

Counterpunching Obama's Defenders

The Problem: Obama's defenders reel off quick stats to defend his record, overwhelming Conservatives.

My solution: Undercut them; don't get embroiled in endless back-and-forth.

1. "We've created 12 million jobs."
 - a. ***But we've added about 18 million people.***
 - b. Besides, since far more people are working part-time now, how is that figure trustworthy?
 - c. If an employer ***splits one full-time job into two part-time jobs*** (a common occurrence under Obamacare), ***that's called "one job created."***

2. "Unemployment is at 5½%."
 - a. ***Why use a fake figure?***
 - b. Millions have left the workforce, so they're not counted. But they still don't have jobs!
 - c. Here's a novel concept: Let's use a figure that ***actually describes how many people are working!*** The Labor Participation Rate is nearly the lowest in 35 years.
 - d. The Unemployment Rate has one good use—comparing job growth from state to state. In this comparison, Republican-led states drastically outperform Dem-led states.
 - e. So, just ***how bad would Obama's performance look without the GOP-led states?***
 - f. One last thing: The biggest driver of overall job creation has come from oil and gas fracking, which Obama opposes. Tell me, what has he done to actually create jobs?

3. "The Stock Market is hitting all-time highs."
 - a. ***Of course it is—for the wrong reasons.***
 - b. It's being propped up by hyper-money-printing and borrowing through Quantitative Easing. ***Thus, stocks are worth more dollars, but the dollars are worth less.*** Whoopdeedoo...
 - c. It's also been ***sustained by ridiculously low interest rates.***
 - d. Btw, ***this also drove up oil prices,*** until the fracking boom and Saudi's actions against Iran.
 - i. Suppose an OPEC nation says they'll sell you a barrel of oil for \$60.
 - ii. You say, "Great! We'll just go print up a trillion more dollars and be right back!"
 - iii. They'll say, "Are you kidding? You've printed more paper, but it represents the same economy! Now we're charging \$85!"
 - iv. Looking at any comparative graph, you'll see our skyrocketing money printing—which drove up the stock market—also drove up your price at the pump.
 - v. Unlike oil, stock prices can't be lowered by fracking booms or Mideast power struggles.

4. "We've had a zillion straight months of recovery after Bush's recession."
 - a. ***EVERY RECESSION BRINGS A RECOVERY—IT'S A NATURAL CYCLE.***
 - b. This is because recessions are either bubble-bursting corrections (like inflated tech stocks and housing prices) or the result of disasters. In any case, the economy eventually overcomes the issue and roars back—hence, "recovery."
 - c. Btw, "Bush's Recession" was caused by the Dot-Com Bust, 9-11, Hurricane Katrina, and the housing collapse. By comparison, Obama has had it incredibly easy.

- d. That said, Obama’s “recovery” has been abysmal. ***Our GDP growth has averaged less than half the rate we enjoyed under Reagan’s recovery.*** That’s incredibly huge.
 - e. In real recoveries, household buying power doesn’t drop—like it’s been doing, big time.
 - f. Finally, ***our latest surge is based largely on cheap oil,*** no thanks to Obama.
5. “Obama ‘got’ Bin Laden.”
- a. ***Obama didn’t “get” Bin Laden.*** Intel got him—intel that was gained by teams for whom Bush greatly increased funding, and with techniques Obama opposed.
 - b. Then, after others tracked Bin Laden down and planned the attack, Obama was left with ***the easiest decision in US Presidential history: Just okay the final hit.*** Just say “yes.”
 - c. Think about it: If you get him, everyone cheers. If you miss, everyone says, “Hey, it was worth a try.” For the president OK’ing the final hit, no courage is needed; no thought required.
 - d. One last point: If “getting” Bin Laden were some indicator of Obama’s foreign policy brilliance, ***wouldn’t we see more examples throughout his presidency?*** Instead, he’s lost Iraq, botched Syria, infuriated Israel, empowered ISIS, rolled over for Putin, missed the march against terrorism (dear Lord, he actually sent James Taylor to sing afterward...)—***wherever Obama draws a red line, bad guys see a starting line.***
 - e. So yes, as long as every move is ***the easiest decision in US Presidential history,*** he’s fine.
6. But here’s the biggest point on Obamanomics: PRICE TAG.
- a. Under Obama’s watch, we’ve spent over \$8 Trillion more than we’ve raised in taxes. ***That’s over \$26,000 for every person—over \$130,000 for a family of five—in 6½ years.***
 - b. Reagan Comparison:
 - i. Reagan’s deficit spending was about \$5,500 per person for his whole presidency.
 - ii. **Results?** Obama has the worst Labor Participation Rate in 35 years (62.8%), while Reagan left office with our LPR at 66.5% and climbing.
 - iii. **Perspective:** So, if we had Reagan instead of Obama, the difference would be:
 - 1. About \$100,000 (\$70,000 inflation adj.) per family of 5 ***not added to the deficit.***
 - 2. Yet, we’d have about ***10 million more jobs created.***
 - 3. And still, our ***military would be robust*** and powerful.
 - c. Bottom line: ***Obama’s price tag is too high!*** Suppose I said you can have new Lexus. Great, right? But then suppose I said it will cost you \$3 million. Is it still worth it?
 - d. Try asking Obama’s defenders this question: “What if, instead of all these failing programs, we had just given everyone half what we wasted—\$13,000 of ***extra*** spending money—over and above what they were already making? How pressed for money would every family of five be with an ***extra*** \$65,000 over these past 6½ years?”
 - i. “Would ANY business be short of customers?”
 - ii. “Would ANYONE be laying off employees?”
 - iii. “So you wouldn’t just have lots of extra money—you’d have tons of jobs!”
 - iv. “Sure, deficit spending is still wrong, but you’d get better results on half the money.”

Game, Set, and Match.

Close each topic with one question: “Tell me, would you have such low expectations for any other president?”