is Slavery."

[Nationalism vs. National Socialism](#)

As soon as anyone says the word *nationalism*, people immediately think of Adolf Hitler. That's because nationalism has been successfully denigrated by the left since the end of World War II. If you are a nationalist, you must be a Nazi, as far as the left is concerned. A lot of well-meaning people believe them.

What the progressives conveniently fail to mention is that the Nazis weren't just nationalists, they were socialists, too. The word "Nazi" is merely a shortened version of their party name, Nationalsozialistische Deutsche Arbeiterpartei or National-Socialist German Workers' Party. The party sought to implement socialism within a nationalist framework, meaning it put the needs of the nation before any international socialist movement.

Their nationalism made them fierce rivals of the internationalist communists, but they were *socialists* all the same. Before the Holocaust got under way, Hitler became internationally famous for

his implementation of a command economy. Hitler allowed private business owners to retain titles to their businesses, but he regulated them so heavily that decisions on what to produce and how much were really made by the state. They were state-owned enterprises in all but name.

At one point, Hitler's control over the economy was so authoritarian that people were forbidden from quitting their jobs.

Hitler even got the government into the automobile business, just like another dictator we know. You may not know this yourself, but the Volkswagen, literally "the people's car," was originally produced by a state-owned factory and marketed to people who would purchase with a strange government savings plan that never had a chance of solvency.

In short, it wasn't nationalism that made the Nazis so horrible, it was Hitler's brand of socialism. Socialism is by nature an authoritarian political system. The state seizes forcible command of the means of production and the fruits of each individual's labor. That's the definition of the word *socialism*.

Hitler's gross abuse of civil liberties was the natural result of his dictatorial command of the economy. The former were necessitated by the latter, just as civil liberties are being attacked here in support of Obama's policies. Had I told you ten years ago that someday soon you could face legal penalties for not buying a product from a private company, would you have believed me? That's just what Obamacare legally requires you to do. This is the true nature of socialism.

The nationalism I propose is obviously not national socialism. We want a strong military that projects power but is used only in defense of American interests, not to conquer the world. We wish to preserve our borders, language, and culture because they are the foundation of our liberty, not because we believe we belong to any "master race." We promote truly free markets within a regulatory structure that seeks to preserve a free and fair environment, not institute a command economy. We insist upon tariffs on goods manufactured in countries where tariffs are imposed on imported American goods or where their currency is manipulated to rig the import-export scales.

I have the intellectual honesty to grant that Obama is not an absolute dictator. However, you'll see he is an authoritarian when you look at the similarities between his authoritarian policies and those of other dictatorial regimes.

- He claims authority to spy on every American, collecting their phone and e-mail records without a judicial warrant.
- He claimed the authority to kill an American citizen on American soil without due process. He had to back up on this after Rand Paul's 2013 filibuster.
- He seized control of an automobile manufacturer and violated contract and bankruptcy laws by distributing assets to unions, rather than to the company's creditors.
- He has given tacit support to street gangs, who could be compared to Brownshirts, undermining the uniformed, local police.
- He may intend to institute a national police force.
- He has essentially erased our border with Mexico, not permitting our Border Patrol to do its job.
- He has purged the military of many patriotic and talented leaders.
- He has antagonized Russia, alienated Israel, cozied up to communist China, and reopened an embassy in Cuba without demanding any advancement of human rights.

These are all the natural outgrowths of socialism, a political and economic system that assigns too much power to the government. It is impossible to separate absolute economic power and absolute political power over all aspects of life, as every nation which has experimented with socialism has learned.

Nationalism without socialism and racism has nothing to do with the Nazis or any other authoritarian society. It is simply love of one's country and its national identity. America's national identity is built around personal freedom. Its borders, language, and culture are the elements out of which that national identity is formed. A nationalist approach toward preserving our borders, language, and culture is the only way to preserve our freedom. We must organize and create a vigorous nationalist movement.

Critics may argue I can't call for a nationalist movement and still claim to be a small-government conservative who supports limits on federal power. That isn't true. Our federal government today is an internationalist one. It aspires to rule the whole world and is willing to act against the interests of its own constituents to achieve that goal.

A nationalist government in Washington, DC, would actually be a smaller government with a more limited scope than the one operating there now. It would represent the will of its own people, returning to its founding principles, including forgoing powers not delegated to it and left with the states or the people. As Abraham Lincoln so eloquently put it, it would be "a government of the people, by the people, and for the people," not a government of the New World Order controlled by a secretive group of unelected plutocrats.

CHAPTER 2

Zero Leadership

One of the consequences of Government Zero is Zero Leadership. We're already there. We have a rogue president, a sleeping Congress, a supine media, a docile, narcotized populace, and a barely functioning Supreme Court.

The rogue president tramples every institution, divides the people by race, sex, religion, and political orientation. He set out to transform the beautiful nation, and in so doing, he's causing irreparable damage.

Like a stoned plastic surgeon, he botched the operation and created a mutilated face and an ugly body politic. The anesthesia he used when he applied his scalpel forever rotted the body politic with his toxic mixture of race and class warfare has been injected so deeply and so often and in such high dosages that the once beautiful nation will soon be unrecognizable.

