



## Back to Basics, a Necessity

Toddy Littman, Wednesday 03 October 2012 - 14:09:40

It would seem the genius of We The People, as it is often referred to in The Federalist Papers, has been thwarted by our educations. Many may immediately argue this fact, however, irrespective of the educational facts we set aside, there remains our approach, our angle and perspective, how we derive our conclusions. Much of this can be taught both by what we reject and what we accept, a sort of tugging of these back and forth in order to confuse, debase, and destabilize a variety of natural and inherent knowledges we gained from our parents. Those who may dismiss such a notion, please see

<http://web.archive.org/web/20090423190627/http://www.nea.org/tools/17231.htm>. So now, let's look at Romney's comment: "There are 47 percent of the people who will vote for the president no matter what. All right, there are 47 percent who are with him, who are dependent upon government, who believe that they are victims, who believe the government has a responsibility to care for them, who believe that they are entitled to health care, to food, to housing, to you-name-it -- that that's an entitlement. And the government should give it to them. And they will vote for this president no matter what. ... These are people who pay no income tax. ... [M]y job is not to worry about those people. I'll never convince them they should take personal responsibility and care for their lives." How many of you have heard the question, and listened to pundits and others ask, What's Romney's plan for seniors? or What's Romney's plan for healthcare? or the classic Republicans want dirty air, dirty water, etc. ? If you let these questions become a means of making your decision, first understand that Ronald Reagan, a Republican, was the one that established the conservation movement, which had been very successful. However, eventually, the power of it (assumed in it being successful) was targeted by the left, and this was taken over to become what we know today as environmentalists (they had to change the name from conservation as that would remind people it was a conservative, a Hollywood film cowboy who appreciated nature and instituted the land conservation and preservation movement as an element of government). Next, however, are the aspects that heinously align with what Romney said, for these questions directly set forth the mentality he described, and the destructive force of the NEA union (established in 1857) backed public school education, that approach and perspective training we received, irrespective of whatever we rejected of their direct informational education. What self-reliant, independent American who believes in caring for themselves, believes they own their own property, and takes care of themselves, would entertain the idea government should take care of them, (code phrase protect you from \_\_\_[ fill in the blank]\_\_\_)? This is how healthcare was sold to us! Remember when the president said this about Doctors?....

Google if you wish to determine the accuracy of his statement about why doctors amputate, because my purpose here is to address the purpose of such a statement, to couch doctors as something to protect you **from**, and how a government regulated and run healthcare system would protect you from the evil doctor, and this speech was given to sell us on healthcare. So now, understanding Obamacare is intended to protect us from these menaces to society, doctors, who altogether, as a collective, carry on this heinous activity purely for the money every time they amputate, it is another class of rich to demonize, apparently. Notice the Progressives never came out and said that Obama needs to qualify what percentage of doctors have been sued and lost based on this claim, how often it is proven beyond any doubt that what the doctor is paid for an amputation is the basis for his decision. No one included, nor has any leftist requested, the stats on how many people actually were properly treated and eventually were required to lose a foot akin to seniors who do not pay income taxes as related to Romney's comment. Yet, Obama said this and has gotten away with it in spite of it being the direct sales pitch of Obamacare, a law the American People never asked for, and passed at a time when the President was telling us Jobs are my top priority. Anyone notice that unemployment hasn't dropped since the passage of



Obamacare? And of course, the hypocrisy of passing a new tax to create jobs, in a country where private enterprise is the economic engine from its founding, hasn't been taken to task either. These are the illustrations of what I call the NEA head, a means of thought, approach, receipt, and acceptance, that show one's basis of reason has been molded and shaped to initiate, and give weight to, the same point of determination that the collectivists embrace: being taken care of. Romney, and hopefully no republican, has ANY plan for seniors, or healthcare, but comprehends the true meaning of regulation, meaning to make regular those activities that cause the highest ethical standards without placing an undue burden on anyone except those who would act in a manner inconsistent with the industry being regulated the lawbreakers aren't fictional characters created by a bunch of academics in government, but are those who are breaking away from the tradition of an industry that has led to its success in a free market economy. In this way the regulation supports the industry and those practices of good behavior and good sense, instead of regulations being a means of dictatorial imposition subject to fines, and thereby, merely a means of government revenue. And if you missed it, the reason we want less regulation (as it is today, a mechanism just to generate government revenues) and a straight taxation, instead of a Progressive one, is to assure incentive in the people to create, to embrace their job and eventually pursue an entrepreneurial endeavor, and every desire as well as opportunity to become as successful as possible. It is in this way that the limits claimed of money, of resources, etc., are broken through. Democrats often refer to the glass ceiling of a woman being President. I submit the glass ceiling of oil reserves, of money sitting in banks that belongs to us, and of upward mobility from poverty, and many others, are imposed as a matter of course on victims who have accepted that they failed as though it is to be worn as a badge of honor, and seeing more and more regulations in their way, have given up to never try again. Is this the American we want to be? Is this the American that will assure an America of free people will exist in the future? Are you sure you aren't one of these Americans? Get away from the noise of assumption and the many notions that spur on the voice of some teacher or professor in your head when reviewing this article, and instead, try thinking entirely on your own, then consider, reflect, and come to terms. Thank you for reading, Toddy Littman