

From: Gregory Brown <[REDACTED]>

To: undisclosed-recipients;

Bcc: jeevacation@gmail.com

Subject: Greg Brown's Weekend Reading and Other Things.... 11/11/12

Date: Sun, 11 Nov 2012 20:00:42 +0000

Attachments: The Permanent Militarization of America Aaron OConnell NYT November 4, 2012.pdf; Military-Industrial Complex Speech, Dwight D. Eisenhower, 1961.pdf; U.S. approaches 'fiscal cliff' =?WINDOWS-1252?Q?ff,=92 and world watches from ? = the sidelines Howard Schneider TWP November 2, 2012.pdf; Middle class faces quick impact from fiscal cliff in form of alternative minimum tax Loir Montgomery TWP November 4, 2012.pdf; 6 Reasons Why the 2012 Election Will Be Considered Historic Huff Post November 7, 2012.pdf; Sandy Versus Katrina Paul Krugman NYT November 4, 2012.pdf; Karl Rove, American Crossroads Spin GOP Election Losses Amanda Terkel Huff Post 11_08_12.pdf; Californians Say Yes to Taxes New York Times Editorial November 8, 2012.pdf; Let's Not Make a Deal Paul Krugman NYT November 8, 2012.pdf; The Real Loser, Truth Kevin Kruse NYT November 5, 2012.pdf; Romney Had a Chance to Beat Obama, and He Blew It Noam Scheiber The New Republic November 7, 2012.pdf; The Fact Checker, Would a tax hike on the wealthy kill 700,000 jobs TWP 11_09_12.pdf; Conservatives Struggle To Explain How Mitt Romney Lost 2012 Presidential Election Huff Post November 9, 2012.pdf; Reality crashes the Republican Party Sandy Banks LATimes November 9, 2012.pdf; The Election is Over — Now What Moyers & Company November 8, 2012.pdf

Dear Friends.....

First of all I would like to start this week offerings with a **CONGRATULATIONS to President Barack Obama and Vice President Biden**, their campaign team and supporters on their decisive win in Tuesday's Presidential Election. Against all odds, including a lack-luster economic economy, obstruction by Republicans in Congress to defeat every policy, legislation and action that might be considered an accomplishment by their Administration, (*October 2010, Senator Mitch McConnell, the Republican leader, famously told The National Journal, "The single most important thing we want to achieve is for President Obama to be a one-term president."*) they defeated Mitt Romney, Paul Ryan whose campaign and outside supporters outspent them by more than several hundred million dollars. Especially when they beat a successful businessman who claimed the skills, experience and policies that would generate 12 million jobs, planned to spend trillions of dollars more on defense and somehow cut taxes on a way to balancing the budget, by getting rid of unnecessary Federal Programs and government fat. If this sentence sounds ridiculous, it's because it is..... To think that a community organizer, with African roots and was "lazy" as former Republican Governor John Sununu claimed, could somehow out-flank with policies and out-organize a better ground-game than the Romney (*who had been running full-time for President for the past six years*) and his campaign team was so difficult for them to conceive, that even after the Romney conceded the election their supporter were still in denial. The fact that not only did President Obama beat Romney with a plurality of more than 3.5 million votes, his campaign strategy led to an Electoral College landslide of 332 to 206 votes, you would think that Republicans would want to try to figure out why their policies only attracted a majority of white men and senior citizens. It is because as Liberal/Progressive political satirist Bill Maher would say, they live in a bubble. How else can you explain that

Republican conservatives suggesting that President Obama and Democrats not see his landslide election as a mandate to implement the policies and legislation that not only this but his 2008 election promised.

In the 2012 election voter breakdown: 72 percent of voters were white, 13 percent African American, 10 percent Latino and 3 percent Asian, with the President receiving 40% of the white 93% of the African American, 71% of Latino, 73% of the Asian votes, 76% of gays and lesbians, 60% of voters under 30 and 55% of women. Again, President Obama won in almost every category of voters except senior citizens and white men. Based on both miscalculation and hubris the Romney campaign believed that if they played to the Conservative whites, especially evangelicals coupled with supporters suppressing voting in non-white areas, (*Pennsylvania House Majority Leader Mike Turzai bragging, "the new Voter ID laws which is going to allow Governor Romney to win the state of Pennsylvania, DONE!"*), they could eke out a win. As such, both Romney and his Vice Presidential running-mate embraced ultra-conservatives policies and rhetoric (*such as – Rep. Paul Ryan took part in a last minute conference call with evangelical Christians, in a desperate attempt to play the religious card he accused President Obama of "Taking America on a dangerous path that restricts freedom and liberty and Judeo-Christian Values"*) to shore up their Tea Party – Christian Coalition laden base, that were offensive to Blacks, Latinos, Asians, gays and women, and the fact that they are playing the blame game instead of looking for policies that will attract these same people voted against them is a example of why they lost the Presidential election and why the Democrats picked up seats in both houses of Congress. But the real big ugly in the Presidential Election is that Republicans blindness never saw the landslide coming as Romney was so confident of a win that he didn't even prepare a concession speech and supporters like Karl Rove were still other supporters still believed that they were winning even after they were told that Obama had already won a majority of Electoral College votes, with states to spare, the election was a rout and Romney and the Republican Conservative Platform was road-kill.

To all of my Republican friends who still think that Mitt Romney would have been a better president than President Obama, forget the outcome of the election, because the fact that Romney (*who is suppose to be a data wonk*) was so blind to metrics of the election that like many boxers he didn't see the punch coming and as such didn't realize the fight was over until he woke-up.... Who is incompetent? And ask yourself, is this the person who you would like to answer the proverbial 3am call? Again... **CONGRATULATIONS** to President Obama, Vice President Biden, as well as to all other candidates whether you are Republicans, Democrats and Independents – federal, state and local, on your wins..... As this is democracy.... **But it is nice when you guy, gal, team or horse wins....**

"Democracy — this is still the most radical idea ever let loose in the world — that masses of people, so feared and loathed by monarchs of old, so distrusted by moneyed and political elites, should be charged with self-government, and get on with it, imperfectly, crudely, but with the idea of creating a prosperous society that leaves no one out. That's not mystical, either. It's been at the heart of the American experience, the hope that sustains one generation to the next. Every election is an effort to retrieve that radical idea and breathe new life into it."

Spending by candidates, political parties and outside groups is projected to hit an unprecedented \$6 billion when all expenses are tallied. Republican megadonors placed a huge bet on red in this election and lost. Outside spending in presidential and congressional races surpassed \$1 billion with more than \$715 million targeting President Obama, who won a second term, and congressional Democrats, who strengthened their grip on the Senate in the face of record independent spending. The withering advertising barrage also did little to change the partisan makeup of the House, where Republicans maintained their majority. *"They spent \$1 billion, and got a return of the status quo,"* said Anthony Corrado, a campaign-finance expert at **Colby College** in Maine. Republican groups prevailed in roughly a third of the contests where they outspent Democratic organizations, according to a **USA TODAY** analysis of races with at least \$1 million in outside political activity in the general election. Spending by liberal groups appeared to be more effective: Democrats won two-thirds of the races in which Democratic-leaning groups outspent Republicans, the analysis shows.

