

INTERNAL ORGANIZING

HOW TO DEAL WITH NEOCON SPEAK

Our reality is rapidly changing. America is changing fast. The big question is, what do we do about it? We can start by looking at ideas and thoughts. Everything we humans do is based on thoughts and ideas.

The old saying, “*The pen is mightier than the sword,*” is talking about this very power of thought and ideas. If someone or some group wants to control what other people do, they start with ideas and the framing of thoughts in the minds of others.

Neoconservatives, ‘Neocons’, are not your parents’ kind of conservative. Words change meaning all the time. Around 1900 a Liberal was a Capitalist. In the 50s and 60s the Liberal label was applied to someone who spent a lot of money on social programs and raised taxes to do it. Thus the “tax and spend Democrats” phrase. And “Liberal” also started to be used.

Presently, the Liberal label is applied to anyone opposing the Neocon perspective. **Neocons are changing America, our freedoms, our financial security, and the legality of collective rights and human rights are in decline. Right-to-Work is a Neocon position.** How do Neocons convince working families to support legislation not in their won self interest? To start with, just the way the words are put together is an example of Orwellian opposite meaning of a position. Right-to-Work sounds great but the meaning should also include, “for less”.

TALKING ISSUES ON THE JOB

American Values, Family Values and Union Values are kept in place by the politicians we elect to represent us. We have been unsuccessful at protecting our Union Family Values at the national level and we are having those values destroyed by Neoconservatives in every part of government.

“Conservative” Talk Radio, frequently paid for by Neocons rather than advertising has been very successful at changing peoples ideas and perception of reality. These talk shows frequently use the same words and talk about the same subjects at the same time in many parts of our Country. This is because they are the advertising arm of the Neocon perspective.

The way they put ideas in their perspective is called ‘FRAMING’.

Within a given FRAME of reality, words take on new meanings. Advertising uses sophisticated psychological and behavioral science to manipulate consumers into buying things whether they need those things or not. These techniques, and others like them, have been used politically to convince people to abandon traditional American, Union and Family Values in exchange for Corporate Values. This is great if you are the CEO of a corporation but no so good if you are a worker employed by that corporation.

Becoming effective in changing anything political is through logical, factual and truthful argument, one-on-one, with people we know. **Any organizing drive starts with talking about ideas or issues.** We all have a good feel for traditional values and should be able to talk about Family Values easily. **Union Values are Family Values.** Yet it is very frustrating to debate and discuss political ideas with Neocons. They are frequently aggressive and loud in stating their point of view. **And they are not usually interested in any facts that contradict what they are saying. They also jump to other subjects frequently. Why?**

FRAMING DEBATE

If you have Neocon friends, you may be familiar with email they forward which is meant to reaffirm neoconservative perspectives. There is something about these emails that suggests to many people the same person wrote most of them. They merge a lot of different ideas together which builds a ‘frame of reality’; so there are several references to church, taxes, schools, America, parents, abortion, patriotism, faith and other emotional concepts all in one package. **We sort of know what is said and that it is misleading and somewhat illogical; but it is hard to get a handle on what is being proposed. Why?**

Also, if you type in a title or the first line of one of these emails into Google, you will likely find the message on a lot of diverse web bulletin boards. **How do these emails get posted on so many unrelated boards and who puts them there? Who sends the emails around in the first place?**

A very good short book that deals with framing and labeling was written by George Lakoff and is titled, **“Don’t Think of An Elephant”**. You can find it at Amazon for \$7.50, <http://www.amazon.com/exec/obidos/tg/detail/-/1931498717/002-0009165-3595240?v=glance> , or at local bookstores for around \$10.00. **In order to organize into an effective political force to stop and reverse the decline of American Family Values, understanding what is being done and how it is being done is essential at this point.**

NEOCON SPEAK

Let's take a look at one of these emails in order to understand Neocon Speak:

Subject: Obituary

Obituary for Mr. Sense

Today we mourn the passing of a beloved old friend, Mr. Common Sense. Mr. Sense had been with us for many years. No one knows for sure how old he was since his birth records were long ago lost in bureaucratic red tape.

