



Bernie Sanders Rapid Response Library

Version 3.0 – 30 Nov 2016

* = New or Updated Content

General Comments.....	5
*Why Bernie’s “Political Revolution” is a Double-Edged Sword.....	5
Reagan Analogy – History Repeats!.....	6
Reagan Comparison - Short	6
Reagan Comparison - Reply	7
Reagan Comparison - Age	7
Electability.....	8
Incorruptibility.....	8
Bernie Differs from Democrats / Morality as a Political Theme	8
Immigration.....	9
Consistent Position /Long	9
Open Borders – Short (COOL)	10
Reagan on Open Borders.....	10
What Open Borders Really Means	10
Positions and Issues.....	11
Popularity with Percentages (Citations).....	11
Popularity with Percentages (No Citations)	11
Figure 1: Infographic showing popularity of Bernie's Positions.....	12
Minimum Wage - FDR	12
Minimum Wage - Effect of \$15 Minimum Wage on Prices	13
Minimum Wage – CEO Hypocrisy	13
Myopia	13
Meme on Wealth.....	14
Income Inequality.....	15
Give Bernie Some Time.....	15
Tuition Free Public Colleges.....	15
*Student Loan Interest Rates – Right Wing Talking Point	16
*Post Office Banks – why it is a good idea	16
*Senator Warren Champions Postal Banking.....	17
*Post Office Banks – why the USPS “loses” money	17
Democratic Socialism	17
Definition from DSUSA.org	17
Democrats vs. Democratic Socialists (DWS).....	18
US Invented EU Dem Socialism	18
Socialist Jew	18
Reagan Was a Socialist.....	18
US Never Elect a Socialist?	19
*RNC Hated and Feared Reagan	20
Dem Socialist Countries have highest GDP Per Capita	20
Electability.....	20
Electability Nr. 2 - Accomplishments	20
Democratic Socialism is Better for Business	21
Quick Response – Anti-Socialist Hypocrisy	21
*Quick Response – Your definition of socialism is outdated.....	21



*Quick Response – If socialism always fails, how do you explain China?.....	22
Possible GOP Attacks on Bernie as a Socialist – NOT CREDIBLE	22
*Social Security is not Socialist ?.....	22
*Americans are used to Socialism – thanks to FOX.....	22
Fascism	23
Definition of Fascism (from Wikipedia):	23
Sanders vs. Clinton.....	23
*Why Sanders will win in Iowa and NH.....	23
*I am NOT Attacking Hillary Personally	23
*Philosophical Difference between Hillary and Bernie	24
*What a Clinton Victory will Mean.....	24
*Hillary Clinton avoids giving answers -1	25
*Hillary Clinton avoids giving answers - 2.....	26
*Hillary Clinton Flip Flops.....	27
Hillary Clinton Wins Primary Against Bernie Sanders, But Can't Beat GOP	27
Positions held / Votes Taken	27
*Hillary Clinton Opposes Ending the Death Penalty	27
*Guns – Bernie and Hillary have IDENTICAL Positions	27
Bernie is the True Democrat.....	27
Numbers among Blacks.....	28
Why Hillary is Running.....	28
Hillary Clinton is not Viable – 3 factors	28
Democrats Need a Big Turnout, Not Hillary.....	29
*Hillary will be Conservative Catnip if she is on the ballot	29
The Email Scandal – Why it REALLY Matters.....	30
Hillary: Progressive or Centrist?	30
Quinnipiac Poll August 2015.....	30
Hillary on Crime	31
*Hillary on the TPP - 2012	31
*Hillary on the TPP - 2015	31
*Hillary's Timeline of Flip-Flops on the TPP	31
Online Presence: YouTube and Facebook.....	32
Hillary the Darling of Wall Street.....	32
*Hillary is a NeoCon Warhawk.....	32
*Hillary is a NeoCon Warhawk – Long Version	33
Hillary: Bible is “Biggest Influence on my Thinking”	35
Hillary's Net Worth puts her in the Top 1%.....	35
Hillary's Donor Base	35
Bernie better against GOP.....	35
Banks v. Guns - A Tale of Two Constituencies	35
*GOP Attacks on Bernie as a Socialist – NOT CREDIBLE	36
*Hillary is VERY Conservative (summary post).....	36
*Hillary on DOMA.....	37
*The BIG DIFFERENCE between Hillary and Bernie	38
*The Clintons and the Trumps are Good Friends	38
*Clinton-Trump Friendship and The BIG DIFFERENCE w/Bernie	38
Figure 2: Ivanka Trump and Chelsea Clinton embrace	39
Figure 3: The Clintons and the Trumps having a laugh together at Trump's wedding	40
First Democratic Debate	40
Why Bernie Sanders Won the First Democratic Debate.....	40