The Sunlight Foundation has calculated the “*return on investment*” of the so-called super PACs in this year’s election. These groups are not officially linked to candidates for office. They received at least \$1.3 billion from anonymous donors, to spend on attack ads and other advocacy not specifically promoting a candidate. The biggest “loser” is the **National Rifle Association**, which spent \$10.9 million in the general election. None of the NRA’s “*investments*” paid off in defeat of the candidates they preferred, according to the foundation. The next **American Crossroads**, a super PAC backed by former George W. Bush administration strategist Karl Rove — had a lower rate of return than any other group in the general election, according to a tally by the non-partisan **Sunlight Foundation**. Overall, **American Crossroads** and an affiliated nonprofit, spent more than \$175.8 million during the entire election cycle. Of the 10 candidates they spent the most to defeat, only one — Nevada Democratic Rep. Shelley Berkley — lost races and gained the desired result with only 1 percent of that sum. More than \$113 million targeted Obama. The **U.S. Chamber of Commerce** super PAC spent \$31.9 million, but only 5 percent of it helped their desired candidates win. Likewise, the same return on investment as the **American Future Fund**, which spent \$23.6 million. “The surprise winner on Election Day may have been the labor movement,” the foundation reports, citing an 84 percent return on investment for the **Service Employees International Union’s** \$15.2 super PAC spending; a 70 percent ROI for **SEIU’s Committee on Political Education PAC**; and 69 percent each for the Majority PAC (\$34.3 million) and **Women Vote!** (\$6 million). Other billionaire donors touted their accomplishments. New York City Mayor Michael Bloomberg spent more than \$8.2 million in the final weeks of the campaign to aid candidates who back his positions on gun control and gay marriage. He also gave \$750,000 to support successful same-sex marriage initiatives in four states, said Stefan Friedman, a spokesman for **Bloomberg’s Independence USA PAC**.

These monies do not include money spent by the presidential candidates’ super PACs — \$68 million by Obama’s **Priorities USA Action**, and \$146 million by Romney’s **Restore Our Future**. their won/loss percentage is pretty obvious. And although many people felt that the new oceans of unbridled money into politics as a result of the **Citizen’s United Decision**, would skew the 2012 election, this didn’t happen as both houses of Congress stayed pretty much the same with President Obama was re-elected. Where money will make a huge difference is in congressional, state and local elections, as well as with voter propositions.

Echoing both California voters and the **New York Times editorial** applauding the state’s voters for approving temporary tax increases to raise \$6 billion a year to shore up the state’s tattered public schools and university system. The President said in an address Friday, on **The State of the Economy**, the country’s top priority has to be jobs and growth, as well as reduce our deficit in a balanced and responsible way. He emphasized that the only way to do this is combining spending cuts with revenue, with the wealthy of Americans to pay a little more in taxes. He made it clear that although he has offered a detailed plan that would cut the deficit by \$4 trillion over the next decade, he is not wedded to every detail of his plan and is open to compromise and new ideas. Instead of saying what President Bush said after being re-elected in 2004, “*I got political capital and I intend to use it*”, (I won and elections have consequences), the President’s language was akin to “*I won and allot of people agree with me, now I am open to your ideas but let’s actually get something done.*” Since earlier Friday morning Republican Speaker of The House said that he was open to compromise and open to ideas, hopefully the elusive grand bargain for a long-term economic plan can be closed before the end of the year.

After accepting the accolades that we are a “*just society*” with the country having elected its first African American President and quickly finding out that unlike Justice Clarence Thomas, Barack Obama was his own man intent of instituting legislation to insure more fairness in banking, healthcare and the holy grail taxes, Republicans went about doing everything they could to obstruct any legislation that could be seen as an accomplishment and as Senator Mitch McConnell, the Republican leader, famously told The National Journal In October 2010 , “The single most important thing we want to achieve is for President Obama to be a one-term president.” Part of this drive was to illegitimize the President, claiming that he is aloof, uppity, not born in

America, not one of us and worse to demonize him as the person who will destroy America so as they could...
"take our country back."

Nowhere was this more evident that today's Republicans are living in *"a bubble"* — ignoring the demographic change in the country, as they convinced themselves and Mitt Romney that he was definitely going to win the election. Of course Karl Rove, O'Reilly, Donald Trump, Rush Limbaugh and other Republican party stalwarts — who consider themselves supporters of the tea party movement — the ultra-conservative activist segment that now dominates the Republican Party, but many mainstream Republicans drank the kool-aid too.

1. Dick Morris: "This is going to be a landslide." The former Clinton adviser predicted a dominant Romney win, calling it "the biggest surprise in recent American political history." Claiming that polls were oversampling Democrats, Morris wondered if "it will rekindle the whole question on why the media played this race as a nailbiter."

2. Roger Kimball: "Obama is toast." The publisher of prominent right-wing book imprint Encounter Books and a frequent contributor to conservative outlets, Kimball boldly predicted that Romney "is going to win, big time." It was easy, he could "tell you in three syllables and a few numbers... Ben-gha-zi." Though the Benghazi story played big in right-wing media before the election, a vanishingly small number of voters reported foreign policy being the top priority in the election — let alone the Embassy issue, which the Romney campaign had completely dropped in the stretch.

3. Karl Rove: "At least 279 electoral votes." "It comes down to numbers. And in the final days of this presidential race, from polling data to early voting, they favor Mitt Romney," Rove wrote in a WSJ op-ed ignoring the fact that most polls showed growing momentum for the president. He predicted that Romney will win 51 percent of the popular vote and "at least 279 electoral votes."

4. Peggy Noonan: "There is no denying the Republicans have the passion now." Noonan is one of the most respected political columnists in the country despite her penchant for deciding things based on her gut rather than actual data. But her Romney prediction wasn't exactly well thought out even by her own standard. According to Noonan, "all the vibrations [were] right" for a Romney win because "something old was roaring back." While this might be the right way to open an H.P. Lovecraft novel, it probably isn't the best way to think about presidential elections.

5. Larry Kudlow: "Yes, that's right: 330 electoral votes." CNBC personality Larry Kudlow bet Romney would "sweep the Midwest," a point on which Michigan, Wisconsin, and Ohio beg to differ. He was so excited about his prediction that Romney would get 330 votes that he repeated it twice — despite the fact that he was making the call two weeks out from the election.

6. Fred Barnes: "Romney will be elected the 45th president of the United States." Barnes, the editor of the Weekly Standard, didn't attach a particular number to his prediction, but his reasoning for betting on Romney was beyond silly. According to Barnes, despite the fact that "there's no empirical evidence" that undecided voters break for the challenger before the election, "it helps Romney." He also bet that Romney would win because of significant advantages among seniors, evangelicals, and gun owners — that is to say, Republicans.

7. Michael Barone: "Fundamentals usually prevail in American elections." Considered by many to be the dean of Washington politics coverage, Barone predicted a 315-223 Romney blowout in which Romney took easy Obama states like Pennsylvania and Wisconsin. Barone's principal reason for calling it huge for Romney, the economic fundamentals, looks even stranger, as they actually favored Obama.

8. Dean Chambers: "The race has shifted profoundly in favor of Mitt Romney." It appears the election has unskewed the unskewer. Chambers, the proprietor of the famous "correcting biased polls" UnskewedPolls.com, made two predictions before the election. While both obviously called a Romney win, the first one predicted a landslide — 359 electoral votes, even larger than Barone's — the second, more sober assessment called a more modest 275. Chambers may owe Nate Silver, whom he described as "a man of very small stature, a thin and effeminate man with a soft-sounding voice that sounds almost exactly like the 'Mr. New Castrati' voice used by Rush Limbaugh on his program" in what appeared to be a takedown piece, something of an apology.