He will be remembered as having cultivated such value lessons as knowing when to come in out of the rain, why the early bird gets the worm and that life isn't always fair. Common Sense lived by simple, sound financial policies (don't spend more than you earn) and reliable parenting strategies (adults, not kids, are in charge).

His health began to rapidly deteriorate when well intentioned but overbearing regulations were set in place. - Reports of a six-year-old boy charged with sexual harassment for kissing a classmate; teens suspended from school for using mouthwash after lunch; and a teacher fired for reprimanding an unruly student, only worsened his condition.

Mr. Sense declined even further when schools were required to get parental consent to administer aspirin to a student; but, could not inform the parents when a student became pregnant and wanted to have an abortion.

Finally, Common Sense lost the will to live as the Ten Commandments became contraband; churches became businesses; and criminals received better treatment than their victims.

Common Sense finally gave up the ghost after a woman failed to realize that a steaming cup of coffee was hot, she spilled a bit in her lap, and was awarded a huge settlement.

Common Sense was preceded in death by his parents, Truth and Trust, his wife, Discretion; his daughter, Responsibility; and his son, Reason. He is survived by two stepbrothers; My Rights and Ima Whiner. Not many attended his funeral because so few realized he was gone.

If you still remember him, pass this on; if not, join the majority and do nothing.

Jot down some thoughts you may have on what was said and how it was said.

The Neoconservative movement is well financed and can afford many mediums to transmit its message to people. Coordinated paid Neocon talk radio, Radical Right (FOX) editorialized “news”, mainstream media’s lack of news and expert use of framing and labeling to convince all of us to support legislation in direct opposition to our own self interest, have been very successful.

Follow the money and you will find that big business, corporations, and incredibly wealthy people are the proponents of these Corporate Values.

These ideas in our sample are framed as ‘common sense’ family values we are all familiar with. We get an overall or holistic feeling that something is being said that is portrayed as solid salt of the Earth fundamental reality. But there is something wrong about it. We get the feeling that there are things being said indirectly, or not clearly defined. If we break this frame of reality down into simple statements we get a different picture of what is being said.

Let's start by trying to translate our sample of Neocon Speak (Common Sense) to understand what is being said:

Translation (*We think this is what this email is saying*)

Our government is incompetent. Its financial policies are out of whack and it is just too complex. Government should be simpler, smaller, and should not have so many laws that require higher taxes to administer.

We need less government regulation, even if the regulation is well intentioned, because regulation is bad and costs too much.

Our criminal justice system should be tougher on criminals. And we should have regulations in place to provide better help for victims.

A corporation should not be held responsible for burns from hot coffee and juries should be so instructed. The victim of self-inflicted burns should not receive huge settlements.

The separation of Church and State, ensuring religious freedom, is the same as outlawing religious texts and beliefs.

When a tax exempt religious group becomes active in political campaigns by contributing time and money, their tax exempt status may change, thereby defining the church as a business, which is wrong.

Our legislators have enacted regulations that are bad, even though well intentioned; resulting in ridiculous situations in our schools.

Schools should be allowed to give aspirin to kids when the child says there is a need for the aspirin. And kids should be allowed to use mouthwash after lunch also.

Teachers in school should be permitted to reprimand an unruly child. If the teacher is punished for doing so, the child will get worse.

Parents are in charge of their kids. Kids are not in charge of parents.

Six year olds cannot have sex and should not be subject to regulations dealing with sexual harassment. A kiss is not sexual harassment if done by a six year old.

There should be a regulation requiring pregnancy to be reported by a school to parents if abortion is contemplated.

Important things like common sense, truth, trust, discretion, responsibility and reason are dead and no longer a part of our society. The disappearance of these values has escaped people's attention.

People should not whine about their rights. If they do, they are weak and do not fully understand the common sense values mentioned above.

If you agree with all this, pass it on. If not, don't do anything like most other people.

