

## IT IS S.A.D.: THE LEFTIST BRAIN EXPOSED

Why Conservatives and Leftists Think so Differently

Copyright© 2010 Rooster Bradford

### **Contents**

#### [PREFACE](#)

[CHAPTER 1](#): Getting to know the Author

[CHAPTER 2](#): Liberal and Conservative

[CHAPTER 3](#): Examples of Left Thought

[CHAPTER 4](#): Illogical Consistencies

[CHAPTER 5](#): The Worst Inconsistency

[CHAPTER 6](#): Leftist in Profile

[CHAPTER 7](#): Conservative in Profile

[CHAPTER 8](#): Source of the Difference

[CHAPTER 9](#): Problems of the Brain--An Overview

[CHAPTER 10](#): Social Autistic Dysfunction

[CHAPTER 11](#): The Common Sense Test

[CHAPTER 12](#): The Chronology of Hominids

“ANNUIT COEPTIS”

*“God has favored our Undertaking.”*

Above the Pyramid on U.S. Dollars

DEDICATION For: Sally B. O’Layne I want to dedicate this book to my Mother, the first Leftist in my life. Without her, I would not have made a lifelong quest to find out why Leftists and Conservatives think so differently about Government.

MY THANKS TO: “With a little help from my friends.”

Thomas Cooper who helped create the Cover My wife, for her help in proof reading and formatting the book. C. Lawrence, who also proof read and helped in our self-publishing of this book. My friends, who have shared a thought or two on the subject. My sincere “thank you” for all you have done.

[\(Return to Contents\)](#)

### **PREFACE**

*Who what and when*

My name is Rooster Bradford. I am one of the few who knows where he was conceived. Knowing where one is born is common, but the moment of conception is seldom known. My assemblage began on a beach in Carpinteria, California. I know, most of you wonder why in the world such a happening is important. My Mother is the reason for this book. She had to tell me where I was conceived. She was a Leftist and knowing her very well was the catalyst for my life time search for an answer to the question: What is the reason or reasons a Leftist and a Conservative think so different?

Purpose of the book: In this book I will examine the obvious differences between Leftist and Conservative thinking.

From these we will study examples of the differences; note the logical inconsistencies; recognize the most important difference, and then begin drawing conclusions. In the final analysis, you will learn why I believe the Leftist brain suffers a sincere disability. They have an impaired ability to use common sense. This stands alone as the distinguishing feature of difference. How that occurs, is our quest.

My Background: I am not a licensed specialist in Psychology or in the medical sciences. I am, however, inquisitive and a good student of many fields of professional expertise. As an active trial attorney for over 34 years, I examined, cross examined and studied just about every recognized profession. For several years I specialized in defending and litigating in the medical profession. To be a good trial attorney one has to develop a rapid ability to act and react to the personalities in a court room. Of course the witnesses and parties are extremely important, but so are the clerks, bailiffs, other attorneys and certainly the Judge and Jury. I became very good at it and this talent has assisted me greatly in this quest.

My other life experiences have also helped. In making the decisions and conclusions found in this book, I was not handicapped by being a psychologist or Psychiatric specialist.

Those professions, like all, become mired down in categories and names peculiar to them. I had no such limitation. Here is a short overview of why I believe I can give you an adequate explanation on the subject.

I received a History and Political Science Degree at Stanford University, and earned an ROTC commission as an officer. I then did 2 plus years as an Armored Officer at Fort Knox, Kentucky and Fulda, Germany. In Germany I helped guard the then East/West Border separating the country.

Upon returning to civilian life, I finished Law School at the University Of Southern California (USC). During this time, on a dare, I obtained a commission as a Naval Intelligence officer and to this very day have good friends I met in that service. I stayed with it until I was rified with the Vietnam wind down.

My hobbies have been surfing, sailing, model building, car restoration, music playing, jass history, collection of all matter of things, an avid reader and student of history, father and coach of little league and soccer. Every day I try to play the piano, practice some brass instruments and play the Scottish Pipes. At one time I was the host of a TV show talk show. For some 16 years I hosted a Jass show on Radio, called "Jassdom Hall". Currently I have a Conservative talk show. I call it, "theroostercrows.net", a wakeup call.

In all of varied interests, I am provided help and support by my wonderful wife Susan.

Thinking about politics and political beliefs hit me early on. Mother was always in one cause or another. My parents divorced when I was 6. Father was your typical boot straps business man who felt government was in his way. He was Conservative. Neither ever took part in politics, as far as I know.

I was never one of those kids who knew what he wanted to do. Being a lawyer seemed ok and kind of fit my view of history and life. My father wanted to pay for it and so it was. My earliest thoughts on politics and political beliefs were Conservative. I used to puzzle at my Mothers way, and found that she and I simply could not discuss the subject without problems. Neither parent, nor any teacher I had, helped me become a Conservative. I was born one. My first political thoughts were conservative. Kind of hit the decks a running as a Conservative. I have never wavered.

As the years went along, I was a successful prosecutor, defense attorney, business counselor, farmer, and business owner. In law I was always a trial attorney. During the legal part of my life, I became a strong supporter of the United States Constitution and a firm believer that freedom and liberty absolutely depend on a government that is fractured, and filled with checks and balances. The founders and I share the belief that consolidated political power is sinister. I also took every opportunity to debate these issues and thoughts with liberals. I can recall many years of defending a Conservative organization called “The John Birch Society”. I believe Birch was a soldier in the Korean War. I never was a member but did study it. Liberals were absolutely “mad dogs” about this Society and we could get into some real sweaty debates, which I loved. Liberals had a terrible fear of this Society. Why?...was the question. To this day I do not know of one example of terror, aggression, or bad conduct by it or its members. The Society was a great subject for debate, and I used it for that. You can see the same fear and sometimes fright in a liberal when they hiccup at the thought of the “Tea Party People”. They have a genuine fear. Why? and for what reasons? To date I do not know of any bad conduct on the part of the so called Tea Parties. Both are collections of Conservatives and therein lay the foundation of Leftist fear.

Over these years I have become painfully aware of the significant differences between Conservatives and Liberals. Of course, there are many variables and each of us are different and not the same politically. However, in the pure sense of it all, a Leftist cannot be a Conservative and vice versa. It is simply an undeniable cerebral difference. Moreover the difference is seldom acquired. It is naturally occurring. One can be lead astray, but not for life. I have never met a recovering conservative, but have met hundreds of liberals who suddenly see the light, and convert, never to return.

After years and years of study, debate, and work with both sides, I finally have determined the cause. Politics is the issue most contentious. About Sex, the French have always said, “Viva la difference”. It is not the same with politics. Here much damage, destruction, and actual war can be caused by this difference. For most of us our right hand is dominate and dependable. Our left is less so. In politics it is much the same.

Fear the left, not the right. For that reason, more than any other, I would love to have everyone think like me. This is not going to happen. Political difference will always be dangerous.

The difference has always, until now, escaped close scrutiny.

When this book is published we can expect severe attacks and blasphemy upon my soul. The matter must be addressed and blown open for view. At my advanced years I have nothing to lose and maybe our world will be improved by what I write in this book.

Finally, I do believe I understand why one boy, like me, would hit the decks a Conservative and the kid across the street would also hit the same deck as a Liberal. That is the purpose of this book---to explain the difference and try to answer the question: Why?

[\(Return to Contents\)](#)

## **CHAPTER 1**

(Capitulo 1 – Spanish)

GETTING TO KNOW THE AUTHOR.

THEME: This book will discuss some weighty thoughts.

They are provocative. The discussion will range from simple observations of the differences between the Leftist brain and the Conservative brain, into deep psychosocial analysis of their different thought patterns and thought disabilities. The purpose is to offer an explanation of why so many Conservatives observe that Leftists seem to have no common sense. The author has spent a lifetime studying this subject. He was educated at Stanford University and the University of Southern California, His B.A. degrees were in History and Political science. He obtained a Doctorate of Law from USC. Later he took every agriculture course available, entitling him to an AA in the subject of agriculture. He does not have a traditional PHD in psychology nor is he a Physician Surgeon with a specialty in Psychiatry. His background is better suited to this task, since he is freer to explore and postulate. As you think about it, because he is not bound up with categories, names and pigeon holes, he is better able to see the problem in a fresh light.

KNOWING THE AUTHOR: I am Rooster Bradford. It is important for you to know my bias and prejudices. I tend to be brief and this book was written that way. Who I am and what I believe is important as you read my analysis of the pivotal difference between the Conservative mind and the Liberal mind.

To borrow a phrase, I should be transparent. I am opening up new doors and windows to provide us all a better view. Why do liberals and Conservatives think so differently about so many important things in life? I will mostly use the term Leftist rather than Liberal since the latter is so vague.

The terms Conservative and Leftist have been coined to help us define general views on the nature of politics. The basic difference between a person who is Conservative and one who is a Leftist has to do with their thought process. That affects many things. In this book, however, we will focus on their political views.

Finding the answer has been a life time interest and study for me. As with most children, I was not political. As a child I did not see the differences, but I am certain they were present with the children I played with.

This difference is not an American problem. It includes each and every human being in the world. To remind you of the scope, I will add different languages to the Chapter numbers.

Just keep in mind the differences have always been with us and always will be.

Very early on I began to listen to and understand the world of political differences. My Mother was a full blown liberal and in those days a follower of Franklin D. Roosevelt and the Democrat party. FDR could do no wrong in her eyes. My Father was a remote person in my life. When I did see him, it was mostly for short times, and I never recall him discussing politics with me. Like a good boy, I followed the admonition that a child was to be seen, not heard. Clearly from what I did hear I could understand why he and my mother were divorced. Intellectually they were on different planets.

I did not become a Conservative. I was born that way.

Certainly the disagreement with my Mother's thoughts was more important than any comments by my Father. Neither was active in day to day politics or seemed to participate in political parties.

From the get-go, I always took the Conservative view when considering any issue which was politically important. In other words it was not instilled in me. I was born that way. I lived apart from my Mother and Father for many of my formative years. In my 6th year, I was placed in Burbank Military School and then with the advent of World War II, I was placed in Page Military School. Both were in the Los Angeles greater area. In those days and in those places, political indoctrination was minimal. With the war there was patriotism. Both liberal and Conservative were patriotic. In my ninth year I was taken by my Aunt Dorothy and Uncle Don and lived with them for another couple of years. Neither was political. During these years I know I thought as a Conservative. In the 6th grade my Mother reentered the picture and I lived with her. She was then married to a soldier serving in WW II. He was away. As I think about it there is no question she and I did not agree on politics. Now as a child you listen and keep your mouth shut, but the brain was saying ---Hey What!! She loved to discuss the political scene and attempted to convince me of the liberal mind set. There was no chance. I held my ground. I was not buying. Now why was that? I loved both my parents. They were not the kind who flooded me with love and affection, but were fair and interested in what I did, and less interested in what I thought, which is normal. I continued to live with my Mother until I went to Stanford University. If indoctrination was going to have a chance, that was the time. It did not. I remained Conservative.

As the years rolled on, my Mother lived with me for the last 10 years of her long life and in the last few years confessed to me she then believed she had been politically wrong. Never a Conservative, but she went out doubting her Leftists beliefs.

Trying to analyze why I was Conservative and others were not took up a lot of my thought. Why on earth did God or evolution cause this wonderful opportunity to disagree and sometimes get violent about it? If God did it ---- Why? If evolution did it, how come? While we were evolving for some 40 thousand years, this destructive attitude persisted. Wouldn't evolution have removed these rough edges? Wouldn't selection and family, make getting along a high priority item? I guess not.

Clearly I was born running on a Conservative deck. No significant environmental or social force made me do it. It has been my observation that most Leftists appear to pop up the same way, rather than be molded into the mindset.

Because of a broken home, I was put with a multitude of adults, especially in schools. I went to so many grammar schools I have lost track. They were varied, from a one room school to mega ones of immense proportions. In all of these no teacher stands out as a mentor. In the 30s, 40s, and early 50s teachers did not indoctrinate much. High school was neutral. I do not recall any political lineups. The only event that stands out was in a Spanish Class. We were discussing the politics of Spain and its Civil war of the 30s. In that war communism lost to a dictator, Franco. Someone asked Mr. Lisbon (our teacher) what socialism was and he described it as follows. Our class room was on the second floor. From where we (students) sat, you would see, on the left windows, and to the right a wall. Mr.

Lisbon was at the front and the back wall served as a place to hook up clothes and things. There were about 7 lines of desks.

He spoke along these lines. He said; let's suppose that everyone here was a socialist. We would believe in a common good and sharing the values of the land. We would believe that everyone was fair and would be tolerant of others. Now in this room the only real thing of value we can share are grades. The desks and room belong to the government. So let us suppose I give an exam and I grade it A, B, C, D and F on a curve.

(Whatever happened to the E) He continued; "Now I seat you all by grades. Over on the window we have As and on the far side, by the wall, we have all the Fs, The Bs are next to the As, then the Cs and then the Ds would be placed next to the Fs. Now in Capitalism that is the way it stays. In Socialism we cannot have such inequality and unfairness. We will have to take from the A's to give to the F's and so on until everyone has a C+." For whatever reason, I knew immediately where he was going.

When he got there, the class sat in silence. He had a time getting a discussion going. Finally, it began and clearly none of the talkers liked it. The fairness and tolerance did not appear.

Jealousy and envy seemed to rule the day. I doubt any student in that class ever loved Socialism, and maybe there was some indoctrination by his example, but Mr. Lisbon simply gave the facts and we had to decide the merits. Indoctrination---maybe, but I think not. My point is that Mr. Lisbon did not influence me.

What he said simply reinforced what I already knew. The light bulb for me was how many students had no idea. If there was someone who liked the idea they stayed quiet. It was an omen of the future.

After High School it was Stanford University for 4 years, the Army for 2+ then Law School and the practice of law. In all of my schooling, no mentor showed up. No one teacher influenced my political beliefs. What I was----stayed and have remained to this moment in time. How is that? At Stanford, I joined the Young Republicans and became politically active in a political party for the first time. All we really did was distribute papers, go to meetings and show up at Conservative speaker events. We also discussed such matters and one Conservative student and I became good intellectual friends and remain so today. We joined the same fraternity, went our separate career ways and eventually came together again and are very good friends as I write this book.

After the military service, I started studying for my law degree. I first went to Hastings Law School in San Francisco.

This was a public funded school, a part of the University of California. There I found many opportunities to debate during school and after. I found debate to be a wonderful intellectual way to test my beliefs. There were many liberals and they wanted to gang up on me. It was fun. After the first year, I transferred to USC law school, and obtained my doctorate in law.

On schedule I passed the State Bar and was admitted to practice in the State of California Courts and the Federal Courts (not the Supreme Court which is a different application.). Shortly after my graduation in 1961 Goldwater began the run for President. I found a hero in this Candidate. I remember the Cow Palace GOP convention of 1964, in San Francisco, and how his conservatism split the Republican Party. I knew I had to do a part to help out because so many Republicans in Name only (Not called RINOS then) refused to help. I even posted campaign posters in Watts, an entirely Black community in Los Angeles. You remember the one where the residences burned it down in 1965 because of a perceived race motivated impounding of the car of Marquette Frye. When the riots were over 34 were dead, 3032 injured and 3,952 arrested. Millions of dollars of property damage occurred as the rioters burned and pillaged the property of others. I hope my intrusion in 1964 had nothing to do with the heated tensions.

Still there never was a mentor or person who influenced my beliefs. Law School made me even more certain I was right. (Did I say Right?) What I mean is that I became a devotee to the rule of law over a Judge and a stronger devotee to the Constitution and the writings of the Founders.

In law practice, I was a trial lawyer and examined and cross examined just about every type of person and profession imaginable. I spent 5 years as a prosecutor and the rest in private practice. I continued to argue politics whenever I could.

Even at Hastings, I found most liberals refused to debate. That has been my life experience. In fact I must say, the few I was able to debate always caved. That is they ended up abandoning logic and common sense, and used emotional cymbals (not symbols) to end their participation. Such as “You just don’t get it, or You are racists, or Capitalists are just plain stupid, etc.” Facts and logic seemed to be abandoned by the liberal debaters who stayed with me.

In time, politics invited me into the mix and I ran for State office twice and, twice I came very close to the incumbent, but lost. My opponent was never found nude in a fountain with two lovely ladies. The incumbency factor did me in. In fact, it was a good thing, because I was a husband and father and quite poor.

If I had won, I would still be poor. Honest men do not get rich in politics.

The years rolled by and still I was outspoken and endeavored to win the minds and hearts of others to the Conservative view. Some call me a renaissance man. If that is true, no one should seek it. Keeps you very busy. Today, among many things, I write this book and have a Conservative talk show called “THE ROOSTER CROWS”

(TheRoosterCrows.net.) I am still at it, trying to convince folks of the best form of government for we, the flawed.

Finally, it is important to know my other interests. They may create a bias. Certainly political debate has always been a small part of my interests. First, I am compulsive about doing as many things as I can achieve physically. I went to school to learn all I could about farming and became a farmer. I still am farming avocados and lemons on my own ranch. I have spent over 30 years as a surfer, collect cars and restore them, love travel, started some 4 nonprofit companies and about the same number commercial ones. My wife and I run a company that's involved with organic production. I play some 13 musical instruments. As a part of my musical interests I formed a large Swing Band which played in all of the really neat places in Southern California. I had and still have a New Orleans Jass band (No, it is spelled correctly.) In it I play cornet and trombone. Each morning I play the piano and sing as often as I can. I am an accomplished Scottish Bagpipe player and have played banjo and guitar. Most of it has been self-taught, after I was 44 years of age. In this busy life I have been married twice and had two children with each. My wife and life partner's name is Susan. Along the way I have studied just about every subject I could. Jack of many and master of few. My critics will pick up on this admission. For example, I developed an extensive chronology of the development of Hominids (you and I). I wanted to prove there is no proof we evolved, came from God, or were dropped here by Aliens. The Chronology does that. I started it to argue against the liberal compulsion to adopt evolution as if it were a God. Trying to debate this issue clearly ran into a stone wall. I needed proof. So I now have it. You too can view this massive work as the last item in this book. I update it frequently and the most recent will be on my web page, *theroostercrows.net* Now you know a bit about me and will be in a better position to judge what I say and write.

As always I have been a Conservative. I register as a Republican and when I ran for office, I did so as a Republican.

When it comes to push or shove, I am through and through a defender of the Constitution as written and amended and opposed to centralization of power.

[\(Return to Contents\)](#)

## **CHAPTER 2**

(Capitolo 2-Italian)

The inherent vice of Capitalism is the unequal sharing of the Blessings.

The inherent blessing of Socialism is the equal sharing of its Misery Winston Churchill.

**LIBERAL AND CONSERVATIVE ISMS COMPARED** You and I need to have a common understanding of these two concepts before we can really have a discussion. I will attempt to avoid the traditional cliché. As I thought about this important project it came clear we have to keep it simple. The subject is huge. We could easily get lost in the tangents. The main sign posts tell us to keep focused on political form. By this I mean, we must not get off on the merits of such things as racial tolerance, but stay on the track of political structure. Moreover, let us focus on liberals and Conservatives in the United States.

If we try to incorporate politics of Britain or Iran, we will lose our way. Liberalism and Conservatism are the same everywhere, but the local flavor changes the discourse.



Now in the United States Conservatism and Liberalism have different outlooks on the law. Conservatives want a strong written law and they begin with the Constitution. They want the judges and legislators to abide by the law as it has been set down. Liberals want a flexible law that can be moved about more easily. For example the Constitution spells out how it can be amended. Liberals want Judges and legislators to amend it.

To them it is faster and more certain. After all a Constitutional amendment requires a 2/3 vote. Conservatives love the concepts set up in the Constitution. They absolutely believe in the fallibility of their neighbor and others, and do not want them to be able to change the law easily. They want it slow and deliberate. They fear centralization of power. Liberals do not and do not care for the checks and balances set up in the Constitution.

I liken these differences, to the design of a gas motor.

When engineers design a gas motor they have to consider a series of checks and balances. For example if the motor is to be dependable and last a long time, the tolerances, the compression ratio, the intake of fuel, the oil distribution system must be designed with a lot of checks and balances. If the design is for power there are other considerations. If it is for speed then, again the engineers will design it with less checks and balances. Conservatives want the motor to last a long time with just enough power to do the job. Liberals tend to want speed and power. Any motor designed for a lot of power or speed has built into the design its own early self-destruction.

Compromises have had to be made to get to the outer limits. It is the law of nature. So it is with Socialism.

Conservatives and Liberals have very different conclusions about what motivates and moves their fellow human beings. Liberals are much more trusting of their fellows than are Conservatives. It is a marked difference. It underlies their differences in the use of the power of government. In short, it is a common sense difference.

Just looking at the collection of power we see marked strata between the two. Conservatives distrust power when it is human controlled. They believe it will be abused. Liberals are much more tolerant of powers use and feel that it will be used for the better and not the worse. In this context, I point out a strange comparison. Conservatives do not like dictators, kings, or power brokers in Politics, Unions or Gangs. Liberals do not see the danger, if any. They tend to adoration, such as "Camelot" with the Kennedy family, the willingness to allow FDR to seek a 4th term. Their flocking to the silver tongue of President Obama. It is as if the liberal is willing to turn over the travails of life to someone else in exchange for security. The Conservative distrust prevents a wiliness to become subjected to the whims of others. In this context then, the Liberal prefers a more flexible and movable government, and the Conservative wants one that moves very slowly and with difficulty.

Liberals believe in Democracy. Conservatives do not.

The latter believe in a representative democracy where the people do not make the decisions, but their elected representatives do. This is a check against wild emotional swings. Clearly the difference is based on trust. Liberals trust one for all and all for one, and Conservatives do not. People are too susceptible to emotion and too often it cripples

their clear thinking. Democracy can be too fast. Conservatives want more deliberation and debate.

So far I have used the word Liberal, but I fear it is too broad. In these times being a Liberal has lost definition.

Conservative has pretty much stayed the course. I now want to use the word Leftist. Other writers have called them Statists, Socialist, or Communists. These are variations on the same theme. Leftist are people who want one government, world government, one justice system etc. They do not want the delay that debate provides. In fact they do not want debate. They are so convinced they are correct that any opposing view should be covered up like a cat finishing its morning constitutional. I once had a jass show on a Public University FM station for some 16 years. I was in the eye of the storm. The station was used as a Leftist gathering and information center. It was S.A.D. to see so many people unwilling to debate. Being unwilling to debate simply means you no longer want to think about the issue. It is settled.

Another aspect of the definition of Liberal and Conservative revolves around their job choices. For example, Conservatives tend to select civilian solo type jobs and tough jobs like the Military. In the Military they are the preferred volunteer. By this I mean, a job where they have flexibility to go their own way. This is why so many private companies are created by and headed up by Conservatives. In the construction world it is hard to find a Leftist. Leftist are less independent and seek to join a group. For example, they like teaching, governmental jobs, or in the civil world joining up with large companies which function much like a governmental agency.

Let's look at choices between independent enterprise and governmental control. The Conservative wants freedom in enterprise. That is why they call it Free Enterprise. Liberals find such freedom worrisome. They prefer governmental control.

They believe a level playing field is more fair and easier to live with. They do not like surprises. A good example would be the current health take over by President Obama and the Socialist Pelosi and Reid (Both have admitted it at one time or another.) Religion or the lack there of is another good example. Leftist are generally against classic religion. This is so because they adamantly believe in Darwin's Theory (notice I say theory) of evolution. Believing in God and evolution at the same time is tough on the mindset. Here I am talking about those who think about politics and there are many who never go there. I am certain you know of many who attend church simply because it is a thing to do and an opportunity to say hello to neighbors. They may be liberal or Conservative, but they are not really thinking about it. Most Conservatives believe in God. They may believe in evolution as well, but they do not consider they are inconsistent. Any rational human being, who has ever faced death---looked it in the eye and came through to live again, believes in God. Why? Because in such a terrible time you need strength from without your puny frame, and God fills that need. Conservatives generally are not picky in which God. It is more of an acceptance of faith. A Leftist simply does not go there. Keep in mind in all of this discussion there are many exceptions. We are talking general overviews. A Leftist absolute acceptance that central power is benevolent is evidence of blind faith. It is akin to Classic Religion. In fact secularism is a faith which is threatened by an outer world God.

Family worship. Here the Leftist is weak. It is because of their tattered belief in a God and the necessary life-controls, a religion provides. Not to steal, not to take another's spouse, etc.

A family obligation means no free love. Why? Because trust and faithfulness are a major part of family and their lack means family deterioration. The Leftist is content to have the life controls come from them and their followers through governmental (societal) controls. The Conservative would rather have such life guideline coming from an overlying religious belief because it allows more freedom. The Conservative finds family much more important than Government.

In the arena of human motivation Conservatives and Leftist are starkly different. Conservatives believe all humans have to be motivated to take care of themselves. Leftist do not.

Finally I want to talk about stealing. It should make no difference to you whether a man with a weapon takes your cash, or whether a man with a law does the same thing.

Conservatives get upset when a legislator passes a law to take more than is necessary for the common defense and the common necessities of communal living. Leftist do not have such an aversion.

[\(Return to Contents\)](#)

## **CHAPTER 3**

(CHAPITRE 3--French)

AGE AND DECEIT WILL ALWAYS OVERCOME YOUTH AND SKILL.

Anon.

SPECIFIC EXAMPLES OF LEFT

*RIGHT THINKING Guns; Life Style; Gender Preference; Governmental Aid; Enemy Lists; Religious Tolerance; Free Enterprise; Spendthrift; Bad Commanders; Energy; Global Warming; Evolution vs.*

*Creationism; Humor; Politically Correct; Discrimination; Abortion; Telling Others What To Do; Changing Names; Illegal Immigration; Health Care.*

Let us examine some unique differences in the thought process between a typical Leftist and a typical Conservative.

Just to refresh your mind, a typical Leftist is one who favors Governmental control of most things. A typical Conservative is one who does not. We are not going to analyze the differences, but simply illustrate them and ask the question—Why? Other chapters will be devoted to answering the question.