The American presidency reached a new low point when Barack Obama gave his speech in Selma, Alabama. On the fiftieth anniversary of Bloody Sunday, when true victims of racism bravely marched in protest of their oppression, the president did what he always does: He divided instead of united. He reopened wounds that were healing, instead of helping them to heal further. This president takes demagoguery to a whole new level.

He was doing just what he wanted to do, which was to divide black against white, straight against gay, Asian against Hispanic, Hispanic against black. This is what the president spends every waking moment thinking about how to do.

I can refute his demagogic speech point by point, but first I want to share something completely different with you. I want to tell you about two dreams I had, both on the same night, that are both very important to what I'm trying to tell you.

The White Owl

In the first dream, I was on a trail in the woods, with my son and another person. I used to walk in the woods with my son quite often when he was a kid. As I walked in the woods in my dream, I came upon a woman. She seemed to be walking a dog on a long leash, perhaps a thirty-foot lead. I stopped for a moment, because I didn't recognize the breed of her dog. But it wasn't a dog.

As the animal turned toward me, I realized it was a white owl with one eye. It had one eye hollowed out. I asked the woman, "Do you often come to this place in the woods?"

"Yes," she said, "we will know each other."

Immediately afterward, in my dream, I was giving a lecture in a seminar room, in a private facility. I was talking to my audience on the meaning of rain. Then, I gave a seminar to another small group on the meaning of hunger. I told them:

“Most of you understand by now that you can eat the most expensive meal in New York City, or the most expensive meal in Los Angeles, but not enjoy one bite of it. Do you know why? Because you’re hungry. I am going to teach you today how to truly be hungry, so you can taste your food again.”

Now comes the most important part. In the next dream, there was a black woman in a black vest. She was middle-aged and heavysset. Around her were a group of black teenagers, with bandanas on their heads. She spoke to them quietly, saying:

“America is a deep country. You must find forgiveness in yourselves in order to know the deepness.”

This is what I had prayed the first black president would teach America. Instead, this president teaches the opposite. He teaches division. He teaches hatred. He teaches envy. He teaches the antithesis of his alleged Christian beliefs. We constantly hear he’s not a Muslim; he’s a Christian. It doesn’t matter. He isn’t practicing either religion.

[Divisive Demagoguery](#)

He is instead practicing the religion of demagoguery. The black woman in my dream was a healer. She told her young audience about the healing power of forgiveness. But Obama is unable to forgive. He does not have forgiveness in his heart, as Jesus taught us to have.

Let’s not forget that Barack Obama has no wrongs for which to forgive anyone. He wasn’t beaten by cops for demanding his rights. He wasn’t denied the right to vote or go to school. He was a spoiled white kid with a black father, who decided to pretend to be a downtrodden black man.

He talks like he experienced racism himself, when he never did. Obama grew up in Honolulu, Hawaii, in a multiethnic society where there is almost no racial discrimination. If anything, whites are the minority discriminated against in Honolulu. Barack Obama has no experience with racism. Yet, he wraps himself in all the rhetoric of those who did.

Even worse, he incites hatred in black Americans for racism where it doesn’t exist, all for political gain. That is how cynically and bitterly this man hates America.

I’m not saying there is no racism in the world today. Of course there is. But Obama talks as if it’s still 1964 and he is Martin Luther King. He talks to black voters as if they aren’t voters, as if they hadn’t won that right fifty years ago. He talks to them as if Darren Wilson is one of those cops beating protestors on Bloody Sunday fifty years ago, even though two separate investigations concluded Wilson was telling the truth and found no case against him.

This is the kind of leadership you get when the people have no representation and the government exists of itself, by itself, and for itself. You get lies instead of the truth. You get division instead of unity. You get hatred instead of healing. That’s Zero Leadership.

I shared my dreams with you for a reason. My soul spirit came to me that night. Those of you who are intuitive, who know there is something beyond the one-dimensional world of politics, know what the dreams meant. They are telling us that the only thing that can save this nation is spiritual, not political.

We have a void of spirituality in this nation today. It is hollowing us out and destroying us from

top to bottom. Regardless of your religion, only by finding your spiritual center can you overcome the division and hatred being forced upon you by Obama and his allies.

Of course, the propagandists in the media aren't talking about him this way. They loved his speech at Selma. They called it "one of his best."¹ The *Missouri Democrat* tweeted, "I dare anyone to listen to the speech the President gave today and then say he doesn't love America."²

Can you believe that? That is classic Soviet propaganda, right out of *Pravda*. It is the opposite of the truth. Every line of that speech seethed with resentment for America and all the wrongs Obama believes America continues to perpetrate.

In a way, Bloomberg was right. It was one of his best speeches, in terms of accomplishing his goals. He was able to mix lies with the truth to foster division and enmity, under the pretense of honoring real heroes of the civil rights movement who overcame real racism.