9. Newt Gingrich: "A Romney landslide." The former House Speaker predicted that Romney will take 53 percent of the popular vote and at least 300 electoral college votes. "My personal guess is you'll see a Romney landslide, 53 percent-plus . . . in the popular vote, 300 electoral votes-plus," Gingrich said. He also predicted that Republicans "may come very close to capturing control of the Senate." He apologized for the faulty call the morning after the election.

10. George Will: predicts 321-217 Romney landslide, "I'm projecting Minnesota to go for Romney," Will said. "It's the only state that's voted Democratic in nine consecutive elections, but this year, there's the marriage

amendment on the ballot that will bring out the evangelicals, and I think could make the difference.”

Now, we are seeing these same Republican Conservatives claim that President re-election, really doesn't mean much and as such he shouldn't take it as a mandate. As Vice President Biden would say, *"this is malarkey."* The people have spoken given President Obama giving him 61,811,225 or 50.5% of the votes over 58,580,193 or 47.9% votes for Governor Romney, resulting an Electoral College landslide of 332 to 206 vote in favor of the President. As both Presidential candidates wanted, this was a choice election. Governor Romney ran on a platform of smaller government and trickle-down economics and the President's message was for more economic fairness that includes raising taxes on the rich and enforcing regulations on business. ***As a result, I would definitely call President Obama's election a mandate and urge that politicians on both side to work together with him for the benefit of the country, the American People and the rest of the world. The country needs bold and decisive leadership with policies that benefit everyone and not just the very few at the top in hope that their benefits will trickle-down to the rest of America. And to my Republicans friends who are being told that American is a "central right" country, more malarkey.... we live in a more ethically diverse country who are more tolerant, believe in science, open to change, less militaristic and want economic fairness.... Sounds progressive / liberal to me....***

Weekend Reading

IN 1961, President Dwight D. Eisenhower left office warning of the growing power of the military-industrial complex in American life. Most people know the term the president popularized, but few remember his argument. Eisenhower called for a better equilibrium between military and domestic affairs in our economy, politics and culture. He worried that the defense industry's search for profits would warp foreign policy and, conversely, that too much state control of the private sector would cause economic stagnation. He warned that unending preparations for war were incongruous with the nation's history. He cautioned that war and war-making took up too large a proportion of national life, with grave ramifications for our spiritual health.

Although military spending in the US is less than 5% of the country's GDP the United States spends an enormous sum on defense — over \$700 billion last year, about half of all military spending in the world. Although the enormous spending on armaments may not have hampered employment and economic growth as much as the Permanent Militarization of America has sucked monies out of upgrading the country's infrastructure, education sector and safety net for those less fortunate, which has lead to the country being less competitive with an increasingly poorer quality of life. The real big ugly is that huge military spending encourages a foreign policy that has become increasingly reliant on military solutions. But Eisenhower's least heeded warning — concerning the spiritual effects of permanent preparations for war — is more important now than ever. Our culture has militarized considerably since Eisenhower's era, and civilians, not the armed services, have been the principal cause. From lawmakers' constant use of "support our troops" to justify defense spending, to TV programs and video games like "NCIS," "Homeland" and "Call of Duty," to NBC's shameful and unreal reality show "Stars Earn Stripes," Americans are subjected to a daily diet of stories that valorize the military while the storytellers pursue their own opportunistic political and commercial agendas. Of course, veterans should be thanked for serving their country, as should police officers, emergency workers and teachers. But no institution — particularly one financed by the taxpayers — should be immune from thoughtful criticism.

Like all institutions, the military works to enhance its public image, but this is just one element of militarization. Most of the political discourse on military matters comes from civilians, who are more vocal about "supporting our troops" than the troops themselves. It doesn't help that there are fewer veterans in Congress today than at any previous point since World War II. Those who have served are less likely to offer unvarnished praise for the military, for it, like all institutions, has its own frustrations and failings. But for non-veterans — including about four-fifths of all members of Congress — there is only unequivocal, unhesitating adulation. The political costs of anything else are just too high.

For proof of this phenomenon, one need look no further than the continuing furor over sequestration — the automatic cuts, evenly divided between Pentagon and non-security spending, that will go into effect in January if a deal on the debt and deficits isn't reached. As Bob Woodward's latest book reveals, the Obama administration devised the measure last year to include across-the-board defense cuts because it believed that slashing defense was so unthinkable that it would make compromise inevitable. But after a grand budget deal collapsed, in large part because of resistance from House Republicans, both parties reframed sequestration as an attack on the troops (even though it has provisions that would protect military pay). The fact that sequestration would also devastate education, health and programs for children has not had the same impact.

Eisenhower understood the trade-offs between guns and butter. "Every gun that is made, every warship launched, every rocket fired, signifies, in the final sense, a theft from those who hunger and are not fed, those who are cold and are not clothed," he warned in 1953, early in his presidency. "The cost of one modern heavy bomber is this: a modern brick school in more than 30 cities. It is two electric power plants, each serving a town of 60,000 population. It is two fine, fully equipped hospitals. It is some 50 miles of concrete highway. We pay for a single fighter plane with a half million bushels of wheat. We pay for a single destroyer with new homes that could have housed more than 8,000 people."

He also knew that Congress was a big part of the problem. (In earlier drafts, he referred to the "military-industrial-Congressional" complex, but decided against alienating the legislature in his last days in office.) Today, there are just a select few in public life who are willing to question the military or its spending, and those who do — from the libertarian Ron Paul to the leftist Dennis J. Kucinich — are dismissed as unrealistic.

The fact that both President Obama and Mitt Romney are calling for increases to the defense budget (in the latter case, above what the military has asked for) is further proof that the military is the true "third rail" of American politics. In this strange universe where those without military credentials can't endorse defense cuts, it took a former chairman of the Joint Chiefs, Adm. Mike Mullen, to make the obvious point that the nation's ballooning debt was the biggest threat to national security.

Uncritical support of all things martial is quickly becoming the new normal for our youth. Hardly any of my students at the Naval Academy remember a time when their nation wasn't at war. Almost all think it ordinary to hear of drone strikes in Yemen or Taliban attacks in Afghanistan. The recent revelation of counterterrorism bases in Africa elicits no surprise in them, nor do the military ceremonies that are now regular features at sporting events. That which is left unexamined eventually becomes invisible, and as a result, few Americans today are giving sufficient consideration to the full range of violent activities the government undertakes in their names.

Were Eisenhower alive, he'd be aghast at our debt, deficits and still expanding military-industrial complex. And he would certainly be critical of the "insidious penetration of our minds" by video game companies and television networks, the news media and the partisan pundits. With so little knowledge of what Eisenhower called the "lingering sadness of war" and the "certain agony of the battlefield," they have done as much as anyone to turn the hard work of national security into the crass business of politics and entertainment.

As Washington approaches the so-called "fiscal cliff," officials elsewhere around the world are worried that economic shock waves from major changes in U.S. tax and spending policies will rock countries around the world. If U.S. policymakers can't break their standoff over how to tame the federal deficit before the end of the year, dramatic increases in taxes and cuts in government spending will automatically start to kick in. Economists warn this could knock the world's biggest economy back into recession with spillover effects for other countries. The potential fallout from the U.S. fiscal cliff could move it to center stage, ahead of the European

debt crisis, as the most pressing risk to world economic growth. This is a reminder of the paramount role that the United States plays in the world economy.