**GUNS:** Please understand the ownership of guns was supposed to be settled in our Constitution. The writing of the founders, without doubt, explains why citizens cannot have their guns taken away. The founders thought it so important they devoted a single amendment, “the second”, to the subject. Freedom of Speech, right to assemble, right of

free press, freedom of religion, and the right to petition had to share a single amendment, the first. Not so with Guns. It was so important it stands alone.

*Second Amendment --US Constitution:* “A well regulated militia, being necessary to the Security of a free State, the right to the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed”

A Conservative, who does not like guns, is afraid of guns, has no interest in guns, simply avoids them. A Leftist dislike of guns is a fear. Fear is an emotion. Normally (Upps! an oxymoron) a Leftist fear is not of the gun, but what it can do to his or her course of conduct. A Leftist wants them banned.

Actually they want to forcible take them away. In many places in America, where the Leftist can marshal the vote they pass all manner of laws to “infringe” (last word of the 2nd amendment) on the use of guns. The concealed weapon laws are the best example.

Leftist restrict the places where guns can be carried, the kind of guns allowed, limit the amount of ammunition or the kind of ammunition and when they really have control, they outlaw them in spite of the Constitution. They recently did this in Washington D.C. and in Chicago. Remember the Supreme Court had to find both laws unconstitutional. As soon as the Supreme Court made its ruling in Chicago, the City Council, controlled by Leftists and their echoes, passed a new law limiting the possession and use to inside the house. One cannot even bring a gun on to a porch.

Why do liberals want to destroy this right? Is it the noise? Is it the fact a gun can accidentally wound or kill? Is it because a gun can intentionally be used to change a course of conduct like the takeover of government?

Certainly all credible evidence proves an armed citizenry depresses serious crime. Criminals do not want to get blown away either. Leftists do not want guns to interfere with their control. In fact there is little difference between a robber taking your property at Gun point, and a Leftist passing a law to take your property against your will. Actually passing a law to do so is worse. It has all the attributes of a sneak attack.

LIFE STYLE: Let’s look at being a Vegetarian or the flip side--do not eat cows because of the methane gas they produce. First, the Constitution did not get into life styles. The founders did not feel the Federal government should have a say whether you had to eat only carrots and chicken. If a Conservative is a vegetarian he or she simply does not eat meat. If a Leftist is a vegetarian, he or she wants all meat banned and certainly will not allow it on their table, no matter who you are. The Leftist will demand Governments regulate it, limit it and when they have the votes outlaw it. Why do Leftists want to control the life style of others?

Certainly life style goes beyond your choice of food.

Let’s look at the life style forced on us by Leftist in the 60s and 70s. I do not know one clear headed person who thinks Woodstock was a socially great thing, or that the gazillion of failed communes provided anything but examples of failure.

What about “Free Love”. Most scientists and doctors today recognize that free love and its fall-outs are responsible for the spread of HIV and a multitude of other viruses. Many bizarre sexual problems of today, not to mention porno addiction, are a result of the

letting go of social restraints. Why do liberals want to go there? Why do they ignore the hundreds of years of social experience that created the restraints? What is this crash and burn mentality they seem to possess?

What about smoking and drinking? I smoked cigarettes for about 10 years and still enjoy a cigar now and again. Yes the smoke can kill and is not good for you. Too much food does the same. Too much sex can kill you. In fact too much of a good thing is bad for you. No doubt, most of us agree some effort should be put forward to reduce the risks, but Conservatives do not agree the Government should dictate what, when, and where. Leftist demand the Government dictate and forbid, just like they did with the 18th amendment (Prohibition). They do not seem to get the picture. If people want to commit slow suicide, they will. So why do they prefer dictation over education? Why can't beer advertise? Why can't a restaurant have a smoking section and a nonsmoking section?

Let us add to this life style list the use of Drugs. In the 60s Leftists took acid to make the world weird. Now the world is weird and the same people take Prozac to make it seem normal.

Legal and illegal drug abuse has always been with us. Before the late 20s all drugs were legal and the abuse was up to you.

Based on the statistics I can find the abuse was less then, than it is today. The ladies against bars, brothels, and booze (the three Bs) and drugs rose up and got us to pass the only stupid amendment ever, to our Constitution.....the 18th—(prohibition).

These prohibitionists were simply another collection of the brain dead. People who take a cause without any thought as to the consequences, the fall out, and their loss of liberty. Why is that?

What causes them to go brain dead? I mean people who do not use history to gauge the present and future. Why these terrible mistakes?

GENDER PREFERENCE: Again the Constitution is silent on the subject. Religions generally are not. Some, like *Islam*, absolutely forbid being Gay. The gender preference is where a man wants a man or a woman wants a women. Not heterosexual. Now a Conservative, who is a homosexual, is alright with it and wants the public to leave he or she alone.

A homosexual Leftist demands Governmental sanction.

They avoid religions that are against it and want secular approval. They are active and direct in wanting a homosexual relationship to be called "Marriage", not because it can be in the traditional sense, but because they want their relationship to be considered normal. Heterosexual and Gay can never be the same. They are different in so many ways. These Leftists are unrealistic. It is their game of smoke and mirrors. No doubt the faint of heart will allow the Gay couple to be married. The real test of whether it does anything or not would be for all heterosexuals to abandon the word Marriage and use the term, Matrimony. Wanna bet the Leftist gays would fight against it and if it passed, would fight to have their relationship called Matrimony? As I write this book a Gay judge overruled the will of the people of the State of California to keep "marriage" for heterosexuals only. His ruling makes no sense. His choice of principles were invented in

his mind. My mind conjures up a picture of a dog chasing its tail, round and round. Doesn't make any sense.

For years now the Leftist have pushed to get rid of the "Don't ask and don't tell" rule in the Military. This rule means that a Gay can serve in the military so long as no one in the Military knows it. Under all recent Democrat leadership there have been pushes to allow military types to be openly gay. Conservatives say it is not a good idea to mix the troupes. The Leftist do not use sense as their reason. In this same vein the Leftist have pushed to allow women to serve in fighting units. An equally dangerous idea. Why? I spent 13 years in the military so I know something about it. Most soldiers in fighting units are young, and have strong sexual desires. It is part of the package. Further you must admit that in any fighting unit the goal is to make the enemy die, and not to die for your country. Now imagine yourself a hot blooded heterosexual male on patrol in Afghanistan. The enemy really wants to kill you. If the point soldier is a hot blooded 20 year old girl, you will be distracted by her presence. It will happen. This is not a game. Your life is at stake. Now as she takes the point of the patrol you become interested in her butt. It is as natural as rain. If we allow open gay guys in the military you could have one behind you as the patrol makes its way. Gay guys are as hot blooded as anyone else. It's just that they direct their lust for other guys. Ok, so you have the 20 year old healthy, horny girl on the point and you bend down to get a better look. At the same moment the gay guy behind you becomes transfixed on your butt. How well are any of you concentrating on where the enemy is or is not?

Remember in Afghanistan civilians and soldiers all look the same. This means each synapse must be concentrated on the enemy. You may very well be in the cross hairs of a sniper and soon to die. This is serious stuff, folks. We are being pushed into a situation where our military is being purposefully weakened and the Leftists are doing it. Conservatives say that if Gays want to serve openly then let them have their own units.

The Spartans in Ancient Greece did it with some success. If the ladies want to serve in combat units, let them do it on their own and together. Why do Leftists demand this mixing of sexual desires in the Military? Is it to foster love, or is it to foster destruction? Will it help or hurt military effectiveness? Bradley Manning answers the questions I ask. He is the gay soldier who in a fit of pique released all manner of secret documents on Afghanistan to WikiLeaks. A forward turret of the Battleship Utah blew up in a fire drill and the investigation pointed at two gay sailors, one of whom was in a jealous rage.

**GOVERNMENTAL AID:** A Leftist wants all significant aid to come from Government. Seldom do you meet a Leftist who is gung ho for charity. All of history tells us Government programs do not work well. It is human nature to look out for number 1 first. That is what the Governmental employees will do. If there is anything leftover then it goes toward the purpose of the program. Moreover if you want to lose a friend, loan them money or make a "charitable gift" to them. It is the nature of the beast.

I need to again say that a Leftist is a socialist/communist type. We already know they do not learn from history. Adolph Hitler rose to power as the leader of the National Socialist Workers Party of Germany. It was to be a socialist experiment.

As in all such experiments, they are easy to hijack because of the centralization of power. Guess what? That is what ole Adolph did. You can blame a failed socialist experiment on

bringing about the Holocaust. Lenin set up such an experiment in Russia. Stalin hijacked it and became the most blood thirsty killer in history. Just these two failed socialist experiments killed over 65 million souls in World War II and after. Do the Leftist get it? Of course not and they are doomed to repeat the same mistakes if we allow it to happen.

A Conservative, if he is down and out, figures out what he has to do, on his own, to get out of the mud. The Conservative knows that lending money, or giving money to someone who is down and out prevents, or tends to prevent, that person from helping themselves and this destroys resolve and character. A Leftist must know all Federal programs are bloated and inefficient, so why do they persist? Why do they want to continue to make gifts of the treasury? Why can't they see that Federal and State Food Stamp Programs are wasteful and are taken advantage of on a daily basis? Maybe they do and then the question is, if so, why do they continue the waste? I personally went and applied for food stamps to learn about it.

From my own observations, of the approximately 500 people who went through this one small office, in one small town, only about 10 percent were citizens. Almost to a man, woman, and child I saw, not one looked hungry. In fact all should have lost weight. Most were Latino and anyone who knows people from Latin America, knows they have strong family bonds which means, no member of the family goes hungry. Nobody there needed food stamps. They want them because it frees up money for Plasma TVs, I Phones' and other unnecessary of life.

Those of us not on food stamps pay for their toys. Yet, faced with all this, the liberal will become very emotional about its need. Why? It does not make sense.

ENEMY LISTS: Leftists have them and Conservatives generally do not. There was much wailing that President Nixon had one, but it was not a list to do harm. His was a watch list. Leftist do not like to debate, because emotional responses seldom stand up to logic and good sense. It is easier to try to get rid of the one who wants debate. For example the Leftist have in many ways tried to get control of the airways to destroy Conservative talk radio. Why? I just said that they do not like debate. That is one.

Second, they put Conservative talk show hosts on an enemies list. Demanding "equal time" "balanced discourse" "public Radio—NPR etc." are some of their methods to destroy the enemy. They claim Conservative talk shows spew hate speech, distorted concepts and Ideas opposed to the common good.

Leftists have been able to get such regulations promulgated by the FCC. They know that Conservative talk radio only survives on advertisers. If they can demand equal time, they will destroy the commercial part of the shows. They know they cannot compete on the airways. Every leftist commercial attempt has ended up in the can. Now where they control the radio, as they do in most Universities, and in most public funded radio, the Leftists will not allow Conservative Talk shows. Oh--- they will pretend they do, but they do not. I know because I am one they kicked off the air. For 16 years I had a successful Jass/jazz music show on the FM station at the University of California at Santa Barbara. I tried to get permission to do a Conservative show and was laughed off the stage. I then used subterfuge and told them I would do a Country Western show and comment.

They thought I meant comment on the music and the artists. I did not. I meant to comment on political issues, which I did.

Once they were tricked it took them some time to recover.

Finally, I devoted the last 1/2 hour of my jass show to Political comment. They went crazy. Finally, one day as I set up the show in studio A the wicked witch of the Left and her student stooge came in and ordered me out of the studio. Do you think I am exaggerating? Go ask Shaun Hannity. The Leftists in charge of that same FM station did the same to him when he was a student there. Leftist in charge will not tolerate debate.

They will not allow the chance that an opposing view might be true and the one they hold false. Is this clear thinking? No it is not... so then pray tell what motivates them to remove free speech and avoid debate? Is it the noise? Is it the Stress? Is it they do not want to be questioned?

On the other hand a Conservative simply shuts off the radio station, or changes it to something they like better. They do not want control or to silence the opposition. A Conservative invites debate. This leftist intolerance is a major indication of the different mindset. Why does it exist?

RELIGIOUS TOLERANCE: Here the Conservative and Leftist are on opposite sides of the world. A non-religious Conservative rejoices at the opportunity for you to pray, worship, etc. as you please. Tolerance is the byword. A secular Conservative does not want to control worship or any evidence of it. Just leave him alone and do not ask him to come to church.

The Leftist is all things opposite. The evidence is everywhere. First any person, who qualifies for the name Leftist, is not a dolt. They think, and most of the time they consider a religion as a competitor for control. Most are atheist and at best religious in name only (Hey! that spells RINO as well). That is why they relish banishing all things religious from all public places. Leftists cannot have the 10 commandments in a court house. Now I might agree if the basis was that you cannot have signs that say "Thou Shall Not Steal, Thou Shall Not Commit Adultery and Thou Shall Not Lie" in a building of lawyers and judges and (God, forbid the thought), politicians. But that is not the logic of Leftists. Leftist demand we cannot have "In God We Trust" on coins, and must remove all crosses, Stars of David etc.

If they had their way, religious people would have to do their thing in caves out of the noon day sun. It is a relentless battle they wage to bury religion so that people can only worship their God, Big Government. But once again history means nothing to them. Not once has Communism, the worst offender against religion, been successful. Still the Leftist demands there be no visible evidence of religion? Isn't the logical next step to banish the evidence in the private sector as well as the governmental?

Communists do every time. What real good is there to prevent a human being from believing in a life hereafter?

Oh! By the way, please do remember that atheism is a religion. If a religion is defined as a set of beliefs about the hereafter then atheism is playing the same game in the same ballpark. They have such a set of beliefs. Many atheists will tell you it is their Religion. Remember Mr. Newdow? He was the fellow who sued, in California, to not have his



daughter say the pledge of allegiance, because it speaks of God. I heard him, not once, but twice say his religion was atheism.

Why? What motivates the Leftist to not be tolerant with religions other than their own?

**FREE ENTERPRISE:** The founders did not bother to make free enterprise a stated liberty or right. Only 9 of the 55 signers of the Constitution were public servants. For several hundreds of years Americans assumed that enterprise was supposed to be free. Yearly leftists do what they can to eliminate this freedom. Income redistribution is just one of the ways. Certainly corporation income tax, (A corporation profits will be taxed in the hands of its shareholder owners), is another example of double taxation against enterprise. Capital gains tax is yet another. Now I am talking only about tax. The regulation upon regulation which stifles free enterprise is even a bigger example. The examples are endless. Have you ever given much thought as to why the Leftist dislike free enterprise? Is it because free enterprise is difficult and therefore not fair to the less capable? Is it because free enterprise stands in the way of governmental control? Is it because they just cannot visualize a world of challenges, success, and reward? Maybe it is just that there is something wrong with their computers; the ones on their shoulders.

**SPENDTHRIFTS:** Many families have been faced with planning their estate to take care of one or more members who just cannot get a grasp on income and expenses. That is what a spend-thrift is--one who spends more than they have. Each of us has struggled with this problem, either personally or with others we know. A credit card is so easy to abuse. The point is that being frugal, saving (which means not spending all you have) requires self-discipline and determination.

Conservatives seem to have a good grasp of the problem. They know a family, much more a government, cannot spend more money than is available. The Conservative knows it can be done but also knows the end result may not be pretty.

The Leftist has a major problem here. Spending more than the Government has is simply simple. This year 2010 is one where many governments, which have been Leftist led, are broke and the result is painful. This is not the first year nor will it be the last. For some reason the Leftist fails to see that once government (actually any entity or person) makes a lot of gifts to people, the beneficiaries expect the giving to continue. When it does not they get upset and the damage can be extensive.

Examples abound. Recent riots in Atlanta over Federal Housing 8 benefits.--Watts riots-- New Orleans in the Katrina blow—on and on into the night. The United States has the largest economy and potential of any other country, but it too, must not spend more than it has. This is not theory. It is economic fact. When government borrows too much, generations down the line have to pay. Speaking of not fair, this is it. Raise taxes and you hit the middle class the hardest. When the middle class suffers the entire economy feels the loss. Why is a Leftist a spendthrift? Do they think it is a Monopoly game and the money is make believe? Do they see Government as Big Daddy War Bucks and the game never ends? Do they fail to see the danger of borrowing on the future of others? What if the others rebel? Do they simply think the future will cure their sins? Do they even think of their mistakes as sins? What set of blinders do they wear? Why is it they cannot see the danger? One thing is for certain, Leftists do not make good ship captains. Ships on rocks

seldom survive and, if they do the damage is extensive. Ask the Captain of the Valdez. The ship of state is no different.

**LEFTIST MAKE BAD GENERALS AND COMMANDERS IN CHIEF:** A good military commander has to have the good sense and ability to make the hard decision. Leftist fail to do so most of the time. Let's examine our own History for the record. I have divided the wars of our country into big ones and little ones. By doing this you will see history tells us Leftists get us into big wars. In small ones Conservatives almost always win and Leftists lose. Whyzat?

#### *MAJOR WARS.*

1864 Civil war.

Started by Democrats in the South and finished by a Republican President 625,000 dead.

1889 Spanish American War: President McKinley, a Republican, resisted the war but the Democrats agitated for it.

“Remember the Maine”. It is a little confusing about who declared it. Not important anymore because no one declares war. The point is that McKinley relied on his military leaders and the war was over within the year.

U.S. dead 2,446 1918 World War I Woodrow Wilson, a Democrat, resisted the war, but had to declare it after he allowed several of our ships to be sunk by German U Boats. He was sending supplies to England. This declared war took 2 years. His resulting dream of a League of Nations failed. The war defeated Germany, but failed peace.

U.S. dead 116,114 1941 World War II Franklin Roosevelt, a Democrat, like Wilson gave so much aid to Europe that we were in the middle of the war. Some say he teased the Japanese so much that they felt they had to keep us out of Asia...Hence Pearl Harbor. Others have said he knew the Japanese were going to attack and he allowed it to happen because the polls showed the American People did not want war. In any event we entered the biggest and second worst war counting the number of our dead. The war lasted about 4 years and devastated our way of life.

U.S. lost 405,000.

Truman, a Democrat, ordered the Atomic bombs, killing from 90,000 to 160,000 or so. A few historians say just the threat could have brought the war to an end. For example Truman could have just blown up an island to demonstrate why resistance was futile.

1950 Korean War Harry Truman, a Liberal, ran this 3 year war, failing to follow the decisions of his Military Commanders. The war stalemated.

U.S. lost 53,000.

1961 Vietnam War Lyndon Johnson, Democrat liberal, started the war, because of what many historians believe was a faked attack on one of our naval vessels. He then injected politics into every aspect of the war. By the time Nixon, a Republican, became President the war was lost. He finished the loss.

U.S. lost, 58,000.

*SKIRMISHES*: (Warlike, but with comparative less loss of time, lives and costs. I have not included Indian wars, and incidents) Bay of Pigs (1962) Jack Kennedy Democrat Loss Iran U.S. Embassy (1977) J. Carter Democrat Loss Grenada (1982) R. Reagan Republican Win Panama (1985) R. Reagan Republican Win Iraq First Gulf (1990) G. Bush Republican Win Somalia (1995) William Clinton Democrat Loss Kosovo (1998) William Clinton Democrat Loss Afghanistan (2001) G.W. Bush Republican W/L Iraq 2nd Gulf G.W. Bush Republican win Simply by knowing the history it is clear Liberals do badly in war. They generally interfere with the Military and prevent them from doing what has to be done to win.

Conservatives listen to the Military and give them freedom to win. A Conservative politician knows his limitations and that he or she was not trained to kill, and has more empathy for the soldier, who was so trained.

Today the war in Afghanistan is a prime example.

President Obama has ordered the military not to kill civilians, when no one there knows the difference between a soldier or civilian. He restricted the use of air strikes for the same reason.

All very dumb. Why do they do that?

*ENERGY*: What is energy? It is oil, atomic, wind, solar, geothermal, coal, hydroelectric, and natural gas. Those are the major sources of energy in the United States. It is fair to say that on each of them, except Wind, Solar, and Geothermal the Leftists are against their development. They used to be split on hydroelectric but have turned more against it in favor of fish, and natural appearing land. Now in knowing Leftists on this issue, we have to view them as very active environmentalists. They either participate directly or aid and abet. It is difficult to separate the two terms. Not all Leftists really care about the environment, but all activists of the environment are Leftists.

That is probably the best way to say it. Maybe a way to analyze their position is to look at the development of organic products.

Organic is a big deal these days and is being regulated by Governments all over the world. It started in the early 60s, by anti-establishment hippies. To a man, woman and child, they were Leftists and environmentalist. They were "one world"

socialist/communist and favored communes. They are the ones who coined "Organic" as applying to foods and stuffs naturally produced. They hated oil. In a discussion with them during those tumultuous times, they always confessed they hated oil not because of its carbon footprint, but because of the large and dominating oil companies. The entire concern about carbon footprints came much later. Hydroelectric was ok because the operators were government like and some cases actual governmental agencies. Atomic has always been on the bad list because of the atomic bombs dropped in Japan. Logic, if applied at all, stopped there. Natural gas and coal followed the same logic as oil, but with somewhat of a lesser hate. Primarily because there are few Coal and natural gas stations down the street, to hate. Solar and Wind have always been considered green, as opposed to black. They, unlike Atomic, have been considered environmentally safe. Just this last week I saw pictures of a Wind machine blowing up with black smoke all over the

landscape. When birds battle the blades, the wind machines win. I am certain, Leftists ignore all this.

Now here comes the problem. All the energy sources mentioned cost money to develop and produce for peoples to use. None of it is free. Oh, yes the sunshine is free and wind is free, but not the machines and equipment necessary to obtain it.

In fact, wind and solar recovery are so expensive people would not pay the price, if it sold for the costs of production. More than that, one can say the oil is free, the coal is free, and the atoms are free, but the equipment needed to obtain and distribute them is not. The short of it is that all energy we can use, costs us money to obtain. Solar and wind cannot presently produce economically balanced energy and all such productions are heavily subsidized by governments. Hydroelectric, natural gas, and oil can be produced in enough volume that the cost comes down to an affordable price. The same can be said of atomic energy plants; however, because of the emotion employed against them, it takes a very long time to recover the exaggerated production costs.

Do Leftists accept the economics of these sources? No, they do not. Why is that? First, their Leftist governments hide the real disparity between so called green energy and the other.

Every wind- mill to make electricity, every solar panel to produce electricity for a lot of people, every hybrid car, and every electric car is subsidized by the tax payers in general. Look in a mirror.

That's you Snow White. This means everyone is paying the difference so the energy produced by the wind mills and solar panels etc. will not substantially increase the citizens' energy bills. By doing this the true costs are hidden. If the governments made it all pay for itself, commercial solar and wind would vanish in a heartbeat. Well vanish is the wrong word. A large windmill field in Hawaii sits rusting away---slowly. Leftist then force the government to promote non -economic energy. Also, the plain economic fact is that a hybrid or electric car would be too expensive without government contributions to their development and use. Obama's government has now decreed that all new cars must get at least 35 mile per gallon. All this means is that we will be driving modified motorcycles. The rate of injury and death will be much higher. The comfort level will fall to the pavement, unless you like bumpy rides in cramped quarters.

While the American cars fail in foreign competition, get smaller and less in number, the German manufacturers are building big cars. They are selling like hot cakes. No big Cadillacs or Packards, or Lincoln Town Cars to compete because of governmental (leftists) interference.

Doesn't the logic seem warped here? If we can continue to use oil and gas, but more efficiently, at a cost the user can afford, isn't that better? Not in the Leftist world, but certainly in the Conservative world. It is not that the Leftist is better at environmental matters. Conservatives are just as concerned about a clean and healthy environment. If it is not an environmental difference then what is it? It is control. Not just control, but control by Government, the Goddess of the Left.

Kind of looks and sounds like Jabba the Hut in Star Wars.

On this issue, let us look at oil. Even the Leftist has to agree we must use oil now and tomorrow or do a lot of walking and never get warm. Yet, the Leftist does not want the environment of his country blemished by oil wells, coal mines etc. He knows that if we buy it from someone else the profits go there. Not just the profits but all the jobs to obtain it will be someplace else. He also must know that in the present world most of the other places are in the hands of people who want to destroy us. This means the dollars we spend for oil in Venezuela, Brazil, all of the Middle East feeds the Jabba Huts of those lands. It is our loss. This is not logical. It makes no sense. Contrary to some studies there is enough oil in the lands of the United States to supply all our needs for a long time. Not today because, as I write this book, all significant drilling has been stopped, by the Obama Administration. Why? Is it simply because of the Gulf Gusher? Even before the gusher, no real development was possible because of blockades put in place by the Leftist government. Leftist demand that our production be curtailed and exploration be stopped, and we buy what we need from our enemies and lose jobs and industry to them. Does that make any sense at all? No, of course not. What drives the Leftist to such crazy things? Is it a passionate love for green space? Not really. Is it an emotional hate of big business? Not really. About the only response you get is that if the Government controls, it all will be better. I guess it is, as I said, all about control. The next question is to ask why.

**GLOBAL WARMING:** This is an environmental issue, but treated here separately because it has grown its own wings.

This issue like so many raised by the Leftist has its feet in quicksand and is not based on solid evidence. Conservatives do not necessarily deny Global Warming and concede that in the entire history of the world it has either been getting cooler or hotter with just a few years of stability. Further, the periods of stability are not a mean point. We are moving on the hot or cold side most of the time. There is no scientific or political consensus of what is ideal weather or where it can be found. If it gets warmer, think of the advantages. Palm trees can grow in Butte, Montana, and Inuit Indians in the Aleutians will be able to have vegetable gardens.

The difference between Leftists and Conservatives is that leftists believe humans are a significant cause of global anything. Leftists not only believe humans are a major cause, but also that humans can reverse the warming. Their logic would seem to mean we can change the hurricane session, the tornado session, the flooding session, the earthquake happenings, the volcano happening and all other changes in the earth we do not like. Heavens to Betsy, we cannot even predict if it will rain next week, let alone a year from now. I might add such logic also means we can change the length of a day, the tilt of the Earth; in fact there is no limit to what we humans can do, in the lexicon of Leftist logic. Probably the core reason for the Leftist belief lies in their rabid dislike of oil. Again get real. It is not oil they hate; it is the private enterprise that obtains it. If we can just go green all will be good and the world will cool.