In that way, Obama is a genius. He is a genius at dividing people and dismantling this great nation. He is a genius at dismantling our military. He is a genius at wrecking our economy with zero interest rates, courtesy of "Grandma" Janet Yellen, allowing him to borrow trillions. You'll soon need a wheelbarrow full of currency to buy a loaf of bread, just like they did in the Weimar Republic.

Think back to my second dream. One would assume, a century and a half after the abolition of slavery, after the Great Society, affirmative action, and trillions of dollars in welfare, after the first black president, the first black attorney general, and black CEOs running major corporations, there would be forgiveness. But there is no forgiveness in this man's heart.

Maybe I have to have forgiveness in my heart for this man who is destroying the great nation my grandfather immigrated to over a hundred years ago.

So, Obama gives a speech in Selma at the site where racial persecution occurred fifty years ago and takes the opportunity to remind us of how terrible he believes America really is. He didn't just talk about racial discrimination. He reminded us that women didn't always have the right to vote, and about the "gay Americans whose blood ran on the streets of San Francisco and New York."³

Blood ran in the streets? Did I miss something? Was there a war in the streets against gays in San Francisco and New York? Yes, there has been violence against gays in America in the past, as there has been in every country in the world. I wish the president was more concerned about the Muslims who throw gay people off rooftops and then stone them to death if they survive the fall. No, Obama is only concerned with how to make America look bad.

This is American history for our president. All he knows about the history of this nation is racism, oppression, and exploitation. Nothing positive happened, except for the work done by slaves and oppressed women. His history book doesn't have the chapter where those supposedly evil white men created the freest country that has ever existed.

It doesn't contain those pages documenting the invention of the telephone, penicillin, the steam engine, motion pictures, the airplane, the suspension bridge, radio, or dozens of other life-changing history-making inventions, by those supposedly evil, white entrepreneurs seeking profits. It certainly doesn't contain the millions of white American males who fought against slavery, much less southern plantation owners like Robert E. Lee, who freed their slaves voluntarily the minute they were legally allowed to do so.

Like everything else that comes out of his mouth, Barack Obama's version of American history is a lie.

Not only did he use the Selma event to stimulate anger, resentment, jealousy, and revenge, he actually invited the race-baiting huckster Al Sharpton to stand with him. Meanwhile, the *New York Times*, in true Soviet *Pravda* style, airbrushed out the attendance of George W. Bush and his family.

their picture of the speech.⁴

That's right, the Bushes marched with the president at Selma, but as in Orwell's *1984*, the *New York Times* tried to convince you it never happened. Instead, they showed that street vermin, A Sharpton. It's chilling.

Along with his resentful, passive-aggressive missives, Obama also peddled his usual catalog of socialist canards. One of my favorites was, "We are the slaves who built the White House and the economy of the South."

This is another half truth. The manual labor provided by the slaves was good, honest work, and was horrible they were not doing it voluntarily or with compensation. But Obama pretends there were no architects, no engineers, no management, and no capital investment for the raw materials that all went into building the White House.

This is the same fallacy leftists since Karl Marx have pushed about laborers providing all of the value of production. I respect laborers, bricklayers, and carpenters for doing honest work, without which there would be no building. But Obama and the left talk as if the building would exist without capitalists, whose labor in the past produced the savings needed to buy the raw materials and pay the bricklayers and carpenters. He talks as if it would exist without architects, engineers, or management.

If that's true, then why don't carpenters and bricklayers just build the building without the capitalist? Why don't they do what the capitalist has done themselves, instead of working for him? I don't have to answer these questions for you. The twentieth century answered them when tens of millions starved to death trying to put Marx's ideas into practice.

[Zero Truth in Leadership](#)

It wasn't so long ago that no one in America would have disagreed with what I just said. But when you have Government Zero, the truth itself dies. A government that exists by itself, of itself, and for itself must destroy the truth, because the truth sets people free.

I recently visited a Chinese antiquities store in San Francisco. An unusually colorful pair of wooden "Foo dogs" in the window stopped me in my walk up Grant Avenue. They were ugly and colorful. Created to ward off evil spirits, they were placed at the entrance of the homes of the rich. These temple "lion dogs" date from the early seventeenth century of the Ming dynasty.

I learned that during the Communist "cultural revolution," the Red Guards roamed China and destroyed these Foo dogs as symbols of a "decadent, bourgeois" culture. Mao believed they were, in Obama's terms, symbols of "unfairness." People tried to remove and hide these treasures of China's vast cultural heritage. Some even removed ceramic roof tiles on which these lion dogs were mounted to save them from Mao's rapacious young thugs of political correctness. Mao named the thugs "Red Guards." Sound familiar?

Today, our rogue president's red guards are rapidly destroying every vestige of America's cultural heritage. From the schools to universities, young brains are being washed of history and logic. Science is being replaced by rote repetition of big lies. Children are being taught that a better, more fair world is being created when, in fact, it is a totalitarian monstrosity.

It is a world of conformist beliefs, not critical thought. It's a world where centralized authority replaces individualism; where conformity and nihilism trump creativity and faith. It is a world where the red guards of America, once independent media and academic establishments, now seek out

remove, and attempt to destroy any symbol of American distinction and greatness.