Now we have some idea as to what positions are implied in this clever misrepresentation. As progressives, we can pull out individual issues and speak about them factually as opposed to falling around within a compressed reality frame as a single unit.

On the job, or with friends, it is not necessary to convince the Neocon of anything. We want to persuade others to consider our specific positions on Union Family Values.

What makes it so difficult to debate a Neocon is the frame of reference that is being used. Everything is mashed together into a fuzzy overall concept or feeling. That is, there are no detailed

specifics or facts presented with the position. The Neocons just know and understand a general position to take and how to label it and talk about their overall position with those in opposition to their point of view.

If we get specific and factual on one issue, a Neocon will usually jump to a seemingly unrelated and different subject in apparent frustration. When the jump is made it seems like the Neocon is changing the subject in an effort to get out of a losing position. To the Neocons it is reasonable to make the jump because the defining aspects of their positions contain all these seemingly unrelated elements, which taken together as a whole, is their position.

With this kind of frame it makes perfect sense to a Neocon to jump from talking about smaller government, to schools being able or required to report a student pregnancy to parents, to lawsuits with seemingly absurd outcomes. This is, to them, a logical way of defining their position as understood and viewed as a whole in our sample.

To Progressives or Liberals the facts are extremely important. Without facts there is nothing to talk about. Neocons use labels to define a position made up of undefined or nonfactual elements. So, when trying to talk about an issue, a Neocon may say you are just a Liberal. And that, to Neocons, is the end of the discussion. Pronouncing the Liberal label satisfies and justifies their position.

We tend to come back with “you are a Conservative” or “you are a Neocon”. The Neocon has won the debate because we have moved into labeling within their frame of reality.

If you ask such a person to define “liberal” they will likely reply with other labels like “tree hugger” or “bleeding heart” or “welfare supporters” or “abortionists”. **These are labels and not concrete definitions.** The Neocon cannot use factual and concrete references because their reality is based upon undefined and **emotional** concepts that are all interrelated. Pulling these integrated concepts apart into separate issues and concentrating on verifiable facts just does not compute. **So other labels are given or a different subject is mentioned in justification and defense of their position.**

Also, Neocons will make statements without any supporting documentation. They may say “I have not heard that or I haven’t seen that” as if their not being fully informed somehow negates factual information.

When organizing by discussing ideas and political positions, it is not necessary to convert the Neocon, as said earlier. Their reality is belief-based so losing a position on a specific item would weaken or collapse their entire reality and the identity they have invested into that reality. **They will seem illogical as they use what they have been taught on radio, TV, and in email to properly defend their statements. The people to influence are those who are being conned into voting against their own self-interest by the neoconservative movement and their fuzzy religio-political beliefs.**

The mainstream media does not report detailed news because corporations do not want to get down to the real facts. The facts may interfere with the Neocon conditioning the Radical Right has spent so much time and money perfecting and establishing.

Take a look at where the story of 'Common Sense' is posted using Google:

<http://www.google.com/search?q=Obituary+for+Mr.+Sense+&sourceid=mozilla-search&start=0&start=0&ie=utf-8&oe=utf-8&client=firefox-a&rls=org.mozilla:en-US:official>

Who wrote it? For what purpose? How was it distributed? Who posted it on all the boards?

Are there people paid to get this kind of stuff in distribution? Note the lack of emails on the Progressive side of things.

The following are some thoughts on understanding some of the techniques used in these types of emails.

Subject: Obituary

Obituary sets the frame of loss, death and fear in a general way.

Obituary for Mr. Sense

"Mr. Sense" sets a frame of personhood and family that is something we all value and can relate to. By putting "Obituary" together with "Mr. Sense," it is stated that Mr. Sense is dead. There is loss and regret.

Today we mourn the passing of a beloved old friend, Mr. Common Sense.

Again, the frame of loss of something of value is suggested. An old friend reinforces the value of the loss and gives Mr. Common Sense the status of being a person and a part of our family. He is beloved and now we have added the first name, "Common," which places Mr. Sense in agreement with commonly held values.