Banks v. Guns - A Tale of Two Constituencies	40
Hillary: Progressive or Centrist?	41
Hillary believes "All Lives Matter"	41
Hillary is a Hypocrite on College Tuition	41
*Bernie is the One who "Gets Things Done" (Legislation)	42
*Climate Change IS the Biggest Threat to National Security.....	42
Debate Results: Polls	42
Figure 4: Table of Post-Debate Poll and Focus-Group Results.....	43
*Response to a "Hillary won" article or post.....	43
*Gravis Marketing Poll showing Clinton won debate	44
*HuffPost/YouGov Poll – Biased by Mainstream Media	44
*NBC/SurveyMonkey Poll – Another self-referentially biased poll.....	45
Jefferson Jackson Dinner	45
*Barack Obama and Bernie Sanders in the same position (eerily).....	45
*Gallup Poll from October 2007 – Past as Prologue.....	46
*Hillary's Speech (typical)	46
*Hillary on DOMA.....	46
*TPP – Bernie and Hillary actually DO NOT agree.....	47
South Carolina Democratic Forum	47
*Hillary Equivocates and does not give real answers	47
Second Democratic Debate.....	48
No Focus Groups?.....	48
Jane Sanders.....	49
Fraud Case	49
Bernie vs. Trump	49
Not Equivalent/ No Story	49
Bernie is an Elected Senator	49
Racial Injustice.....	50
Racial Position/Platform.....	50
Response to articles or assertions that "Bernie has a Race Problem"	50
Hillary on Crime	51
50 Year Record.....	51
Apology for Slavery.....	52
Hillary believes "All Lives Matter"	52
Racial Justice Platform	52
Polls Show Bernie Gaining Among Blacks as Hillary "Plunges"	52
Figure 5: Chart shows massive drop in HRC polls among Blacks, whites, all Dems	53
DNC and Media Conspiracy	53
Only 6 Debates	53
*Bernie has no chance of winning – detailed answer	54
USSR.....	54
Russian Flag in Office.....	54
*Russian Honeymoon	54
*Nicaragua	55
*Support for Sandinistas	55
*Cuba.....	55
*Response to Posts about people "fleeing" Cuba for America	55
*The Cubans have nothing	56
*Quality of Life is Good in Cuba.....	56
Iran.....	56



History / Coup	56
*Denmark.....	56
*Forbes says Denmark is the “No. 1 Best Country for Business”	56
*Market Cap Comparison	57
Quick Responses for Online Commenting.....	57
Misc. Snippets	57
Inflation / Tuition	57
Liberty University	57
Pope Francis Video	58
The VOX Interview.....	58
Bible Supports Socialism	58
Ann Coulter Spills the Beans: GOP want HRC to run	58
*Bernie’s Legislative accomplishments.....	58
Bernie’s Plan will NOT cost \$18 Trillion	59
Private Prisons.....	59
Rape	59
Bernie is NOT a Warmonger: He is Historically Anti-Defense Spending	59
70% of Americans support for Bernie’s Positions	59
Only 2% of Sanders Supporters are “Anti-Hillary”	59
*The Social Election.....	59
Did Bernie Suggest Psychological Factors Cause Cancer?	60
*A Great Source of Information.....	60
*Tweet about Elizabeth Warren and Clinton’s Link to the Banks.....	60



General Comments

***Why Bernie's "Political Revolution" is a Double-Edged Sword**

Bernie Sanders is attracting huge crowds, and his followers - his main demographic - is comprised of young people and working class people who usually do not vote. One of Bernie's main themes is that "Republicans win when turnout is low." Bernie has identified this group of "self-disenfranchised" voters who have given up on the system. This is why issues that have strong majority support among citizens do not get addressed in Congress. Establishment politicians know that young people, students and the working poor just do not show up.

Only 35% of voters voted in 2014. Even in Presidential years, 50% of voters stay home. Among young people, 60% to 80% do not vote. Bernie has targeted this group. and his "Political Revolution" is nothing more or less than a campaign to bring these non-voting groups to the polls and get them involved on an ongoing basis in the political and electoral process. That's it.

Bernie is confident that if we increase voter participation, we will have a country and a government that better serves the people.

HOWEVER - the people that Bernie is attracting are loyal to Bernie, not the Democratic Party. Much was made of the fact that at the Jefferson-Jackson Dinner in Iowa last week the Bernie supporters left en masse after his speech and did not stick around to listen to Hillary Clinton. This fact reflects what I, as an avid supporter and follower of the Sanders campaign, know to be true: Bernie has a "yooj" following that is enthusiastic and fervent, almost evangelical in nature, but that enthusiasm is reserved only for Bernie.

Because these supporters do not usually vote, they will not show up in any polls of so-called "likely voters." That is why the Sanders campaign continues to exude confidence even in the face of daunting poll numbers.

This massive movement (and it is a movement) is however a double-edged sword. If Bernie becomes the nominee, this cohort of previously non-voting voters will most certainly propel him to victory. If however Hillary Clinton becomes the nominee, this same horde of potential voters will not come out to vote. They will, in all probability, avoid the polls like they avoided the Clinton speech in Iowa.

The Democratic Party Establishment needs to consider this. They have in 2016 a chance to massively expand their party's base, to get huge numbers of voters to come to their side, and to dramatically change the political landscape in America in a way that has not been seen since Reagan.

If however the Democratic Establishment see fit to use their power and influence to

ensure a Clinton nomination, they will lose the chance to recruit these people and condemn the country to Right-Wing dominated government for another generation, and in so doing also risk losing the General Election in 2016.

Reagan Analogy – History Repeats!

Imagine, a politician who is true to his ideals, even when they are not popular; one who stays the course, keeps true to himself, and seizes the right moment when the US public is of the right mind to accept his radically different message.