Obama is great at leading America in the wrong direction. He certainly has the audacity to speak of hatred for America with a smile and the whispering intensity of a preacher. All the while he's leading us backward instead of forward.

For the rogue president, it is still 1963 and there is still Jim Crow. Socialism is still cool; it hasn't been fully discredited yet. America is still divided racially. Gays are still beaten in the streets. Women still don't have the right to vote.

He wants to lead us backward, because it divides us and keeps us fighting with one another. That's the foundation of his party's success. And he's good at it. That's what makes him so dangerous.

When I say "dangerous," I'm not exaggerating. Leadership has consequences, whether it's good leadership in the right direction or terrible leadership in the wrong direction. We've just seen a civilization completely break down in Ferguson, Missouri, over what turned out to be a tragic but justified use of lethal force by a policeman defending himself. The big lie, "Hands up, don't shoot" was an invention.

Had the president and his attorney general condemned the looters and rioters unequivocally, or even just stayed out of it altogether, it might not have gone so far. But they both had to weigh in and condemn Darren Wilson before any conclusive evidence of his guilt was available. Then it turned out there was no evidence. He was innocent. By then, it was too late. The city was already burning.

I'm not saying there is no racism anywhere in police departments or that people don't have a right to peacefully protest where it really exists. But rioting, burning the private property of innocent bystanders, and using protest as an excuse for mayhem is not peaceful protest. It is not a right. It is a crime.

Safeguarding life and property is the first duty of any public official. That's why we have a government in the first place. As the Roman consul Cicero said over two thousand years ago, "Although it was by Nature's guidance that men were drawn together into communities, it was in the hope of safeguarding their possessions that they sought the protection of cities."⁵

Incidentally, Cicero also warned us about the demagoguery of "income inequality." His friend Lucius Marcius Philippus introduced a bill to redistribute property and suggested in one of his speeches that all property should be equal. Cicero condemned the speech, saying, "What more ruinous policy than that could be conceived?"⁶

Wise men like Cicero have been warning us for thousands of years about demagogues preaching income inequality and subverting respect for private property. Aristotle warned us about it, too. So Obama is nothing new. He's just another Philippus. But he goes a step further in inciting a war on cops. He's not just threatening private property with his calls to "spread the wealth around." He's endangering everyone's lives by encouraging a war on cops.

It's not just in Ferguson. Obama's socialist ally, Mayor de Blasio of New York City, has been just as culpable as Obama and Holder in encouraging this violence. When two cops were killed, executive order style, last December, the head of the police officer's union said the mayor had "blood on his hands."⁷

He was right. Leadership has consequences. I disagreed with the nonindictment of Eric Garner and his killers. I said so unequivocally on my show, *The Savage Nation*. However, like any rational person, I blamed the killing on the individuals who perpetrated it, not every cop in New York.

Mayor de Blasio did exactly the opposite. In rhetoric worthy of his socialist idol, Obama, he said he was afraid his son wasn't safe walking the streets anymore, "and not just from some of the painful realities of crime and violence in some of our neighborhoods, but safe from the very people they want to have faith in as their protectors."⁸

Do you see what is happening? These demagogues are not just inciting people's emotions to win elections. ~~They are breaking down the pillars of civilized society.~~ When that common bar thug dressed up as a cop killed Eric Garner, he should have been indicted. That he wasn't was injustice for Eric Garner and his family. But when you indict all cops everywhere and express sympathy for people who murder them, none of us are safe anymore.

This is where Obama and the progressives have led us. They have incited contempt for the protectors of life and property. They have encouraged hatred of everything great about America. They have convinced a lot of gullible young people that the freest, richest, greatest nation on earth is actually a prison where white privilege reigns, women and minorities are oppressed, workers are exploited, and the environment is destroyed.

Obama is the same kind of pedantic, academic socialist as the professors who tried to have the American flag banned on the campus of the University of California, Irvine. They sided with a bunch of useless, idiotic left-wing students who drafted the petition because the American flag "contributed to racism." Does this sound familiar? These ideas start with our leadership.

Universities have become hotbeds of anti-Americanism, bent on attacking the nation's honor itself. It was from this environment that the current president emerged, and his fellow socialists in academia are feeling brave.

Do you want to know how bad this poison can get? One hundred eighty Americans have actually attempted to join ISIS.⁹ That's right. Their minds are so warped by progressive hatred for America that they've actually decided the ninth-century throwbacks who burn people alive might be better.

Certainly, 180 people is like a dust speck in a nation of over three hundred million. But you should be alarmed that even one American kid could actually reject the freedom this country offers for the murderous tyranny of the Islamofascists. This is what happens when your leadership wages nonstop demagogic war on freedom of religion, free speech, private property, and free markets. Hatred of freedom and civilization drives people toward the antithesis of freedom and civilization.

Of course, some of these are not American kids at all. They weren't U.S. citizens and they never did believe in American principles. They were radical Muslims living in Obama's America, where there are no borders. Tuberculosis, measles, and EV-D68 are not the only things this administration's irresponsible immigration policies have imported. It has also imported some of the Islamofascists themselves.