Mr. Sense had been with us for many years.

We have reinforcement of personhood, long time friendship, and Family Values. Something we can all relate to. Something that is tried and true.

No one knows for sure how old he was since his birth records were long ago lost in bureaucratic red tape.

In a way we are made to feel guilty because we didn't even know how old our old, long time, friend was. These feelings of loss and guilt are ingeniously transferred to it being the "bureaucracies" fault. In other words, it is the government's fault. We need not feel guilty because it was Red Tape and therefore government inefficiency and incompetence that is fingered as the cause of our feelings. Government is bad!

He will be remembered as having cultivated such value lessons as knowing when to come in out of the rain, why the early bird gets the worm and that life isn't always fair.

We are remembering an old friend who taught us and nurtured in us basic lessons in Values. And that old friend is dead because of the government's inept indifference. We don't even know how old Common Sense was. We feel guilt and have placed blame here.

What does “come in out of the rain” mean? It is basic common logical sense that does not have to be explained. It is a Valuable Lesson we learn early on in our lives. You don’t need a bunch of facts; after all, it is just common sense.

“The early bird catches the worm” refers to hard work that is justly rewarded. This is surly a Family Value in America.

“Life isn’t always fair?” Is this a disclaimer? Does it suggest that things are just the way they are and sometimes you get the short end of the stick? Does it imply that you cannot or should not do anything about it? Just suck it up, get to work earlier and work harder? These are certainly Corporate Values too.

Common Sense lived by simple, sound financial policies (don't spend more than you earn) and reliable parenting strategies (adults, not kids, are in charge).

Common Sense is portrayed as simple, folksy, unpretentious and a “what you see is what you get” sort of old friend. Salt of the earth, Family Values!

“Sound financial policies and don’t spend more than you earn” is good advice and everyone knows it’s true. It is just plain common sense. But why use the word “policies”? Does a family have policies? Does the word “policies” make you think of government?

“Reliable parenting strategies” is mentioned. “Adults, not kids, are in charge.” ‘Strategies’ is a word that is a little strange to use. Kids are brought up in context with valuable lessons taught by an adult which is just common sense but strategies are required. What strategies?

His health began to rapidly deteriorate when well intentioned but overbearing regulations were set in place.

We are back to government. There are too many “overbearing regulations.” This implies that regulations are a burden and out of line. Government has too much power over us. But nothing is defined. Regulating what? Regulating who?

What were the “well intentioned” trying to fix? The well-intentioned were like kids and just didn’t have common sense. The overbearing regulations were set in place by the kids, not adults, and made law. They were killing Common Sense. Common sense tells us overbearing regulations are bad. We need facts here.

Where do these values and perspectives come from? These are Corporate Values in common sense clothing.

Reports of a six-year-old boy charged with sexual harassment for kissing a classmate; teens suspended from school for using mouthwash after lunch; and a teacher fired for reprimanding an unruly student, only worsened his condition.

Another jump in logic is made referring to unspecified events in a school. Grade school, military school or college? Private or public? Were the police involved? Was there a court decision? Without specific facts even Common sense would be at a loss as to how to take all this.

In context these are examples of silly, well meant regulations that produced a stupid result. Therefore, regulations are bad and do not reflect common sense.

A six year old kisses a classmate and is charged with sexual harassment. How many times did it happen? Did he restrain the girl? Was it a French kiss? Where was the kiss planted? No facts are presented.

The mouthwash is also not specific. Did the student use the mouthwash at the table and squirt it at classmates? Spit it into a plate of food? Who knows? Did it even happen? And would accounts by private individuals be accurate?

And when the adult teacher was punished for using common sense in reprimanding an unruly student, the student gets worse. Did the teacher get fired for telling Billy Bob to sit down and pay attention? Not likely. But the way the issue is stated it looks way out of line with common sense. Regulations did it! Bad regulations!

Mr. Sense declined even further when schools were required to get parental consent to administer aspirin to a student; but could not inform the parents when a student became pregnant and wanted to have an abortion.