Conservatives say no way. All you have to do is fly over the Earth and see how little of it we can affect. For example, if every human being stood tall and waved a very large fan, air movement would not be touched. Oh, the air right around the fan would move, but no place else. The jet streams, the weather, the evening breezes, the movement of hot and cool air off the land masses onto the oceans and back again would not change. Compared to Mother Nature, we are powerless. Now add to this fervent feeling of the Leftist, the

facts that their scientific back up and support has been corrupted by their own, and you have fraud of immense size. They will not give the opposing viewpoints the time of day. They stand by Al Gore, (the sex poodle), and give him Peace awards and never once question the issue. They just accept it as a fact. Why do they do that? Isn't good science the best measure? Not to them because it does not fit their view of world order, which is ultimately world control by a central stainless steel God (Government). It is part of the secular religion. Leftist complain of blind faith in religion and yet that is exactly what they have in large government. Why do they do that?

**EVOLUTION VS CREATIONISM:** This is the age old question of whether Man evolved from another animal, was placed here by God, or placed here by folks from outer space. Now this is a subject I have studied long and hard. Many years ago I began a chronology of the origins of man. You can find the updated one in *The Rooster Crows. Net*. I have also put it into this book as the last chapter. Every time I found an article in any source about the origins of man, I placed it in the chronicle. What pushed me to do it was my belief, humans did not come out of Africa as many so called scientists claim. Nor did I believe there was a single mother in Africa from which we all sprung. It made no common sense based on what we know happened and what we have. I and most scientists do not trust DNA when it attempts to track back thousands of years. Just the time creates too many variables. My chronology is a listing of all printed scientific work on the subject. It demonstrates that there is no proof Homo sapiens evolved from apes. The Homo sapiens just seem to appear on Earth about 40,000 years ago. Our big brain gene is dated at around 37,000 years ago, at least as it exists in us. Oh there is evidence that Neanderthals were here about 350,000 years ago, but science does not list them as in line with us.

Another purpose of my work was to demonstrate for one and all, that our children should be taught all three theories: 1- Man may have evolved. 2- Man may have been created by a God. Or 3- Man may have been placed here by aliens from another place in the Universe. Let the children decide for themselves. Here in lies the great divide between the Leftist approach to education and the Conservative. Conservatives love to be fair and balanced. Leftists demand indoctrination.

Leftist to a man and woman become very emotional about any discussion of our arrival other than evolution. In fact, where they control, they demand children be taught only evolution. School books and curriculum are replete with this problem. In 2010 a major battle between the Leftist and Conservatives occurred in text book selection in the State of Texas. Conservatives won that day, but Leftist threatened to diminish the Texas selection in other States. Analyze their position. They demand that only evolution be taught, when any chronology is clear that Darwin's theory is still just that...a theory. God's creation is a theory. The Outer space story is a theory. They are all theories with no scientific fact. Leftists cannot stand this analysis. Why?

I have a Leftist cousin who will no longer talk to me because he obtained a degree in college which he believes makes him smarter than me. He points out that upright walking ape like animals have been on Earth for some 4 million years and that is proof of evolution. I agreed with him that ape like animals have been on earth that long and some still are. When I said there was no proven connection between any of them and the Homo sapiens or the Neanderthal, he said, "F\_\_\_ You" and hung up the phone. Now this is the

typical type of response from a Leftist when faced with logic or evidence contrary to their pet belief. I sent him a nice note and a copy of my Chronology and he has never responded. I believe we will pass on without ever again passing by. It is S.A.D.

Why is it a Leftist will not tolerate theories contrary to their own? Why do they explode in epithets as their last defense before they disappear into their capsule of protection? What is it in or out of the Leftist brain which prevents open and clean debate?

HUMOR: Humor, or the lack of all or part of it is also a good example of the differences between Leftists and Conservatives.

My old Webster's Dictionary defines humor as coming from the Latin word humere or umere (Moist or to be moist) It then lists a variety of meanings. *One is, " 2-a- a person's disposition or temperament; b- a mood, state of mind. 3. Whim; fancy; caprice. 4- The quality that makes something seem funny, amusing, or ludicrous; comicality."*

And finally "*5-a- the ability to perceive, appreciate, or express what is funny, amusing, or ludicrous*"

Unfortunately Webster does not discuss what "quality" means or what the "ability to perceive" can be.

My observation of Leftists clearly demonstrates they have a subdued sense of humor. They especially tend not to be able to laugh at themselves. Observe Leftists you know. Maybe it is you. It should become clear. In one way or another a leftist finds a belly laugh difficult. Most humor has some sort of parody on reality. Very often the parody is on some oddity of life For example there is the old comedy line.....*Take my Wife.....pleaaaaasssee!!* A good Leftist will find it sexist and the humor will be damped. A Conservative takes it without serious meaning. It is just a joke. Have a laugh. Find fun.

There is another aspect of understanding jokes and humor which will help us understand. To make a joke one works with parody, irony, exaggeration, and surprise, but always working from reality. Very often you are working off of some disability, or oddity. For example, "He is so old,,,,,, he was Methuselah's babysitter." Or "*If President Obama's ears were any bigger, we wouldn't need Air Force one!*" Now you know a Leftist would come undone on the last one, but probably not like the babysitter one either because it pokes fun at age.

Let's look at another form of humor which makes Leftist not laugh but frown and pout. In the days of jass (way it was originally spelled) every one made jokes of the other guy's oddity. For example, if you were fat, you ended up with the name, Fats Waller or Fats Domino or Big Daddy. If you had lost a hand or part of an arm, you might be called Wingy Monone, as he was. If your hair looked strange you could have been called "Pudd'n head Jones" -- a real live trumpet player. If you were young look'in, you would be called "Kid" like Kid Ory. If your face was less that pretty, you might be called "Muggsy Spanier. If you were short it was Pee Wee Russell and so on. These are real nick names of real people. Back in the 20s and 30s this was the way we described each other. Fats Domino loved his name.

It gave him status and was humorous. It was the same for most.

The Leftist destroyed it. They cannot see humor in such parody.

It is as if they want everyone to look the same and appear the same. They prefer grey as their favorite color. They have a problem with the sense of humor. They do not get it. Can you tell me what is wrong with humor? Why must it be sanitary by some Leftist's definition? Why should anyone care if the people who are the butt of the matter don't care? Why do they want people to do it their way? What order of the universe makes them correct and Conservative's not? Being Politically correct is part of this left leaning syndrome.

**POLITICALLY CORRECT:** The entire concept of being politically correct is a corollary of the analysis just made on Humor. In short this is an unwritten rule. One simply cannot say something, which might offend someone else's idea of religion, race, sexual orientation etc. It is an idea of the Leftists and not a Conservative. It is a type of denial of free speech. A Conservative loves a good joke. Making some aside remark on one's sexual preference or the color of their skin is not made to hurt, but to make light of, that is, to take the stress off of, the difference. For example, we all see it and it ain't no big deal.

The true Leftist takes offense on these matters and demands that everyone else conform to their idea. They detest differences. The Conservative does not see the importance and does not really care. The Leftist is so short sighted on this issue they fail to see they do not cure it. It goes underground and is used anyway. Now why is it a Leftist demands everyone do as they do? What is wrong with making light (light) of some difference? Why do they not see the merits of discussing differences rather than forcing such discussion into closets?

Shouldn't it be true, the more we observe and discuss our differences the less important they become? Leftist do not demand that Blacks quit calling Caucasians Honky, now do they.

Isn't that strange? Is there an explanation?

**DISCRIMINATION:** Our world is absolutely filled with discrimination and it always will be. Islam will not tolerate Jews.

Jews will always prefer their own religion. One body style will always attract more of the same body style than not. Some like it hot and some not. Some like Chili and others do not. Some like big breasts and others not. The Leftist's political discrimination is the most odd. Leftists attract each other and Conservatives attract each other and therein lays a great example of discrimination. Leftists do not see they are discriminating when they get together and exclude those nasty Conservatives. Conservatives do not care that much.

Leftist have a common belief that black people are discriminated against because of their color. They still are and blacks discriminate against other blacks and colors as well.

Today, however, color preference is not a big deal.

Conservatives, by and large, do not care what your color is or is not. What they care about is your self-discipline and your wiliness to work and your effort to care for your family and property. Leftist do not recognize this. They think that if United States closes its borders to people from South America, that it is discrimination. They do not see the issue as it in truth is, security and waste. Somehow, in their minds illegal people are or



should be legal. Huh? It does not make sense. Does this mean that all illegal stuff should be legal? Some say they are really lying when they peg it as discrimination. What they are really doing is covering their true reason and that is to obtain more people who will vote for them. This one is a real poser.

Don't you find it queer that someone would want more people when more people necessarily pull down the standard of living and compete for Union jobs?

Another peculiarity in this example of Discrimination is the indiscriminate use of the term Black to describe a whole lot of people who are not Black. Now Black should be more or less synonymous with African by origin. Today Leftists use it to describe anyone who has any part of African Heritage. Now isn't that the worst type of discrimination you can imagine? Now take President Obama.....Pleeeeeeese. . All of the left say he is Black and the first Black President etc. In fact Obama believes he is black, and he has demonstrated a dislike of his White heritage. (Remember how he derided his Grandmother who was afraid to have blacks walk behind her.) Most Conservatives are puzzled by this absolute. Isn't he 1/2 white?

What happened to that part? Does it get no recognition? Why not? Leftists refuse to use the word Mulatto and feel it discriminates. Yet Mulatto is just a word that gives some credit to the other races that make up a hybrid. After all, some of the best corn is hybrid. In fact, Mulatto does not discriminate. It recognizes and describes facts. It recognizes various sources of genes. When a Leftist says Sidney Bechet was probably the greatest Black Soprano Sax Player in the jazz world, aren't they discriminating in several ways? First of all, he was a Mulatto so no credit is given to his other genes. Second of all, he is being separated from all other jazz players by race. All discrimination of the first order. A Conservative does not care about race. It's the performance first and foremost. Most Conservatives, when talking about Sidney Bechet or any other person of many different genes, leave off the part about being some particular color. So should Leftists. They do not. Leftists insist on dividing us on one basis or another. Why? Their conduct fosters conflict.

Is that what they want? Why?

I have always held the belief the first major discrimination in the world was against people of white skin with light colored eyes. Tell this to a Leftist and they laugh at you and mutter some incoherent rant about your sanity. Hear me out.

White people developed in one place in the World only. Not in Africa. Not in Asia. Certainly not in the Americas or Australia.

White people developed only in one place..... Northern Europe.

This development had to occur after the last Ice Age when Europe was warming up and it became a very green and wonderful garden. Before that time ice covered over 1/2 of what we call France. No one lived on the ice. Humans swarmed in from the East, Middle East, and Northern Africa as the ice retreated. Generally, they were called Celtic people but they came from many places. There had to be a very large mixing of genes. Sex generally is more active when it is warmer and the food more plentiful. All of the people who came there had dark hair and dark eyes. They began to displace the existing humantypes who had lived against the Ice for hundreds of years.

These were a red haired group of hominid called the Neanderthal. These were folks specially adapted to living close to snow and cold. Ever think a red head was just a little different? This may explain it. As the glaciers moved away (Global warming of a great degree) the mix of genes must have been terrific. Out of this mix, a gene or two got sideways and low and behold, in one or more tribes, a woman gave birth to a mutant, a blond child. Now if you were in a tribe of black haired people and had never seen a blond child, what would you more than likely do? You would discriminate. The Gods had been angry. That damned mutant would be rejected. Mothers being mothers would have protected these odd children, and she too would be the victim of discrimination. These discriminated people would tend to come together where they would not suffer discrimination. As they did so they would move in the only direction they could, North. The Atlantic hindered them to the West, the Mediterranean to the South, and the press of people from the east was never ending. As the snow retreated, they advanced to the North. There they found more of each other and made families and had sex and guess what. More Mutants.

Now I have never found this theory anywhere. No scientific DNA motivated studies etc. have been found on the subject. I have simply used common sense and logic and knowledge of my fellow to figure this out. Nothing else seems to make any common sense.

Of course the once discriminated against blond blue eyed people had revenge. They came West and South, in Viking long boats, sending young horny males in search of riches, plunder, wealth, and the comforts of the opposite sex. They ruled Dublin for almost 300 years. Their revenge was far and wide and lasted a long time. See any blonds lately? That is where they came from. There is no other logical explanation unless you crank in God or Aliens.

Now a good Leftist bears a strong sense of guilt about slavery and discrimination (Whites vs. Blacks) and never think about the first major discrimination. Let's talk about this aspect of the larger question of discrimination differences between Leftists and Conservatives. If you have paid any attention to history, either from school or your own studies you might have learned that slavery is not unique to white people. Every race on earth has possessed slaves. In fact the western world slave trade, bringing African people to North America, was not simplistic. It was a slowly developed bit of commerce. There were labor needs in Europe and the Americas (The Demand).

Ship owners figured they could make some money bringing people to fill the demand. They found the supply. The boat captains found that it was easy to obtain people from the Western part of Africa. First, it was a whole lot easier to just sail down the coast from Spain than go any other place. As they went a-looking they met up with Africans who lived along the Atlantic. They then worked out a deal with these people. You give us folks who can work and we will give you salt, gold, guns, and other things of value. The coastal folks then would raid other African people, further inland, obtain captives and sell them to the boat captains. This is the way it happened. The boat captains avoided going on raiding parties. First the boat crews were few in number and not acclimated to the land. Second, they would have had to hire a bunch of men to do such a thing.

It was much easier and cheaper to deal with the coastal tribes.

History simply tells us Africans enslaved Africans and Honky bought them, keeping up the enslavement, and selling them to people at the ports of call. These people then turned around and sold them again. If you have read the bible, Koran, or any other bits of ancient history Slavery was everywhere. The Greeks had them. The Romans had them. The Chinese's dynasties all had them. The Mayans and Aztecs had them. The People of Africa enslaved each other all the time. It was a way of life. I am currently reading AZTEC, by Gary Jennings, a good book on the Aztec empire before the Spanish destroyed it. It was a big deal in the early civilizations of America, to raid other cultures and obtain slaves. These were particularly enjoyed as sacrifices at the alters of their various temples where they developed the art of using obsidian knives to rapidly cut out a slaves heart, fast enough, so that the dying person could see it beat. In one such temple in "One World", the number of slaves killed in this manner was in the thousands, all at one event.

Now the treatment of the slaves in Southern United States by, dare I say Democrats, was humane by most world standards. Slaves were property and most folks do not like to destroy, weaken, or otherwise devalue their property. It is tough to get a good days work in a Cotton field in the hot humid South with a human who is hungry, sick, disabled, or not otherwise fit for hard work. The point is that maltreatment of slaves in U.S.

was rare. Of course all Conservatives join Liberals in denouncing slavery today in any form. They likewise did at the founding of our Constitution, and slavery was not approved in that document. Why? Because the issue was left to the States to decide. Leftists however continue to act and react with a guilty conscience of something that was banished from our world over 145 years ago. Why do they do that? Is it simply a means to obtain votes for power? Is it to pit one people against others?

Is it more than that? If so, what is it? Certainly it is not a present discrimination. It seems to be guilt trip because of a very old discrimination and that does not make sense.

ABORTION: This is an interesting difference. It has significant religious aspects to it as well. By and large Leftists, unless possessed of a guilt trip because of religion, are in favor of abortion at any time. They believe the decision is only for the pregnant women or government. Dads are out. Grandparents are out. The Fetus is in but out. Leftist have, for a very long time, argued this is a personal right of the women and ignore any rights of the fetus. Of course abortion or privacy are not mentioned in the Constitution or any of its Amendments. Well, no one thought so until Roe vs. Wade was decided in January 22, 1973 (410 U.S. 113). This is one of the best examples of the "Living Constitution" concept of the Leftists. Leftist know they can never get the votes to amend the Constitution to implement their pet projects. Since they cannot they came up with the concept that the Constitution lives and breathes. It's Alive Master!!! It's Alive! The Roe case started in Texas, which had a law making it illegal to assist a woman to get an abortion. The Leftist argued this violated the due process rights of the women.

They found a US District Court in Texas to go along with their idea. The court invented a Right of Privacy. They further invented that it appeared in the Due Process clause. Read it over carefully. You will find no mention of Privacy. The case Jane Roe vs. Henry Wade, District Attorney in Dallas County went to the US Supreme Court. That court on high, with White and Rehnquist dissenting, held that this judicially invented right existed

and they further found, by looking behind the curtain, that it was Jane's sole power until the fetus becomes viable. They were not done. They then invented what is viable. If the fetus could live outside the mother's womb, albeit with artificial aid.

Yes sir, there it was in the Constitution all the time. We just never knew it. Ah yes, folks, pay no attention to the man behind that curtain. He cannot give the Tin Man a heart if he is exposed. The living constitution concept side steps the difficult task of amending the Constitution by its own provisions it violates the Constitution and the Leftist could care less.

**TELLING OTHERS WHAT TO DO:** The mental difference between a Leftist and a Conservative is dramatic when it comes to telling people what to do or not to do. The Leftist wants to micro manage you. The Conservative wants to macro manage you. Now what is meant by Micro and Macro? Macro management is absolutely necessary in any social network of Humans. It is more important where we are massed, such as in cities. The 10 commandments are but one example of macromanagement.

The Christian commandments have sisters and brothers in each religion of the world. It does not make any difference if it is Borneo or the mountains of Afghanistan. Even a society which tries to function without Religion, like the now dead Soviet Union, had similar rules of conduct. In order to live with some security and peace, we have to tell each other some things to do and some things not to do.

Leftists go way beyond Macro and that is what I call Micro management. Leftists have to perch themselves on our shoulders and tell us when to move, laugh, drink, smoke, copulate and how. Leftists, using safety, as their cover, have entered the world of cars for example. When I was a young man a car was a mechanical devise that got us from one place to another. I could get grease and oil all over me, wipe my face with an oil smudge and feel good about my most recent car repair.

Leftist have turned a car into an object of control and social change. To make it more environmentally pure, they have forced us to pay for and to endure a laboratory for a motor. It is so complicated now, that the average owner cannot repair it.

Only computers and specialist can. The dirty little secret is that most of the time the computer does not know what is wrong with the car. I can give you a zillion examples. Leftist have demanded that we have to get so many miles to the gallon to save the planet at our expense. They know the car will be small and not safe in a collision. Oh yes the modern car is safer today, what with air bags in front and to the side, but somehow I continue to read about dead people in auto accidents. Point is the modern car does not stop deaths and injury. Just think of the other micromanagement aspects of the car today. You have keys that talk to the car and make it do a bunch of things, unlock the doors, start the motor, open doors, and wind windows up or down. If you do not have the key, then you have a code which can do the same stuff. When you get in you have to adjust the seat, up, down, sideways, and adjust the back of it to fit whatever. It will not start unless the gear is in a particular place and or the clutch is pushed in. If you fail to put on a seat belt, the car either tells you to or rings a bell until you do. I really dislike little electronic bells. If the emergency brake does not automatically release, another bell rings until you release it.

Should you leave your lights on, another voice or bell tells you to shut them off. Many cars will not even start unless the seat belt is engaged. Some will hoot and holler if you back up to something too close. Today, cars will even park themselves, if you leave the steering wheel alone. Oh yes, do not drink and drive, do not use a cell phone, or text while driving, do not tint the windows too much, do not put too many stickers on your windows, do not drive the car unless you had its exhaust tested, do not smoke in it if children are present. It is never ending. Finally, when you stop the car and get out and lock it with your code or key, thieves can steal it easy. Somehow the micro managers have not been able to make it safe in that regard. Oh, I almost forgot. Three times I forgot and left my keys in my car and when I went to get in it again, it was locked. The key did it on its own.

What else can it do, I do not know. I am afraid to be in a dark room with that key. God only knows what else it can turn on or lock up. Hey!!! and I did not even talk about GP control and all the talking that goes on about where you are and where it thinks you are going.

The Leftists demands to be able to control your life on a daily basis. Let us look at smoking. No longer can a person smoke where they want. They are told where they can puff away. Most of the time a restaurant or bar owner cannot even have smoking areas. Mother and father cannot smoke in the car if a child is there. Of course the leftist probably smokes pot and somehow that is different. Miracle of miracles, pot smoking is not dangerous to your health, does not cause cancer or emphysema and no one has to pay millions to the government to compensate the State for free medical care. I almost forgot.

Pot is actually a medicine, don't you know.

No longer can a person provide child care because they want to. Now you have to go to school and get a license. Your food has to be tested and retested. You have to have hand sanitizers in many places and do not forget to wear rubber or plastic gloves. We no longer can rely on the business man to protect us and himself at the same time. Now it is Government via the Leftist who will do that. Personally I would prefer the businessman who does not want trouble, being sued, losing his product, or livelihood because of some error. Somehow bureaucrats with their dictatorial, corrupt, and selfish way do a better job, in a leftist's world of make believe.

Why does a Leftist want such detailed and micro management of our daily lives? Have they wiped out pestilence and the flue? No. Have they started to change the climate?

No. They have simply added costs and burdens.....that's all.

**CHANGING NAMES:** Almost always it is the Leftist who thinks they will really improve stuff if they change the name.

Conservatives do not think it is wise to force everyone to change in mid-stream, and needlessly relearn what you thought you had a handle on. For example, let us consider "Divorce". In the Leftist world divorce took on a sinister meaning, so they changed it to "Dissolution of Marriage". Of course they want same sex folks to be "Married", so they too can be "Disillusioned" (used to be divorce you know). I recall we used the term "Drunk Driving".

Leftist changed it to “driving under the influence”. The California vehicle code, for drunk driving, used to be section 502 and every one remembered it. It has now been changed 4 times, and no one remembers it, except the policeman and attorney. When was the last time you heard “Stewardess” on an Airplane?

Somehow it became sexist so, now it is “Flight Attendant”. The word “Secretary” is also disappearing because it is sexist.

Now the same job is called “assistant” something or other. In the medical field you are no longer “Dyslectic” Now you have a “Reading Disorder”. Once we all knew what “Manic Depressive”

meant. Leftists had to change the words to avoid the nasty word “Depressive”-- Now it is Bi Polar. For years I thought it was someone who liked Antarctica as much as the Arctic. Another word the Leftists are pushing out is the demeaning term “Clerk”

Now it is team member.

How long will Christmas last in light of the Leftist determination to take God out of it by calling it Winter Festival or Happy Holiday? Oh yes, Easter Break is now Spring break.

Why change the names? It does not make sense. It does not help. It hurts. It divides. It is crazy.

**ILLEGAL IMMIGRATION:** Of course, it is not immigration but the Leftist call it that to make it sound better. Without doubt the differences here are dramatic. To a person, a Leftist supports and wants illegal immigration. To a person, Conservatives do not. It is Federal law which makes being here illegally a misdemeanor or possibly a felon. Pure and simple the Leftist wants to disobey the law. Why won't they follow the law and change it democratically? Is it simply that they know they cannot? Or is it more sinister?

If you are not a citizen, you must have properly issued papers to be in any country. These laws have been a part of our fabric since paper and country came together. If it is against the law and in fact is a crime, how can a Leftist support those who are here illegal and to a person demand amnesty and/or citizenship? Arizona, Florida and several other places have passed laws directed to identifying an illegal and setting about to deport them. Leftist fight this in the courts. Obama's administration got a leftist Judge to rule the Arizona law unconstitutional. This Clinton appointee lady judge is pure and simple an aider and abettor of crime. Why? you ask.

Remember I was a long time prosecutor and defender of the bad guys in law. Since time stood still it has been the law, here and there, that a policeman has a duty to apprehend anyone he or she believes is committing any crime. Why such a duty?

Because if you did not the Cop could accept a bribe with some hope of not being caught. Discretionary arrest has never been the law. Neither Arizona or Florida or any State do not have to pass such a law except that the Federal Gov. (Obama's) told the locals not to arrest for a federal crime. Just another leftist dodge to not obey the law. Do leftist have the same tolerance for thieves? Of course not, so what is the logic?

In this same context the Leftist do not want to control our borders to prevent illegal entry. For that matter, some RINOs join the Leftist, as did our last President Bush. Now, if you aid and abet a crime aren't you equally guilty? Of course you should be. If it is a

traditional crime like theft, you would be apprehended and jailed. Why then do the Leftist laugh at this legal principal when it has to do with coming into the country illegally? Something is crazy here.

A Conservative is a very strong believer in upholding the law and doing it equally. A Conservative has no problem arresting an illegal and sending him packing. A Conservative thinks profiling is a good idea. The Leftist permits profiling at airport security. Illegal immigration is a prevalent crime committed by people who mostly fit a certain profile. Certainly this is allowed when our police go after Mafia. The fact a person is of Italian roots becomes very important.

Only the dumbest amongst us will fail to see this terrible gap in logic. Why do Leftists support illegal immigration?

Assuming they are not dumb, then they ignore laws they do not agree with, and worse seem to do it to gain support of illegal people. Why? For votes...for power...for the fun of it? Excuse me, what in the world is going on here? Read on. I have the answer.

On this same issue, is the non-logical support the Unions give to illegal people who take jobs which could be available to citizens. Is there a conspiracy between Union leaders and Leftist to reach Socialism at any cost? Union leaders support the outsourcing of jobs and this is a real puzzle.

Weren't they put in power to protect jobs and the worker?

Finally, why do Leftist and Union leaders not support a clean jobs program, where we simply declare all illegal's to be here on a contract for a period of years. They have to sign up.

At the end of the term years they have to return with their family.