[Zero Leadership for the World](#)

That brings us to Obama's leadership on the world stage. In the face of the real oppressors of women, homosexuals, and other minorities, oppressors who are beheading people and burning them alive, he is a complete pushover. Where is his audacity in dealing with ISIS? Where is his audacity in dealing with Iran? Instead of dealing with these real threats, he is provoking a war with Russia that America cannot afford and may very well lose.

Let me tell you about another speech that was given just a few days before Obama's Selma address. It wasn't given by a Republican. It wasn't even given by an American. It was given by a foreign head of state, but, ironically, it was the first time in a long time I felt proud to be an American again.

I'm talking about Israeli prime minister Bibi Netanyahu's speech to Congress on March 3, 2015. It was a mirror image of Obama's speech, just as that leader is a mirror image of Obama. Here is

real leader, stating facts and showing pride in his country's history and heritage. His speech united instead of divided. Republicans and Democrats, who broke ranks with the president for the first time since his inauguration, were on their feet cheering on dozens of occasions.

I go back in history and compare this speech to something Winston Churchill did. He also addressed Congress, during World War II. Speaking just three weeks after Pearl Harbor, he said:

Sure I am that this day, now, we are the masters of our fate. That the task which has been set us is not above our strength. That its pangs and toils are not beyond our endurance. As long as we have faith in our cause, and an unconquerable willpower, salvation will not be denied us. In the words of the Psalmist: "He shall not be afraid of evil tidings. His heart is fixed, trusting in the Lord."¹¹

Can you imagine the comparison between Winston Churchill and the duplicitous community organizer we have in the White House today? Churchill's speech also united American Republicans and Democrats. It united the United States and Great Britain against the Axis powers. This is what real leaders do. They unite.

Real leaders are also stand-up people. Despite a long history of passive-aggressive sniping from the Obama administration, Netanyahu took considerable time to thank Obama personally for those times when the president *did* do his duty to support our ally. He was gracious and deferential to a man who has constantly tried to undermine him and his fight to protect Israel from enemies who want to destroy her.

In a way, he was talking to himself during that part of the speech. Obama did not attend, citing the American custom of not meeting with foreign heads of state so close to an election.

What hypocrisy. Weeks before the story broke, I warned my radio listeners on *The Savage Nation* that Obama had sent hundreds of operatives to Israel to try to undermine Netanyahu and the Likud Party in the Israeli election. We're supposed to believe it was a mere coincidence that tens of thousands of Israelis organized and called for Netanyahu's replacement just four days after his speech.¹²

Sure enough, barely a week after the protest, Fox News broke the story that a bipartisan commission was investigating whether the Obama administration was funding efforts to overthrow Netanyahu.¹³

He did more than fund those efforts. The president of the United States sent approximately two hundred fanatical left-wing street operatives, including one Jeremy Bird, who ran Obama's 2008 campaign with an iron fist, to try to overthrow Netanyahu. They failed.

This election was almost as significant for Americans as it was for Israel. If you analyze it, several things jump out at you.

First, the bias of the media was so overwhelming against Netanyahu that it was beyond embarrassment. It was a joke, a laugh line. We know the media is all anti-American, all anti-Israel, all of the time. We know they're antinationalists. The media is comprised of overeducated and underlearned people who believe they're not citizens of America, or any other nation, but citizens of the world.

Barack Hussein Obama thinks the same way. Before he became president, he went to Berlin, and in that memorable, meaningless speech, the president of the United States called himself a "citizen of the world." Boy, did he ever mean it. It may have been the one and only thing he said that day that he truly

meant. He certainly isn't at heart a citizen of the United States.

So, the Israeli election was to some extent about Obama. People ask me, "Are you happy that Netanyahu won?" I say, "Well, the real story is that Obama lost." He spent all of his powers trying to defeat Netanyahu short of going to war with Israel and he lost.

Those of you who are religious were celebrating and saying it was God's hand that gave Netanyahu victory. That's one way to look at it.

I'm more of a pragmatist than I am a religionist. Pragmatically speaking, the Jews in Israel know their backs are against the wall. They know what an existential threat to their survival means. Americans don't really know what it means because they live in a dream world.

I don't blame them for that. Who wants to walk around agitated twenty-four hours a day over what might be tomorrow when they can enjoy today? Very few. Those of us who do it for a living have to do it. We are hired to do it. We are hired to be the seers, and we see what's coming in this country.

Obama's attempt to manipulate the Israeli elections failed, but it was par for the course. He consistently attacks our allies and panders to our enemies, always leading the world toward greater instability. Obama wanted more socialist leadership in Israel. That would have made Israel easier to manipulate into accepting a Palestinian state, based on indefensible Israeli borders.

That would have furthered the progressive dream of one multicultural, socialist world order, but it is not in the best interests of the American people, any more than for the Israeli people. American interests are best served by a strong Israel, as the bulwark of democracy and freedom in a region increasingly dominated by tyranny and ninth-century theocracy.