Another jump to the administration of an over-the-counter drug by a school to a student and regulations (by a governing body) preventing such action causes the poor child to suffer a terrible headache all day in class. The overbearing regulations say you need to check with the parents first. This is really mixing things up. Is it common sense to give a kid an aspirin? What about ibuprofen? What about Tylenol? A cold capsule? Dexedrine? What were the specific regulations and why were they enacted? Is this true? What school was involved?

Another jump to pregnancy is made where common sense says a school should inform the parents if an “abortion” is contemplated. Regulations again. Why would the school know about a planned abortion? Why was it decided that the parents should only be told by the child? And we should consider the word “abortion” itself and phrases like “partial birth abortion.” Remember, we are not commenting on the issue here. We are looking at the use of words to set a frame and label to push a perspective.

The word “abortion” is used to suggest the dire consequences of not telling the parents about pregnancy. Suddenly the entire anti-abortion right-to-life frame of reference is evoked. Religion and certain religious doctrines are brought into the discussion. How do all these different things relate to one another?

They all combine emotionally to build a frame of reality that is defined as common sense without factual data to support specific parts of the reality. So if we take issue with giving an aspirin to a kid with a headache, it is reasonable to bring up abortion. They both are needed to define this perspective.

Finally, Common Sense lost the will to live as the Ten Commandments became contraband; churches became businesses; and criminals received better treatment than their victims.

Another jump is made from abortion to religious tenants. Here Jewish Commandments from the Old Testament are made to seem illegal in America. Yet we live in a country that ensures religious freedom for all. Are we talking about Communist China perhaps where religious

texts are banned? Are we talking about the merging of Church and State? Is the author opposed to the fundamental doctrines America was built upon?

Some churches are businesses. That is just plain common sense isn't it? But the implication is that some evil force has defined something Godly, the Church, as something crass and base; a business. This is bad for churches and, by implication, bad for God. It should not be forgotten that there is a link between neoconservatives and an extreme sect of radical religious fundamentalists which provides a clarifying context here. Some churches are big business. And some get involved in politics jeopardizing their nonprofit status. Another overbearing regulation!

Yet another jump to another subject is made. Some criminals do get pretty good treatment compared to their victims. Look at Martha Stewart or Kenneth Lay who has yet to be tried. But this is likely not directed at them or their like. Who are we talking about? There is clearly injustice which is not a Family Value. Religion, churches, businesses, criminals and victims are all blinded and bonded together. What exactly is the point? How do these different things relate to one another? Remember, this is all in the context of death and loss of an old friend, Common Sense.

Common Sense finally gave up the ghost after a woman failed to realize that a steaming cup of coffee was hot, she spilled a bit in her lap, and was awarded a huge settlement.

This is another jump in logic. While criminals receive better treatment than victims above, here the MacDonalD's Corporation, (this is most likely what is being alluded to), the criminal, is punished severely and the victim, a demented older woman, is treated very well. Some people may know that her grandson gave her the cup of coffee which she held between her legs in a moving car.

What evidence was the jury presented with? What were the facts of the case? Somehow we are being told common sense would not punish the corporation in this instance. So why did the jury find MacDonalD's guilty? The point is that we have not read the case. We only know that the corporation was unjustly treated.

Common Sense was preceded in death by his parents, Truth and Trust, his wife, Discretion; his daughter, Responsibility; and his son, Reason. He is survived by two stepbrothers; My Rights and Ima Whiner.

*Family Values are brought up in a family context which is very powerful.
(Definitions from American Heritage Dictionary, 4th Edition.)*

Parents = truth and trust. Truth: 1. Conformity to fact or actuality. 3. Sincerity; integrity. 4. Fidelity to an original or standard. And **Trust** is 1. Firm reliance on the integrity, ability, or character of a person or thing. So what Common Sense says here is the result of truth and trust in the truth, two solid Family Values.

Wife = discretion. Discretion is 1. The quality of being discreet; 2. Ability or power to decide responsibly; 3. Freedom to act or judge on one's own. This reinforces the idea that she had all she needed to decide something if we look at the definition. But what? Common Sense, the husband, perhaps. And who would think of the word "discretion" anyway in this context?