Analyses by the International Monetary Fund, private analysts and credit-rating companies have all painted a grim picture if U.S. officials fail to resolve the current stalemate: a downturn in global trade; a sharp fall in commodity prices; a blow to confidence that could undermine investment and bank lending around the world.

“The US fiscal cliff represents the single biggest near-term threat to a global economic recovery,” the Fitch Ratings service said in a recent analysis. “[T]he dramatic fiscal tightening implied by the fiscal cliff could tip the US and possibly the global economy into recession. At the very least it would be likely to halve the rate of global growth in 2013.” If the fiscal cliff is not resolved and all the measures were to come into force, the United States, the U.S. would almost certainly be in recession next year and start dragging almost all of the major countries down with — with only a few major nations avoiding damage. The IMF has estimated that the automatic spending cuts and tax increases would knock perhaps four percentage points of growth off of a U.S. economy that is already only growing at 2 percent annually.

That means a serious blow to trade with Canada and Mexico — the countries likely to lose the most because their economies are so closely integrated with the United States. But it also means slower growth in China as U.S. imports fall, shaving perhaps as much as a full percentage point from a major Asian economy that is already slowing. Although Brazil, by world standards, has a relatively small portion of its economy tied up in trade, it relies heavily on commodity exports, so any downturn in manufacturing centers like China would likely mean Brazil earns less for its iron ore, copper and other commodities. Right now most countries are hoping that Washington will find a way to avoid the automatic tax hikes and spending cuts, because many in Brazil recall that their economy has suffered before from developments in the United States. The U.S. financial crisis that started in 2007 and spiked with the failure of Lehman Brothers dealt a stiff blow to Brazil’s economy. And repeated efforts by the U.S. Federal Reserve to lift the U.S. economy with massive infusions of cash is blamed in Brazil for a long list of local problems as money gushed from the United States into world markets. As such, people in Brazil and other counties are hoping that the fiscal cliff will not happen. See Howard Schneider’s article — ***U.S. approaches ‘fiscal cliff,’ and world watches from the sidelines***, in ***The Washington Post***.

As a way to deal with the “fiscal cliff” Congress is look at the alternative minimum tax, an obscure provision of the tax code that is about to become alarmingly relevant to millions of middle-class taxpayers because more than 26 million households will for the first time face the AMT, as it will tack \$3,700, on average, onto taxpayers’ bills for the current tax year. Because those people have never paid the AMT, they have no idea they are in its crosshairs — put there by a broader stalemate over tax policy that has kept Congress from limiting the AMT’s reach. Forget about the much-publicized tax hikes set to take effect for 2013 — if you have a couple of children and annual income over \$75,000, chances are good that your taxes are on track to go up substantially for 2012.

Residents of high-cost urban areas, including Washington, would be hit hardest, with about 2 million households in Maryland, Virginia and the District in line to face the AMT for the first time, by official estimates. Unlike most tax increases in the fiscal cliff, including the expiration of the George W. Bush-era income tax cuts, the AMT bill would come due almost immediately. And tax experts say it would be extremely disruptive to try to fix the AMT after the 2012 tax year closes Dec. 31.

Needless to say this would be an unmitigated disaster for U.S. taxpayers, especially since the IRS has advised Congress that trying to fix the AMT after the filing season begins in January would lead to processing delays of more than two months for nearly half of all returns — significantly postponing the delivery of refunds — as many people count on their refunds, which average around \$3,000, to cover immediate needs. Please feel free to look at Lori Montgomery’s article in ***The Washington Post***, ***Middle class faces quick impact from fiscal cliff in form of alternative minimum tax***.

The alternative minimum tax was created in 1969 to prevent the super-rich from using credits, deductions and other shelters to avoid taxes altogether. In simple terms, it's a flat tax with two brackets, 26 percent and 28 percent. Breaks for dependents, medical expenses, and state and local taxes are all disallowed. Instead, taxpayers get a single big deduction, called the AMT exemption, which usually rises with inflation. Taxpayers who owe more under AMT rules than under normal tax rules must pay the higher amount. Over the decades, the AMT has ceased to affect the extremely rich, because their tax bills are higher than the AMT rates. Instead, the inflation-adjusted AMT has come to target 4 million to 5 million taxpayers with annual incomes between \$200,000 and \$1 million. This year, however, a gridlocked Congress has failed to approve the inflation "patch" that prevents millions of people from falling into the AMT's grasp. The last patch expired in December. If a new one is not enacted, the AMT will hit 31 million taxpayers this year, reaching deeply into the middle class.

Nationwide, nearly one in five taxpayers is in line to pay the AMT. And while the levy is causing bipartisan nightmares, urban states — which tend to lean Democratic — are by far the most vulnerable. That poses a challenge for Democrats planning to use the fiscal cliff as leverage to force Republicans to raise taxes on the wealthy to help reduce the federal budget deficit. President Obama has threatened to veto legislation that extends the Bush tax cuts for the wealthiest 3 percent of households, a top GOP priority. With President Obama winning reelection and Republicans refuse to give in, Democrats say they are prepared to sail over the cliff and let the Bush tax cuts expire for everyone for the 2013 tax year. That would put them in position to press legislation in January to restore the Bush tax cuts — probably in a different form — for taxpayers earning less than \$250,000 a year.

But the AMT could throw a wrench into those plans, because there is no easy way to deal with the levy once the cliff is breached. For the moment, party leaders are blaming each other for not addressing the problem. To Republicans, the AMT is another reason to "extend all the expiring tax policy so we can overhaul the tax code to create jobs, spur economic growth and get rid of the AMT once and for all," said Antonia Ferrier, spokeswoman for Sen. Orrin G. Hatch (Utah), the senior Republican on the Senate Finance Committee. Democrats, meanwhile, accuse Republicans of holding AMT payers hostage in the pursuit of tax advantages for millionaires. "The fact that Republicans are willing to risk not doing an AMT patch — which has always been bipartisan and relatively noncontroversial — shows to what extreme they're willing to go to protect the wealthy few," said Sen. Charles E. Schumer (D-N.Y.). If both political parties continue to play this dangerous game of chicken, in addition to the certainty of a recession, the AMT will add another layer of economic pressure on many more American families.

Republicans love to quote Ronald Reagan's old joke that the most dangerous words you can hear are "I'm from the government and I'm here to help." During the Republican primary earlier this year, Mitt Romney and almost all of his Republican opponents said that if elected they would do their best to destroy an agency whose job is to say exactly that. And yes, it's hypocritical that the right-wing news media are now attacking Mr. Obama for, they say, not helping enough people. See pictures of the storm damage in the link:

<http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2225112/Superstorm-Sandy-Death-toll-hits-FIFTY-damage-set-50BILLION.html> For more information see: Paul Krugman's article in the **New York Times**, *Sandy Versus Katrina*.

The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) is an agency under the United States Department of Homeland Security was initially created and implemented by two Executive Orders on April 1, 1979 under the Carter Administration. The agency's primary purpose is to coordinate the response to a disaster that has occurred in the United States that overwhelms the resources of local and state authorities. The governor of the state in which the disaster occurs must declare a state of emergency and formally request from the president that FEMA

and the federal government respond to the disaster. While on-the-ground support of disaster recovery efforts is a major part of FEMA's charter, the agency provides state and local governments with experts in specialized fields and funding for rebuilding efforts and relief funds for infrastructure by directing individuals to access low interest loans, in conjunction with the Small Business Administration. Additionally, FEMA provides funds for training of response personnel throughout the United States and its territories as part of the agency's preparedness effort.