Obama's meddling in the Israeli elections was the Arab Spring strategy all over again. Remember how that started, with those "spontaneous" protests in the streets? Do you remember Hillary Clinton cackling "We came, we saw, he died," after Mu'ammur Gadhafi was killed by an Islamist mob? She was quite self-satisfied with her "Arab Spring," wasn't she? What do you think of the results now?

Take a look at the Middle East after this administration toppled secular governments, allowed radical jihadists like the Muslim Brotherhood to seize power, and abandoned the Iraqi government instead of leaving a stabilizing force behind, as so many advised. It's more radically Islamist than it has been in a thousand years. ISIS has established a caliphate and threatens to take over all of Iraq and then move on to Syria.

Does this benefit the American citizens whose interests Obama is supposed to represent? No. The administration's foreign policy has worked in direct opposition to the interests of the American people, almost without exception.

That's just what it was doing when trying to bring about regime change in Israel. The president and his sorority want a leftist government in Israel that will not speak up, as Netanyahu did, when the United States makes the wrong deal with Iran. They want a government that will not, as Netanyahu said, stand alone and go to war, if it must, to safeguard the Israeli people.

Netanyahu was like Gary Cooper in *High Noon* during that speech. He said to the American people, "The bad guys want to kill me and my townsfolk. We would love for you to join us, but if you don't, we're willing to fight alone."

That's not to say Netanyahu wants a war. He is a war hero and knows what war is. War is hell. It's the worst thing that can happen to a society. Neither Netanyahu nor the Israeli people want war with anyone. He said himself, "Now we're being told that the only alternative to this bad deal is war. That's just not true. The alternative to this bad deal is a much better deal."

The Democrats ignored these very clear statements and claim he's fearmongering, implying he does want a war.

Do you think it is fearmongering to explain what the throwbacks in Iran are? The mullahs of Iran have said they are going to wipe out the State of Israel and then kill all the Jews in the world. That should put the fear of God in your heart. It's not fearmongering to face reality.

It was actually Kentucky Democrat John Yarmouth who was doing the fearmongering when he implied Netanyahu wants war. He said Netanyahu's speech was "right out of Dick Cheney's playbook" and that "Netanyahu basically said that the only acceptable deal was a perfect deal or an ideal deal." That's a lie.

The Israeli prime minister actually gave some good advice on how to both avoid a war and make a better deal with Iran, if only Obama and the Democrats were listening.

Unfortunately, the president claimed he didn't even watch the speech, which I find extremely hard to believe. Can you actually believe any leader in the world wasn't watching that speech? As I listened to the address, I saw the leaders of every nation on earth taking time out of their busy schedules to listen to what has to be one of the most important speeches of our lifetime.

Obama said he didn't, but that he read the transcript. He said Netanyahu "didn't offer any viable alternatives" to the deal Obama was working on. That's not true. Here is what the prime minister said:

*Now, if Iran threatens to walk away from the table—and this often happens in a Persian bazaar—call their bluff. They'll be back, because they need the deal a lot more than you do. And by maintaining the pressure on Iran and on those who do business with Iran, you have the power to make them need it even more.*¹⁵

That is what any honest person would call an alternative. To what? To the accommodative approach to negotiations the president is taking. Prime Minister Netanyahu understands the region. He understands the Iranians and their negotiating tactics. He understands that you have to be strong, that hard-way buyers are strong in the Persian rug markets.

Taking a strong position in negotiations is not the same as provoking a war. "Peace through strength" is what won the cold war. Back when we had real leadership in this country, we faced down an empire with over thirty thousand nuclear weapons and brought it to its knees without firing a shot. We were able to do that not only because of what Ronald Reagan did, but what he didn't do.

One thing he didn't do was make threats he wasn't ready to back up. He didn't go around the world drawing red lines, only to make this country a laughingstock when adversaries crossed them with impunity. Instead, he strengthened our military to a point where the Soviets couldn't hope to keep up. He picked his battles, deploying troops only when communists attempted coups in the Western Hemisphere.

Reagan constantly won the public relations battles with Mikhail Gorbachev. He famously said "Mr. Gorbachev, tear down this wall," while speaking to a cheering crowd in what was then West Berlin. I've often imagined him flashing that winning smile and saying, "You should have listened to me," when the German people tore down the Berlin Wall themselves, marking the beginning of the end of the USSR.

Ironically, Russian president Vladimir Putin has acted a lot more like Reagan than our own president has over the past several years. When Obama drew another of his red lines for Bashar al-Assad in Syria over chemical weapons, it was Putin who prevented war and solved the problem with diplomacy. He worked with his ally, instead of undermining her, and persuaded the Syrian government to hand over all of its chemical weapons.

Whether you like him or not, Putin is another example of a real leader who puts the interests of his

people first and leads with strength and restraint. He's shown the most restraint in dealing with the Obama administration, which has done nothing but provoke him.

Russia's interests don't always coincide with America's, but Putin understands his primary function as president. Is he a politician? Of course he is. But he never sells out his own people just to keep himself or his party in power. Maybe that's one reason the Obama administration demonizes him so much. Just as Obama probably resents the comparison to Netanyahu, he may very well resent comparisons to the Russian president who has outclassed him so many times. Obama should be building a partnership with noncommunist Russia and taking a hard line with Iran and ISIS. Instead he's soft on Iran and ISIS and risking a disastrous war with Russia, which the United States could lose.

