



OBAMA'S 'REPUBLICAN SEQUESTER' SETUP

"He who permits himself to tell a lie once, finds it much easier to do it a second and a third time, till at length it becomes habitual..." --Thomas Jefferson (1785)

Addressing the National Governors Association this week, [Barack Hussein Obama](#) proclaimed, "At some point, we've got to do some governing. And certainly, what we can't do is keep careening from manufactured crisis to manufactured crisis."



PhotoOp Prop Cops

But Obama himself engineered his rapid political ascension -- from junior senator in 2005 to president of the United States in 2009 -- *precisely* by hopping "from manufactured crisis to manufactured crisis." Page one of his political playbook, authored by Rahm Emanuel, states: "You never want a serious crisis to go to waste...crisis provides the opportunity for us to do things that you could not before."

This unknown "[community organizer](#)" and [disciple of hate](#), was mentored by [avowed Marxists](#), who paved his way into the Illinois State Senate in 1997 and the U.S. Senate in 2005.

Virtually unknown, but backed by wealthy ultra-Leftists [John Kerry](#) and [Teddy Kennedy](#), Obama won the presidential election in 2008 on a banking crisis precipitated by a [manufactured mortgage crisis](#). He won a [narrow re-election in 2012](#) based upon his tried-and-true manufactured [classist disparity crisis](#).

Now Obama is setting up his Republican opponents for a big fall in 2014, based upon a manufactured "[Republican sequester crisis](#)."

According to Obama: "Republicans in Congress face a simple choice: Are they willing to compromise to protect vital investments in education and health care and national security and all the jobs that depend on them? Or would they rather put hundreds of thousands of jobs and our entire economy at risk just to protect a few special interest tax loopholes that benefit only the wealthiest Americans and biggest corporations? That's the choice. Are you willing to see a bunch of first responders lose their job because you want to protect some special interest tax loophole? ... If [Republicans] allow this meat-cleaver approach to take place, it will jeopardize our military readiness; it will eviscerate job-creating investments in education and energy and medical research."

The litany continues: "Emergency responders -- their ability to help communities respond to and recover from disasters will be degraded. Border Patrol agents will see their hours reduced. FBI agents will be furloughed. Federal prosecutors will have to close cases and let criminals go. Air traffic controllers and airport security will see cutbacks, which means more delays at airports across the country. Thousands of teachers and educators will be laid off. Tens of thousands of parents will have to scramble to find childcare for their kids. Hundreds of thousands of Americans will lose access to primary care and preventive care like flu vaccinations and cancer screenings. And already, the threat of these cuts has forced the Navy to delay an aircraft carrier that was supposed to deploy to the Persian Gulf. And as our military leaders have made clear, changes like this ... affect our ability to respond to threats in unstable parts of the world."

Despite feigning dramatic opposition to the "Republican sequester" in his national "Chicken Little" tour, both Obama and his congressional Democrat sycophants want sequestration to occur, so they can attempt to use it as a noose to hang Republicans ahead of the 2014-midterm elections. The undisputed master of deception and Demagoguery, Obama is banking big political fortunes on the implementation of the much-debated 2.3 percent cuts to federal spending, reducing the *growth* of spending, not current allocations -- a plan that *Obama himself* hatched -- almost half of which are defense cuts.

This is precisely why Obama made Republicans an offer -- more taxes and no spending cuts -- that they can *only* refuse.

What's that? You say you're surprised by my analysis because Republican "leaders," House Speaker John Boehner and Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell, and their Beltway pundits, haven't mentioned Obama's real sequestration agenda? Well, they've been so busy taking their rebuttal cues from Obama that they missed his strategic agenda -- at their imminent peril, and that of the nation.


Obama claims, "I'm not interested in spin, I'm not interested in playing a blame game." But his "Republican sequester" political strategy is nothing more than spin and blame shifting, now that the shelf life for blaming George Bush has expired.

So, how does Obama's ploy play out between now and 2014?

Once these cuts are implemented, Obama and his [NeoCom cadres](#) will blame the "Republican Sequester" for any and all ills between now and the 2014 midterm election. Obama knows that the net effect of his \$150 billion payroll and income taxes hikes, on top of skyrocketing ObamaCare health insurance premiums, mounting debt and deep military cuts already enacted, will send the economy back into recession.

Thus, from sequester forth, every negative economic GDP or jobs report, which in reality demonstrates the continued *planned* failure of Obama's socialist "recovery stimuli," will be blamed on the "Republican Sequester." Moreover, Obama will employ his classist "[politics of disparity](#)" playbook to blame sequester "cuts" for every runny nose in America, claiming the nation can't "afford" even minuscule cuts to socialist welfare programs.

And make no mistake -- in partnership with his public relations network, the [Leftmedia](#) and their MSM propaganda machinery, Obama may win the [public opinion](#) contest.