Now if a person is caught and they do not have the contract they go immediately to their native country. If there is a need for additional foreign workers we simply issue new contracts. New Zealand has had such a program and it works very well. They even help control by selecting the country of workers and every so often changing countries and language. For example, for 6 years the workers come from Brazil. Next they came from the Philippines. It is profiling to help enforce the contracts. Why can't Leftist see the logic of this solution? Why do they want amnesty with all the burdens it places on citizens?

**HEALTH CARE:** This is a difference with a major twist.

In the Military I studied Communism quite a bit. The Cold War was in my bones. I learned that taking over Health Care was a major cornerstone of any Socialist/Communist takeover of a society by peaceful means. Once the leftist have it they have you by your proverbials, if you get my meaning. This was in their work books and pamphlets of the 30s and 40s. Not today because they hide. Other names are used, such as progressive, and environmentalist. Books like, "Manual for Community Club Leaders", and "Party Building" are common communist books on organizing. Saul D. Alinsky, when he wrote "Rules for Radicals", did not give health care special treatment since his focus was on ways and means to organize. Never the less any student of Communism knows what I say

is true. Their stair way to their stars, is Social Security, Health Care, and Military Control.

Autism fits this blind control syndrome. Remember my telling you Socialism/Communism control never has been and never will be successful in the long run. Use common sense and you know it. Leftist do not.

[\(Return to Contents\)](#)

## **CHAPTER 4**

(KAPITEL4)

“Who ever said the pen is mightier than the sword obviously never encountered automatic weapons.”

General Douglas MacArthur ILLOGICAL CONSISTENCIES In this Chapter, we will explore the oddities of the Leftist/Conservative differences as demonstrated in Chapter 2

3. The point is, if you read chapter 2, you had to learn, that not only do Conservatives and Leftists think very differently, but that the leftist is not consistent. Conservatives are consistent.

Conservatives support law and order, and want equal protection.

Their conclusions are more in conformity with reality.

Conservatives want a way of life which recognizes the weakness of man/women and sets up guide posts to prevent serious damage and conflict. Leftists do not see this, and they even deceive themselves into believing that mommy will always be there with a blanket.

Let me try to put a face on the Leftist's approach. I have identified the following categories of Illogical consistencies from Chapter 2 and 3.

- 1- Selective disregard of laws.
  - 2- Subterfuge to disobey certain laws.
  - 3- Using law to destroy.
  - 4- Using money they do not have.
  - 5- Using law to buy votes and power 6- Stealing by law.
  - 7- Use of coercion to obtain goals.
  - 8- Denial of debate 9- Denial of other icons.
  - 10- Use of reckless methods.
  - 11- Lack of Humor 12- Self Deception In the above we find that a Leftist denies reality. In the following we see they have impossible dreams.
- 1- They believe they can eliminate Religion.
  - 2- They believe they can eliminate debate.
  - 3- They believe they can take from some and give to others without causing damage.



4- They believe people will work hard without rewards.

5- They believe in other impossible dreams, such as the elimination of discrimination; the making a problem better by changing its name. (Drunk Driving to Driving under the influence.); spending more than they have, and trying to obtain conformity. These are fictions.

Impossible dreams, in the human world.

*The following* observations of Leftist behavior are bizarre to say the least. Their diminished humor and lack of humility is a poser. Their belief that humans can be turned into robots to function on command, is from a Hollywood sound studio. Bizarre is a kind word.

*Most Glaring:* To many, the Leftist positions on life are totally illogical and inconsistent. On one hand they can oppose capital punishment of a despicable human being even after that person had a fair trial and a dearth of appeals. On the other hand, they can allow, the death of a fetus (Child hidden by a Mothers skin) without a trial, without law, and with no right of appeal. Keep in mind I am not religious so this observation is without that bias.

The Leftist can demand full Civil court room procedure for a foreigner who has or has tried to kill our people, and yet will support a foreign government in the killing of its citizens, (Communist countries) without the slightest human rights cry being uttered.

The Leftist can cry all day long about the guilt of 150 year old slavery in this country, and yet support countries that allow it, and worse indulge in a form of slavery in governmental dependence. Talk to Star Parker, a lady who crawled to freedom from welfare slavery, and you will know what I am talking about.

Her book is aptly named, "Uncle Sam's Plantation". Worse yet, full on Socialism and Communism necessarily takes away individual freedom... (aka Slavery) The only difference is that most of the slaves will not pick cotton. The Leftist brain does not even see similarities here.

The Leftist position on the destruction of traditional marriage is queer. Keep in mind humans tend to pair up for child production and a better life. It became Holy Matrimony when Religions got involved. Religions sanctified it and so it has been for nearly a 1,000 years. Today Leftist brain supports the gay and lesbian community to destroy the tradition and create a whole new concept. They fail to see the risks of destroying 1000s of years of tradition in support of a family. All Gays and Lesbians can agree that "Marriage" is not going to make them straight and it is not going to allow them to procreate with each other. The Conservative ones will also agree it will diminish the historical significance of Marriage as we have known it. You cannot disagree with me. To prove my point let's put it to the test. Let's pass a law that henceforth all gay and lesbian unions shall be called Marriage and all straight unions will be called Matrimony. If it is witnessed in a Church then it is Holy Matrimony. See how long the Leftist will let that lay. Somehow the Leftist sees no problem calling a peach an apple, or seeing Mica for Gold. No matter how hard they try a straight is not going to be gay and the odds are a gay is not going to be straight. Pass all the laws or get all the soap opera judges to say so, and it will always not be so.

*The logicalless (new word) of Guns.* Leftist refuse to obey the existing law set out clearly in the Constitution. They try mightily to take it away by stealth. Conservatives support the law.

*With life style* you see a different approach. The Leftist attempt to create law to change ones free choice. If Pot is unlawful they will not only war against the law they will purposefully disobey it. Of course they have the right to undo a law or make a new one, but they know they will fail, so again it is subterfuge to get their way. These characteristics appear in most spoiled people. Pot dispensaries for medicinal purposes are part of their costume.

*Free sex.* It is an attempt to destroy existing law which set up barriers for harmful behavior, and again they use subterfuge. Passing out condoms to children, is listed to prevent venereal spread, but really is to destroy celibacy. Maybe you missed the Washington D.C. episode, but it stands out as a great example of Leftist logic. The schools there found out that students were complaining that the free Condoms were not big enough and did not last under stress. Their solution was to have Trojan Company produce bigger ones that would last longer.

They totally ignore parental and religious control of morals. So we see their use of stealth subterfuge again and again. It is called manipulation in the world of psychology. Leftist do not want family or church to threaten their God, Jabba the Hut.

*Gender preference* is pretty much the same pattern as above. They cannot prevail in the halls of the legislature or at the ballot box on Gay Marriage, so they attack the California people's choice (Prop. 19 won by 65 %) in the Courts. They carefully, with subterfuge, select the judge. They know the Attorney General who has to defend the proposition, has a limp wrist and wa-la, they obtain a judgment that the proposition is puff and smoke. The same limp wrist will appeal it. He is the California Attorney General. Some know him as LuLu. See how it is done. Leftist attempt to have open Gays in the military by removing regulations which forbid it. They know they could not prevail in Congress on the issue. So once again it is by twisting the law or undoing a regulation, by hide and seek pressure, not by Amendment or a voted on law.

*Governmental aid* is a strange one. Here the Leftist push for maximum free benefits for as many citizens as possible. They include illegal folks as if they were citizens, which is contrary to law. They use sympathy to abuse the system to the n'th degree.

For example food stamps mostly benefit people who are not hungry and who are illegal. The users simply use the free food to be able to spend their money on other things. A logical person knows that free stuff does not build character, strength and self-reliance. Extending unemployment benefits does not benefit society. It benefits sloth, and dependency. So what is this effort? It is as if they are willing to steal from some to give to others. Why? The only logical thought is that they want to control all people and this is one way to do it. Give the people candy and game boys and you have them. It is buying votes, which by the way is otherwise illegal. So we have absolute disobedience of laws they do not like and the creation of laws to motivate people for their own purposes. Not pretty. Oh! do not forget all the free meals at schools. Just so you think correctly.

They are not free. Again I want you to look in a mirror. Yep, that's you dummy! You pay for them. Moreover the government meals take away parental control. No longer is Mom or Dad involved in lunches or coming up with the coin for a meal. Now it is the leftist God Jabba, in charge.

*Enemy lists:* This of course is coercion. Here the Leftist uses their muscle to silence the first amendment unless you agree with them. For the Leftist, free speech is not free if you disagree. If you do you become their enemy. General McChrystal found this out, when Obama destroyed his career for speaking against the administrations way of conducting the Afghanistan war. Debate is suppressed where ever they can do that. Give them full power and the enemy list will be used to create the sound of silence. In my years of trying to debate Leftists it is clear they do not want to discuss logic, or common sense. They want their way. If I remember correctly Leftist will disobey laws they do not like, will create laws to enslave folks, and create laws to silence debate. In this same sense Political correctness is a part and parcel of silencing debate and free expression. You will be told what you can say. Leftists try to be language decider, judge, jury, and the high priest of talk-the-talk.

Why?

*Religious intolerance:* This is certainly a Leftists goal.

Not of all but most. A true Leftist will deny with spittle flying all over the place that he or she has a God, but they do. It is Government. We know that Communism clearly tries to stamp out religion and when it cannot, it restricts and taxes it almost into the dirt. Confiscation of church property without compensation (Known as stealing) has been practiced in all Communist Countries. This is really like the enemy list. It is an attempt to deny debate, as well. Why? The only logical conclusion is they want to control and do not want another loyalty that might be a threat---a Church. On this point one of the complete mysteries is why the majority of people of the Jewish faith continue to support Leftists. The Jewish faith has fought yearly, no daily, against all manner of attacks to remove or restrict their religion. Why do they support Leftists who dislike and want to destroy their worship? It does not make sense.

This is simply another example of non-sense. The Leftist stance on evolution over creationism, or alien planting, is simply a part of the religious attack. Take the faith of God and replace it with the Faith in Government.... Cradle to Grave. It has always failed.

*Free Enterprise*” Leftist attacks on free enterprise have to be seen in the same light as their attacks on Religion and debate. It seems there is no logic except a desire to remove a different way, a different reward, than the ones the Leftist will hand out. It is a continued attempt to remove opposition, and obtain control. It is the spoiled child thinking. The problem with this approach is that all history tells one, it is impossible to remove opposition. It will go underground, it will side step, it will masquerade, but it will not go away. Even genocide will not work, because newborns will grow up to resist control. The point is their quest is not logical, It is something less than logic.....it is logicaless.

*The issue of spending more than you have* does not fit the above analysis. It is not breaking a law, it is not avoiding a law, and it is not so much the doing of something to

entrap a person (enslavement) or gain control. This willingness to spend and tax is reckless. It is like driving a car, at high speed, into a concrete wall. The final act is painful, and deadly. Spending too much means the destruction of an economy as much as it means the destruction of your family. There is and cannot be any difference. Economics is a law of nature. It is, as if the Leftist believes by spending a government into bankruptcy he or she can create such chaos that they can take complete control.

It is why so many Leftist blogs today want Obama to be a Dictator. Remember the ramblings of Woody Allen to the same effect. So what we have is intentional assault on opposition using as a weapon, insolvency. The assault itself is reckless because they have no assurance they will win complete control.

There is another way to achieve their desires, but the Leftist knows they are not good in the battle field.

The fact that Leftist are not good in battle is well demonstrated in History. I have pointed this out in the war analysis, under the title "Leftists make bad Generals and Commanders in chief". There are many other examples. The Spanish civil war pitted a strong communist movement vs. a strong totalitarian movement led by Franco. Franco won. The Soviet Union left Afghanistan with its tail between its legs. It can win a civil war only when it has brought the existing government to its knees and has split the opposition and bought the people with promises of lollypops in every kitchen. Divide and conquer.

Leftists and spoiled children know it well, but they are not the same.

*The issue of Energy* is again different, but has as its ultimate goal, control of the resources of the Country. If it was really about the environment then the issue should be population reduction and that means an all-out frontal attack on Religions.

A Leftist knows this can only happen when he or she is fully in charge.....So he uses the indirect approach, curtail this industry, curtail this use, and curtail that, use money to save this or that which cannot be saved. Of course they do work on population control indirectly. It is called abortion, and a women's right of privacy, and governmental allowance against the desires of the people and religions. The same analysis can lay with their approach to energy. They know battery powered cars, wind machines, solar electricity are not economic. If they can bleed the country on these issues, all the better. Deep down in the Leftists soul they desperately want control by any means. Never let a good Chaos go unattended, so said Obama's Left hand man, and every other Communist coming down the pike. Is wanting chaos normal? You know it is not, but it is part of their manipulation.

Global Warming is man-made, so says the Leftist. This is an emotional issue which is hard to prove or disprove, but is very effective in gaining more and more control. In fact it can be said this is a major tool to obtain global control. Of course the blind spot is that no one can control the world's population of Human beings and make them all jump at the same time and sing the same song. The long story of the human being is one of conflict. Not even Soma will do the trick, but the Leftist thinks so.

Anyway it is simply another tool to gain control, via guilt and emotion. If it is not slavery then Global Warming is our fault.

*The issue of Humor* or the reduced level of it in a Leftist is very different. This is a personality quirk which is not assumed. The Leftist is born with it in varying degrees and this is most important. It helps explain the disobedience, the subterfuge, the hiding of a real issue with guilt, emotion, racial conflict. Etc.

I do not know how you cannot reach the conclusion that something is short circuiting in the mind of the typical Leftists.

Anyone who believes a Governmental God will be benevolent is the same person who will idolize John F. Kennedy, and create Camelot around him and his family. They then will not see that JFK's brother Edward Kennedy was an abuser of woman and drink. How else could they not take him to task for Chappaquiddick and the lifeless body of Mary Jo Kopechne, the young lady he left to die? Leftist pretended it did not happen.

He too was put on a pedestal. They called him the Lion. They are the same ones who flocked for Moe, Fidel Castro, Lenin, Stalin, Hitler and many others. They do not see the world as it really is, but as they dream it should be. They love movies and plays and any other make believe. I wish it was Fantasy Island, but it is not.

*Redistribution of Wealth:* Leftist need for taking from the rich to give to the Government for doling out to the poor is not done because they are clear thinking or benevolent. It is done to bring down the size of a threat to their control. When you debate with a liberal and tell them redistribution of wealth is not necessary, because it happens naturally, they look at you as if you had a large wart on your nose. Even with examples the Leftists stand in denial.

What do I mean when I say wealth redistributes itself naturally? I explained this to a liberal lady once and she looked shocked. She said she had never thought about that. I will bet, she worked her way back to sanity. Here is the deal. All wealth is held by human beings. All human beings die. Some of the wealthy humans have children. The overwhelming number of such children go no place, but instead use up the wealth of their departed wealth keeper. Some die with no children to carry the torch. Some leave a lot to charity. Charities seldom grow big.

Even they wear out because of the sappers who run them. Now this does not just happen with rich folks. It happens to us all. In your family of siblings and cousins how many were real go getters and wealth obtainers? Darn few. Take a look at the really big wealth keepers of our Country. After their death, wait 20 years and count their kids who took over the wealth. How many kept the wealth on track or increased it. Do not worry.

You only need to count to 10. Some of the names which come to mind are Stanford, Huntington, Crocker, Carnegie, Ford, Rockefeller, Mellon, bla bla bla. Although Howard Hughes took his father's mantel and ran with it, he crashed into a world of paranoia. He had no kids as well. Oh, yes we must not forget the Kennedy Dynasty. Old Joe, the rum runner, had a passel of kids. Only JFK was really famous. The others either died tragically or because of a brain tumor, and none of them took up the mantel of Joe the wealth keeper. Any grandkids worth a plug nickel? I do not see any. JFK did not create wealth. He used daddy's wealth and abused it..... that's all.

See I told you the Leftist cannot get their eyes off the imaginary wart. They cannot get beyond that to the truth. Truth to a Leftist is hurtful.

Finally I want to restate a Conservative belief. All humans are different and function in different ways. This will not change. We can only generalize as we try to better understand the huge canyon between a typical Leftist and a typical Conservative. Let's move on.

[\(Return to Contents\)](#)

## **CHAPTER 5**

“America will never be destroyed from the outside. If we falter and lose our freedoms it will be because we destroyed ourselves”

President Abraham Lincoln THE MAJOR DIFFERENCE We have discussed many of the more common differences between the Leftist and the Conservative thinking in Chapter 2 and the inconsistencies in Leftist thinking in Chapter 3.

It is time to address the most significant difference and that has to do with their respective choices in Government. Essentially the two choices in the United States are; Socialism/Communism (a form of government which controls all aspects of life.); and a Constitutional-Republic. (A form which does not try to control all aspects of life.) Conservatives, in American, want the latter and understand government is necessary to provide common necessities (such as roads and ports) and defense. Leftist want Socialism. In full bloom Socialism always fails taking with it too many lives and gobs and gobs of value. In spite of all the lessons of history, Leftists are attracted to it like moths to a flame. It is their fatal attraction.

This type of major difference has always existed from the beginning of social living. Of course it has had different names and occurred at different places. For example in the earliest of tribes the members gathered together to cooperatively do the common needs and to provide defense from the enemy.

A solo act was sure death. There has always been an enemy.

Other human beings will always want what you have. Even in a Tribe this greed and desire to live off of others work was a problem. The earliest Shamans figured a way to have others provide food and shelter. They learned to presume to predict the future, with incantations and assemblage of rocks and stuff.

When they did, they went on welfare, under a different name. Of course they had to lie good and that too has not changed. Some non-shamans tried their best to secure comforts from others.

The Chief or head guy's main problem was keeping the hunters and warriors in line. Keeping them in their own Hogan or bed, keeping them from not taking others food, tools and weapons etc. Some were gung ho and others were laid back. In all the thousands of years of human existence these differences have always been there. In any population there has always been about 1/3 who want to be taken care of, about 1/3 in the middle, and about 1/3 who want to do their own thing, as much as they can. It is the same in the United States even now. A way to use this 1/3 analysis in today's world is to look at the polls attempting to show a President's Popularity. The President will automatically get at least 1/3. If his popularity is 43 % then only 10% of the middle or other side also supports him. In a Republic or Democracy a Presidential candidate cannot just run for the

Middle 1/3. If he or she does they will fail. Such a candidate has to go for the automatic 1/3. That is they have to declare they are Leftist or Conservative. Then the trick is to try and pick up enough of the others to win. Sometimes there is a lot of misleading going on. The most notorious example today is Candidate Obama, saying he would not raise taxes on certain folks, and he represented Change. Somehow he failed to mention the Change was to Socialism. He won partly because his opponent refused to say or do the things to keep his 1/3 in line.

Socialism/communism are names given to the Leftist of today. There is a slight difference in the two. In Socialism there can exist private property. In Communism, at least in theory, no private property beyond your personal effects can exist. In other words Communism is simply the ultimate togetherness.

The concept and definition of Socialism as we know it did not exist until well into the *Industrial Revolution*. There is no agreement as to the exact year the Industrial Revolution began, but it is agreed it started in England and Scotland and then spread to Europe and America. It began sometime in the 1700s and ended in the late 1800s. What caused it were the major changes in agriculture, manufacturing, mining, and transport.

The change had its linchpin in harnessing energy to multiply a man's labor and change materials from one form to another. It was not wind, hydro, or solar power that supplied the energy, but coal and gas. Fast, efficient, and affordable.

During these dramatic changes in how we did things, cultural shock took its toll. No longer were we land bound. We had to gather in places of industry and travel became common.

What happened to our families and the general conditions of labor were extraordinary and certainly never experienced before.

There was no history to fall back on. There was no real comparison to ancient empires, such as the Roman, Greek, Egyptian, or Assyrian. This was different and many strains and sprains occurred. Certainly one of them was the relationship between the business owner and the worker. The owner capitalized and invented the business, and developed the network of supply and demand. The workers came to make it happen. Their goals were not the same and the advantages and disadvantages were likewise askew. In some places the conditions of the worker were ignored by the owners. Many times the workers lack of cohesiveness and togetherness was taken advantage of by some.

In one place a new concept grew where the owners would act like government (there was very little Government in those days) and provide better conditions for the workers. Now this should not surprise you. Some owners would surely realize that if the workers were happier they would work better.

Understand government in those days did not provide much oversight, sanitation, etc. Governmental responsibility seemed to end with the fall of the Roman Dictatorships. If workers were to have a better place to live, raise a family, educate the kids etc., the Governments of the 1700s were not going to do it.

Private enterprise was the only one which could, financially and through leadership.

In Scotland, the seed of socialism was born. The man's name was *Robert Owen*. He was born in 1771. As was the custom he began labor at age 10, and soon moved to the developing textile industry. Because he was honest, hardworking, and responsible, he became the youngest Mill manager in Manchester, England. When he was 20, he bossed over 300. He saw that a happy worker produced more. As a developing owner he wanted to take advantage of that fact. He became an advocate of creating the happy worker with benefits and a share of the profits.

Soon, Mr. Owen obtained the chance to buy the New Lanmark textile Mill, in Scotland. This place is still there. It is near Glasgow and is now open to the public. Owen was a part of a partnership at that time, but his was the dominate voice. He set about taking advantage of the "happy worker". He improved housing with company built facilities, stopped employing young children, installed safety equipment, and opened a company store which did provide the lowest possible prices for his workers. In 1816 he opened his first infant school, two years before Karl Marx was born. It was the first of its kind in all of England and Scotland. Owen was swimming upstream. Some owners did not want to go this extra mile and grumbled. Many of his workers did not like his regulating how much alcohol they could drink or that they could not work their children in the mill for additional income. They grumbled. However, he persisted and other owners came to copy him. His workers went along, especially when the Mill had to close for 4 months, because of no raw material. He paid their wages anyway. He went public with his ideas and was the most important man to push and obtained the 1819 Child Employment Act which regulated their employment.

He was not a religious man and the churches were not fond of him as he made no special arrangements for his employees except to not work them on Sunday, most of the time.

He did help workers form trade unions in line with his belief that "Labor, not capital, is the wealth". Of course labor is nothing without capital, but he did not see that. Probably just too close.

Mr. Robert Owen is considered by most as the father of modern Socialism/communism. After Owens death in 1820, his son or son in law continued his humane concepts until the mill was sold. He son or son in law, took the idea of Utopia to American. After all things would be better there, and certainly these idealistic feel good concepts could be taken to the extreme, (communist like) and all would be well. He founded "New Harmony", Indiana in 1824. He purchased it from a failed communal group known as the Harmony Society. Of course harmony was elusive. New Harmony was a pure socialist/communist place. It lasted two years when infighting brought it down. It is S.A.D. that Robert Owen himself could not have lived to see what happens when you try to do the nice things from the bottom up. It fails each and every time. He was successful because he had the power and the capital from the top down.

Mr. Owens ideas stayed alive in England and Scotland and the failures in the U.S. did not seem to damper the efforts.

Mr. Owen was not alone. Other philosophers and writers saw the same scene and wrote about it.

In Germany, Karl Marx was born in 1818 and lived to 65.



He began to speak the same way Owen had acted and was eventually kicked out of Germany. He went to Paris and there met Fredrick Engles. Engles was also an expatriate of Germany.

They collaborated and eventually the French told them to leave.

They went to Brussels and bounced around in England and Brussels most of their productive lives. Both attempted to return to Prussia, but eventually were kicked out and ended their association in England. Karl was the son of a lawyer, but made his living out of sedition. Engles was the son of an industrialist and was sent to Manchester (the first major job for Owens) to work in a very poor Mill. It was here he formed his anti-capitalist ideas. Engles was two years younger than Karl but had money from some books he wrote. He was the main support of Marx.

In 1848 Karl, with Engles help, wrote the Communist Manifesto.

They were in Brussels at the time. In short, they were not your idea of law and order types. They regaled in anti-social behavior and writing.

The Communist Manifesto essentially establishes the attitudes and ideas of modern socialism and communism. In it you are struck by the glorification of class conflict. The Proletariat (workers) vs. the Bourgeoisie (the job makers), this same play on class conflict goes on in American today. Karl said in his Manifesto; *“the development of Modern Industry, therefore, cuts from under its feet the very foundation on which the bourgeoisie produces and appropriates products. What the bourgeoisie therefore, produces above all, are its own grave-diggers. Its fall and the victory of the proletariat are equally inevitable.”*

In this small part of the work, you can see the core beliefs. First the owners steal, ups! I mean “appropriate”.

These dolts who had the power and wealth and made jobs were stupid and would die. Those who did not have power and wealth and did not make jobs would win. Now if you think this is logical, then I bid you adieu. How can the worker work without a boss and risk taker? It is impossible Every failed commune stands in mute testimony. It is impossible. Every failed communist experiment screams out, it is so.

All right, we have explored the origins of Socialism and Communism and I hope you can see the lack of logic in its manifesto. I hope you accept history to the point that it has never been successful. Where it has been tried it destroys property and life. The millions killed by Hitler, Stalin and Moa are milestones on the road to hell. The billions of property they took is another. The people killed and displaced by Castro is mind boggling. What is currently happening in Venezuela is an open book of suffering created by the Communists. They do not care about your property. They will take it.

A little time ago a clock repair man told me this story. It was of him and his father in Romania. At the time the teller was a child. When the Communist took control (with the Soviet Union assistance) two of the party members came to his father’s shop of jewelry and clocks and told him that it was their time and he was to leave. When he returned several days later, all of value was stolen. Oops!!! Appropriated, if you are a Communist. Don’t you remember, there is no private property to steal in Communism? His father tried to renew his company but the Communist would not have it. He fled losing all his

life labor and property. The son, the teller of the story, told me it was happening in the United States and soon we would all have to ..... He simply moved his index finger over his mouth. He meant keep shut up.

Socialism/Communism is the major difference between a Leftist and a Conservative. From a Conservatives point of view the adherence to a proven failed system is crazy. Why do Nancy Pelosi, Barney Frank, Waxman, Boxer, Feinstein, Obama and on and on believe in such a terrible result? The only explanation is that they are in denial of history. It tells them nothing. It is like the response of the late Edward Kennedy, when asked why he believed in a system of government which has failed for thousands of years, and he replied "because it will not, when I run it". Isn't that wacko? How can someone believe that all those who failed before were dunces and idiots and only you can do it right. Somehow the lessons of history mean nothing to them.