Maybe it's better that he's ineffective at leading, since he's trying to take America in completely the wrong direction. He doesn't care about the best interests of the American people. He cares about destroying borders, language, and culture, and building his progressive utopia.

Not acting in the interests of the people is really a problem with both parties. Sure, they disagree on a lot of things. But there is one thing more important to both parties than anything they disagree on with each other: staying in power. They love living high on our dime, and they try to do what they're elected to do only when it doesn't jeopardize their chances of keeping their cushy jobs.

I'll never forget a picture that appeared on the top of the *Drudge Report* back in early January. The Republicans had won the Senate the previous November and had just taken office that day. As of that day they controlled both houses of Congress, but do you know what picture Matt Drudge ran? It was John "Man-Tan" Boehner bear-hugging none other than the most despicable woman in American politics, Nancy Pelosi. It couldn't have been more appropriate.

What does this bear hug symbolize other than he did their bidding? He went to her, gave her a hug, and showed us all how much opposition there really is in Washington. I'm sure you can find the picture without too much effort. Boehner looks like a satisfied little boy being hugged by the man bear, Nancy Pelosi, who really runs the show.

Twenty-five representatives had opposed Boehner's reelection as Speaker. That was the opposition out of hundreds of Republican representatives who hold a majority in the House. Those were the only people out of over five hundred elected representatives who thought anything should change at all.

So, you can expect more of the same rather than less of the same. You can recognize the election was for naught. It had no meaning whatsoever. You can brace for taxation without representation to continue. You can expect the oligarchy to answer to the Wall Street powers who truly run the country.

As I've said, we can't even count on the Supreme Court to act in our interests most of the time. Obama's appointees Elena Kagan and Sonia Sotomayor are bad enough, but what about supposed conservative justices? Obamacare could have been struck down even with Kagan and Sotomayor on the Court if that fool John Roberts hadn't sold us out, calling Obamacare a tax.

So, there's no leadership and there is no opposition party, neither in the Congress nor in the Supreme Court. If that sounds hopeless, believe me, that's how I feel sometimes, too. But it's not hopeless. Later in this book, I'm going to tell you exactly how we solve these problems in the long term and restore the America we loved.

In the meantime, we have to hold on to as much of our freedom as we can. The good news is that Obama's administration is almost over. What a celebration we should have when the most divisive presidency in American history comes to an end. The bad news is we can't be sure that what follows won't be worse.

Leadership Post-Obama

We don't know who the Republican nominee is going to be yet, but it still doesn't look like any of the candidates can beat the Limber Leopard, Hillary Clinton. I called her that in my 2005 book, *The Political Zoo*, because, in addition to being willing and able to change her spots at any time, she has strength the current president lacks. Unfortunately, she's on the wrong side. She could bring stronger leadership in the wrong direction than we have right now.

She may not have attended school in an Indonesian madrasa, but she's been making friendly with Muslim groups since the mid-1990s. The president is supposed to be responsible for the actions of his Cabinet, but do you really believe the academic in chief had any control over the Limber Leopard?

Clinton has been siding with the Muslims since before Obama was even a community organizer. It's a good thing she's not associating with those intolerant, bigoted conservatives. Her husband shares her affinity for the throwbacks. "Wolf Boy" Bill Clinton actually called for the arrests of the *cartoonists* at *Jyllands-Posten* after the riots over their satires of Muhammad and Muslims. Never mind punishing the rioters and murderers—Wolf Boy wants to arrest the cartoonists for exercising their right to free speech.

This is still what passes for progressive or liberal today. Remember the Pope's answer to the murders at *Charlie Hebdo*? Those who insult someone's religion should expect a "punch in the nose." Neofascism is alive and well, and the Clintons could step right in to lead the wolf pack again.

The Limber Leopard also seems to share her husband's ability to sidestep any controversy, no matter how egregiously she's behaved. Forget E-mailgate. Nobody cared, even when the progressive jackals at the *New York Times* and the Associated Press seemed to turn against her. She gave a press conference that would have gotten Richard Nixon hanged instead of just impeached, but she just brushed it off. The rules don't apply to her.

That really didn't surprise me. If she could get a U.S. ambassador killed due to her dereliction of duty as secretary of state and not be held accountable, who's going to care about her e-mail server? It's not as if cybersecurity for the top foreign policy official in the country is important when ISIS is hacking into databases containing the home addresses of active-duty soldiers. No, all the liberals care about is that she'd be the first female president.

While E-mailgate should be important, the bigger issue is really her legacy as secretary of state. It was the worst tenure in the history of that Cabinet position. She has literally destroyed the world order and not for the better. She has wrecked the Arab Crescent. She has started a new cold war with Russia. How much worse can it get? World War III? This is what we should be talking about when considering her candidacy for president.