Obama's sequestration protest is *not* about avoiding minuscule cuts to government growth because Republicans refuse to acquiesce to additional taxes, as they [foolishly did in December](#).

Instead, Obama's strategic objective is the evisceration of what's left of the Republican Party in order that his [Socialist Democratic Party](#) can control the Executive and Legislative branches, and most of the Judicial branch, effectively rendering the constitutional pretense of checks and balances null and void.

That one-party control is a necessary component of the Obama agenda -- [breaking the back of free](#)

[enterprise](#) under the weight of increased taxes, regulations and trillion-dollar annual deficits, and "[fundamentally transforming the United States of America](#)."

I'm sure the above assertions about Obama's macro socialist agenda sounded strident and partisan -- absurd perhaps -- when I voiced them first back in 2008. If you're among the shrinking ranks of those who still insist such assertions are too strident and partisan, then you have officially taken leave of your senses.

Despite all of [Obama's rhetoric](#) concerning cuts in defense spending, those cuts are actually his highest priority. They punish a national-defense constituency that didn't vote for him and leave intact entitlement programs that fund his [government poverty plantation](#) constituency breeding grounds.

In reality, though Obama *increased* overall spending by 20 percent in his first term, he has already cut more than \$489 billion from the defense budget by canceling or delaying major weapons programs -- the largest percentage cuts in military spending since 1972 -- leaving our military understaffed and under-equipped. He has already ordered a cut in Army and Marine personnel by 200,000, a reduction in Naval warfare capacity by more than 230 ships (including two carrier battle groups), and a reduction in Air Force fighters from 3,600 to 1,500.

Right now, seven of our 10 carriers are docked, four of them like sitting ducks in Norfolk. (Hope nobody sinks a ship in the narrow Thimble Shoals channel between Norfolk and blue water.)

Again, those dramatic defense cuts are already in the works. How convenient that Obama will now blame national security and economic consequences on the "Republican Sequester"!

Of course, Obama's strategy depends upon his false assertion that sequestration is a Republican idea: "The sequester is not something that I've proposed," he claims. "It is something that Congress has proposed."

His former budget director, Jack Lew, supports this fabrication: "It was very much rooted in the Republican congressional insistence that there be an automatic measure."


But amid the many voices rebutting Obama's falsehood, one is gaining traction. The Washington Post's most well-known investigative journalist, Bob Woodward, who exposed Richard Nixon's role in Watergate, has accused Obama of "moving the goal posts" in his disingenuous negotiations with Republicans.

In a Post op-ed last week, Woodward made clear that sequestration was the "brain child" of the Obama administration: "My extensive reporting for my book 'The Price of Politics' shows that the automatic spending cuts were initiated by the White House and were the brainchild of [Jack Lew, then-budget director during the negotiations] and White House congressional relations chief Rob Nabors. ... Obama personally approved of the plan for Lew and Nabors to propose the sequester to Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid (D-NV). They did so on July 27, 2011."

This week, Woodward told CNN that a "very senior person" in the Obama administration (National Economic Council Director Gene Sperling) warned, "You will regret staking out that claim." While the context of that email did not seem overtly threatening, I am sure Woodward knows how to read between the lines. The Obama regime has a long history of these soft warnings to anyone in the Leftmedia who dares express a dissenting views.

Ignoring that warning, on Wednesday Woodward took Obama to the woodshed for publicly declaring that Obama was not sending a carrier in response to the current meltdown in the Middle East because of the pending sequestration. "Under the Constitution, the President is commander-in-chief and employs the force. And so we now have the President going out because of this piece of paper and this agreement. 'I can't do what I need to do to protect the country.' That's a kind of madness that I haven't seen in a long time."

Surely Woodward never actually believed Obama would honor in any way, shape or form, his oath to "[support and defend](#)" above his devotion to socialist partisanship?



Whether Obama can pull off his sequester setup is yet to be seen, but given the current "establishment leadership" of the Republican Party, his chances are good. He has ordered Boehner and McConnell to meet with him, House Minority Leader Nancy Pelosi and Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid Friday morning -- probably so he can then tell the nation

Friday afternoon that the Democrats did their best to avert the economic decline caused by the "Republican sequester."

The election of 2012 was, in the words of Thomas Jefferson, "between economy and liberty, or profusion and servitude." By a [narrow margin](#), the latter stole the election, and we are now at the [tipping point](#) of Liberty.

Obama's economic model is based on the Cloward-Piven strategy, a socialist scheme to overload the government welfare system to the point of crisis, requiring replacement of that system with a national system of "guaranteed annual income and thus an end to poverty." This collapse is written into the genes of the debt load Obama has created, a burden that he anticipates will overwhelm free enterprise within the coming decade.

If Obama wins a socialist majority in the House in 2014, that model is all but guaranteed.

There will one day be a new morning in America, another [Sunrise on Liberty](#), but in the meantime, we face some very dark years ahead.