This politician speaks plainly, has an answer to every question, and is magnificently convincing because he is sincere and well-practiced in his delivery, in his positions, in his unabashed embrace of a political philosophy that had been decried as “radical” and “fringe” and “out of the mainstream” for the past decades.

Suddenly, this politician gains traction with the Common Man, who appreciates his honesty, understands his outrage, and has had enough of the “mainstream” political philosophy that has simply stopped working for America. He leads what quickly becomes a political “Revolution” that dramatically changes the political landscape in America ...

Yes of course I am talking about Ronald Reagan.

But I think the same holds true for Bernie. He has spent decades in the wilderness. He has endured the long period in which “liberal” was a dirty epithet, and “socialism” even worse. But his time has arrived, and I would bet that we will see “Bernie Republicans” come out and support him.

And after all, why not? Bernie represents the economic interests of what we used to call “Reagan Democrats” - every one of his positions enjoys strong majority support among ALL Americans, regardless of party affiliation.

Bernie is running against a woman with a LOT of baggage, and one who is beholden to what Bernie calls the “billionaire class” ... just as Reagan was able to dismiss GHW Bush, Bob Dole, John Anderson and others as “too liberal” and corrupt during the 1980 GOP Primary, Bernie will also be able to sell himself, ultimately, as “the real deal” - with Hillary being just too conservative and corrupted by her billionaire friends on Wall Street and K Street.

Yes, my friends, the pendulum is finally swinging. We thought we were seeing a sea change with Obama - but he turned out to be just another opportunistic politician. Bernie is the clear-eyed, consistent, unabashed Liberal that America will love.

More info here: <http://www.euroyankee.com>

Reagan Comparison - Short

Imagine, a politician who is true to his ideals, even when they are not popular; one who stays the course, keeps true to himself, and seizes the right moment when the US public is of the right mind to accept his radically different message.

Suddenly, this politician gains traction with the Common Man, who appreciates his honesty, understands his outrage, and has had enough of the “mainstream” political philosophy that has simply stopped working for America. He leads what quickly becomes a political “Revolution” that dramatically changes the political landscape in America ...

Yes of course I am talking about Ronald Reagan.

But I think the same holds true for Bernie. He has spent decades in the wilderness. He has endured the long period in which “liberal” was a dirty epithet. But his time has arrived, and I would bet that we will see “Bernie Republicans” come out and support him.

Like Bernie, the “Reagan Revolution” also came out of the blue: remember – the great socialist programs of Medicare, Medicaid and The Great Society were all introduced in the late 60’s – if someone had told me a scant decade later that a far-right cowboy B-movie actor who was against Social Security and against Medicare and against Roe v. Wade and against unions and against civil rights would win in Michigan, Massachusetts, New York, and yes, even Vermont, I would have told them they were CRAZY.
So go ahead. Call us crazy.

Reagan Comparison - Reply

Bernie Sanders will be our next President, so get used to it. The “free market” capitalism / libertarianism you all claim to support is the greatest MYTH ever perpetrated on humanity - there is no such thing as a free market, there are only different people who make the rules. As a Democratic Socialist - which is very different from a Socialist (see <http://www.dsausa.org>), Bernie believes that people should have a larger role in deciding how the market functions, so that the economy is there to serve the people and not vice-versa. I remember 1980 when Reagan won by a landslide, a far right Conservative winning NY, NJ, MA and almost every other blue state except Minnesota - it was a blowout. And now the country is ready for a blowout in the other direction.
So hold onto your tinfoil hats, it's going to be a bumpy ride for y'all.

Reagan Comparison - Age

Bernie is about as old as Joe Biden is, and just a few years older than Hillary. However, I like to compare Sanders to Reagan, who also led a transformative (as Obama says) “revolution” in American politics.

When Reagan was elected, he was 69, which was just 3 years away from the average life expectancy at the time. Bernie is 73, but he is a full 6 years away from the average life expectancy today.

In short, if 50 is the new 30, then 70 is the new 50.

Just as Reagan wanted to take the country back 50 years to the time pre-FDR and pre-New Deal, Bernie wants to take the country back 50 years to the time pre-Reagan and pre-Reaganomics. In order to do that, he needs to have perspective, he needs to know about the concepts and the movement of which he speaks. Bernie's age in this instance brings gravitas and authority, and his “50 years of consistency” means all the more because of the longevity of his convictions.

Electability

I would remind everyone that Bernie Sanders is a "socialist" that has been re-elected NINE (9) TIMES to Congress. As a socialist, he was re-elected Senator with 71% of the vote.

I'll say it again - as a socialist, he won with 71% of the vote.

Show me a Democratic politician who has that record, and running in a state with a higher GUN ownership rate than Nebraska, Ohio, Illinois, North Carolina and Missouri.

Oh, and just for good measure, this "socialist Jew" got those huge mandates in a state with just under 1% Jewish population.

Incorruptibility

Bernie Sanders has been in Congress 25 years. He has been re-elected 9 times, most recently with 71% of the vote. Before that he was Mayor of Vermont's biggest city. And after all that, his Net Worth is only \$330,000. And most of that was from a \$200,000 severance his wife got from her job running a college.

So if you want to say Bernie is stupid for being so poor after all those years in politics, or he's an idiot or inept because he stayed in politics so long without making a fortune or getting a sweet job as a lobbyist or consultant, then you are welcome to make that argument.

Such an argument would certainly be more believable than saying Bernie Sanders is corrupted by money and big donors.