On the other hand, a Conservative pays attention to history and has paid attention to the mistakes of the past.

Wherever a Conservative sees a consolidation of power in government in history, he sees its abuse and he sees great suffering of his fellow man. It does not make any difference what you call the consolidation. It will be abused. The Roman Republic worked until it was taken over by the dictators (called Caesars). Then the power was abused, the strength used up and it fell. The Soviet Union is no more. Its failure leaves a dismal path of destruction of property and lives. A man by the name of Hitler led the German National Socialist Workers party to stardom. It was a socialist experiment. The power was consolidated and he took it. One can say that the Holocaust was the direct result of a failed socialist experiment.

The Founders of our Constitution (who lived but 8 generations ago) were not dumb. They were not naïve. They were just like you and me. They were property owners, family men, learned in history and the way of governess. They had rebelled from consolidated power in England. They had seen its abuses in Europe. They were aware of why Rome fell, why the Greece states exhausted each other and fell. They understood history and set about to create a government that would not be eaten up by power-mad dogs. In gathering at the convention, they also knew that too little power at the center was not good.

The Continental Congress had fallen into bickering, and was ineffectual for national defense. How could they come up with a system which could endure and provide the best possible peace and comfort? They settled upon a Republic which divides power into three branches. The Legislative, the Executive and the Judicial, in that order. They tried by the use of checks and balances to prevent one being dominate over the other. No one can argue with me on this point, unless they have read the Federalist Papers and studied these men and their lives. They knew what could bring it all down and said so.

Once the electorate directly or through their representatives learns they can vote themselves the money of others, from the treasury they will. It is stealing, stealing, -- stealing the work product of others to replace that which is lacking in your own back yard. It always has brought a country down and it will bring the United States down, if it is not stopped.

It is S.A.D.

Consciously or unconsciously (I prefer the latter) a Leftist believes in centralized power in spite of the history lessons. It is not a question. History's Socialist failures are at 100 percent. All such experiments have failed. There is not enough wealth in any nation to sustain copious handouts, begging and takings. No tribe survived where many members of it sucked off the strong.

Why does a Leftist insist on failure? How can a Leftist believe it will not happen when he or she does it? Why does a Leftist believe in peace, "if we just all get along", when history is four square against such a dream? Are they just simple dreamers who deny reality, or is there something basically wrong with their thinking?

I am of the firm belief, after a life time of trying to debate with them, that leftist suffer a wiring defect. They are not evil. All of us will admit their dream of "peace in our time" is wonderful to contemplate. We all do that. Why do they not grasp the reality, that there can never be peace in our time so long as humans remain as they are? And why are there so many of them? You and I, who see life in real time, simply have to admit they cannot be allowed to control. You cannot leave them in charge of your children. You cannot let them secure your home and belongings. Leftist will take you down with them if you let them.

Finally, I want to return to the Conservative common sense mind and address our weaknesses. In rough and trouble times, we prevail because we have the strength and resolve to meet reality head on. In war, we are the great leaders, because we can see the battlefield as a killing zone, and we will take all steps necessary to see to it that the enemy dies, and we do not.

If this means stealth, then so be it. If it means killing innocent women and children, then so be it, if it means being down right unpleasant, then so be it. If the enemy will not field armies, but attacks us hiding as civilians, then any suspicious person dies.

We know the enemy will change tactics if their camouflage no longer works. We will smoke them out until they leave us alone.

It is Reality. If a religion aids and abets the killing of our people, we will force that religion to change or be itself eliminated. In short, Conservatives will not pretend and place their heads in the sand so that their posteriors get blown off.

But Conservatives have a weak spot which has been taken advantage of over and over again. Conservatives know it, but like an Achilles' heel, it is a weak spot. Conservatives are by their nature Conservative. That means they do not want to get into other people's faces. They do not want to get involved if they do not have to do so. They want to be left alone to take care of themselves and their families and live a good life. That is not realty either. Conservatives must, in the future, set aside a portion of their life to community service where they work to keep the Leftist in minority. Having peace means checks and balances in all aspects of life. Conservatives must set them up and must maintain them. The war, President Obama wages on Arizona, is just such an example. Conservatives have to get out of the bottom of the boat and take over the rudder and sails and point the bow into calmer waters. That is what Conservatives have done in Arizona and hopefully it will continue.

[\(Return to Contents\)](#)

## CHAPTER 6

(Kapitel 6-Danish)

A Conservative sees the glass 1/2 full.

The Leftist sees it 1/2 empty Anon.

LEFTISTS IN PROFILE: Social Dreamers; Weak Self Control; Religious Worship; Avoidance of History; Spoiled Person Characteristics; Defective Social Analytical Ability; Defective Common Sense; Unsupported Beliefs; Manipulation; Humorless; Impaired Ability to Debate and Danger vs. Peaceful.

In the second and third chapters, I tried to set up comparisons and analysis to help us try to fathom a Leftists mind. The study has been clinical---my way. I have not kept logs and notes on control groups and others. I do not have to. I have lived a long and fruitful life. As the saying goes, I have been there, done that. Because of my education and experiences, coupled with the many years I have had to observe and learn, there is no substitute. I will go toe to toe with any PhD or Physician in a discussion of the mysteries of the Leftist mind.

These days it is hard to find a PhD who is not a liberal/Leftist.

After all, most are a product of the Socialist age. My fresh approach is much needed. A kettle cannot call itself black. In my many discussions with professional shrinks, I know they become rigid and difficult to conceive a new approach. It is true of any profession or job.

Now is the time to profile a typical Leftist. What I say here is certainly not true of each and every Leftist. It is true of the typical Leftists, Statist, Socialist, Communist or whatever you want to call them. That is most of them.

As stated, we have examined the differences which help us see their characteristics. A profile is a different way of looking at the characteristics. Some of what is written here may sound as a repeat, but here the emphasis is on characteristics, not differences. I do not mean to isolate their characteristics as applying only to politics. The profile is for everything they do or do not do. We cannot lose sight of the fact that the terms "Leftist and Conservative" were coined simply to identify these people as to their political choices. In many ways they remain different and not all are political. Leftist and Conservative are not descriptive of their choice of spouses, for example, nor does it seem to affect the choice of adult beverages, unless it's Starbucks. The Profile: *First, Social Dreamer*; In matters of political choices, the Leftist is nearsighted. By this I mean, they select dreams of a world which makes them comfortable and reject the hard realities of life. Most of them, believe the slogan, "Make Peace Not War".

They refuse to believe their fellow man or women will not. They believe in solo power. I did not mean Solar; however, leftist believe in that as well. They believe if they have total control of everything, then all will be ok. You recall Woody Allen lamenting that all we needed was to make President Obama a dictator and all would be well. They idolize central power and cannot begin to comprehend it will be corrupted. That is why they created Camelot for JFK, why they elected FDR for an unprecedented fourth term. In some ways, their dreams give them a pretend world. It is not real.

*Second, Weak Self Control:* A Leftist is not well disciplined. Of course there are many variances, but about daily life their ability to deny themselves and to command themselves is weak. This explains the concepts of “free love” and other forms of self-indulgence. You will see more Leftists gathering around a Starbucks than you will Conservatives. Why is that?

Because Conservatives are worried about too much caffeine and liberals refuse to consider it may cause them all manner of harm.

They revel in the ambiance where they can see and be seen.

This weakness is a part of their favoring a strong “benevolent” leader. For example, in a room of people they, more than Conservatives, will automatically select the tallest and biggest male in the room to be the leader. They do this on blind faith, with hardly any thought as to whether this tall stranger might be as dumb as a rubber crutch. This faith sometime borders on worship of big and powerful.

This weak self-control or discipline is also why they gravitate to occupations which provide them protection. This is why they fit so well into academia, Hollywood, the theater, governmental jobs and many of the art forms. Of course, they generally avoid governmental jobs that reek with danger, such as police, military, and related occupations. In my 13 years of military service, and my 34 years in and around law enforcement, the Leftist was scarce as teeth on a hen.

*Third, Religious Worship:* Most Leftists avoid worship of intangible Gods. It is a strange anomaly with number two above.

You would think a person, who has weak self-control and opts out for the big guy in the room, would go beyond that and worship a God. They have trouble making the leap. Most professed Atheists are Leftists, and many of them can be downright intolerant. They tend to develop spittle around the corners of their mouth when you say “God is Good”, but again another imponderable appears. They shut up when a Muslim says, “Allah is Great”. The weak self-control allows fear to act as a brake creating inconsistency. Just try to argue with a Leftist that atheism is a Religion. They do not get the concept. You see religion is generally described as a set of beliefs in the hereafter. You might believe in several intangible Gods or Rocks or wind as Gods etc., but the Leftists does not fathom that if you believe there is no God, and no hereafter, that is such a set of beliefs.

*Fourth; Avoidance of History:* What is meant here is that the Leftist pays scant attention to history as a precursor of the future.

History proves, making peace is spotty and not long lasting.

Further history is clear war is a part of the yearly chronicle of Homo Sapiens existence. In my long life, we suffered WW II, Korean War, Vietnam War, Bosnia, Panama, Island of Grenada, and Middle East Wars in Somalia, Kuwait, Iraq, and Afghanistan.

I am certain I have missed one or two, and I am talking only about the United States. Add all the other wars and there is no end to it. Leftist believe that once we have world government we can cure the problem. Impossible.... a dream,... a fantasy. Just look at Islam as an example. The Leftist does not see a danger in Islam and refuses to pay any attention to their history of abuse and war. The Leftist cannot use History as a learning

tool, because it is too upsetting. The Leftists does not like to have their surroundings threatened or laughed at.

Even if you could get to the Leftist's "A Brave New World" you would have to destroy humanity as we know it.

Certainly the family would be gone. Aldous Huxley, the author of "Brave New World" did just that. He created levels of humans grown out of test tubes and kept the more effective under control with "Soma". Today's Leftist prefers pot. He developed a world in which all humans failed to exist. They were replaced with clone like creatures, albeit they looked and felt human. I do not believe destruction of life is progress, but surely it is change. It is the kind of change Obama preached in his campaign to be President.

*Fifth, Spoiled Person Characteristics:* This is a weaker characteristic, but very often observed. It does not mean they are spoiled, but they have mannerisms and habits which are similar. As they dream of Utopia, they see themselves protected and cared for by it. A Leftists leans on strong central control as salvation just as a spoiled person grew to rely on Mom and Dad.

I always remember the story of the spoiled (probably Leftist's) student sending a telegram (today it would be a text message) to his Conservative dad. "Dear Dad, No Mon, No Fun, your Son", and the father's response. "Dear Son, so sad, too bad, Your Dad."

*Sixth, A defective Social analytical ability:* This is different than being a social dreamer. What we are talking about here is mental agility. For example, Leftists have as much IQ variance as Conservatives. At least there are no studies which contradict this conclusion and it has also been my observation. The point is their ability to memorize and regurgitate the memory in a test is about the same. Leftist seem to have an internal battle between their comfort level and common sense. In fact common sense, accurate historical data well processed, is weak in the liberal and very weak in the leftist.

For example, the belief that central control will solve the world's problems is not sustainable. They do not see it. To be able to mold the world with the wave of a wand, all the people have to be the same. It will not work if there are a lot of Conservatives or other folks who do not want to do morning calisthenics, drink only milk, and smoke no cigars. They will object and the wand simply becomes a stick. Of course, this defect may also be a cause for their desire of complete control of births, cloning etc. To ever obtain Utopia you would have to wipe out over 1/2 of the populations and just as soon as you did that you would have to DNA test each new born to see if they are adaptable or not. If not they would kill the bad ones. Huxley saw this problem and then wrote a story that even with cloning you could not keep out the human spirit. Kind of like breeding a strain of dogs. The Leftist does not get it, no matter how high their IQ is or is not. It is a defect in their wiring. It is a defect in the ability to process data.

*Seventh, Defective common sense:* It has been referred to as part of several of the above characteristics. Common sense is the ability to make decisions which will minimize risk and failure.

The common aspect is heavily reliant on our knowledge of history, old and current. This includes our willingness to accept history as indicators of future conduct. If you have it, it

comes from education and experience. Learning how to hammer a nail takes physical strength, but it also takes common sense --- the knowledge to know which hammer end to use; how to place the nail; how to raise the hammer; deliver an effective blow and not injure yourself. Most pure bred Leftists are not well coordinated.

Most of the time it is not their lack of physical ability. It is the effective use of common sense, to move the muscles most effectively. The sense part of "Common Sense", simply refers to the mental agility to use the common knowledge effectively.

*Eighth, Unsupported beliefs:* Parts of the above play a role in what we observe here. This is another example of leftist's blind faith. For example, a Leftist has blind spots in logic, when it comes to such things as whether Government has money or as Senator Chris Dodd (Democrat from Conn.) said, to explain why he would not vote for a GOP law to require Fanny Mae and Freddie Mac to refuse any loans where the buyer had not, at least pony up 5 % of the purchase price, (In the 60's, you had to have 25% to get a loan of any size.) "...passage of such a requirement would restrict home ownership to only those who can afford it." Dodd is a Leftist and he simply does not make any sense. Blind spot. It should be painfully obvious that the only wealth government has is the wealth it gets from its citizens.

Leftists do not see it. It should be painfully obvious that the reason we had a financial meltdown in 2010 was because the Leftist had demanded Fannie and Mac take unsupported (lenders ability to pay) loans. Now, taxpayers will have to pay for all the loans that failed. We will do that with money Congress gives to these agencies to bail them out. That money is ours.

The list goes on and on.

*Ninth: Manipulative:* Leftists are manipulative. This is a big worry.

They function like the spoiled child, stated above. A spoiled child will tell Mom and Dad what he or she thinks they want to hear to get their way. In some quarters, it is called lying. This manipulative nature of the leftist makes them an ideal candidate for political office because they have little conscience in what they say. They will promise the illegal to be legal, the poor to be rich, the illiterate to be intelligent, etc. They pretend to be the Wizard of Oz. It is a characteristic of the Leftist to mislead to get their way. For example, Obama campaigned on "Change"

without telling anyone what kind of change he had in mind.

Pelosi wanted a vote on the health bill without bothering to read it, because passage was more important than what it said. Why was that? Because total health care control is a cornerstone of socialism/communism. Once passed, they could change it as they see fit. Almost all Leftist do not want to support the written Constitution and yet all of them who take a position with the government, whether a judgeship or not, have to take an oath to support it. Most of them lie when they take that oath. Not important to them. Like a manipulative spoiled child they will say and do what they perceive is necessary to get their way.

*Tenth: Humorless:* On average, the Leftist is not a happy person.

Oh, they can be a comedian but that does not make them happy.

Jokes can be memorized and the Con can make it sound funny.

They can laugh but not heartily. They can dance and sing, but down inside, they find it difficult to smile broadly when not before the camera. Next time you watch Harry Reid, Maxine Waters, Henry Waxman, Pelosi, or Obama himself (substitute your favorite Liberal freely) look for spontaneity in their amusement. It is weak. You cannot picture one of them laughing at a ribald joke, laughing till they cry. It is not there folks. In this characteristic, it is S.A.D.

*Eleventh, Impaired ability to Debate:* I have spent a lifetime trying to debate Leftists. Most of the time it is frustrating, because the typical Leftist will not get intellectual about any issue. Uniformly they reject history. As we have discovered, they will not follow common sense. They have packaged responses and tales to tell you, which are heard most of the time. They avoid the nuts and bolts and come on with generalities. Over and over, in Radio and TV shows, you will hear the liberal repeat canned response rather than get down and dirty. One of the best places to hear this is on the Rush Limbaugh show. His staff will gather the remarks of the left leaning media on a particular issue. He calls it a montage. The announcers/reporters use the same key words. It is as if the Leftist of the main stream media are being given scripts from some underground bunker. In debate, if pinned down, the Leftist will answer with something that is off the mark. You are talking about motivation as a tool to cure welfare, and they will respond that we just do not understand the down-trodden. I always have the feeling they live in a capsule and cannot tolerate anything outside of it. Like the ancient Sophists, they revel in sophistry.

Way too often the final Leftist response is some derogatory statement, such as “You’re a Racist” “You’re intolerant” “You Conservatives are mean spirited” “You have no generosity” or the final response and winner of the grand prize is, “F\_\_k You!!!” Or “Screw You, you dumb s\_\_t.” I cannot cry over spilled milk. Call in the cats.

*Twelve, Dangerous vs. Peaceful:* This is the most explosive (love the choice of words) issue which distinguishes a Leftist from a Conservative. Of course, there can be dangerous Conservatives but they are few in number. Let us remember Klu Klux Klan members were mostly Democrats and liberal. I am certain there may have been one or two Conservative, closet Republicans, in the group. In those days, if you were white male in the South you were registered as a Democrat. The point is if you are a betting person the odds are in favor of the Leftist causing trouble and not the Conservative. In my life time, close to home, the riots were all Leftists led. They were the ones who burned down a nearby Bank of America. The continuous riots at the WTO (World Trade Organizations) meetings have been Leftists. All Union led riots are Leftist. At the Nevada, Search Light Tea Party this year (2010), it was Union Leftists who threw eggs and turned street signs around, and yelled obscenities at the passer-byes. For over 16 years, I did a Jass show at the University of California at Santa Barbara on their FM station.

That place was used as a marshaling ground for Leftist demonstrations and disruption. When an opportunity came up to demonstrate, you could see the gleam in their eyes. In the State of Washington, officials have for years suffered blown up Power Towers and all have been Leftists. Combine a Leftist with an environmental issue and the T finally gets added to the T.N.



On a bigger scale, look at Waco, Texas. It was Leftist led by President Bill Clinton who became so reckless and minddead that they killed over 40 children in that Compound. I said children folks. I do not know whether Mr. McVeigh, who retaliated and blew up the Federal building in Oklahoma, was left or right. He did not say. For the debate, let's assume he was Conservative. His act would not have happened, "BUT FOR", the acts of Leftists. The examples are in the Millions.

One of the most shocking bits of Leftist destruction, I can recall, was the killing of JFK in Dallas. All of the evidence was that Lee Harvey Oswald was a Communist on some twisted mission. Even his killer, Jack Ruby, was a registered Democrat.

Notice how they buried all that with JFK.

Conservatives are by their nature Conservative. This does not mean they will not respond with force. They will. The point is they respond, not initiate. Again play the odds.

Conservative are more in favor of peace than war. Leftists just say it like it is possible. Conservatives know it is not, especially if you allow free love. Nothing is free.

The Leftist mind is not OK. Many before me have marveled at what appears to be a lack of common sense with Leftists. This observation is correct. Many others have said Leftists are mentally impaired. Even Rush Limbaugh and Sean Hannity have come very close to saying so. Certainly other Conservative talk show hosts, including yours truly, have gone past close. We say it like it is. Michael Savage even did a book titled, "Liberalism is a Mental Disorder". We are correct. I am going the step further and tell you how and in what manner Leftist have a neural dysfunction.

In the final analysis, a Leftist will not change any more than I can become a non-renaissance man. It is in the wiring and it cannot be repaired. A Leftist is like a computer with a bad virus. Strange things happen and go bump in the night.

What directs us all is our brain. It is our computer. I am not talking about social or environmental effects, except to conclude social contacts and environmental stimulus have very little to do with making one a Leftist or a Conservative.

Generally, we are born that way. We have been focusing on the power of logical and coherent thought. Our brains determine who we are and what we do.

The defect I identify does not mean a person will necessarily be Leftist. There are Conservatives who have a similar wiring problem, but the number is small. On the other hand, all true Leftists have the problem. If you know someone who is a recovering liberal, they just shed the overburden which had been placed on them.

You know that many brains do not work well. Science has pretty well catalogued the more obvious dysfunctions and has set up ways to treat, hospitalize or give them substances to make their lives somewhat bearable. Mental illness is well studied, but no one has had the courage or insight to suggest, in a real way, that Leftists are wired wrong.

What we have here is not presently considered a mental illness. That is the problem. This strange difference has been ignored or accepted as neutral. No longer can we do this.

Leftist in charge is like having a blind man fly your plane or drive your car or operate on you to remove something or another.

Disaster awaits.

[\(Return to Contents\)](#)

## **CHAPTER 7**

(Capitulo 7—Portuguese)

“I voted Democrat because I believe that people who cannot tell us if it will rain on Friday, can tell us that the Polar ice caps will melt away in ten years, the oceans will flood New York and disaster will be everywhere, but we can stop it if we drive a Telstra, eat only vegetables, love a Religion that hates us, and do what we are told to do.”

anon A Conservative in Profile First, keep in mind the terms Conservative and Leftist describe how one reacts to stimulus about Government. They are not words which well describe other focuses of life. This was true of the founders as well. George Washington and Thomas Jefferson had slaves. Many believe Thomas had an affair with one of his female slaves and had a child by her. Ben Franklin was a womanizer. John Adam was too religious. Thomas Paine was too vocal. Each was different. On politics they were basically the same.

The leaders, such as Jefferson, Washington, Franklin, Madison, Adams, and Hamilton were well balanced when it came to politics. They lived reality. They were not dreamers of things they knew would not work. They, and each of them, had heaps of common sense. If they had not used common sense they would have come up with a type of government led by themselves. They knew they had to create something which would provide Liberty and Freedom to the people beyond their lives. They knew they had to try to prevent the collection of power in the Federal Government. They knew that if they did not, their heirs would suffer. To this end, they divided the Federal Government power and built in checks and balances. Of course, they could not envision the speed with which we do everything now. They walked, rode horses and traveled in buggies. On water they sailed. There were no airplanes, no telephones, no telegraph, and no television. Their news came from word of mouth and tabloids. They lived a much more deliberate and less cluttered life.

A Conservative is more than anything else a realist.

Being Conservative does not mean you are a saint. A Conservative can be just as much a sinner as a Leftist, but when caught, he or she generally admits their failing. Leftist seldom do. A phrase which shall burn forever is, “I never had sex with that women” ... President Bill Clinton. Do not forget Edward Kennedy, the Lion, who left a young girl to die in his car and then denied it. In reality, he was a beat up old alley cat without social redeeming features. Not the Lion his leftist followers called him.

The list is endless.

As a realist, a Conservative sees life as it is and sets about doing those things to cope with the weakness and strengths that confront him. A Conservative is not a good manipulator of facts to suit their purpose.

Characteristically, the Conservative founders did not suffer noticeable neural disorder. Their social development was good to best. Their communication skills were on point

and clear. They did not evidence repetitive behavior. None of them seemed to possess any unusual abilities not common to the average citizen. Their sensory abilities seemed normal. The motor skills seemed to be up to the daily tasks and they did not walk into things too often. In short, they did not appear to have symptoms of neural dysfunction.

Quite normally the Founders could not predict the future.

They could anticipate what humans would or would not do, based on the common past. Had the Founders been able to see the future better, I am confident, based on their papers, they would have put in the Constitution stronger language to curtail those who would not think clearly. They did not see that the few Leftist at the convention would someday dominate the halls of education, government jobs, union leadership and so forth. They did not see the gathering storm. They must be forgiven because most of you did not see it coming either, but we are in the eye of a hurricane.

Aside from the Founders every one of you who often puzzles, “But that does not make common sense!”, is probably a Conservative. You do not hear a Leftist say it makes common sense. They do not go there. Why is that? Because they cannot be introspective on most subjects. It hurts.

All must admit that being a Conservative or a Leftist does not make you automatically evil or someone to be avoided.

Bad breath coexists. It is not necessary, in today’s world, to put bells on every Leftist we know. A warning is not necessary. We just know when they begin to argue. At a city council meeting, or at a Union gathering, you are going to know who has common sense and who does not. Call them on it. Make “Common Sense” the warning shot. To say one does not make common sense is not to say they are crazy, but it is to say they are disabled.

Had the Founders been able to see the future better, I am confident, based on their papers, they would have put in the Constitution stronger language to curtail those who would not think clearly. They did not see how the Leftist would someday dominate the halls of education, governmental jobs, union leadership and so forth. They did not see that. They must be forgiven.

Today, it must be the goal of Conservatives to carry on the founders work. This must be done by adding more checks and balances to the Constitution.

A Conservative can fall ill to many other problems. For example, mental illness, the kind we can catalogue, can occur to a Conservative too, and it does not make them any less Conservative. I know several manic depressives, who, when they are off their meds, are weird and not predictable. When they are on the meds, they function well and are Conservative.

The point is a Conservative, as well as a liberal/Leftist, only applies to that aspect of ones view of politics and government.

In other matters both can be difficult and both can be wonderful.

Today, it must be the goal of Conservatives, carrying on the Founders work, to add more checks and balances to the Constitution.

[\(Return to Contents\)](#)

## **CHAPTER 8**

(ROZDZIAŁ 8—Polish)

Life is tough and it is a whole lot tougher if you are stupid.

John Wayne SOURCE OF THE DIFFERENCE Without “thought”, we are but a prolific species. What and who we are comes from the brain. Also, it should be clear, the differences we discussed in Chapter 1, 2, and 3 are dramatic. The Leftist does not react and think like a Conservative on a gazillion issues. Again the focus here is political. Leftist and Conservatives may both like the same single malt scotch, but it is likely only the Conservative enjoys a good cigar. Not that a Leftist might not like the cigar, but he cannot be perceived as fouling the air with one. Sushi is good, bad air is not. The differences can be identified in several areas of study, but here we are focused on the different views on government. After all, that is the reason for the terms Leftists and Conservative. The words divide politics into different approaches. The word Leftist signifies a more polarized concept than the meaning of Conservative. By that I mean, a Conservative is more flexible and moveable than is a Leftist.

Simply put, the Leftists have a group political approach and the Conservative has a solo one. Most are born different thinkers in these aspects. Once in a while, social interactions during life may affect the approach, but way down inside the difference is like the Grand Canyon. Deep and wide.

The Leftist brain is wired differently than a Conservative one. Of course, you can reverse this and it is still true. The Conservative brain is wired differently than a Leftist one. The why and wherefore part, is the interesting study of this book.