Daughter = responsibility. 2. Something for which one is responsible; a duty, obligation, or burden. Could this be responsibility for actions? Does it relate to the abortion example above?

Son = reason. 1. The basis or motive for an action, decision, or conviction. 2. A declaration made to explain or justify action, decision, or conviction: 3. An underlying fact or cause that provides logical sense for a premise or occurrence. Clearly reason comes from and is part of common sense implying that all the things written about common sense are reasonable.

Step Brothers = My Rights and Ima (I am a) Whiner Rights: 1. Conforming with or conformable to justice, law, or morality: 2. In accordance with fact, reason, or truth; Whiner: 1. To utter a plaintive, high-pitched, protracted sound, as in pain, fear, supplication, or complaint. 2. To complain or protest in a childish fashion.

The impure half-brothers are whiners worried about their rights. Rights are enacted through regulations. Regulations are bad. These are not just single words as the preceding definitions of family members but more complex two-word concepts. Also these are only half brothers, so they are not the 'real' thing. What exactly is being said here?

Whining and personal rights are equated. In America we have personal rights and that is what our Bill of Rights is all about. So this whining about rights frame is really an anti-American, anti-democracy and anti-freedom statement. This is the exact opposite of Family Values and common sense in America.

Not many attended his funeral because so few realized he was gone. If you still remember him, pass this on; if not, join the majority and do nothing.

The implication is that we have had common sense taken from us without even knowing about it. We have come to a place where common sense is no longer used in America.

If you want to set yourself apart from the uncaring, rights whining regulators send this little gem to other people. Or you, if you see no value in this story, just do nothing like most of the fools who don't know what is really going on.

From this we learn that there is a constant barrage and reinforcement of fuzzy Neocon frames of reality which are not factual and enable people to believe they are supporting old American Family Values while actually supporting Corporate Values, which are diametrically opposed to the values. **This is an example of conditioning aimed at persuading people to vote against their own self interest and to not really think too much about it.**

Talk about issues on the job. If a Neocon labels you, ask for the definition of the label. Ask for the factual basis for the Neocon's position. Don't get caught in jumping to other subjects. Stay on the original subject and use defining concepts like "common sense" and "family values" when stating your position. Be prepared to reference facts, where they can be checked, or give the guys a printout.

Use words like 'American freedom', 'democracy', 'Bill of Rights', 'rule of law', 'protection' and 'security' when defining a common sense American Value, Family Value, or Union Family Value in the context of the argument. **Don't let the Neocon get away with using our words to support the corporate perspectives.** And don't be afraid to use labels too as long as we can support the label with facts. Neocons are frequently anti-American, which is easily seen when we breakdown what they are actually saying.

CLASS PARTICIPATION

Let's practice. Now who wants to be the Neocon? If it is hard to be the Neocon we have to find one willing to let us practice on his or her positions.

Here are some different emails to practice on. What is actually being said? What are the facts? For example, the **Postal Service** is not subsidized by taxes. Great service is provided even in remote rural areas. And the price is reasonable and delivery is fast. So what is this guy's problem with the Post Office? How are all these things related? Taken together in a fuzzy non-thinking sort of way what is the point? What are the facts?

In my life, I thought I had a handle on the meaning of the word "service."
"The act of doing things for other people."

Then I heard the terms:

- Internal Revenue Service
- Postal Service
- Telephone Service
- Civil Service
- Selective Service
- City/County Public Service
- Customer Service
- Service Stations

I became confused about the word "service." This is not what I thought "service" meant.

Then today, I overheard two farmers talking and one of them mentioned that he was having a bull over to "service" a few of his cows.

SHAZAM! It suddenly all came into clear perspective.
Now I understand what all those "service" agencies are doing to us.

Is the conclusion at the end true? For example, the inheritance tax has been around a long, long time. What is the purpose of this tax? Why was it enacted? Why and when did these individual taxes get established? Again, the overall impression is that we are taxed to death. Corporations certainly claim they are!