Bernie Differs from Democrats / Morality as a Political Theme

You have made the same errors that so many make when talking about Bernie - that is to equate his political beliefs and his stance on issues with those of Barack Obama, Hillary Clinton and/or the Democratic Party. This is simply not true. If it were true that Bernie's positions and those of the Democratic Party were one and the same, then HE WOULD BE A DEMOCRAT.

Indeed, this erroneous mindset is witnessed by two facts that no one in the fourth estate seems to be able to put together. On one hand, Sanders is criticised because he has not managed to introduce legislation that gets voted on and passed. On the other hand, he has voted 95%-99% with the Democrats on legislation that DID come up for a vote. If I am allergic to seafood and really want filet mignon, and my choice for dinner is either salmon or chicken, I will vote for the chicken. Welcome to the frustrating world of Bernie Sanders's 25 years in Congress.

Bernie is a Democratic Socialist, which means he believes in many things that used to be the bedrock of the Democratic Party, but disappeared from the American political landscape following the Reagan Revolution. Indeed, Bernie's political platform is taken almost word for word from FDR's "Second Bill of Rights" aka the "Economic Bill of Rights." This legislation was a non-starter in the US at the time, but it did become adopted by the European countries when they rebuilt their political systems following WWII.

Bernie disagrees strongly with Clinton and the Democratic Party on many issues. TPP is the latest - Bernie never misses a chance to rail against the TPP as well as



every other "Democratic" trade deal since NAFTA, which he characterises consistently as "disastrous" for American workers, and all of which he voted against. He thinks Obamacare is nothing but a sop to the insurance industry and is adamant about expanding Medicare to cover all. I will not go into every issue here, but suffice it to say that the Democratic Party has, since Bill Clinton and the DLC, become a party of the centre, with Obama acting as what would have been a centre-right politician anytime prior to 1990.

THE BIGGEST DIFFERENCE between Bernie and the Democrats, however, is Bernie's unabashed penchant for framing his arguments in quasi-religious moral terms. He is not afraid to talk about greed, and to accuse the Koch Brothers and corporate giants of greed. The Democrats still seem to be languishing under the 80's meme that "greed is good" and that one should not "criticise success". Bernie will have none of that. He believes - and he exhorts his supporters to believe - that there is something morally reprehensible about being wealthy and wanting to acquire even more wealth "while children go to bed hungry."

Bernie is a big fan of Pope Francis and even channels the Pontiff on both the Senate floor and in his rallies. He believes, like Francis, that Climate Change is not a social, economic or even scientific issue - it is a moral one.

Liberals have traditionally been loathe to couch their positions in religious doctrine, and Democrats especially shy away from using words like "greed", "evil", "abhorrent", "abysmal" and so on to describe their political foes or an opposing viewpoint. Not Bernie. In fact, I have not heard a politician so fond of using the word "grotesque" since Newt Gingrich in the 90's. When Bernie's supporters say that he "tells the truth" and "gives it to you straight" they might as well be saying that he is not afraid to call a sin a sin, and a sinner a sinner.

Bernie and the Democrats not only differ in terms of policy they are literally worlds apart in how they frame the debate itself. Bernie is appealing to the Christian nature of Americans, telling them that it's OK, they can come back to what they always knew in their hearts: that Jesus would condemn Gordon Gekko and raise high the modest worker. Bernie is reminding them of what they learned in Sunday school, and he is giving them a way to exercise those beliefs in a context that will redound to the overall good not just of society, but of themselves.

That is a powerful message indeed, and not one that Hillary or any other establishment Democrat can offer.

Immigration

Consistent Position /Long

Bernie's position on immigration is completely consistent with his overall philosophy and especially his opposition to international "trade" agreements such as GATT/WTO, NAFTA, CAFTA, PNTR, and now TPP. These deals are backed by the Koch Bros. and other Big Businesses because they facilitate the free flow of CAPITAL and GOODS between nations without regulations, and place corporations' profits above the sovereign will of the people in the participating countries. What has been missing so far however, is an agreement on the free flow of LABOR.

Of course the big multinationals would like to see "open borders" where all people can go - and work - everywhere. Unfortunately, there are still these pesky things called "nation states" that try to serve the best interests of their citizens, and this

means workplace regulations. The Koch Bros. and other multinationals would like to see both sides of the equation covered, so that Capital and Labor BOTH would flow freely without being subject to regulations or controls by individual nations. Wages would then plummet everywhere in a dismal race to the bottom, leaving even more profit for the corporations.

Bernie is completely correct in saying that if such an “open borders” policy is ever adopted then nation states like the USA will for all intents and purposes cease to exist, and we will all live in a dystopian world ruled by mega-corporations like in Rollerball. Is that what you want?

More info here: <http://www.euroyankee.com>

Open Borders – Short (COOL)

Bernie assumes that an "open borders" policy would further diminish the strength of the nation state as we know it and further increase the power of multinational corporations. We already have trade deals that allow corporations to sue nations if they pass regulations that eat into profits (real or projected) - America has already lost the right to COOL (Country of Origin Labelling) which used to tell an American consumer where the hamburger you are buying actually came from. Not any more - the meat could come from Nebraska or Canada or Mexico - you will never know. Phillip Morris is suing Uruguay because that country implemented an anti-smoking public health campaign.