Climate change is real with the US experiencing huge storms with more and more frequency. More than ever the storm damage is crossing over multiple states. As such, it really requires a federal level response to help storm victims. And we can see how a strong federal government response such as which is currently happening that distinguishes the praise of President Obama in contrast to disastrous response to Katrina. And remember that last week when all local, state and federal offices were close during Sandy, FEMA was the only government office that was open and addressing the needs of those affected. The best line on this, comes from Stephen Colbert: "Who better to respond to what's going on inside its own borders than the state whose infrastructure has just been swept out to sea?"

In the **New York Times** editorial, *Californians Say Yes to Taxes* it applauds the sensible decision that California votes made on Tuesday when on a ballot initiative they approved temporary taxes increases to raise \$6 billion a year to shore up the state's tattered public schools and university system. The ballot measure, Proposition 30, was an audacious gamble by Gov. Jerry Brown. It was thoroughly derided by a well-financed opposition led by anti-tax conservative groups with undisclosed donors. It raises the state sales tax by one-fourth of 1 percent for four years and increases income taxes for seven years on those making more than \$250,000 a year, despite the "no new taxes" mantra of simplistic conservative politicians.

California's serial budget crises over many years have resulted in increased class sizes in schools, reduced instruction time and layoffs of thousands of teachers across the state. Meanwhile, students in the state's public colleges and universities have faced rising tuition, fewer campus resources and shrinking chances for enrollment. Officials say the ballot measure's approval will mean that public school systems will not have to reduce the length of school years and colleges will not have to raise tuition. It will also allow community colleges to restore thousands of classes and add 20,000 students. As is so often the case in California, where the 1978 property tax revolt led by Howard Jarvis became the stuff of political folklore, a new and unpredictable chapter may be opening. This week, voters also gave the Democrats, led by Governor Brown, two-third majorities in both houses of the State Legislature. This means that they will have "supermajority" control and the ability to raise taxes and pass other measures without Republican approval.

As one of the Californians who voted for this proposition, I believe that Grover Norquist and his conservative supporters are wrong to doubt that a large group of Americans aren't willing to raise taxes to enable to country to address education, healthcare, infrastructure repair and sure up the safety net for the poor, so that future generations have a better America to inherit.

Politics

Tuesday's election was important for many reasons. Its outcome will certainly benefit millions and millions of people -- both in the United States and around the world. And President Obama's campaign will be remembered as one of the best-run political efforts in the history of American politics. But beyond the many important short and mid-term consequences, I believe it will likely be remembered as an inflection point in American political history. Here are six reasons why:

- 1). This election was truly a battle for the soul of America. It presented Americans with the clearest choice in my lifetime between traditional progressive American values -- a vision of a society where we are all in this together on the one hand -- and a vision of a society in which everyone looks out first and foremost for himself alone on the other.
- 2). The right wing viewed this election as a critical opportunity to delegitimize progressive economic policies,

return to the trickle-down economics that they put in place during the Reagan and Bush Administrations, and abandon the social contract implicit in the New Deal. They failed.

3). America will implement ObamaCare.

4). This election will go down as the final chapter in the right-wing's "culture war." They lost.

5). Tuesday's election was a clear rejection of Romney's call to return to a Neo-Con lead foreign policy of go-it-alone recklessness and bluster.

6). This election made it clear that if the Republican Party continues its war on minorities, it is destined for political irrelevancy.

For more information see the attached article from *The Huffington Post*, **6 Reasons Why the 2012 Election Will Be Considered Historic**, as it articulates in detail why President Obama's win this week is more than the re-election of one person.

AGAIN: One of the biggest losers on Tuesday/November 6, 2012 was former George W. Bush administration strategist Karl Rove and his Super PAC, Crossroads organizations which spent more than \$300 million on Republican candidates in the 2012 election, with some of the biggest spenders in the conservative movement putting their hopes -- and dollars -- in the care of Rove. Combined, his groups were the largest single outside force of the 2012 election. According to the **Sunlight Foundation**, **American Crossroads**, Rove's super PAC, saw just a 1 percent return on its investments and **Crossroads GPS**, the political nonprofit arm, saw a 14 percent return. Rove remained in denial about GOP misfortunes on election night. Even after the networks had called Ohio for President Barack Obama, Rove continued to insist on Fox News that Republicans could win the state.

Rove said Obama was "lucky" Hurricane Sandy walloped the East Coast when it did because it "interrupted Mr. Romney's momentum and allowed Mr. Obama to look presidential and bipartisan." Rove also claimed that Obama and Democrats won through their ground game, which is something that super PACs and all their attack ads just can't control. But many Republicans aren't buying it. Having told his mega-donors that not only their money will help Mitt Romney defeat President Obama, he assured them that his strategy would enable the Republicans to recapture the US Senate. **American Crossroad Senatorial Losers include:** Connie Mack, Denny Rehberg, Tommy Thompson, George Allen, Heather Wilson and Todd Akin.

"The billionaire donors I hear are livid," one GOP operative told **The Huffington Post**. "There is some holy hell to pay. Karl Rove has a lot of explaining to do ... I don't know how you tell your donors that we spent \$390 million and got nothing." Even the blustery billionaire Donald Trump went after Rove on Twitter on Wednesday, writing, "Congrats to @KarlRove on blowing \$400 million this cycle." See the article by Amanda Terkel in **The Huffington Post**, **Karl Rove, American Crossroads Spin GOP Election Losses**. As my father would have said, "Karl Rove is trying to make the truth sound good and it ain't working."

Republicans across the country were shell-shocked that President Barack Obama defeated Mitt Romney in Tuesday's presidential election with a plurality of more than three million votes and finishing the race with 332 electoral votes while winning every battleground state except for North Carolina. The blame game began almost immediately, as Republicans looked to determine how a vulnerable incumbent like Obama had found a pathway to reelection. The evidence behind the president's victory points toward a stronger appeal to middle-class Americans, one of the most formidable ground games in the history of politics, and serious failures within the GOP to attract Latino and women voters. But a faction of conservatives were having none of it -- offering up instead a series of explanations for their nominee's loss, rounded up below:

- **The media selectively reported Romney's gaffes:** Rich Noyes of the conservative Media Research Center
- **Fact-checkers were biased:** Rich Noyes of the conservative Media Research Center
- **Hurricane Isaac hit the Tampa convention:** Christopher Ruddy at Newsmax
- **Romney was too nice:** Christopher Ruddy at Newsmax

- **Hurricane Sandy and Chris Christie get the blame:** Robert Stacy McCain wrote in the American Spectator
- **Obama won by “suppressing the vote.”:** GOP strategist Karl Rove
- **Romney wasn’t conservative enough:** Republican conservative leaders in the House of Representatives
- **Americans are basically ignorant:** Sen. Ron Johnson (R-Wisc.)
- **Liberals bought the election:** The Free Beacon
- **Obama was backed by the 47 percent:** Retiring Rep. Ron Paul (R-Texas)
- **America’s white establishment is now a minority:** Bill O’Reilly at Fox News

For further details please see **The Huffington Post** article this week: *Conservatives Struggle To Explain How Mitt Romney Lost 2012 Presidential Election*

Although I support the sentiment in Paul Klugman’s article this week in the **New York Times**, *Let’s Not Make a Deal*, I applaud the President who on Friday, because instead of taking a victory lap or reminding everyone who won the election with a huge mandate, on Friday in an address to the country on the state of the economy, he urged compromise and that he was open to other ideas as long as they were balanced. President Obama used the speech to remind everyone of his economic recovery plan that would reduce the deficit by \$4 trillion over the next decade, urging the House of representatives to immediately pass legislation that has already been passed that would extend the Bush Tax Cuts for the Middle Class which he described as everyone making under \$250 million a year or 98% of the people in America..... And then work together to pass a long term economic plan to grow the economy and reduce the deficit in balanced way.