Subject: Taxes

Accounts Receivable Tax
Building Permit Tax
Capital Gains Tax
CDL license Tax
Cigarette Tax
Corporate Income Tax
Court Fines (indirect taxes)
Dog License Tax
Federal Income Tax
Federal Unemployment Tax (FUTA)
Fishing License Tax
Food License Tax
Fuel permit tax
Gasoline Tax (42 cents per gallon)
Hunting License Tax
Inheritance Tax Interest expense (tax on the money)
Inventory tax IRS Interest Charges (tax on top of tax)
IRS Penalties (tax on top of tax)
Liquor Tax
Local Income Tax
Luxury Taxes
Marriage License Tax
Medicare Tax
Property Tax
Real Estate Tax
Septic Permit Tax
Service Charge Taxes
Social Security Tax
Road Usage Taxes (Truckers)
Sales Taxes
Recreational Vehicle Tax
Road Toll Booth Taxes
School Tax
State Income Tax
State Unemployment Tax (SUTA)
Telephone federal excise tax
Telephone federal universal service fee tax
Telephone federal, state and local surcharge taxes
Telephone minimum usage surcharge tax
Telephone recurring and non-recurring charges tax
Telephone state and local tax
Telephone usage charge tax
Toll Bridge Taxes
Toll Tunnel Taxes
Traffic Fines (indirect taxation)
Trailer registration tax
Utility Taxes
Vehicle License Registration Tax
Vehicle Sales Tax
Watercraft registration Tax
Well Permit Tax
Workers Compensation Tax

COMMENTS:

Not one of these taxes existed 100 years ago and our nation was the most prosperous in the world, had absolutely no national debt, had the largest middle class in the world and Mom stayed home to raise the kids.

What the hell happened???

Type “National debt history” into Google. Take a look at the links. Here is one. What was the national debt 100 years ago?

http://www.toptips.com/debt_history.htm

This is funny. But what is the thrust of the joke? Is it real? How would you find out? Is the underlying comment about government workers and bureaucracy?

I was getting ready for work when I looked out the window and saw the utility company starting to erect a pole in front of my house. They were going to position it directly in front of my picture window. No way, absolutely no way was I going to permit this. I gulped down my last bit of coffee and went directly to the crew supervisor and told him in no uncertain terms that I was not going to permit his crew to put that stupid electrical pole directly in front of my picture window. He took out a plat map, a map for pole locations and a right of way document and explained that it is the best location for it. I told him it is not the best location for me and when I came home from work that day I did not want to find that pole in front of my window. I told him I didn't give a hoot where he put it but not in front of my window. I felt pretty smug as I drove off to work because I felt I got my point across. I know darn well they are afraid to put it there now.... Ah..... the feeling of power.....at least until I got home.

keep scrolling down.....



Soldier's Letter to Kerry

Dear Senator Kerry:

Since it has become clear that you will probably be the Democratic nominee for President, I have spent a great deal of time researching your war record and your record as a professional politician. The reason is simple, you aspire to be the Commander in Chief who would lead my sons and their fellow soldiers in time of war. I simply wanted to know if you possess the necessary qualifications to be trusted in that respect.

You see, I belong to a family of proud U.S. veterans. I was a Captain in the Army Reserve, my father was a decorated Lieutenant in World War II; and I have four sons who have either served, or are currently serving in the military. The oldest is an Army Lieutenant still on active duty in Afghanistan after already being honored for his service in Iraq. The youngest is an E-4 with the military police. His National Guard unit just finished their second tour of active duty, including six months in Guantanamo Bay. My two other sons have served in the national guard and the navy.