Bernie sees an open borders policy as part of that continuum - taking power away from nations and their elected governments and giving it to multinational corporations. He is consistent, and he is right!

More info here: <http://www.euroyankee.com>

Reagan on Open Borders

Look, “Open Borders” is not just a Koch Brothers idea, it was Ronald Reagan’s position, and Bernie is nothing if not the anti-Reagan. In 1980, Reagan said we should “open the border both ways” with Mexico:

<http://reason.com/blog/2014/11/21/friday-av-club-what-gop-immigration-poli#.pvk98o:K0AD>

More info here: <http://www.euroyankee.com>

What Open Borders Really Means

People talk about “open borders” without, I think, fully realizing what it would mean. I think many people think it would only affect unskilled workers, but obviously it would have to apply to everyone. So you would have plumbers, machinists, skilled and semi-skilled workers coming to America in hopes of making 5x what they make in their home country.

Likewise, I expect that any “open borders” policy would include provisions allowing professionals like engineers, software developers, managers – even doctors and lawyers – to move to America and work.



This is why Big Business and the Koch Brothers LOVE an “Open Borders” policy – it would, in effect remove the need for outsourcing. Rather than move the jobs to Vietnam or India, the Indians and the Vietnamese could just move to America! It would radically drive down the cost of labor – indeed, wages AND salaries would plummet – and it would dramatically increase profit!

Imagine – those techies in Silicon Valley would no longer be making those huge 6-figure incomes. They will be making the same as their colleagues in Bangalore and Karachi. Larry Ellison, Jeff Bezos and other tech billionaires will be popping champagne! – Oh, and so will those Koch Brothers Bernie mentions.

More info here: <http://www.euroyankee.com>

Positions and Issues

Popularity with Percentages (Citations)

Bernie’s ideas are not radical or "fringe" positions - they are SUPPORTED BY STRONG MAJORITIES OF AMERICANS:

65% support expanding Social Security:

http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/11/19/social-security-benefits-poll_n_4305258.html?utm_hp_ref=politics

67% support “Medicare for All” Single payer health care:

<http://thehill.com/policy/healthcare/229959-majority-still-support-single-payer-option-poll-finds>

63% Support Free Tuition at public colleges:

<http://thehill.com/blogs/blog-briefing-room/230064-poll-majority-support-obamas-free-tuition-planb>

64% support increasing corporate taxes:

<http://www.people-press.org/2015/03/19/federal-tax-system-seen-in-need-of-overhaul/>

61% support increasing taxes on the wealthy:

<http://www.people-press.org/2015/03/19/federal-tax-system-seen-in-need-of-overhaul/>

63% support a \$15 minimum wage:

<http://www.nelp.org/content/uploads/2015/03/Minimum-Wage-Poll-Memo-Jan-2015.pdf>

Moreover, 215 economists support Bernie’s proposal of a \$15 Minimum Wage as well – they even submitted a petition to Congress:

<http://www.budget.senate.gov/democratic/public/index.cfm/2015/7/top-economists-are-backing-sen-bernie-sanders-on-establishing-a-15-an-hour-minimum-wage>

Popularity with Percentages (No Citations)

Bernie’s ideas are not radical or "fringe" positions - they are SUPPORTED BY STRONG MAJORITIES OF AMERICANS:



- 67% support "Medicare for All" Single payer health care
- 63% Support Free Tuition at public colleges
- 64% support increasing corporate taxes
- 61% support increasing taxes on the wealthy
- 63% support the \$15 minimum wage (as do 215 prominent economists)




Figure 1: Infographic showing popularity of Bernie's Positions

Minimum Wage - FDR

When FDR set up the Minimum Wage as part of the New Deal in 1933, he said:

“It seems to me to be equally plain that no business which depends for existence on paying less than living wages to its workers has any right to continue in this country. By "business" I mean the whole of commerce as well as the whole of industry; by workers I mean all workers, the white collar class as well as the men in overalls; and by living wages I mean more than a bare subsistence level-I mean the wages of decent living.”

So you see, the Minimum Wage was and has always been meant to mean a Living Wage. We just need to go back to that idea.

Minimum Wage - Effect of \$15 Minimum Wage on Prices

A \$15 minimum wage will add only 17 cents to the price of a Big Mac.

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/news/wonkblog/wp/2015/07/30/what-doubling-the-minimum-wage-would-do-to-the-price-of-a-big-mac/>

Currently, taxpayers are paying \$153 billion a year to subsidize low-wage workers:

<https://www.washingtonpost.com/posteverything/wp/2015/04/15/we-are-spending-153-billion-a-year-to-subsidize-mcdonalds-and-walmarts-low-wage-workers/>

Minimum Wage – CEO Hypocrisy

The CEO of Dunkin’ Donuts, Nigel Travis, notably slammed the movement toward a \$15 minimum wage, calling it “outrageous.” But while low-wage workers have not seen a substantial raise in decades (along with declining purchasing power since the 1960s), Travis himself has been raking it in. This year, he earned about \$10.2 million—or about \$5,800 per hour—which is twice what he made in 2014, making his own hypocrisy the only thing that is “outrageous.”