Since President Obama has already outlined his position under the olive branch of compromise, if Republicans continue to obstruct his policies, like Krugman I suggest that the President play hardball, letting his Republican opponents know that he will allow both the Bush-era tax cuts and the Obama administration’s payroll tax cut are set to expire, as well as the automatic spending cuts in defense and elsewhere (sequestration) to expire. Consequently, Republicans will not be able to blackmail the President. Also, a tough stand by a President who is not up for re-election, gives Republicans the excuse to counter Grover Norquist and others, that voting for legislation that includes taxes, enabled the country to avoid sequestration. As such, President Obama should hang tough, declaring himself willing, if necessary, to hold his ground even at the cost of letting his opponents inflict damage on a still-shaky economy. The country spoke Tuesday, when it decisively re-elected President Obama as this endorsed his economic policies of a balance of spending cuts with a small tax increase on those who can afford it the most.

No matter who you voted for or supported, one of the ugly aspects of the 2012 election is that facts and truth did not matter by candidates and their supporters and not just on the Presidential or national level as distortions, innuendoes, fear mongering and out-right lies became mainstream in all parties. Kevin Kruse points this out in an article this week in the **New York Times**, *The Real Loser: Truth* – “*Venomous personal attacks and accusations of adultery, miscegenation and even bestiality are as old as the Republic. Aaron Burr was the sitting vice president when he killed Alexander Hamilton.*” And that since WW11, Candidates accordingly believed that being caught in an outright lie could damage their careers. Or as Daniel Patrick Moynihan famously said, “*Everyone is entitled to his own opinion, but not his own facts.*”

Brass-knuckle political campaigns are old as our nation but this most recent election including primaries in both parties, except that since the 1970s there are five major factors that have lowered the cost for politicians who lie and, more important, repeat their fabrications through their attack ads. **First** is the overall decline in respect for institutions and professionals of all kinds, from scientists and lawyers to journalists and civil servants. **Second** are changes in media regulation and ownership. **Third** began after 1987 when the Federal Communications Commission abolished the “*fairness doctrine*,” as political operatives realized they had more room to stretch the

truth. **The fourth** factor happened when most news organizations (with notable exceptions) abandoned their roles as political referees. Many resorted to an atrophied style that resembled stenography more than journalism, presenting all claims as equally valid. Fact checking, once a foundation for all reporting, was now deemed the province of a specialized few. I added a **fifth** factor, when news became entertainment as Paddy Chayefsky prognosticated news would morph into entertainment in search of greater ratings.

But while the line between fact and fiction in politics has always been fuzzy, a confluence of factors has strained our civic discourse, if it can still be called that, to the breaking point. But as this campaign has made clear, not even the dedicated fact-checkers have made much difference. PolitiFact has chronicled 19 “pants on fire” lies by Mr. Romney and 7 by Mr. Obama since 2007, but Mr. Romney’s whoppers have been qualitatively far worse: the “apology tour,” the “government takeover of health care,” the “\$4,000 tax hike on middle class families,” the gutting of welfare-to-work rules, the shipment by Chrysler of jobs from Ohio to China. Said one of his pollsters, Neil Newhouse, “*We’re not going to let our campaign be dictated by fact checkers.*” To be sure, the Obama campaign has certainly had its own share of dissembling and distortion, including about Mr. Romney’s positions on abortion and foreign aid. But nothing in it — or in past campaigns, for that matter — has equaled the efforts of the Romney campaign in this realm. Its fundamental disdain for facts is something wholly new. Kruse: The voters, of course, may well recoil against these cynical manipulations at the polls. But win or lose, the Romney campaign has placed a big and historic bet on the proposition that facts can be ignored, more or less, with impunity. AGAIN: The 2012 election is the ugliest in decades, as it has allowed politicians of all persuasions to feel free to ignore facts, distort their opponent’s policies and lie without any fear of consequences or retribution.

As Noam Scheiber points out in the article this week in **The New Republic**, *Romney Had a Chance to Beat Obama, and He Blew It* – that although the Obama campaign telegraphed its re-election strategy: First it would soften up Mitt Romney as the sort of heartless over-dog who could watch Seabiscuit and somehow root for his big scary rival. Then it would add a policy dimension to the argument, accusing Romney of wanting to cut taxes for the rich while defunding the programs the rest of us rely on. The personal argument would explain why Romney wanted to screw the middle class (*because he’s an economic overlord who looks down on them with disdain*). The policy argument would explain the how. The strategy worked with the President receiving three million more votes and 332 electoral votes. With Romney’s knowing the President’s playbook and raising more money to mount a response, we have to ask how did he lose, especially during a weak economy.

The Romney campaign clearly misread the landscape, as they believed that frustration with the economy would suffice to dislodge the president — that the race would ultimately be about the incumbent and not the challenger. But the race was never entirely a referendum on the struggling economy (which, as it happened, far more people still blame on George W. Bush rather than Obama). As it was also a referendum on fairness — how else to explain that 60 percent of voters nationally believe the rich should pay more taxes? In this sort of environment, Romney was never going to be an ideal candidate. But the refusal to make the slightest accommodation to Americans’ growing sense of grievance and explaining in detail that how “*his policies would produce a rising tide that will raise all boats, instead of sticking to trickle-down-economics*” will go down as a historical blunder.

Even after the election, it appears that Republicans are continuing to skew the facts and fudge the truth for political gain with the latest being: **Pete Sessions (R-Tex.)**, on Fox News, Nov. 8, 2012 saying “**The president wants to raise taxes on the wealthiest 2 percent of Americans. But what that does is it net loses 700,000 more American jobs that are really from people who need those jobs.**” And **House Speaker John Boehner (R-Ohio)**, Nov. 9 saying, “*According to Ernst & Young, raising the top rates would destroy nearly 700,000 jobs in our country.*” Which Boehner repeated at a news conference the morning this column appeared. According to an aide, Sessions obtained his figure from a study prepared last year by two economists at Ernst & Young for the Independent Community Bankers of America, the National Federation of Independent Business, the S Corporation Association and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce — all opponents of the president’s agenda. The

study is titled “*Long-run macroeconomic impact of increasing tax rates on high-income taxpayers in 2013.*” In other words, this is not an immediate impact, but the “*long run.*” You have to dig into the endnotes on page 22 to find a definition of long run: “*For models of this type, roughly two-third to three-quarters of the long-run effect is reached within a decade.*”

Oh. So, even if one accepts the assumptions in this model — a big “*if*” — it still means that the loss of 700,000 jobs would not come in the first year, or by the end of Obama’s second term, or even a decade from now. Yet Sessions says the jobs would be taken “*from people who need those jobs,*” suggesting it would have an immediate effect. (*Note: 700,000 jobs is a one-year figure, applying the long-run effect to today’s economy.*) Moreover, while 700,000 jobs sounds like a lot, it actually translates into one-half of 1 percent of total employment. Given that this is a long-term prediction, there is certainly a lot of room for error. So much is dependent on the assumptions in the model. There is also another revealing endnote: “*Using the additional revenue to reduce the deficit is not modeled.*” That means the analysts did not even study the effect of Obama’s stated purpose for raising taxes; the 700,000 figure assumes that the revenue raised from the tax increase would be used for increased government spending. Yet presumably any deal on fixing the fiscal cliff would result in a lower federal deficit, since all sides agree they have that goal.