You should not be surprised that the study of the brain is less well understood than the workings of a computer. In a computer, we can create memory boards and figure out how to make them small and compact and can even give them simple logic. We have not and will not be able to give *emotion, common sense, or intuitiveness*, to a computer. If they talk to us they, like a parrot, simply repeat what is programmed for repetition. In fact, most studies of brain function... why it does what it does... are still in the dark ages. You can spend a lifetime getting mired down in words and categories and studies of all types. I have no doubt that many who fancies themselves wise persons of the mental world will criticize this work as superficial and unfounded in science. To them I respond: “Your ignorance is astounding when you consider how little is yet known of what makes up the brain functions.” Give lowly me a chance. I am a scientist without portfolio. So was Einstein and Socrates. Hopefully, we stand on the same platform. Of course I am at the other end.

Keep in mind I have lived a long life studying this phenomena, and more particularly I have lived the last 20 years up and close to it as is humanly possible. I doubt anyone can exceed my experience and my study.

Scientist’s with normal Portfolio, know the brain lobes (Frontal, Parietal, Temporal, Occipital, and Cerebellum) and the hemispheres of the brain. (The hemisphere concept deals with the fact that the right side of the brain provides signals for the left side of the

body and vice versa. We tend to use one more than the other.) These same scientists have also, more or less, decided that certain signals to our body and brain have a lobe they like more than any other.

For Example: *Frontal Lobe*: Source of Conscious thought. Generally, the largest lobe.

*Parietal Lobe*: Integrates our senses, and has something to do with visual-spatial (space) awareness.

*Occipital Lobe*: Most of our sight signals are processed here.

(It is at the back of the head) *Temporal Lobe*: Handles the sense of smell and sound and processing complex vision. This lobe is under the Frontal and Parietal lobes and goes across the brain to both sides.

Each of the lobes feeds and is fed by the other lobes, by matter called the corpus callosum. Think of it as the hard drive which makes all the software work. Each of the lobes is kind of software that is hard wired in.

Scientists can test you to decide if you are left or right brained, from the hemisphere approach, but the main point is that *Cognitive Science* is in its beginnings---not its endings.

Cognitive Science is the interdisciplinary research of mind and intelligence; embracing philosophy, psychology, artificial intelligence, neuroscience, linguistics and anthropology. Just putting those words together is mind boggling. Included is the study of formal and informal logic, rules, concepts, analogies, images, connectionism and actual and theoretical neuroscience.

It goes on and on.

You can spend a lifetime trying to understand the various aspects of human behavior via the brain. We all spend most of our lives working to survive amid a maelstrom of acts and reacts. Some folks spend their lifetime putting the various bits and pieces in categories and giving them names. It does not mean they have a better answer because they know the bits and pieces. It simply means that is their specialty. In the final analysis, you may have just as good an idea of why one ticks as they do. In my many years of examining “experts”, I learned that most of them use smoke and mirrors to tell their tale. In fact, we all do in one way or another. The point is, do not give to science the Holy Grail. Do not put the science of the mind on any kind of pedestal. There is much to do. We know so little.

One very good example is *Common Sense*. Are there grants to study just it? If there are, I have not found them. In fact, you can find a great deal of rhetoric of what common sense is or is not. For some reason, I always remember the lyrics to Cy Coleman’s song “Witchcraft” which glorifies common sense.

“...I’ve got no defense for it, the heat is too intense for it. What good would common sense do for it. Cause its Witchcraft, Wicked Witchcraft..”

I do not mean to imply that what causes the difference between a Leftist and a Conservative is witchcraft, but it has crossed my mind. Especially so when I become exasperated trying to get one to use logic. But then an old Warlock like me understands

the occult, I think. You remember the above song recording by Frank Sinatra. It was and is special. Ole blue eyes and I met each other once. Shared an adult beverage too.

Imagine that. Maybe that is why I recall the song so well.

The definitions of common sense are varied and abound. Let me add mine because it makes, dare I say, more common sense to me.

The first word of “Common Sense”, “common”

Means the collection of observations and experiences (data). These are acquired.

The second word, “Sense”, means the mental agility to work with the data and draw conclusions (intuitions) from it.

If your common sense works well, you make few mistakes in life. If it does not, you will make many more, because your logic or ability to use the data is flawed. As Mr.

Wayne observed, being stupid, makes life all the more difficult.

We have discussed intelligence and being stupid before, but let me dwell here for a moment to better understand. To not be stupid, means you have a good balance of Intelligence (I.Q) and Common Sense.

Scientists, one and all, can bore you to death with their testing and knowledge of I.Q. Ask any member of the Menses International Society (Club of those of high intelligent quotients) what intelligence is and they will say they have it. I will say they do not necessarily have it. A high I.Q. alone, does not make intelligence. You have known many very bright people who cannot tie their shoes, let alone play ball. Why is that? They have a defective common sense. It is the latter which makes it easy to tie a shoe and to field and throw a ball. Oh yes, muscle ability is a requisite, but much of it is common data used for the particular activity. The data is acquired out of practice and teaching. It is the good sense (mental agility) to use that data effectively which levels out life. A good I.Q. and good common sense makes up good intelligence.

Do any research on common sense, and you will be amazed at how scientists, for the most part, accept it, but do not attempt to analyze it. Philosophers pontificate on it, but do not analyze it. Albert Einstein said, *“The only real valuable thing is intuition”*. Intuition is another way to look at common sense, all though it includes pre- programmed reactions, like moving the head back and forth to find the mothers nipple the first time. We humans are born with few instincts (sometimes called intuitions).

Yes the infant moves its head to find food, but it will easily give up the natural nipple for a rubber one, once the source data is processed. Another way is to think of intuition as a combination of “common data” and the mental agility “sense” working on the data to guide us. I believe intuition is better described simply as our common sense. Ok, maybe the head movement casts a different shadow.

This ability to make sense of the data no doubt is found in the Frontal Lobe. This is where we develop Conscious thought. Most would agree the interaction with the other lobes makes exact location of “Common Sense” beyond our reach today. There are some recent studies out of England which say x-rays can detect autism, but what kind is still to be discovered, if at all. Most would also agree that all portions of the brain can have

wiring problems which manifest themselves in all manner of ways. Psychologists and Psychiatrists spend their careers in trying to find cures and explanations for these wiring problems.

Much work needs to be done. Of all the sciences, this is the one most neglected. It should be given top billing.

Scientists and Physicians and Surgeons who work the field pretty much agree the frontal lobe is the probable source. I accept that and then add.... It, like all the lobes, can have short circuits, and badly tuned distributors. At a factory, turning out hard drives and software, they test and discover the bad ones and discard or reprocess them. With humans, it is not done. If there is faulty development, it stays there until you die. You may be able to compensate some, but you do not cure it.

It is easier to study brain damage than mal development and much has been done to locate the problem and understand what to do with it. For example, if a person suffers a brain injury (could be a stroke) personality changes are expected. Even here, I have not found studies of what happens to common sense. It may be mentioned, but it is not the subject nor does anyone I found dwell on Common Sense as a vital part to complete the package of intelligence and wisdom. This is the shame of the specialist.

Before we leave the quest of the source we need to think about a few other issues that are relevant to our understanding of the brain. One is that if a scientist today suggests, as I do, that a Leftist is wired wrong, they are nearly burned at the stake.

In fact, I would not be surprised if they come and burn a big W on my lawn. If a scientist suggests that one race seems to have, or may have, more cognitive ability than another, the Leftists throw eggs at them and scream at them and effectively damage their career. I think of the Stanford Professor, Mr. William B.

Shockley. Now, he was no average scientist. He was given the Nobel Prize, along with two others, for inventing the transistor, and with his company, helped to create Silicon Valley. During World War II, he was very instrumental in the development of radar. His study on what would happen if we invaded in Japan, gave the statistics to the White House which caused them to decide to use the Atomic Bomb. Not a dummy. When he left the world of electronics he took up a chair at Stanford University, (One of my alma Maters) as a professor of Engineering and Applied Science. One of his focuses was "Intelligence" in the field of Eugenics. He wanted to understand the level of intelligence of humans in the far future and whether or not race would have anything to do with it. His conclusions of lower IQ and its effects by the Black race is what set the mad dogs of liberalism on their heads. They, the defenders of equality are the same imbeciles who think it is ok to take money from some give it to others (graduated tax). It does not jive, if you're hip. I do not know if Shockley was right or wrong, but I do know we need all kinds of inquiry into the function of our brains and it should be welcomed as a teaching tool, not as a hot potato. Today, scientists in this effort are cowed and are afraid to come out. A very bad situation.

Another example of liberalism intolerance for anything which might point to their disability is "The Bell Curve". I am not an expert here, but have watched with some interest the Leftist dither and mad cow disease symptoms because of it. The Bell Curve,

published in the middle 1990's was the product of one Richard Herrnstein and Charles Murray. They too touched on race and intelligence. For that taboo, they have roundly been stoned by the ever tolerant Leftists. Their primary concern was not race, but to explain, using public and private statistics, the gaps in intelligence in various parts of the United States. Now it is impossible to do this without finding race as an influence one way or another. They identified an intelligence gap and that is demonstrated by the Bell Curve. They warned about a decrease of intelligence if something was not done. Oh yes the Leftists cannot be bothered with such worries when they are consumed with Global Warming, and that ugly disgusting stuff...Oil.

What I hope you understand is that the scientific world is crippled by the left as the former tries to understand I.Q. and Common sense. Scientists are frightened to venture into the dark unknown recesses of brain inquiry for fear of being half buried and stoned to death. What I hope you also understand, it is not Conservatives who want to do this. Conservatives want and hope for enlightenment.

[\(Return to Contents\)](#)

## **CHAPTER 9**

(KEOAAAID 9—Greek)

He uses statistics as a drunken Man uses lamp-posts... For support rather than illumination.

Andrew Lang (1844-1912) AN OVER-VIEW: PROBLEMS OF THE MIND Because the mind is so elusive about telling us its secret, we cannot precisely list all of its problems. With a car or computer, diagnostic work is relatively easy because we have the blue prints. We created them. God, Darwin, or Aliens created our brains, and whoever did it, they made the divining difficult. We have developed some as-built drawings of the ole gray matter, but mostly it remains a mystery. No one has learned the inter-workings well enough to tell you or me what makes up a single thought.

Listing and examining the misfires of the brain is a little better. These misfires are often enough and alike enough that we can attempt to define them.

*The IQ definition of Dumb and Bright:* One way to define misfires is to rate the ability to memorize and logically apply the memory. This is the Intelligent Quotient syndrome. (I jest.) For example, a low IQ is measurable. We can find a mean mark and rate very good IQ and set a mark for the dumb and the genius. But this is not an end in of itself. By doing so, you have only gone half way to wisdom or full intelligence. Wisdom is a combination of IQ and common sense. To see how little common sense has been studied, and how enamored we are with IQ simply search the Web for either. Having spent days and days researching this issue, I can tell you most of the so-called IQ tests are not well done. Those found on the internet are pathetic. The many, so called Common Sense, tests I found were IQ tests. Besides, there is a great ego thing that goes with IQ. Most dummies might believe that if they have an over average (90 to 110) IQ, they are superior. Superior over what pray tell? This is so, even if they flunk out in social gatherings and cannot pick their nose the same way twice. This ego trip is why there is a Mensa International which is a grouping of people who have scored high on an IQ test.



As I stated elsewhere, I have known several and too many of them would score low on a comparable Common Sense test. No one has come up with a way to measure Common sense, but I will attempt to do so before this book is out.

*The major listing of brain misfires.* There is a general division between misfires. One is defined as Psychiatric disorders and the other is Disorders of Neural Development.

You will not read this any place but here. Understand the line between the two is not discernable by measurement. It is somewhat arbitrary. It seems to me that being severely autistic is just as much of a concern for family and friends as someone with sleep disorders or someone who is schizophrenic.

Psychologists and Psychiatrists have done their darnedest to categorize all these problems. The list is an ongoing effort by the American Psychiatric Association (called the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders---DSM).

You have to take your hat off to them for their effort. I, for one, believe grant searching and ego boosting motivates much of the listing and proposed listing. Do not forget mind reading has yet to be proved and each of us is different. Gad Zooks!! the variables are out of this world. It is a given that we do need categorization if we are going to be able to treat and otherwise handle the misfires. Obviously, the health and wellbeing of those not so afflicted is dependent on some degree of control.

So far the DSM states there are the following categories of disorders. (not disorders of neural development) Adjustment *Anxiety Dissociative Eating Impulse-control Mood Sexual Sleep Psychotic* \* *Sexual dysfunctions Somatoform Substance Personality* \*Under Psychotic disorders fall the better known problems of Manic Depression (now called Bipolar so as not to offend anyone); Obsessive Compulsive, Schizophrenia and enough special sleep and sexual disorders to wake the dead.

What you discover is that there are many misfires which seem to be pushed to one side. For example, Narcissism (major ego problems) does not rise to Psychotic levels; the confidence person (AKA con-man) does not; and Autism does not make the list either. These latter are loosely called defects in neural development. Sorry, I personally do not see the difference, but then my doctorate is in law and I need glasses to read. In my simplistic way, a misfire is a misfire is a misfire.

You know another misfire which gets very little attention is being dumb.....having a very low IQ. Now, obviously, if it gets too low we have categories for that, such as imbecile, moron, half-moon etc. For example, besides being the former name of the City of Taft in California, (and a slew of other towns around the world) Moron is the psychiatric world's word to describe someone with the intelligence of an 8 to 10 year old. An imbecile is one with an intelligence of a 3 to 7 year old. The question of Retardation or low IQ has many identified and unidentified causes. Obviously, low I.Q. is a concern of the person afflicted and their families. Today, there are many cover words such as "mentally disadvantaged", "developmentally disabled".

Somehow, if you change the name every 10 years it makes the problem better. You understand. Yesterday it was divorce, and now it is dissolution of marriage. Name games for the faint of heart.

Does the obvious thought differences between a Leftist and a Conservative rise to the level of a psychotic aberration?

Should it be left to the level of a neural disorder? Is it simply honest differences between thinking men and women? From all the prior chapters we have explored the differences. I hope you agree, the differences are Grand Canyon like. That is, a Leftist is over here mentally and a Conservative is over there, at least on the issues of politics and government. Said another way the differences really are a warp in the way the mind perceives how to cope in society. Just on gun rights, a Conservative wants to follow the law and a Leftist does not. Isn't that a pretty basic problem? In some places, we arrest people who will not follow the law, but somehow this, and the other Leftist avoidance of the law slips by. Why does it slip by? Because this difference has been considered a matter of opinion and not a brain misfire. In the next chapter, I will try to explain why it is not and can no longer be considered a mere opinion problem. It is a mental problem.

I am not alone in believing Leftists were behind the door when common sense was handed out. Others have seen the problem as psychiatric as well One is *Dr. Lyle Rossiter*. The Dr. in front of his name means he is a physician/surgeon or otherwise known as a Medical Doctor. He is board certified in general and forensic psychiatry. He has over 36 years of experience in his field. He also is known as a Psychiatrist. He wrote a book with this title; "The Liberal Mind: The Psychological Causes of Political Madness."

In this book, he describes that the liberalism (Leftist madness) displayed by President Barack Obama and the present Democrat party leaders can simply be described as a psychological disorder. He then reviews how those views are destructive of a free and ordered society. He sees them as the head chopper of the virtues of self-reliance, self-direction, selfdetermination, altruistic (he should have said autistic) concern for others, charitable care for others etc. Dr. Rossiter did not go where this book goes. He goes on to write how the Leftist agenda preys on weakness and feelings of inferiority to divide the people by: (a) creating and reinforcing perceptions of victimization, (b) satisfying infantile claims to entitlement, indulgence and compensation, (c) augmenting primitive feelings of envy, and (d) rejecting the sovereignty of the individual, subordination him to the will of the Government.

He could have compared the President to a Super Confidence Man (Con Man) or he could have said he is acting just like a person with autism.

Another person with courage is a self-proclaimed recovering liberal. She is a psychologist in Berkeley. Her name is Robin. You can learn more about her at "robinofberkeley@hotmail.com".

Her focus is on President Obama, but it could have been on his appointed advisors, Speaker Pelosi, Senate Big Guy Reid, Waxman, Watters, Dodds, and on and on. All the so-called leaders of this menagerie of Leftists now running the United States of America. Not one of them understands the significance of ...United States. Doesn't "United" have a common meaning?

Doesn't "States of American" have a common understanding? In combination their joining must mean something special.

Anyway, she points out how even some liberals, like James Carville and Maureen Dowd have questioned President Obama and have asked, “What in hell is going on?” She points out how little we know about this man. This man who acts strangely.

She acknowledges his ego, but feels Narcissism (being in love with your own reflection) does not fit. She wonders about his strange outbursts and giggling and statements like he wants to know whose ass to kick. She notes that so many things he does seem inappropriate. He does not even appear to know it. (Little lady it is called being autistic) She even asks the question, is something wrong with his brain? Does he have Asperger’s Syndrome? She just asks the question, but discounts it as a full blown syndrome because she does not know if he suffers repetitive behavior. In this book, we answer her question. She even wonders if he is schizo-typical in nature. She comes up with no answer, but just a lot of questions.

This book answers the questions and we will discuss the Doctor and the lady Robin more. Read on.

[\(Return to Contents\)](#)

## **CHAPTER 10**

(Kapitel 10 - Swedish)

Some cause happiness wherever they go.

Others, whenever they go.

Oscar Wilde SOCIAL AUTISTIC DYSFUNCTION Try as you might, you will not find the above title in any scientific analysis except this book. The reason is simple.

S.A.D. was invented right here in River City.

We cannot dwell on Autism without also spending an equal time on Common Sense. As you will learn, I believe autism and a defective common sense are one in the same. If not, then they are kissing cousins. If the defect of common sense is slight, then the autism will be slight. No one else seems to address this comparison. Certainly common sense is and has been a major part of the United States’ greatness. I cannot think of one of your national heroes who appeared to have poor common sense. This mental facility was a major part of our Revolution. John Paine was a prolific writer for the Revolution and his articles were titled, “Common Sense”. This was in 1776.

His basis of common sense is best expressed by reading his articles. Over and over again, in today’s Conservative airways you hear the lament about the lack of common sense. Glenn Beck’s best seller was titled, “Common Sense”. The Fox Cable News Service calls for a “Fair and Balanced” approach. This is a call for common sense in such matters. As we continue in our analysis of autism, ask yourself on each characteristic, isn’t that really a failure of common sense?

You have been with me during my travels in search for the reason or reasons Leftist think so politically differently from Conservatives. You have learned about my studies of my dear departed leftists Mother and how I differed with her. The only positive aspect of her passing was that I was able to cancel her subscriptions to Leftist magazines and respond to the ACLU and Sierra Club that my Mother could no longer donate to their

organization. She was mildly autistic. For the last 20 years, I have been up and personal with autism in my own family and the family of friends and acquaintances. Autistic people are not rare.

You have studied with me, the differences in detail, the examples of their thinking, the logical inconsistencies, the major difference, their profile, and then we began to zero in on the brain for our answer.

I have not found any brain abnormality that fits the Leftist better than autism. Autism defines Leftists. Not all autistic people are Leftists, but most are. In their struggle to accommodate and care for themselves they, like the spoiled child, become very myopic. Socialism looks and feels good to them.

Autism is a relative recent study but it is a condition which has always existed. The present work to set it up as a special psychotic problem began in the 40's. Doctor Leo Kanner introduced the label "early infantile autism" in 1943. At this time, there are many, including me, who are putting their oar into the water. Before all the present hubbub, we used to call severe cases of autism as "nare-do-wells". You know the kid who just did not fit in, couldn't do well in school, or any other thing he or she got involved in. The worst of them were basically unemployable. Even mild forms can have trouble holding on to a job. Something about not understanding that being on time is important or that dressing correctly impresses.

In my Webster's 2nd Edition 1979, Autism is defined as follows.

"...in psychology, a state of mind characterized by day dreaming, hallucinations, and disregard of external reality"

As we now know, this old definition was way too simplistic. Going back a bit, the term autism was first used by a Swiss psychiatrist, Eugene Bleuler, in 1910, as an attempt to define a type of schizophrenia. He took the word from the Greek word "autos" (meaning self). Now you know where "Automatic"

came from. There it lay, until 1938 when *Hans Asperger* of the Vienna University Hospital used Bleuler's word in a lecture about child psychology. He was studying one aspect of autism which he described. In time, his description became known as Asperger Syndrome. It was not formally accepted until 1981.

This was after one Kranner redefined it in 1943, presenting his study at John Hopkins Hospital. His study was of 11 youths who had strikingly similar behavioral similarities. He used such terms as "autistic aloneness and insistence on sameness". It took some time for this new term to rid itself of its attachment to Schizophrenia. It is now conceded it is not that, but is classified as a neural dysfunction. In common lingo, a wiring problem.

Today, it is considered one of the things to look for in school children who do not do well, but otherwise appear bright.

Personally, in my family and the family of friends, I have studied it closely.

If you go back to the words of Bleuer, when he said the following, "autistic withdrawal of the patient to his fantasies, against which any influence from outside becomes an intolerable disturbance." You have just described the Leftist who continues to pursue Socialism when all history dictates that it fails. They will not tolerate a different view.

They froth at the thought of the John Birch Society and the Tea Parties as horrible people who threaten their One-World. Our Chief of Home Land Security calls Veterans and Tea Party people as dangerous as terrorists.

Now autism is still being categorized and listed in its various parts, if we can find the parts. We have a long way to go in understanding it. There is severe and mild and many names have yet to be invented. In the area of political preference, I coin the term "Social Autism Dysfunction" ( S.A.D.). This may be a new idea for you, but it is not a new observation. Every family has a member who is probably autistic. You know them. The mild ones otherwise appear normal, except that they never do well in most things. Sometimes they will excel in one thing or subject, but that is another category. They are the cousin, or brother, or sister or another, who, when they are in little league, they were not good and generally played outfield and most time did not pay attention to the game. You know the kid who had to be dragged to the game. It made them very uncomfortable.

They may have been slow to talk but that is not necessary to have autism. When it came to self-discipline in anything they flinched or did poorly.

Even though the autistic child may have a high IQ, they have difficulty using it. In high school the autistic youth just gets by and tends to be loner. Oh, they might hook up with other loners, but they do not run in the main stream. Most are not evil or intentionally bad. They just do not seem to fit. As one educator told me, they will go through life not able to rough it in the free market system. They cannot respond accurately and on time. Now you may understand why a Leftist does not like the free market system. It scares them and frustrates them. They need a comfy blanket.

Autism is generally described as a disorder of neural development. I have said autistic people are wired wrong. Since there are so many synapses which comprise the brain the wiring can take on an imponderable amount of variances. It is not considered a mental impairment, by some, but some so called experts do not make a distinction between IQ and common sense. Mild cases of autism are not even observable unless you know the person well. It is most dramatic in youth and as a person grows into adulthood they can, if they realize the problem, begin to modify their behavior to reduce the impact.

Unfortunately, the more severe do not have this opportunity.

The mild and slight may never realize they are different, in which case, accommodation is slow. Accommodation means learning what is normal and copying it.

To support the above observation, think about yourself.

Be candid. All of us have some wiring problem. Maybe you transpose numbers or letters routinely. You have learned to accommodate. Maybe you cannot remember names well. You accommodate. Maybe you stand out as special in remembering names or numbers. Maybe you find playing music way over your head. With music, maybe you do not accommodate, but you could. Even if you are tone deaf (a mental problem), you can accommodate well enough to have a good time playing. You still may not be able to recognize the tone of middle C, but you know where it is on the piano. Maybe you feel uncoordinated in some activities. A typewriter key board baffles you. You accommodate. You see no one is perfect. Some are less so.

Most of these problems, however, are isolated and do not fit into a pattern and do not make you different. Autism is a known pattern of misfires.

Let me spend some time discussing it in scientific terms.

If I repeat myself, it is necessary for a complete understanding.

First, Autism is listed as one of several *Pervasive Developmental Disorders*: It is often referred to as PDD. One other PDD is Rett Syndrome which has to do with a small head and brain development. Another is listed as Asperger Syndrome. This is autism without a communication problem. Another is listed as Childhood Disintegrative Disorder. Again this is a form of autism. In this type, the child will develop naturally to about age 3 and then begin to regress into the type of characteristics found in autism's definition.

Autism is generally described as a "Disorder of Neural Development" It is highly variable, from really disabling to barely noticeable.

Its characteristics fall into three categories which are not necessarily exclusive.

1- Impairment of social interaction: It is often said that these social deficits distinguish autism from other developmental disorders. I do not agree. They are not exclusive to autism, but always a part. Generally the social deficits are: a- A lesser attention to social stimuli, such as their name, eye contact, and social participation. This is one factor which makes employment difficult. If they had good common sense this would not be a problem.

b- They exhibit more attachment to their caregivers, but without good feelings of security. Spoiled children have a similar attachment. Common sense could cure this attachment problem.

c- They have problems making main stream friends and tend to function alone or with other similarly dysfunctional people. The obvious reason is they say and do things which do not fit the normal. For example, several boys are gathered together and are having a general discussion about sports, cars and girls. The Autistic child will become super focused on the new BMW Coupe and go on and on about it. Pretty soon the other kids look at each other, roll their eyes and avoid the autistic boy. A healthy good common sense would have warned the boy to cease and desist BMW's.

d- They develop frustration which can result in tantrums or unusual responses. Of course, this is caused by a and b above. Common sense is the aspirin.

e- They often display sleep problems. Oversleeping, going to bed late, going to bed with noise from the TV or radio, and leaving lights on. A healthy common sense tells us to conform to the sun and the moon. It is from the light of the day and dark of the night that we develop our bio-rhythms. Obtaining a good night's sleep is a major part of mental health. Disrupting the bio-rhythms gives us jetlag. Autistic people suffer a lot of jetlag even if they are not flying. Common sense would cure the problem. Their accommodation helps, if they know the problem.

f- Often they have atypical eating habits. For example, at breakfast they may reject the normal breakfast foods for dinner foods, etc. A bowl of chili and a hotdog are perfect for 7:00 AM. Common sense tells us to conform to the mores of our surroundings.