<https://www.bostonglobe.com/business/2015/03/30/dunkin-ceo-pay-doubled/hXp2WjwxpBWIKkPWtdsD4J/story.html>

Travis is not the exception by a long shot, either; the average CEO makes about 300 times what their staff earns, and CEO pay has increased about 54 percent since the start of the economic recovery in 2009, according to the Economic Policy Institute. Even worse, the federal minimum wage stands at \$7.25—which is exactly where it was in 2009.

Yet for the top 1 percent of earners, incomes have quadrupled since 1980.

<http://www.cbsnews.com/news/richest-americans-see-huge-growth-in-income/>

Myopia

Ever since the 1980's - and especially under Clinton and the so-called "Democratic Leadership Council" - the two parties have pursued the same economic agenda. Clinton co-opted all the economic policies of the Republicans so that he - and other establishment Democrats - could get the support of wealthy donors.

There was then a tacit agreement that the Democrats and the Republicans would "fight it out" over social issues like Abortion, Gay Marriage, Gun Control, School Prayer, Evolution, Race, Immigration, and so on. No one talked about economics. Bernie has been criticized for being "too focused on economics" - but that is only because no one has talked about economics in terms of the middle class since 1980. People are just not used to it. We have been told for 30 years that "economics" means tax-cuts for the rich, and to the extent that you were either for or

against those tax cuts, you were judged to be a Democrat or a Republican, a "liberal" or a "conservative" - we became completely MYOPIC as country, unable to see what is really going on.

Now Bernie comes along and says, "wait, instead of arguing over just how much or how little to CUT Social security, let's talk about expanding it. Instead of fighting over how to make college more "affordable" - let's just make it tuition-free - like it used to be up until the 70's."

So - minds are being blown, because we have collectively lost our memory of when things used to be different. People reject Bernie's ideas as "radical" and yet everyone knows that what he is saying is true. We have just become so docile, so accustomed to moving on that small little playing field that the donor class and the political elite have set up for us, that we cannot imagine doing anything to really affect the status quo - for 30 years we have tinkered around the edges, made small adjustments here and there ... now we need to actually reverse the decline that we have been experiencing and return to what we were before money became the be-all and end-all, before "trickle-down economics" became a matter of accepted faith. Before the political Establishment conspired with the wealthy to rob the middle class. FEEL THE BERN!!!

Meme on Wealth

There is a popular meme on the Right that goes something like this:

"Socialism is horrible, because eventually you run out of other people's money. Do you realize that if you confiscated all the wealth, every single penny of the top 10% that it would only run our government for six months or so."

Let's do the numbers:

Total Net Worth of all US households: \$84.9 Trillion

<http://www.wsj.com/articles/americans-net-worth-hits-high-of-84-9-trillion-1434038401>

Net Worth of the top 10% of US households (75%): \$63.9 trillion

<http://www.mybudget360.com/wealth-inequality-america-top-10-percent-of-us-households-control-75-percent-of-wealth/>

Net Worth of the top 1% of US households (35%): \$34.9 trillion

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wealth_inequality_in_the_United_States

Net Worth of the top 0.1% of US households (25%): \$21.2 trillion

<http://www.theguardian.com/business/2014/nov/13/us-wealth-inequality-top-01-worth-as-much-as-the-bottom-90>

Total Federal Budget for 2015: 3.9 trillion (Wiki)

This means that the net worth of the top 10% could run the Federal Government for 16 YEARS.

Are you surprised? I would imagine that most people do not realize just how much frigging money the top 10% really do have.

But this is even more interesting: the total DEBT of the US is now at \$19 trillion –



that means the Net Worth of the very top 1/10th of 1% (0.1%) could more than wipe out our entire DEBT! Isn't that fantastic? Bring me my pitchfork!! :-)

Income Inequality

Bernie's right in pointing out that the US has a "grotesque" and "absurd" level of income inequality. According to Global Finance magazine, which lists all countries by their GINI coefficient, which represents the income distribution of a nation's residents. Out of 34 OECD countries, the US is the 31st WORST in terms of income inequality. In case you are wondering, the three countries we beat are Turkey, Mexico and Chile.

Give Bernie Some Time

Bernie has been campaigning for four (4) months, and he started with very little money and very little staff. He has been growing, but I think it is grossly unfair to "challenge" him to address issues beyond his core message so early in the campaign. Of course Bernie is a liberal, of course he supports minorities, of course he is anti-hate.

I think you could say the same for EVERY Democrat in the race - and that is the part no one seems to understand.

Bernie has to run and win a Primary against a powerful opponent, and he has to do it by drawing distinct DIFFERENCES between himself and Clinton. Do you think anti-Muslim hatred is an area where Sanders and Clinton deeply disagree? Or racial injustice? BlackLivesMatter? Support for minority, civil and gender rights are baked into the Democratic Party platform - every Dem candidate can be counted on to have more or less the same position on all these issues.

Economics is where Bernie is different. Single payer health care - no one in the Democratic Party (except Conyers) is talking about that. Tuition free public colleges? That is something unheard of since the 60's. Paid family leave and holidays? Again, no one is talking about that. Same with expanding Social Security, Bernie is against the TPP; Clinton supports it. Bernie wants to break up the big banks; Hillary is against that. Bernie wants to tax Wall Street transactions; Hillary would never even consider doing that. THESE ARE THE AREAS OF DIFFERENCE THAT BERNIE NEEDS TO STRESS AT THIS POINT IN THE RACE!!