The Pinocchio Test: Sessions is able to point to a study (though he stated the 700,000 figure as a fact), but on several levels his claim is misleading. First, the study was underwritten by the White House’s opponents. Second, the study never examined what Obama claims he will do with the revenue — dedicate it to deficit reduction. And finally, the figure is so “*long term*” — more than 10 years away — that it is absurd to suggest those jobs would be lost in the near term. **UPDATE:** Boehner did attribute the figure to Ernst & Young, but he went even further in saying the top rates would “*destroy*” 700,000 jobs. As we said, that is simply absurd....
Giving both comments – Three Pinocchios – A serious distortion bordering on a lie.

As Sand Banks pointed out this week in the **Los Angeles Times**, *Reality crashes the Republican Party.* — Republicans wondering what went wrong, it's not a matter of fine-tuning a message or finding minority candidates; It turns out this presidential election wasn't so much about race after all, the problem was a platform that was based on issues that it turned off immigrants, women, minorities, single mothers, young people, gays and lesbians. Images of winners and losers on election night said it all: the Norman Rockwell tableau in Romney's sullen Boston ballroom versus the kaleidoscopic diversity of Obama's Chicago victory montage. The America the Republicans want is not the one we have. According to exit polls, support for Obama came from 93% of blacks, 71% of Latinos, 73% of Asian Americans, 76% of gays and lesbians, 60% of voters under 30 and 55% of women. Conventional wisdom would credit the win to smart campaigning and coalition-building.

Barack Obama's romp took many by surprise. Even as Obama votes piled up on Tuesday night, political operative Dick Morris, who has worked both sides of the aisle, kept predicting a Mitt Romney landslide. It's hard to argue with the demographic dimensions of Obama's victory. He won in almost every category of voters except senior citizens and white men. That's led to lots of head-banging for GOP pundits: Romney might have won, they say, if he had eased up on illegal immigration and found a running mate who could attract Latinos or draw votes in swing states. But this is not a matter of fine-tuning the message or rustling up a candidate with brown skin or serviceable Spanish. The problem is a platform that staked out the far-right fringe on so many issues that it turned off immigrants, women, minorities, single mothers, young people, gays and lesbians. But these are not your classic ideological coalition, with shared interests and concerns. These are a collection of folks alienated, over time, by Republicans and their mission to return America to an era when some people had it really good — and whole groups of others had to settle for leftovers.

Yes, people vote their pocketbooks, but they also vote their passions. And these passions reflect not only their age and ethnic heritage, but the sort of personal lives that right-wingers have made clear they're not willing to abide. Women are having babies without marrying the fathers. Gays and lesbians aren't willing anymore to stay hidden in the closet. Young people are using social media to lift their champions and bury their opponents. And Latinos and Asian Americans are staking their claim to a growing slice of this American pie. And that affects the

rest of us. If you don't have a family member who's gay, you probably have a friend or co-worker who is. If you have teenagers at home, you've probably learned to accept their bands of multiracial friends.

Single mothers are rejecting hypocritical rhetoric from Newt Gingrich, with three marriages and a string of infidelities, arguing that allowing gays to wed violates the sanctity of marriage and Paul Ryan who believe that woman should not have control over their re-productive rights although he also claims that big government is intrusive. Women heard a wake-up call in Todd Akin's remarks about rape shutting a woman's body down. This kind of idiocy is frightening, and it brings clarity to what's at stake in the debate over abortion. And young people rebelled at being written off as society's leeches. When they are working full time for poverty wages or desperate for jobs that don't exist, part of that sponger demographic — the 47% — that Romney privately mocked.

Sandy Banks: "I don't know if it's mean-spirited, shortsighted or simply wishful thinking, but the Republican Party is pandering to a base that is rapidly shrinking in a country that's learning to tune them out. It would be nice to think that this botched campaign reflects the pull of the party's fringe, and is easily correctable. But the GOP has been tacking right for decades. Obama's ascent to the presidency just escalated the phenomenon by helping to launch the tea party wing, whose mission was getting him out of office.

According to Emory University professor Alan Abramowitz, who has studied the tea party for years, that ultra-conservative activist segment now dominates the Republican Party. Tea party folks donate more money, attend more meetings and rallies, and pester elected officials more than other party regulars. They are rabidly against abortion and gay marriage and tend to hold hostile attitudes toward blacks and gays. And more than half of Republicans — 63% of party stalwarts — consider themselves supporters of the tea party movement. That explains why the muscle-flexing of the "new America" in this election drove party leaders bonkers.

There was Karl Rove on Tuesday night, having a temper tantrum when **Fox News** called Ohio — and the race — for President Obama. Rove had funneled hundreds of millions of dollars to Republican candidates and had very little to show for it. And there was Bill O'Reilly whining that this country is "*not a traditional America anymore,*" implying that Republicans value hard work and fair play, and those other people just "*want stuff.*" And Morris, excusing his roundly mocked projection of a Romney landslide by admitting that the "*new America*" caught him by surprise. He thought that the election four years ago was nothing but a "*one-off,*" that voter-turnout demographics would "*go back to 2004,*" he said. I guess he figured the groups that cinched Obama's first term — minorities, women, young people — were only there for the party. Which means Republicans weren't beaten only by arithmetic this time. They lost through willful blindness." Again... *The Bubble...*

As most of you know, I am a big fan of American journalist and public commentator, Bill Moyers and this week on **Moyers & Company**, Bill spoke with journalists Bob Herbert, Reihan Salam, and James Fallows to discuss/explore what will happen now that the 2012 election is over. See the attached web-link on this week's show - ***The Election is Over — Now What?***: <http://billmoyers.com/episode/full-show-the-election-is-over-now-what/>

ADDITIONALLY: **Moyers & Company** asked several of their recent guest thinkers for their instant reactions to the re-election of Barack Obama. They came back with unique and succinct responses that covered everything from Afghanistan and climate change to the "fiscal cliff" and Obamacare. Add your own reactions at the bottom of each post. For any of you progressive political wonks who would like to see how others view the election and, I invite you to take a look at the attached collective article of their answers – ***The Election is Over — Now What?***

Joke of the Week

Here's how to keep all that political 'news' in perspective...