Hillary's even worse than Obama on health care, too. Remember, the Limber Leopard was pushing a completely government-run, single-payer health-care plan when she was the First Lady back in the 1990s. Fortunately, we did have some semblance of an opposition party at that time, and her efforts at socializing medicine gave her party a landslide midterm election defeat, giving control of the House and Senate to the Republicans.

How times have changed. After eight years of nonstop, anticapitalist rhetoric from the current Marxist in chief, there may not be enough clear-thinking Americans left to resist. She just might be able to pull off as president what she failed to do as "co-president."

Even so, we may want to be careful about how vigorously we oppose her. Elizabeth Warren is even worse.

She is a woman who could be elected only in Massachusetts. She has at least one thing in common with the president, which is claiming to be someone she is not. As I said before, Obama was a spoiled white kid with a black father who decided to become a downtrodden black man. Elizabeth Warren is a blond-haired, blue-eyed white woman who claims to be Native American.

That was how she got into Harvard and how she ruled in Harvard. That's how she got over on whitey, by playing the ethnic race card as a Native American. Sound familiar?

However, "Elizabeth Warren is not a citizen of the Cherokee Nation. Elizabeth Warren is not enrolled in the Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians. And Elizabeth Warren is not one of the United Keetoowah Band of Cherokee. Nor could she become one, even if she wanted to," according to *The Atlantic*.¹⁶ She's even less a Native American woman than Obama is a downtrodden black man. Yet she "described herself as a minority in a law school directory and was touted as a Native American faculty member while tenured at Harvard Law School in the mid-1990s,"¹⁷ based on what is reported as an unsubstantiated claim of having one-thirty-second Cherokee blood.

You don't think she used her phony Native American ties for political gain, don't you? You don't if you're a 1960s liberal anachronism who thinks Chairman Mao was a great leader.

Remember Obama's speech when he told business owners, "You didn't build that"? Guess what? He didn't come up with that piece of socialist sophistry on his own. He didn't even get it from his own speechwriters. Elizabeth Warren actually said it first.¹⁸

So we could have another presidential candidate claiming to be someone she's not, who's even more socialist than Obama. Let's see how the progressive jackals behave as the campaigns really get into full gear. I wouldn't be at all surprised if the Associated Press takes down Hillary with the lawsuit, so Fauxcahontas can step into the void. The AP is suing the State Department for access to Clinton's records.¹⁹

That was why I was warning my listeners not to be too anxious to get rid of the Limber Leopard when the E-mailgate story broke back in March. As terrible and truly vicious as she is, Fauxcahontas really would be worse. She says she's not running, and maybe she won't this time around, but she's not going away. Nor are her poisonous, socialist ideas.

Meanwhile, the prospects on the Republican side aren't much better. Can you imagine making a choice between Jeb Bush and Hillary Clinton? Have we not had enough Bushes and Clintons for sixteen out of the past twenty-two years? Can anyone possibly say with a straight face the American people are represented by either of these insiders?

Jeb Bush thinks Common Core is just a wonderful idea. He thinks we need more immigrants because they have stronger families and are more entrepreneurial. I'm not kidding. With conservatives like him, what do we need liberals for?

Who else is there? Marco Rubio certainly isn't ready for prime time. I might vote for him out of default, but he has no, as they used to say ten years ago, gravitas. He's not a president. He's not a leader. More important, he, too, would sign his party's death warrant by flooding the nation with immigrants. But the Republicans are so desperate they might make him a candidate just because his last name ends in a vowel.

The important question to ask here is, "Where will any of these Republican candidates lead the nation?" We can see where the progressives have led us. It does no good if we elect a Republican who's not a conservative and just continues leading us down the same road, with a few prettier words.

This is why I said the Israeli election was important for America. If you analyze the election, you understand what needs to happen here.

Netanyahu was behind in the polls just before the election. He then made a dramatic move to the

- [read New Tastes in Green Tea: A Novel Flavor for Familiar Drinks, Dishes, and Desserts online](#)
- **[read The Arab Awakening: The Story of the Arab National Movement](#)**
- [read Lean Auditing: Driving Added Value and Efficiency in Internal Audit pdf, azw \(kindle\), epub](#)
- [Dead End Deal \(1st Edition\) here](#)
- [Professional Web Design: Techniques and Templates \(5th Edition\) here](#)
- [read Seventh Grave and No Body \(Charley Davidson, Book 7\) pdf, azw \(kindle\)](#)

- <http://diy-chirol.com/lib/Other-People.pdf>
- <http://twilightblogs.com/library/P--draic---Conaire--Rogha-Sc--alta.pdf>
- <http://studystategically.com/freebooks/The-Secret-Life-of-Pronouns--What-Our-Words-Say-About-Us.pdf>
- <http://studystategically.com/freebooks/Echoes-of-the-Haitian-Revolution--1804-2004.pdf>
- <http://tuscalaural.com/library/Pacific-Lady--The-First-Woman-to-Sail-Solo-Across-the-World-s-Largest-Ocean.pdf>
- <http://diy-chirol.com/lib/Architecture-in-a-Climate-of-Change--2nd-Edition-.pdf>