Bernie has a 25 year Congressional record, plus several years as a Mayor, to analyse if you want to know where he stands on issues. But for his campaign to be successful, he must address, re-address, iterate and reiterate again and again those things that make him DIFFERENT from Hillary.

Please - let's allow him the room and the time to do that.

Tuition Free Public Colleges

The public colleges and universities that Bernie wants to make "tuition free" were established using Federal Land Grants back in the 1800's (under the Morrill Act). As part of their charter, they were to offer tuition free educations to in-state taxpayers - just like anyone who lives in a city or town gets to attend that town's High Schools "tuition free." This is not a radical concept!!

Anyway, these public universities thrived, people were educated and these institutions stayed tuition free for over 100 years. That's right -- until the mid 1960's you could have gone to UCAL Berkeley or UCLA for FREE. What happened in the 1960's? Well, Ronald Reagan and other conservative State Governors wanted to cut

taxes and maintain balanced budgets -- so ... they introduced tuition to the previously free public colleges. Nice, huh?

So DO NOT frame this proposal as some sort of radical "leftist" idea - Bernie Sanders simply wants to turn those public colleges and universities back into the truly "public" schools that they were originally established to be, and the way they functioned for a century before radical "rightists" decided to start making people PAY for what was supposed to be a public service.

For a list of all the public universities that used to be "tuition free" before Reagan and other conservatives took over, click here:

<http://www.nap.edu/read/4980/chapter/2>

***Student Loan Interest Rates – Right Wing Talking Point**

Ignorant right-wingers make the argument that "Bernie doesn't understand economics" because he asks why student loan rates are higher than car or house loans. Conservatives say it is simply because there is no collateral.

But it is CONGRESS that sets those loan rates!!

Bernie is saying that it is in the interest of the public good and the national future of our country to have an educated population. If Congress is setting the interest rates, if the government is running the student loan programme, then the Congress should not be acting like Wells Fargo or Citibank. They should be acting for the good of the country and of the American people. And that means having lower interest rates on the student loans that the government makes.

***Post Office Banks – why it is a good idea**

This is an excellent idea because there are many parts of the country where there are no banks. Indeed, of the 30,000+ Post Offices in the country, 59% are located in Zip Codes where there are no traditional banking services available.

The people who live in these "bank deserts" have to rely on check cashing services and payday lenders, which charge exorbitant fees. Each year, the average "underserved" household spends \$2,412 – nearly 10 percent of gross income – in fees and interest for what is euphemistically called "alternative financial services". These people are getting doubly screwed because they are paying exorbitant fees but do not have the opportunity to create a credit history, have access to affordable, safe and sustainable financial services, or build assets over time.

Postal Banking is widespread throughout the world, and 1,5 billion people rely worldwide on Postal Banking. It is like universal health care, paid family and medical leave, and free college tuition – just one more thing that every other industrialized country in the world has, except the US. It is a valid a trusted concept, and one that is already proven to work in the US. From 1917 to 1967 the US had Postal Banking. The United States Postal Savings System (USPSS) eventually closed because it was not allowed to charge or offer high interest rates, and as banks opened more branches everywhere, they could not compete. NOW, however, banks have been closing branches, and so we have "bank deserts" where almost 40% of Zip Codes in the US do not have a single bank in them – yet they do have a working post office,

staffed with trained professionals who are already doing certain limited financial transactions such as Money Orders.

More info here:

<http://www.campaignforpostalbanking.org/know-the-facts/>

***Senator Warren Champions Postal Banking**

“Nearly 60 percent of Post Office branches are in banking deserts. They are in zipcodes where there are either one or no bank branches. This means that the Postal Service already has the strong brick-and-mortar presence in low-income and rural communities that traditional banks are leaving behind.

“ . . .it’s not often in life when you see such a perfect match: there is a big need — 68 million Americans, who don’t have access to traditional banking — and a Post Office that has plenty of additional capacity. The two can be put together, bring down costs [and] bring more families into the financial mainstream. . . ”

***Post Office Banks – why the USPS “loses” money**

The government (the PRC) sets the postal rates. It tells the USPS, for example that UPS and FedEx only have to pay \$0.02 for every package the USPS helps deliver. This is GREAT for UPS and FedEx, because it keeps their costs down, and they make more PROFIT.

This is NOT good for the USPS, because they are not covering their costs. So they are "losing" money in order for FedEx and UPS to "make" more money. Don't you see? It is just another indirect subsidy to big business.

In the 2014 Election alone, FedEx contributed over \$2 MILLION to political campaigns, and spent another \$13 MILLION on lobbying. UPS paid over \$3 MILLION in campaign contributions and spent another \$7 MILLION in lobbying.

Why do you think they give so much to the politicians? Among many other things, it is so the politicians will keep the USPS rates DOWN and run the USPS at a loss which is, in the end FedEx's and UPS's gain.

It is just like the government allowing Wal-Mart and McDonald's to pay their workers so little that they qualify for Food Stamps and Medicaid. By making the taxpayers pay part of the employees' "compensation", this is an indirect subsidy and a transfer of wealth from taxpayers to those corporations in the form of government-subsidized operating costs. Talk about socialism!

Democratic Socialism

Definition from DSUSA.org

Bernie is not a "Socialist" - he is a "Democratic Socialist" - and yes, that is a thing, and yes, it is different from standard "Socialism". In other words, think more Sweden and Denmark than Cuba and Venezuela.