2- Impairment in Communication: (Not a part of Asperger.) a- More severe cases will exhibit early problems with speech, unusual gestures, diminished responsiveness and different vocal patterns. As the autistic child get older, he or she can modify this conduct to appear more normal. As stated this is called accommodation. It is pretty certain most adults, who realize they have a problem, will accommodate. For example, such a person can learn that it is normal to go to bed early, so they learn to do that. They learn it is not normal to talk off the subject. They will work hard to stay on it.

b- Their focus in communication may be off center. For example, they may fix on the pointing hand rather than on the object pointed at. Again, what are considered normal hand gestures as an aid to communication can be impaired. As a child, they may run with their hands out instead of in line. This they can accommodate by faking common sense.

c- They may have difficulty with self-generated imagination, but become attached to an imagination generated by others or things such as electronic games and shows.

Common sense stops us from going there or pulls us back if we do.

3- Restricted Interests and Repetitive Behavior: a- They may have repetitive body movements. This may not even be noticeable and can be removed with accommodation. A good effective common sense tells us waving our hand around is wasteful energy and causes others to stare at us.

b- Often they have compulsive behavior. Stacking things, putting things in a line, obsessive play with small things.

What they are doing here is generally repetitive. Again, accommodation is fairly easy. What goes on behind the Green Door is another matter. Perfect example of a defect in common sense. You see, common sense is a tool to avoid things that fail.

Leftists never get the message about Utopia's built in failure.

c- They tend to be resistant to environment change.

When one feels threatened by their surroundings, obviously any change will be perceived as an additional threat. Maybe threatened is not the correct word. An autistic person has trouble relating in a normal way to what surrounds them so these things have to be coped with. This is their environment. If there are birds and bees, they will be resistant to changes about them.

They will spend millions on the reintroduction of the California condor, when common sense tells you it is doomed. There were good reasons the birds became endangered and those reasons cannot be rolled back. The Leftist will be emotional about saving a smelt in the Sacramento Delta and to hell with the farmers and people who populate the Southern part of the State. A Leftist will be very resistant to oil and its production even though they know that we need it and have to buy it (with billions of dollars) from people who basically would like to see us dead. If the leftist does not have to see those nasty ole oil rigs and pipes and such, then it is better for them. They get very emotional about such things.

d- Often they have ritualistic behavior or sameness of conduct. This is not a big separate characteristic and is generally part of b and c above.

e- Eating abnormalities are common. This was mentioned in f of number 1 above. 80% will have some trouble deciding to eat breakfast food for breakfast or wanting dessert as a meal. Common sense of what is considered normal would be very helpful here.

f- Restricted behavior. I call it a focus problem. This can include preoccupation with a particular conduct, which just as suddenly, can be dropped.

g- Prone to accidental self-injury. This is not often a part.

Only about 20% fall into this category. Common sense is the facility which reduces injury along with fear. The latter is a combination of common sense experiences and natural intuitive impulses. Remember a flame burns.

4- SPORATIC SYMPTOMS: The following symptoms of autism are sporadic in appearance. They are not listed as part of the three above.

Remember, a good dose of common sense cures them all.

a- 5 to 10% will show extraordinary abilities or talents.

Savants etc. Of course, this can show up in people without autism.

b- May show superior skills in perception and attention in limited areas. Part of a- above.

c- Sensory abnormalities are prevalent as in most developmental disorders. You can expect to find more on the downside with autism.

d- Most autistic people display some degree of coordination problems. For example, they may have problems using a hammer or balancing on a ladder. Again, this is common in most PDD.

Let me add my two bits worth to the above observations of others. What does explain each and every one of the characteristics is an impaired common sense. Whether it is social difficulties or keeping a clean room, the autistic person lacks some amount of common sense to direct them. This can be learned and that is what is known as accommodation. They learn what they must do in a given situation to not seem unusual.

My research did not find any discussion of the more current problems autism may bring. Let me add my own studies and observations.

One interesting side issue is the maybe-cult belief which has developed because a young child, 2 to 5, may speak about his or her real parents (other than the biological parents) or of a different life. An example is the book of Carol Bowman titled "Children's Past Lives". She attempts to review the many such experiences and filter out the make believe from the heart felt stories. One of the things she mentions, to support the latter, is the child speaking in a matter-of-fact tone. May I be so bold as to suggest the child or children are probably autistic..... the Asperger type. Of my own personal knowledge, I know of several autistic children who have said these things and a characteristic is Bowman's observation of a flatter tonal delivery in speech. I have noted it, especially when they are trying to be serious. Bowman does not address the observance as a mental problem. She sees it as spiritual. I see it as autism.

The young autistic child and adult will find tasking difficult. Here you find they do not do their homework, taking lessons is difficult, and taking orders is even more difficult.



Some might say it is laziness, but in the autistic person, they do not grasp the need to prepare. They do not process the data correctly. This also becomes a problem with employment.

Common sense disability.

In this day of electronic blizzardry, the autistic person can get buried. They can spend hours and hours playing the same electronic game over and over again. Cars present another observable characteristic. They tend to drive too fast and put the car to tests it does not appreciate. Common sense problems. They do not like to care for their car any more than they like to care for their room or other property. Even though they are taught the art of car repair, they will be reluctant to do it.

They know how to clean their room but cannot get to it. The autistic person generally appears more passive and low key.

Their speaking manner may tend to be flat with limited inflections. Their sense of humor may also be impaired. Without good common sense, humor is often missed.

Finally and most importantly is the aspect of *manipulation*. Any impaired person will try to accommodate to limit the impairment. For the autistic this often means coming up with a cover story, excuse, or false explanation. Some call this lying. The autistic person knows they cannot compete on a level playing field so they learn how to gain an advantage by telling an untruth. This is most evident in the typical Con Man (confidence man) who is so willing to lie and so blind to know his end and discovery is inevitable. I suggest that most confidence people are probably autistic. Within this realm of untruths, stealing from their caregiver is easy. Especially if the caregiver tries to force them to obtain a job by cutting down the money supply.

In the political arena, manipulation is very observable and unfortunately prevalent. I must say it is heavily weighted on the left side of the aisle. President Obama's failure to keep promises between his campaign and his presidency are remarkable. His manipulation by the use of the word "Change" is scary. He did not mean clean up Washington D.C. He meant Socialism in its worst format. He knows the truth. Hiding his smoking is just a part.

Obviously, autism is a neural disorder, so where in the brain is it? Autism disorder seems to be a part of the frontal lobe which we learned is the center of conscious thought. It is here that common sense is developed. One of the most used demonstrations of autism is of a small child who stacks drink cans. The cans fall over. He/she repeats the same mistake and the cans fall over and he/she repeats it until they are distracted or someone takes the cans away. The autistic child never picks up the problem. Their common sense is impaired. So too does the Leftist conduct themselves.

You say to a Leftist that the greatest murders on Earth in the 20th century were all Socialist or socialism generated. It does not register or is denied. They just keep on pursuing a dream of Utopia. You tell them Utopia has never been successful and each time it is tried nationally, it causes great death and loss of property. They do not hear you. You explain that right next door there is a Communist country (Cuba) which has, since its inception, kicked out dissenters, killed thousands, seized property without compensation, caused worldwide problems (Cuba and the Soviet Missile crises) and is failing terribly.

Cuba even ran out of toilet paper last year. When you tell a leftist these truths, they begin to ask you why you are racist or why won't you let more tourists go there, or it is the U.S. embargo which is the cause of Cuba's miseries. They are deaf to reality. You have heard it many times. How come those Democrats do that? *It does not make common sense.* Well it is true. They have defective common sense. Unfortunately, they are in charge in the year of this book 2010.

I am again reminded of the most recent statement by Senator Chris Dodd when he voted against a GOP bill to require Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac to require of all loans they buy that the owner put up at least 5% of the purchase price. Let me remind you his words were to the effect that if we did that those who cannot afford to buy a house could not. Now the normal person when asked the following question will have a common sense way to complete it. The question is for you to finish the following statement. , "If you cannot afford to buy a house..... then you should or must not buy the house." The underlined part is the finish of the statement. It is normal. What Dodd said is abnormal. When President Obama told Joe the Plummer that the government had to redistribute his wealth, common sense people were shocked. When someone points out that taxing one citizen more than you tax another is not equal protection under the law, the Leftists does not get it. When Speaker Nancy Pelosi said that it did not matter what was in the health bill because once it was passed they would change it any way. Common sense thinkers were shocked. Leftist were not.

Autism is an impairment in the processing of information.

I believe for the milder cases there is no discernable difference between it and an impairment of common sense. They should be synonymous. The information is made available to the eyes and ears and goes into the frontal lobe and is misdirected. If the data is not misdirected, common sense prevails. If it is misdirected and does not find normality, it will not make common sense. Now when you think about it, as our population has skyrocketed all over the Earth there are multiple more times for this bad wiring to occur. It may be genetic. The evidence is not convincing. Assuming that it is, then when two like folks with mild autism get together, there is more of a chance it will pop out in their offspring. We cannot be blind to the fact that President Obama's parents were strange. His parents and his grandparents all loved Communism, apparently never giving a thought to its abject failure worldwide. Maybe they were common sense deficient as well. Some commentators say autism may be caused by mutations. I do not agree unless we want to believe that is the way we are all going. Let us hope it is a dead end which occurs simply because our brains are so very complicated that perfection is not possible. As stated before, it has always been with us, but without a name.

Autism is not mental retardation because the IQ level does not seem to be affected. Most autistic people share with all others a varied I.Q. which means their memory and recall is not an autistic problem. It is common sense which is in question and we have not even begun to test for it or grade it, but I will in this book. Every characteristic of autism can be explained because the person has a defective common sense. My test will be criticized but so then were the Wright brothers. Humans fly?

Nonsense, if God wanted us to fly he would have given us wings.

In mild cases of autism, no one will know unless we have comprehensive testing. This book is just a beginning and I challenge the scientific field and other interested persons to, as they say in Texas, "Getter Done!!!".

Let's look at some of the characteristics of Autism from a slightly different angle.

1- It is highly variable. So is deficient common sense.

2- It is not presently curable. This is because we cannot redo the wiring.

3- It is an impairment of social interaction. Autistic persons lack intuition which others take for granted. When young, they seem to be standoffish and weakly responsive to stimuli, such as their name. Because of these problems, they learn to get around them by being manipulative. In family, they are more likely to bite the hand that feeds them. Most do not even know it. If their autism is mild, growing older allows them to become less obvious. Nothing is cured, it simply hides.

Common sense deficiency can be masked but it cannot be changed.

4- It is impairment in communication. Speech is slow to develop and once developed becomes manipulative. This generally resolves itself after the first 10 years of age. In some, it never occurs. In a few others communication is enhanced.

I have placed the problem of lying (manipulation) as a part of autism. As the neural development disorder happens, the afflicted person, generally unknowing, begins to fabricate stories to make them appear more normal. Even though they do not know, they have the disorder of a defective common sense, they do sense discomfort with those who are normal. To cover this, they accommodate or lie, to make it better for them. The fib is a tool and not the little white lie to make tears go away. It becomes easy to lie because they do not have the common sense to know they can be easily found out. Why are you late?

Oh, I had a problem with this and that, when they did not. Why did you not do your homework? Oh, I had a headache or I forgot my books. The autistic politician can lie all day long and not comprehend that others are keeping track and are able to point out the lies. It is not important to them. The immediate satisfaction the lie gives them is what is important. President Obama fits this perfectly.

5- Autism certainly has a restriction of interests. Normal stimuli may tend not to be normal to them and they will ignore or avoid. Their skills in sports suffer and good grades are elusive.

Here you find the child who becomes addicted to visual stimulus such as Game Boy and TV or Computer games. With age they can mask these things when they finally accept others concern and disapproval. In this day and age, electronic stimulus provides a great example of this restriction of interests.

You have seen them or heard of them...the kid who is mesmerized by Electronic games. Even today, he or she can spend all day playing computer games, especially car driving ones. Their common sense is in most ways disabled. My wife told me of the time she first rented an apartment. It was in a large complex and down below her was a young lad who left the door open and watched TV cartoons all day. She never saw him do anything else. Two ladies would come, now and again, to see to his basic needs. His only comfort was a

blanket. Clearly the ladies were related and more than happy to have him there rather than with them. In this electronic world with its speed, with its make-believe, with its out of world attractions, an autistic person can find all manner of restricted interests which make him or her comfortable. I would love to be able to study the childhood of Pelosi, Obama etc. Remember Obama told us, in one of his books that in College he chose his friends carefully.

So carefully that other students in his class never heard of him.

Sounds like restriction in interests to me.

6- Autism often results in repetitive errors. Here is the child who stacks those darn ole cans only to have them fall and does not have the common sense not to repeat the act. Here is the youth who lines up objects for no apparent reason and then destroys the line, only to do it again. Here is the Leftist with political choices. He or she makes poor choices, which is also a clear example of repetitive mistakes. Repeatedly seeking a failed system, Socialism, is stark. Use your head (excuse me common sense). If you understand human nature you know socialism and communism are doomed. You cannot get a nation's diverse personalities to work hard and do right for the common good. It simply will not happen, now or in the future.

Just using common sense to understand why Socialism fails is easy. Easy for a person with good common sense, that is.

Again, let me explain. Any given population has about 1/3 who will not work and want to be taken care of, and about 1/3 who are changing with the wind, and about 1/3 who are industrious and hard working. You can argue with the percentages but not the general categories. Now in Utopia, to conquer greed, lust, laziness, etc. and get everyone to do for the common good is not going to happen unless you destroy or otherwise get rid of a whole lot of folks. Aldous Huxley handled it by having all people created in the lab. How do Obama, Pelosi, and Reid propose to get over this common sense obstacle?

They don't because they cannot see it. They are autistic. It is disheartening to think our destiny is being directed by common sense deficient people. It is worse to realize they were elected.

In about 1/3 of autistic people you find frequency of selfinjury.

I do not think this is anything but a result of a lack of common sense not to injure yourself. They do not appear to do it on purpose. It is not because they want to, but because of an error. A good example is that the current bunch of Socialist running the United States under President Obama. They have no apparent clue they will be destroyed or their families will be destroyed by Socialism. Only the top few have a chance of staying pat and that chance is not good. Ask any nonconforming Cuban who probably has a Miami address now.

Everyone else can be and generally is sacrificed, as the plan unravels. They do not and cannot see their unhappy future.

Earlier I mentioned there was a great deal of work to do with understanding autism. Just some categorizing has occurred.

Much is to be done. As I noted the most famous is Asperger's Disorder (sometimes called a syndrome). Some call it a milder variant of *Autistic Disorder*, the broader name. Some say they are all part of a larger group called *Autistic Spectrum Disorders*.

In the U.S., you see the term "Pervasive Developmental Disorders –PDD". I suggest Social Autistic Dysfunction (S.A.D.); a focus on the ability to fit well in a social setting is a new cataloged form of autism which must sit side by side with Asperger's.

Again, Asperger's effects are considered mild in the big picture, but disabling all the same. Most are not going to keep a regular job, unless they really can bite the bullet and compensate. If they select a job, it will be one that does not cause sweating and grunting. It will be, to them, clean and neat, like teaching, or politics. Asperger's, like S.A.D., have a pattern of similar symptoms. The list has been gone over. It is the same.

Now S.A.D., as a part of the big picture, shares the Asperger symptoms with some variances because of the focus on politics. In reality "politics" is to all of us a way of discussing our environment. It is how we act and react together without killing each other.

1- Social interaction problems. The lack of robust humor is part. Can you just imagine Nancy Pelosi and Barney Frank having a really big belly laugh? The need to change words such as Divorce to Dissolution is a problem. The unneeded focus on race and group identity; the Bourgeois vs. the Proletariat.; Class conflict; Union vs. the Fat Cats; Gov. vs. the private person, is a problem. The autistic person finds boundaries and laws difficult to live with. Their inability to obey laws is a part of this. May I mention gun control once more? I will say more in 3 below.

2- Delay in cognitive abilities. We are dealing with mostly adults here. Seldom is the 10 year old speaking on the merits of a Gulf shutdown because an oil well blows out. Adults have made adjustments to mask the problem but it is still there.

Although the country is desperate for oil, the autistic would focus on greener pastures and deny drilling and exploration and when one well goes bust, shut all wells down. They would speak with forked tongue and figure most will not get it. Not true... those with common sense get it.

It shows up in strange ways. President Obama is the ultimate actor with a prompter, but without one he stammers and stutters as he struggles with his cognitive abilities. In other words, he has mastered reading the words and the emotion, but still has problems thinking out a problem and expressing clearly his conclusions. This explains his outbursts and bad decisions.

This also helps us understand why Maxine Watters, Congress person from Southern California, blurted out to an oil company executive, something to the effect, that it would be different when they took over the oil businesses. Her pause in her delivery, when she realized what she had said, was classic. A work of art.

Also remember Senator Big Box Boxer from California. Again, in one of their committee hearings, she had a high ranking military man testifying and he kept calling her "Ma'am or Madam".

Remember, she came undone and began ranting about that he was to address her as Senator, because of all her hard work to obtain that title. I think she thought he was calling her the head gal in a brothel, just between me and the gate post. But the obvious lack of common sense was that it never occurred to her that she was being given all the respect that a military man has been trained to provide a woman in civilian life. Besides, the Constitution says there shall be no titles of nobility.

### 3- Preoccupation with one or more objects or subjects.

With a child it is easy to see the problem because they do not understand what you are looking at. With an accommodating adult it becomes different and not so easy to see, but it is still there. Certainly one such subject with S.A.D. is the Leftist preoccupation with control. I keep referring to President Obama, but it is not just him. It is those of a similar problem who are in charge. It was Edward Kennedy; it is Dodds, Waxman, Pelosi, Maxine Watters, and Reid. The fascination with control, to the disadvantage of liberty and freedom, is mind boggling. Now you ask, how to a man and women, do Democrats line up with these leaders on the issue of control, whether it is car maker take over, health take over, bank take over, insurance take over, etc., for what reason? Are they all autistic? The answer is for the most part, yes. Some may just step in line out of fear and stupidity and, of course, the fear is created by the autistic leaders.

I am alone when I say the Leftist are dominated by people with social autistic dysfunction. I am not alone when it comes to seeing in them some psychotic problem. Earlier I spoke of the Physician Rossietter and the Psychologist Robin who agree with me that the Leftists are out of balance and dangerous because of it. They are against the legal and moral foundations of ordered liberty. Although the good doctors do not look at it as a fetish for control, that is what it is. The Leftists' desperate desire for control is like the Devine Wind in World War II. So long as the pilot has the controls, the plane is spectacular, but it will not return. It is doomed. I can almost see Pelosi, Obama, Frank and all of them with the white head bands, drinking sake and shouting...Banzi! Banzi! Obama, alone of all the Leftist leaders, is spectacular in his speech and manner. It is a characteristic of the autistic personality that it can be quite charming. The more charming, the better the manipulation. No con man was ever successful without it. Many become past masters at it. In all ways, as Shakespeare said, "Life is but a stage and we the actors thereon." That is a perfect description of President Obama and many autistic people. They will walk the walk, and talk the talk, but remember, just because it walks like a duck and quacks like a duck it may not be a duck. A characteristic of a S.A.D. person is also that they do not like hard sweaty work. A hike on the Muir trail or a good game of Tennis is not work to them. It is play. Cut weeds, dig a ditch, work with iron, be a welder, sweep up a dirty place, are all specific work they do not like. Remember we said they are unemployable in the free market place. This is one reason. They are very sensitive to their comfort zone as they see it. This is why so many of these people swarm to academia, science, and, government. Hey, they can get clean clothes, a lot of time to fool around, plenty of time off, little accountability and so on. Again, remember they are seldom attracted to any government job that has grunt work, etc. For all these reasons, most contractors, welders, and people of muscle are Conservative and not Leftists. It is the same with police and the military. Danger is not a friend of an autistic person. Their world is too confusing and bewildering for such nervous strain. Many an autistic young

man will tell you they would not fit in the Military. Their world is just too tough already without the rules and regulations of a military program.

I mentioned *Robin of Berkeley* in the previous chapter She is a recovering Liberal who is involved in psychotherapy in Berkeley. I do not know what her last name is but I do not blame her for a little anonymity, especially around Berkley. I was told her PhD is in a relevant field. The article I reviewed was for the “American Thinker” and she describes Obama’s odd mannerism, secret former life, narcissism, his flat approach when passion is needed, his aggression when smarts is better, and especially his failure to realize when his behavior, such as “whose ass to kick”, is out of touch. She finds him disconnected and believes there is something wrong with his brain. She even mentions Asperger syndrome as a possible explanation. She dismisses this thought with “..but certainly not the full-blown disorder.” That is where they all make their mistake. Autism is so varied. Some severe, some very slight. Obama is autistic. Certainly his mother and father had symptoms of the same. When you think that the milder forms of autism are simply a disabled common sense, then it begins to fit together. Certainly when the 5 year old stacks the cans over and over again there is a lack of common sense to know what is wrong and when to stop. When the 14 year old cannot let go of the game control and goes over it, over and over again, it is a faulty common sense. When it is President Obama and he prejudices police officers and a governmental employee, Shackly, (who his system fired) it is faulty common sense. This is not good for eye, body, or soul.

Robin explores many possibilities but she, like all I have studied, has failed to dwell upon autism. Therein lays the answer. There in, is the explanation. A defective common sense.

One aspect of the autistic person I have not discussed is substance abuse. Little to no study has been made on cause and effect here. My own observations are that the autistic person is very likely to try substances that are not good for them, but not likely to become addicted, because of their fragile personality. It bothers their comfort zone. Trying cocaine and smoking, such as found in President Obama’s life is consistent.

I have talked with many physicians whose specialties are in general medicine and most of them firmly believe there is some mental problem with Obama, Pelosi, Reid, Waxman, and on and on. They just have not spent the time to ask the question, Why? And look for the only possible explanation. I have and now you know the rest of the story.

My hope is that scientists with common sense will feel challenged to put all the pieces together, come up with some good testing of common sense, and allow us to benefit from it.

Certainly we may be able to avoid another 2008. Judging one’s *common sense* must become a part of vetting of any candidate.

[\(Return to Contents\)](#)

## **CHAPTER 11**

### **THE COMMON SENSE TEST.**

It is absolutely amazing to me how the world of psychiatry and psychology has not developed a way to test common sense, just as we test IQ. Of course, various avocations and occupations do prepare fitness tests for their particular needs. There is testing for

autism, but I must say it is still in the developmental stage. Certainly such tests are not set up to focus on common sense. Many times all of these are really tests which include common sense testing.

We all have known very bright, by IQ standards, people who are all over the map on matters which seem so common.

Einstein stands out. He forgot how to comb and care for his hair, did not wear socks and his upper garment was generally a bad looking sweat shirt. Little things like keeping your room picked up, tying your shoes, choosing the right colors, and stuff like that.

We have known people who were absolutely sharp as a tack when it comes to inventing things and yet cannot remember to eat. Their balancing common things seem askew.

Estimates tell us approximately 136 million minds are created every year. Roughly 20 per 1000 of population. In all that volume, error is a part of the package. Quality control is totally lacking...none. Some minds will be defective, some will be great, and all will be different. The stories abound about the person, who is mentally defective in most things, but can draw pictures of what they have seen in amazing detail, or play a piano in a way that is a marvel.

Some say Common Sense has passed on. In the London Times the following appeared.

“Today we mourn the passing of a beloved old friend.

Common Sense, who has been with us for many years.

No one knows for sure how old he was, since birth records were long ago lost in bureaucratic red tape. He will be remembered as having cultivated such valuable lessons as; Knowing when to come in out of the rain, Why the early bird gets the worm.

Life isn't always fair, And maybe it was my fault.

Common sense lived by simple, sound financial polices (don't spend more than you can earn) and reliable strategies (adults, not children, are in charge).

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

Reports of 6 teens suspended from school for using mouthwash after lunch; and a teacher fired for reprimanding an unruly student, only worsened his condition.

Common sense lost ground when parents attacked teachers for doing the job that they themselves had failed to do in disciplining their unruly children. It declined every further when schools were required to get parental consent to administer such lotion or an aspirin to a student; but could not inform parents when a student became pregnant and wanted to have an abortion.

Common Sense lost the will to live as the churches became businesses; and criminals received better treatment than their victims. Common Sense took a beating when you couldn't defend yourself from a burglar in your own home and the burglar could sue you for assault.

Common Sense finally gave up the will to live, after a woman failed to realize that a steaming cup of coffee was hot.



She spilled a little in her lap, and was promptly awarded a huge settlement. Common sense was preceded in death, by his parents; Truth and Trust; by his wife, Discretion; by his daughter, Responsibility; and by his son, Reason.

He is survived by his 4 stepbrothers: I know my rights, I want it now, someone else is to blame, and I am a victim.

Not many attended his funeral because so few realized he was gone. If you still remember him you are blessed.”

In all Mind testing we dwell on Intelligent Quotient (IQ) and pay scant attention to the other major factor, common sense. Everyone will have a level of each. What level for common sense? The following test is simplistic and I hope scientist will devise a much better one. I and some of my friends have created a series of questions which test common sense.

The result is on a simplistic scale of 1 to 10. 10 is very good common sense and 1 is very poor common sense.

Take the test and then on the last page you will find the answers and a way to judge your score.

Question 1: If you have a square peg and a round hole. Can you put the peg through the hole?

a- Yes b- No c- Maybe Question 2: Faced with a desperate person who has a knife and is advancing to kill you, what option would you take if you have a pistol?

a- Run b- Stand and use the pistol as a club c- Reason with the man d- Shoot and aim to wound him.

e- Shoot and aim at his center.