- 1. The Wall Street Journal is read by the people who run the country.*
- 2. The Washington Post is read by people who think they run the country.*
- 3. The New York Times is read by people who think they should run the country and who are very good at crossword puzzles.*
- 4. USA Today is read by people who think they ought to run the country but don't really understand The New York Times. They do, however, like their statistics shown in pie charts.*
- 5. The Los Angeles Times is read by people who wouldn't mind running the country, if they could find the time -- and if they didn't have to leave Southern California to do it.*
- 6. The Boston Globe is read by people whose parents used to run the country and did a poor job of it, thank you very much.*
- 7. The New York Post is read by people who don't care who is running the country as long as they do something really scandalous, preferably while intoxicated.*
- 8. The Miami Herald is read by people who are running another country, but need the baseball scores.*
- 9. The St. Louis Post-Dispatch is read by people who want only the score of the Cardinals game. They drink Budweiser, Budweiser, and wait a minute -- what was the question?*
- 10. The San Francisco Chronicle is read by people who aren't sure if there is a country or that anyone is running it; but if so, they oppose all that they stand for. There are occasional exceptions if the leaders are handicapped minority feminist atheist dwarfs who also happen to be illegal aliens from any other country or galaxy, provided of course, that they are not Republicans.*
- 11. The National Enquirer is read by people trapped in line at the grocery store.*
- 12. The Seattle Times is read by people who have recently caught a fish and need something to wrap it in.*

Quote of the Week

"You know that your party is in trouble when someone asks.... did the rape guy win? And you have to ask.... which one?" Alex Baldwin

This Weekend's Music

This week's music offerings are from one of my favorites, Al Jarreau, who I first met in the 1970s when Warner Bros Records brought him to London to promote his debut album "We Got By" and we connected five years ago in Marbella, Spain when he and George Benson headlined a sell-out concert, promoted by my dear friend and big brother Victor O'Gilvie. Please enjoy.....

Seven-time Grammy Award winning American jazz singer, Al Jarreau was born on March 12, 1940 in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, the fifth of six children. As an early achiever he was student council president and Badger Boys State delegate for Lincoln High School, going on to Ripon College, where he also sang with a group called the Indigos. Jarreau graduated in 1962 with a Bachelor of Science degree in Psychology. He then went on to earn a master's degree in vocational rehabilitation from the University of Iowa, worked as a Rehabilitation Counselor in San Francisco and moonlighted with a jazz trio headed by George Duke. In 1967, he joined forces with acoustic guitarist Julio Martinez. The duo became the star attraction at a small Sausalito night club called Gatsby's. This success contributed to Jarreau's decision to make professional singing his life and full-time career.

In 1968, Jarreau made jazz his primary occupation. In 1969, Jarreau and Martinez headed south, where Jarreau appeared in such Los Angeles hot spots as Dino's, The Troubadour, and Bitter End West. Television exposure came from Johnny Carson, Mike Douglas, Merv Griffin, Dinah Shore, and David Frost. He expanded his nightclub appearances performing at The Improv between the acts of such rising-star comics as Bette Midler, Jimmie Walker, and John Belushi. During this period, he became involved with the United Church of Religious Science and the Church of Scientology, but he is no longer affiliated with Scientology. Also, roughly at the same time, he began writing his own lyrics, finding that his Christian spirituality began to impact his work. In 1975, Jarreau was working with pianist Tom Canning when he was spotted by Warner Bros. Records and soon thereafter released his critically acclaimed debut album, *We Got By*, which catapulted him to international fame and garnered him a German Grammy Award. A second German Grammy would follow with the release of his second album, *Glow*.

One of Jarreau's most commercially successful albums is *Breakin' Away* (1981), which includes the hit song "We're In This Love Together." He wrote and performed the Grammy-nominated theme to the 1980s American television show *Moonlighting*. Among other things, he is well known for his scat singing and the ability to imitate conventional guitar, bass, and percussive instrumentation. He was also a featured vocalist on USA for Africa's "We Are the World" in which he sang the line, "...and so we all must lend a helping hand." Another charitable media event, HBO's *Comic Relief*, featured Al in a duet with Natalie Cole singing the song "Mr. President," written by Joe Sterling, Mike Loveless and Ray Reach. Jarreau took an extended break from recording in the 1990s. As he explained in an interview with *Jazz Review*: "I was still touring, in fact, I toured more than I ever had in the past, so I kept in touch with my audience. I got my symphony program under way, which included my music and that of other people too, and I performed on the Broadway production of *Grease*. I was busier than ever! For the most part, I was doing what I have always done ... perform live. I was shopping for a record deal and was letting people know that there is a new album coming. I was just waiting for the right label (Verve), but I toured more than ever."

In 2003, Jarreau and conductor Larry Baird collaborated on symphony shows around the United States, with Baird arranging additional orchestral material for Jarreau's shows. He has toured and performed with numerous musicians, including Joe Sample, Chick Corea, Kathleen Battle, Miles Davis, David Sanborn, Rick Braun, and an most recently George Benson. He also performed the role of the Teen Angel in a 1996 Broadway production of *Grease*. On March 6, 2001, he received a star on the Hollywood Walk of Fame, at 7083 Hollywood Boulevard on the corner of Hollywood Boulevard and La Brea Avenue. Al Jarreau appeared in a duet with American Idol finalist Paris Bennett during the Season 5 finale and on *Celebrity Duets* singing with actor Cheech Marin. In

2010, Al Jarreau is a guest on the new Eumir Deodato album, with the song "Double Face" written by Nicolosi/Deodato/Al Jarreau. The song is produced by the Italian company Nicolosi Productions. On the 16 February 2012, he was invited to the famous Italian Festival di Sanremo to sing with the Italian group Matia Bazar.

It was reported on July 23, 2010 that Jarreau was critically ill at a hospital in France, while in the area to perform a concert at nearby Barcelonnette, and was being treated for respiratory problems and cardiac arrhythmias. He was taken to the intensive-care unit at Gap late on July 22, 2010. Jarreau was conscious, in a stable condition and in the cardiology unit of La Timone hospital in Marseille, the Marseille Hospital Authority said. He was expected to remain there for about a week for tests. In June 2012, Jarreau was diagnosed with pneumonia, which caused him to cancel several concerts in France. Since then, Jarreau has made a full recovery and continues to tour extensively.

Al Jarreau- After All - <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vg14HPuXLOU>

Al Jarreau - Susan's Song - https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=phAIbAwWE50&list=AL94UKMTqg-9CiW5aAtYUS_DRCtZfotwQJ&index=61

Al Jarreau, Oleta Adams - Waters Of March - https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=BFOLYbljWe4&list=AL94UKMTqg-9CiW5aAtYUS_DRCtZfotwQJ&index=16

Al Jarreau - SO GOOD - https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-bilQy6f0E8&list=AL94UKMTqg-9CiW5aAtYUS_DRCtZfotwQJ&index=32

AL JARREAU - Something that you said - <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=oTu6NCFrOvc&feature=related>

Al Jarreau - We Got By - https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=kO9FZF-UXFQ&list=AL94UKMTqg-9CiW5aAtYUS_DRCtZfotwQJ&index=50

Al Jarreau - Try a little more Tenderness - https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=BYt_RefBWNo

Al Jarreau - She's leaving home - https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=iinIIW-TM_4

Al Jarreau - Wait For The Magic - <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=1jqEzJaACFE&feature=related>

Al Jarreau (Feat. Kathleen Battle) - My Favorite Things - <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=iQwzaNOyXQE&feature=related>

I hope that you enjoyed this week's offerings and as always wish you a great week.....

Sincerely,
Greg Brown

--
Gregory Brown
Chairman & CEO
GlobalCast Partners, LLC

--
Gregory Brown
Chairman & CEO
GlobalCast Partners, LLC