In looking at your record I found myself comparing it not only to that of my father and my sons, but to the people they served with. My father served with the 87th Chemical Mortar Battalion in Europe. They landed on Utah Beach and fought for 317 straight days including the Cherbourg Peninsula, Aachen, the Hurtgen Forest, and the Battle of the Bulge. You earned a Silver Star in Vietnam for chasing down and finishing off a wounded and retreating enemy soldier. My father won a Bronze Star for single handedly charging and knocking out a German machine gun nest that had his men pinned down. You received three purple hearts for what appears to be three minor scratches. In fact you only missed a combined total of two days of duty for these wounds. The men of my father's unit, the 87th, had to be admonished by their commanding officer because: "It has been brought to our attention that some men are covering up wounds and refusing medical attention for fear of being evacuated and permanently separated from this organization..." It was also a common problem for seriously wounded soldiers to go AWOL from hospitals in order to rejoin their units. You used your three purple hearts to leave Vietnam early.

My oldest boy came home from Iraq with numerous commendations and then proceeded to volunteer to go to Afghanistan and from there back to Iraq again. My sons and father have never had anything but the highest regard and respect for their fellow soldiers. Yet, you came home to publicly charge your fellow fighting men with being war criminals and to urge their defeat by the enemy. You even wrote a book that had a cover which mocked the heroism of the U.S. Marines who raised the flag on Iwo Jima. Our current crop of soldiers has a philosophy that no one gets left behind; and they have practiced that from Somalia to the battlefields of the Middle East. Yet as chairman of a Senate committee looking into allegations that many of your fellow servicemen had been left behind as prisoners in Vietnam, you chose to defend the brutal Vietnamese regime. You even went so far as to refer to the families of the POWs and MIAs as Professional malcontents, conspiracy mongers, con artists, and dime-store Rambos.

As a Senator you voted against the 1991 Gulf War, and have repeatedly voted against funds to supply our troops with the best equipment, and against money to improve our intelligence capability. I find this particularly ironic since as a Presidential candidate you are highly critical of our pre-war intelligence in Iraq. However, you did vote to authorize the President to go to war, but have since proceeded to do everything you can to undermine the efforts of our government and our troops to win. Is this what our fighting men and women can expect of you if you are their Commander in Chief? Will you gladly send them to war, only to then aid the enemy by undermining the morale of our troops and cutting off the weapons they need to win?

Our country is at war Senator, and as has been the case in every war since the American Revolution, a member of my family is serving their country during the war. Now you want me to trust you to lead my sons in this fight.

Sorry Senator, but when I compare your record to those who have fought and died for this nation, and are currently fighting and dying, the answer is not just no, but Hell No !

Sincerely,

Michael Connelly February 14, 2004 Dallas, Texas

Forward this to EVERYONE you know--we can NOT afford to have this man as the President of the United States!!

Eric D. Bellamy

Communications Specialist

Knoxville's Community Development Corporation

Always ask yourself what the overall purpose of the email is? And also remember, these kinds of statements almost never have links to facts from a reliable source.

Look at the labels used in this example. “Inheritance Tax” becomes “Death Tax”. Sounds awful!

From the Seattle Times. I like this guy’s perspective...

Allegory makes a point about the estate tax

The proposal by the governor and the state Senate to raise the death tax brings to mind a story I once heard. That story makes a point that Democrats don't seem to know.

A group of 10 men would have breakfast each morning at a local diner. They would divide the bill by each person's net worth. One of the individuals had accumulated much more wealth than the other nine, so he ended up paying 85 percent of the tab each morning.

Initially, the nine who shared a small portion of the bill were conservative in what they ordered, as only one of them was paying the majority of the bill. Eventually they became at ease with the arrangement and began to order the most expensive menu offerings.

The one wealthy person became irritated with the arrangement and cited his concern but to no avail. Then one morning, the group met for breakfast but only nine were present. The wealthy person had decided that he would no longer participate in the daily occurrence. He could eat his breakfast elsewhere and at a much smaller cost.

Liberals should pay heed to this story because one day they may find themselves with the opportunity to pay for all the wonderful things they dream up for others to pay for.

If you question the validity of this point you might ask why Boeing executives now eat their breakfast in Chicago.

Nat Webb
Walla Walla

When debating with Neocons, keep these examples in mind.

Then form the basis for their belief and frame of reality.