Question 3: You are working in your garden, when a cold wind comes up and it begins to rain. You should leave the garden and seek shelter a- As soon as you feel the first drops.

b- As soon as you gather your tools to a dry place.

c- As soon as the rain makes the dirt too muddy to work.

Question 4: Your family needs a replacement car. You have \$1,000 in money you can spend to obtain it.

a- Use the \$1,000.00 as a down payment on a new car.

b- Find a dependable car that costs \$1,000.00 c- Use \$500.00 of the \$1,000.00 as a down payment on a new car, keeping \$500.00 for its upgrade.

d- Use the \$1,000.00 to buy a classic car you have always wanted.

Question 5: You are an adult in a group outing consisting of 3 other adults and 20 teenage children. You are at Disneyland. There is not enough money for all of you to receive an all events pass.

Who should decide who gets what?

a- The 4 adults.

- b- The tallest and strongest Adult.
- c- The teenagers by a majority vote.
- d- The teenagers by a 2/3ds vote e- A majority vote of the 3 Adults and the Teenagers.

Question 6: You have been tasked to open a locked door in a hurry.

You have been given a ring of 40 assorted keys and told one will work. The door lock has “Master” stamped on it. Assuming you know little to nothing about locks what would be the best way to unlock the door.

- a- Break off the lock.
- b- Try each key in the lock c- Find a knowledgeable person to do it.
- d- Locate a “Master” key on the ring. If it fits, try only those that look like it.
- e- Do not trust a Master key because they are not set up for one lock.

Question 7: You are in charge of a group of people who do not have a home to live in. They live in apartments, or their cars. Each of their incomes is in the lower brackets and sometimes spotty.

Each of them wants to buy a house. Which of the following is correct?

- a- Set them up with a savings plan to collect a substantial down payment.
- b- Set them up with a loan which will take all their discretionary money to pay the loan.
- c- Set them up with a loan which they will not be able to pay.
- d- Tell them they cannot buy a home.

Question 8: Assume you are traveling into a foreign country. You have made arrangements with your Hotel to have someone at the depot to pick you up. When you arrive there is no one from the Hotel for you. Which option should you chose.

- a- Telephone the Hotel and learn where the person is or whether they were ever sent.
- b- Wait for the Hotel person by giving them some more time.
- c- Take a taxi to the Hotel.

Question 9: Assume you are in a third world country. You have arrived at a single track train station. The track goes north and south. You hope to travel south. As you traveled to the Station it began to rain and storm and night has fallen. The local people who had no real shelter have filled the station to sleep and keep out of the storm. The ticket window is closed. The toilets no longer work.

A southbound train stops at the Station. It is packed and all seats are taken. People are even sleeping under the seats.

The only observable space is that between cars.

Which of the following actions makes the most common sense?

- a- Try to find a taxi or other conveyance to take you back to the place from which you came.

- b- Wait for the Ticket window to open and buy a ticket for a proper train.
- c- Board the train without a ticket and hope to buy one from someone on board.

Question 10: You are a military officer. You have been given command of a Combat Division consisting of several infantry Regiments and some specialized units. One of those is a specialized reconnaissance unit. The officers and men of the Regiments all dress alike. Most of the special units also wear the same uniforms worn by the Regiments. For whatever reason the reconnaissance unit (RU) had developed a variant of the uniform with special applications and colors. This had been the case for several years and the members of this unit were proud of the fact they looked different. They have good esprit-decorps.

Your regulations say that all uniforms must in fact be uniform. What action should you take?

- a- Comply with the language of the regulation and tell the RU commander to make his men wear the same uniform as the Regiments wear.
- b- Create a committee to investigate what is best for your command. Give them authority to talk with all interested parties.
- c- Ask the officer who commands you for instructions.
- d- Do nothing so long as there is no change in the esprit-de-corps of all units.

Answers to questions 1 through 10 1- (Maybe) Since you do not know the sizes, the peg may go through if the hole is large enough or the peg is small enough.

2- (e) To insure survival use the best tool available. Aiming at his center is the least likely to miss.

3- (b) The most important matter is to preserve your tools.

Getting wet is not a big deal.

4- (b) Since all you have is \$1,000.00 use it in the most economical way which does not burden you with other problems or debt.

5- (a) Having the 4 adults decide is the fastest and since they are in charge it is their responsibility.

6- (d) Since the ring contains the key, this will be the fastest and surest way.

7- (a) As the person in charge, the best interests of the people is part of your task. Setting up a savings account may in fact work, and all the time it exists it offers them hope.

8- (c) In both (a) and (b) there is no way to be certain of getting there or certain of how much time will be lost.

9- (c) You want to go South. The train is there. The staff want to obtain more money for the trip so they no doubt will help you along.

10- (d) Reconnaissance is vital to the lives of all troops. Making certain those soldiers are at their best, means keeping their spirit up. Taking away the variations will reduce and maybe destroy their spirit. Don't take the chance unless the spirit of all units is affected by it.

[\(Return to Contents\)](#)

## **CHAPTER 12**

HUMAN TIME LINE CHRONOLOGY OF HOMINIDS Definitions: *Hominids* (*Hominid*) I use this general term to define all the animal species that walk bipedal, have a thumb, and have significant brains and kind of look like you and me.

These mammals appear on earth some 4 plus million years ago and many varieties have been found and are still a part of the animal world today.

*Homo sapiens*: is the term to describe us. I use Human and man as synonyms. It is the general consensus that a brain size of approximately 1350 cc and a lighter skeleton define a *Homo sapiens* as distinct from all other Hominids. Although no one can say for certain, *Homo sapiens* appear, as defined, a geological, short time ago. About 70,000 years ago there was a dramatic reduction of all mammalian life including Hominids. This was caused by either volcanic eruptions, or a polar cap shift. In any event the world entered a dramatic Ice age. All findings of evidence of *Homo sapiens* are after this time. Clear findings are about 40,000 years ago; in the form scientists have labeled Cro- Magnon. Keep in mind the Neanderthal, not *Homo sapiens*, seems to have been on earth from around 516,000. Certainly they were in Europe by 270,000 years ago.

THE PURPOSE: This research is to understand the *proven* Origins of Man. The dominant theory is that modern *Homo sapiens* came out of Africa. Common sense and logic cast doubt. No one has ever found a linkup between *Homo erectus*, Cro-Magnon, Neanderthal, and or Modern Humans. None of the research has ever found pieces of a Cro-Magnon, or Neanderthal in middle or lower Africa. There is a good argument that modern human did not come from Africa, but developed differently in different places from a common source such as *Homo Erectus* (Ancient types that walked, had modern type hands but a small brain), or as some say, we were planted here from another planet or, or as some say placed here by a God The point is the evolutionary hypothesis is little more than speculation, complicated with doubtful DNA studies.(The problem is the use of unreal and arbitrary assumptions) (See #1 at end.) In other words the “Theory of Evolution” is simply a theory, which has yet to be backed by hard evidence.

` We do know that many erect walking animals that kinda looked like us appeared on earth over 4 million years ago. We do know we have identified many varieties. We do know they appeared to be on the main continent housing Europe, the Middle East, Far East and Africa. We do know none appeared in Australia, North or South America until the *Homo sapiens* began swaggering from place to place. The best guess-- it was in the temperate band through Europe and Asia that was home to our ancestors. For you out of Africa blank owners, this includes North Africa.

Another analysis of the same information causes considerable speculation of the “Out of Africa” belief as well.

This is the disparity between, and lack of connection between, the stages leading to modern Human development. The anthropologists and paleontologists are checking bone pits and, way--la--- We just seem to appear.

TIME PERIODS: [To help focus the search.] *Ediacaran Period*: Development of Sea life and its extinction, by Volcanic Eruptions, we think.

790- to 630 Million years ago: *Cryogenian Period* Major Ice age.

540 Million years ago: *Cambrian Period*: We see the very beginning of today's life forms.

488 to 444 million years ago: *Ordovician Period*. First land plants appeared.

395 million years ago. Some rocks in Poland reveal foot prints of ancient tetra pods. Science news. 1/30/10 359- 299 Million years ago: *Carboniferous Period*.

Forests, swamps, and many insects appear. Oldest ID'd tree, the eospermatopteres . 6 meters tall, and 1.3 trunk diameter.

251- Million Years ago: End of *Permian Period*. Mass Extinctions of sea and land life.

251-65 million years ago: *Mesozoic Period* (Triassic) Plants with seeds appear and Reptiles show up. (Jurassic) Dinosaurs roam. (Cretaceous) end of Dinosaurs and a mass extinction.

200 Million years ago the Ganga continent tore apart.

130 Million years ago the first flowers appeared.

65 Million Years ago. The Mass extinction, out of Yucatan and the beginning of Mammals. The Mass extinction was caused by a comet striking The Yucatan peninsula of what we call Mexico. Some say the effects of the Comet earth cover was added to by considerable volcanic activities on what we call the Indian Plate.

About Mammal development; (1) It took about 3,500,000 years to go from first ape like man to the Stone Age. (4 mill to 700,000).

Present evidence tells us the *Australopithecus Africanus* (kind of looking like us) are of this time period.

(2) The archeological studies of the Neanderthal indicate it was on earth some 380,000 years. It was separate and distinct, from all the other varieties. The best evidence is that its brain size was comparable to Humans, but its body was not built for speed. Its torso was shorter and squarer.

The face was much flattened at the forehead. It had reddish hair, which covered the body much more than humans. We do not know if this hominid had language, but it did leave some art in the form of stone tools and cave drawings.

(3) Archeological findings place the first evidence of Look-a-likes somewhere between 200,000 and 150,000 years ago. These finds are of a smaller brained kind, non-beer drinker. Probably 45 hp vs.

our 540 hp. They could have had language, but who knows.

(4) Modern Human, with its many variants (Caucasian, Negroid, Asian, and lesser in numbers such as Indian, Australian native etc.) has been identified as here for approximately 40,000 years. The term *Homo sapiens* (or Modern Human—wise man) is keyed to the finding of a larger brain size (1350 cc) in a lighter built body. This seemed

to be faster and could endure hardships easier. During the approximate 40,000 years, there have been scant modifications. The most impressive is size.

Certainly we can point to better health and ease of living to greater body size, but why can't we do the same for brain size. Maybe we can, you and I, however how do you explain its leveling out at around 1350 cc.

(5) Simply there has not been enough time, or findings, to explain the major variants in the races, in a mere 40,000 years. If we all came from "out of Africa" as some claim, through doubtful DNA studies, how do we explain such significant differences in race? Scientists don't and today are hampered by Political correctness. Another factor which has been little studied is the coloring of hair, eyes and skin. How did we get such variances in a mere 1,600 generations? (Divide 40,000 by the common number of 25 for a generation) (6) In fact the color differences really are left to raw speculation. About the only evidence left would be paintings and drawings in caves and blond ink was hard to come by. Most Homo sapiens on earth have very dark hair, dark eyes, and skin from yellow, brown, to black. Where did the blond blueeyed people come from? My speculation is based on common sense and logic, only. With the lifting of the last ice age some 15,000 years ago Europe became a garden. No longer was Great Britain covered by an ice cap. The cap that had covered northern Europe began to retreat. Common sense tells us no one lived on top or underneath these caps. Homo sapiens began to fill in. From, where? Not just from Africa because we had a mixing of people. If you use the genetic explosion into blond, red, and light skin and eye colors.

Logic tells you the people contributing to this genetic diversity had to come from different sources, and from different places. (Cannot logically explain genetic differences without a cause.) This new population began to crowd the Neanderthal who had already been there for a long time. The Neanderthal was not built for speed or quickness of limb. He was built for ruggedness and the ability to withstand cold. Northern Europe is the only place in the world where people begin to produce light colors. The blonds probably were the first to be discriminated against if a genetically mixed tribe suddenly produced a blond blue eyed child the natural tendency would have been to boycott the child and mother. The only place these discriminated against people could go would have been north, as the caps receded. New lands. The Mediterranean stopped any direct southward movement. People still pushing in from the East would have made that difficult, and to the West-- Water. This may explain why this color became dominate in only one place on earth, northern Europe and Scandinavia. In turn that is because of genetic diversity which occurred there and nowhere else.

LET ME NOW GIVE YOU A CHRONOLOGY OF HOMOININS AND HOMO SAPIENS. THIS IS A LISTING OF TIME AND EVENTS AS I HAVE FOUND THEM IN MY READINGS. NO ONE HAD PROOF READ THIS OR COLABORATED WITH ME; THEREFORE, PLEASE INFORM ME OF ANY ERRORS YOU THINK I HAVE MADE. Theroostercrows.com \*\*\* THE CHRONOLGY 7 to 6 Million Years ago a "maybe" upright apelike creature, called Orrorin Tugenensis (another was Oreopithecus found on an island near Italy— long arms) was discovered (See attached work.) Several discoveries with different names for this time period but the finds are of small samples.

Much speculation 5.6 Million Years ago the Atlantic poured into the Mediterranean basin lowering the ocean levels by as much as 9.5 meters.

5.3 to 1.8 million years ago called the Pliocene Epoch.

4.5 million years ago. It is guessed that the asteroid belt began to form up.

4 Million Years Ago. Generally considered the beginnings of something less ape like and more human like.

The lone significant change is up right walking.

The name Homo Australopithecines was penned to describe this animal. It had the smaller brain.

A most recent find, named Ardi, fits this place.

The find was in Ethiopia (North West Africa, across the Red Sea from Yemen). The find was of a female weighing approximately 110 lbs. and 4' tall. My readings did not find any comparison to Australopithecines.

3.2 Million Years Ago. Australopithecus Afrarensis found in Ethiopia. "Lucy" was the name given to the skeleton first found in Ethiopia. Current thinking is that she was chimp like and her type was a dead end. That means we guess she was not in direct line with Homo sapiens. . Ethiopia is in the Horn of Africa. From a latitude position it is roughly on the same one that runs, north of the Equator, through southern India, into the Philippines and in the Americas where Costa Rica is located.

2.5 Million Years Ago. More Archeological finds of Australopithecus.

2 Million Years Ago... Findings of Homo erectus generally dated about this time. Same time period an Australopithecus sdeiba found in South Africa.

Supposed to have more human like legs than most apes. AP article 4/9/10 1.77 Million Years Ago. Homo erectus found in Asia and dated to this time.

1.6 Million Years ago. Stone tools found in Eastern and Southern Africa/ Science news 1/31/09

1.5 Million years ago. Homo Erectus Foot prints found in Kenya.

This shows a foot shape much like Hominess, i.e.: large toe closed up with the others and an arch.

1.200,000 Million Years Ago. This is the dating of a Jawbone of an Australopithecus (southern ape) found in a cave in Northern Spain.

Science news 3/29/08

800,000 Homo Species (unclassified) (Maybe Homo Antecessor) which is thought ( a guess) to be a predecessor of the Neanderthal found in Spain First findings of a Hominids which look more like Homo Sapiens. This was in Europe. This sample is very poor, and scientists are not in agreement.

Homo heidelbergensis is discovered, in Israel and with it the finding of a camp site divided into functions. For example a place for sleeping, food prep tool making etc. Not humans.

790,000 Findings of Fire being kept by Hominids.

780,000 Earliest dating of Peking Man. Homo erectus- Asia.

700,000 Dated stone age tools found in S.E. England 516,000 to 270,000 Neanderthal shows up from findings in Europe.

450,000 to 180,000 The time period it took the British Islands to separate from the European Continent. Separation at Dover.

250,000 Clearly Neanderthal is populating Europe Homo Erectus Skeleton found in China

200,000 to 150,000 Early Homo types found in Africa. DNA disciples claim this was the first Human. Their brain size was smaller than modern man, and bone structure was heavier.

164,000 South Africa cave discloses early shell fishing and use of pigments.

160,000 Hominids remains found in Ethiopia, North Western Africa.

These findings show a brain configuration comparable to modern Homo sapiens, but it was smaller. Not Homo sapiens These finds, plus DNA tracing, triggered the “Out of Africa” theory of the development of modern humans, but there is no scientific connection. Again much guessing. North Africa H characteristics similar to Modern Humans.

Another view is that there was parallel development towards modern human in Asia, Africa, and Europe, which started before 200,000

135,000 Early beads found in South Africa. Stone age types.

130,000 Stone axes found in Crete suggesting early stone age activity there.

100,000 to 80,000 Neanderthal teeth found in a Poland Cave, establishing that they lived in that part of Europe as well.

100,000 to 17,000 A finding that florescence’s “The hobbit”

(small person) is found to have lived in the Indonesia Island of Flores. Most now believe these little Hominids were a separate genesis that upsets the “Out of Africa” theory. Their brain size was like a Chimpanzee. They used stone tools. Might have microsphalec possibilities.

82,000 early beads found in Morocco, Africa.

76,000 TO 60,000 Years: Glacier period when a Glacier cap covered the northern hemisphere.

72,000 In coastal South Africa there was finding of heated stones probably used to make better tools

70,000 (Maybe beginning in 80,000) there was a dramatic reduction of the Hominid population in the world. It is believed to have been caused either by volcanic eruptions or polar shift. We endured into a commonalty called “Ice Age”.



For certain Yosemite had a good blow and another super Volcano, Toba, in Indonesia had a good blow adding to the Winterring of the world.

50,000 Early hominids populate Australia. Article did not discuss type.

Neanderthal still found to be in Europe.

45,000 Woolly Mammoths still roam the earth.

Hominids migrated through the Middle East.

Folks in Asia. Modern Human skull found in Borneo in 1958.

A Neanderthal flute found in a Slovenian Cave.

Considered oldest flute ever found. "Making Music 2009"

41,000 Carbon dating find of Neanderthal bones located in Germany.

40,000 Homo Sapiens in the form of Cro-Magnon man appear in Europe. Presumed from Asia.

Earliest bead findings in Europe.

In 2001 ancient skeleton of a Hominid type found in a cave near Beijing. The Chinese say the bones (incomplete Skeleton) show some traits of Modern human and ancient types.

Maybe interbreeding.

Neanderthal tooth found in Southern Greece in 2002, at a seaside excavation.

Findings in Spanish Cave of Shells with holes indicates Neanderthal had ornaments, and other shells indicate he used paint or cosmetics. The Week Jan 2010.

38,000 Neanderthal bone-female- found in a cave in Croatia

37,000 *Large brain genes appear in Humans.* This is the result of Genetic and DNA work.

36,000 Studies of animal tusks, in Alaska demonstrate a large die off, probably because of a large meteorite. It caused a new Cold cycle.

35,000 Generally considered the beginning of the last Ice Age. Which covered most of England, Germany etc.

Appears to be in northern hemisphere only.

Some place its start around 25,000. It began to abate around 15,000. Certainly no human types lived on or under the caps.

35,000 Asian people clearly do migrate into Europe.

The Neanderthals disappeared from SW France.

28,000 The discovery of what is believed to be the first Pottery

20,000 Last Neanderthal live out their final days in Spain.

Stone age footprints found in Australia, at 20,000 years old.

18,000 Pygmy people (Hobbit types) found on a small Island in Indonesia. (See 12,000 below.) China: Oldest pottery pot found in a cave. "S.N. 2009"

Human camp sites found in Virginia, along with Cactus Hill and Stone tools unlike Clovis. Dating is in issue "S.N. 1.21-09"

14,000 From a cave in Oregon USA, some found evidence of Human habitation. (Fire etc.)

13,950 Beginning of melt down of the Laurentide Ice Sheet in what is now Canada. Beginning of the end of the last Ice Age.

13,000 to 11,000 Considered to be the end of the last Ice Age. This was the last Maximum period of world Ice Age. Ice came below the great lakes in the U.S. In Europe it covered the Scandinavian Countries and about 1/2 of England. Some of the Southern Hemisphere was affected. All was colder and Glacier activity was greater.

Especially cold in New Zealand.

In Bolder Colorado there was a find of old Clovis Tools with a protein residue showing Camel, Bison, and Venison DNA.

12,900 Comet exploded over North America. It was a major disaster to the ecosystem and the history of life. It accelerated the end of the Ice Age and made it very cold for about 1,200 years.

Also, No Clovis tools found in North America after this time. (Clovis style is typical European.) One theory about North America is that people came here across the Ice shelf from Europe.

Clovis people Stone Age artifacts here are the same as those in Europe and unlike those in Asia.

12,000 Pygmy people inhabited Indonesia (Hobbits).

Some claim this date is better than the 18,000.

Average Height of around 3 feet.

Also claim of Aliens crashing in China Grobo stones. Dropo small people. Huh! What? Israel. A women Shaman was found buried.

Many tools of a shaman This date is considered the beginning of the great lakes and Niagara Falls as the Ice Cap retreated north. The Great lakes were believed to be created in more ancient rivers that flowed under the cap.

At Bigger in S. Lanarkshire, Scotland, flints were found dated to 12,000. No mention if Clovis or not. "The highlander, Nov. 2009"

11,000 Clovis tools found in North America. May have been older as the dating method was not great.

This is important because Clovis tools came from Europe, not Asia.

10,000 Humans cross the Bering Sea to North America, Mastodon dies out in North American.

Saber Toothed Tiger still in North America.

From this time until about 7,500 the Sahara was green with Monsoon Rains.

What is now England was connected to France.

The land between them was called Doggerland.

As the Ice age retreated, water covered Doggerland.

9,300 Kennewick man. Male skeleton found in 1996 in the banks of the Columbia river, Washington.

“S.N. 1-21-09”

9,000 Considered by many as the dawn of agricultural efforts.

8,400 Lake Agassiz, largest fresh water lake in the world, (Caused by Glacier melting in North America) last drained north into Ocean, causing all manner of changes. It had started its drain about 13,000 Years ago. This last big drain was via the Hudson by and raised Ocean levels by 2.5 meters and set in motion a 400 year climate adjustment.

8,000 Petro glyphs in Central Norway North Sea oil exploration demonstrates that England was connected to France by a low lying land called Doggerland.

7,500 Arrow Head found on U.S. East Coast.

Sahara drying up.

5,500 Stone Age cave paintings and small sculptures in Norway.

Horse domesticate in the Steppes.

Evidence of metal working appears.

5,300 Iceman found in 1991 in the Italian Alps Dark Hair and Eyes. Believed to be Celtic. Probably a former leader who was chased out of his community.

5,000 The rise of the Egyptian Population and Empires. A large Copper and Bronze factory was found in Jordan.

Central Asia, uncovered evidence of horses being cared for and milked.

4004 The biblical year of the Flood.

4000 Caucasian found in West Asia in the Tarrin Basin. Evidence of Beer making found in Mesopotamia In Peru, in a dessert Cave, gold jewelry was found. Earliest discovery in this part of the world. And a good time was had by all until about 600 AD.

The upper great lakes broke through into what we call Lake Huron and Erie. The water then flowed to the Atlantic.

Greenland findings of Hominids shows they had Brown eyes, dark skin, thick brown hair, DNA suggests their closest relative to be the Chukchis found in Eastern Siberia. Probably came across the northern lands.

3,400 Greek civilization begins and lasts until 146 BC when conquered by the Romans.  
Science News 1/30/10

3,000 Stonehenge was begun with the smaller stones.

Some other stone works in Scotland have been placed at this time. The Largie Stones in Argil

2,500 On the Shetland Islands evidence of metal working homo types.

Pyramid in Egypt.

2,000 Celtic people are believed to have populated the Volga area and are generally classified as Indo European Many groups comprise the Celtic movement. They spread East and West. They developed the 1st coins the storage of grain.

Domesticate Citrus began in The Fertile Crescent, Middle East.

Evidence of humans living in Southern Peru to about 1250. Desert between present day Peru and Chili 1,800 Only 3 percent of humans lived in Cities. 2007 the percent is over 50 percent.

1,500 Celtic Migration into Europe begins Stone wheeled cart found in Armenia, and Asia.

Stonehenge monument is abandoned and falls into disrepair.

1,390 Norse people 1220 Norse artifacts found in Greenland.

1200 Beginning of the Iron Age

1000 Polynesian's first sailed to Hawaiian Islands.

900 Europe Bronze age in full bloom

866 First Norse invasion of Northern Scotland where they found Pictish people.

800 First Polynesian arrives in New Zealand.

790 Norse invade England's Coast and rule Dublin for 300 years etc.

600 Iron Age comes on strong.

540 Greek Hecataeus writes of Keltia people.

Barbarians 400 Celtic People invade Roman Empire.

BC/AD 100 AD Julius Caesar Invades Gaul. (France)

600 AD Beginning of the Islamic Faith

1148 First Crusade to free holy Land from Islam.

Knights Templar led the way. They finally lost the Holy Land to Islamic people in 1239.

1645 Little Ice Age hit the world for several years. It made Greenland so cold that the Vikings abandoned it.

End of Chronology.

NOTES

1- DNA: It seems everyone is relying on DNA to prove everything and of course it has been used to claim that we are from the womb of one lady who lived in Africa. The

mother of all moms. DNA has its place, but when you stretch out the mathematical variables to track to one lady you have joined the inmates. Besides who was her mate? Her Parents and on and on. Was it immaculate?

2- Cro-Magnon Man: Unlike the Neanderthal the Cro-Magnon simply became us, sort of, Today the term seems to mean Early Humans. Of all the populations in the world, the Finnish people seem to have the most look-a- like to the Cro-Magnon. DNA studies place the Cro-Magnon in the East, Middle East, and Northern Africa. Some has been found in Native Americans in the USA so maybe these were the guys that brought Clovis tools across the Ice Shelf to North America.

3- For Hominid discussions go to [talorigins.org/faqa/homs/species.html](http://talorigins.org/faqa/homs/species.html) Attached: Triassic Legacy. (Go to the Rooster crows.com)

Writers Note: I began this Chronology because, as a trial Attorney, I found doing so helped me understand any sequence of events. Further, I was concerned that to deny students the opportunity to study all theories of the arrival of Homo sapiens was counter productive. I am not a religious person, but from what I knew, evolutionists were no more right than the creationists. This Chronology proves it. Let Students decide for themselves. It is not ours to dictate.

2010 For further information contact the author at <http://theroostercrows.net>

Email contact: [rooster@west.net](mailto:rooster@west.net)

###