There is even a national organization for Democratic Socialists in the US:

FROM: http://www.dsusa.org/what_is_democratic_socialism

"Democratic socialists believe that both the economy and society should be run democratically—to meet public needs, not to make profits for a few ... Democratic socialists do not want to create an all-powerful government bureaucracy. But we do not want big corporate bureaucracies to control our society either. Rather, we believe that social and economic decisions should be made by those whom they most affect"

More info here: <http://www.euroyankee.com>

Democrats vs. Democratic Socialists (DWS)

Democrats - at least the ones that supported ACA (Obamacare) over single payer, believe that things like health care should still be a for-profit industry, and the health care companies should still have profits and spend their customers' premiums on marketing and making political contributions and lobbying - but maybe just not as much as they might have otherwise. Why do you think health care stocks skyrocketed after Obamacare was passed? A Democratic Socialist, however, believes that health care is a right and should be provided by the State and paid for with our tax dollars, just like the military.

That is what DWS was afraid of saying.

More info here: <http://www.euroyankee.com>

US Invented EU Dem Socialism

The US actually invented European style Democratic Socialism!! It was all based on FDR's "Second Bill of Rights" - a.k.a., the "Economic Bill of Rights" (look it up!). FDR could not get it passed through the Republican Congress (sound familiar?) but it was worked into the Marshall Plan and the US-assisted rebuilding of the European countries after WWII. Europe never had a socialist tradition - they were used to monarchies, class structures and dictatorships - all the things our Founding Fathers wanted to get away from. So America gifted them a new way to start over clean and build a society that honored labor, protected the middle class, and granted rights to the individual that Americans still don't have. Bernie aims to rectify that.

More info here: <http://www.euroyankee.com>

Socialist Jew

They tell me Bernie can't win because he is a Socialist Jew. I tell them America celebrates a Socialist Jew every December 25!

Reagan Was a Socialist

People think that "Socialism" means the re-distribution of wealth. Well, in that case, the biggest Socialist President we have had was Ronald Reagan. In 1986, when Reagan slashed the top tax rate again, his redistributionist obsession led to a perversity in the law. The wealthiest faced a 28 percent tax rate, while those with lower incomes faced a 33 percent rate; in addition, the bottom rate climbed from 11 percent to 15 percent. For the first time in history, the top rate fell and the bottom rate rose simultaneously. Even unemployment compensation was not spared. The

jobless had to pay income tax on their benefits. A year later, the man who would not spare unemployment compensation from taxation called for a cut in the capital gains tax. Thus, Reagan was a staunch socialist, totally committed to his cause of wealth redistribution towards the affluent. This started a trend of redistribution UPWARDS that goes on today. Bernie Sanders wants to correct that situation.

And as far as socialized, government-run healthcare is concerned, again, Reagan was its biggest proponent! When Reagan signed the Emergency Medical Treatment and Active Labor Act into law (which forces ER's to treat everyone) he didn't just socialize medicine, he did it by putting the burden on the people and businesses who were actually doing the right thing and buying health insurance policies and he did it while laying an unfunded mandate on the states.

And yet people think he was for small government.

More info here: <http://www.euroyankee.com>

US Never Elect a Socialist?

People say that America would never elect a Socialist. And I tell them, they already did: they elected FDR three times! That's right, the "New Deal" was the largest bundle of socialist programs the world had ever seen, establishing, to name just a few, Social Security, the FDIC, the FHA and the SEC.

The socialist trend continued with Lyndon Johnson in the late 60's. He established Medicaid and Medicare, which is still the largest "socialist" medical scheme on earth, in terms of people who get free health insurance from the Government. And what does Bernie want to do? He wants "Medicare for all" - and you think that is such a hard pill to swallow?

Universal Daycare and Family Leave were both passed by Congress on a bipartisan basis in 1971, but vetoed by Richard Nixon.

An the \$15 minimum wage that Bernie is pushing would increase the price of a Big Mac by 17 cents – is that such a disaster?

Free tuition at public colleges and universities was THE NORM in the US until the mid 60's, when Reagan lead a movement to stop it.

Indeed, Ronald Reagan didn't just become President in 1980 - he also led a successful national movement - what was called the "Reagan Revolution" – one which not only won the White House but gave the GOP control in the Senate for the first time in 26 years. I am old enough to remember it, having voted in that election as a liberal - and I remember how shocked everyone was that he won, because he was thought to be too "radical". Remember, Medicare and Medicaid had only been passed 12 years earlier, and the socialist streak in the American consciousness was still thought to be strong. Reagan had to fight for the nomination against the "establishment" GOP, and the RNC limited the primary debates to only 6 because they were so afraid he would get the nomination. Such a move has not been done since, except for this year when the DNC did the same thing to shut out Bernie Sanders.

But Reagan did win. And he won BIG. If anyone had told me in 1979 that a far-right cowboy B-movie actor who was against social security and against Medicare and against unions and against civil rights would win in almost every blue state, including Michigan, Massachusetts, New York, and yes, even Vermont, I would have told them

they were CRAZY.
So go ahead. Call us crazy.

***RNC Hated and Feared Reagan**

The RNC hated Reagan - they limited the debates to only 6 just because of him. The 1980 nomination was supposed to go to an establishment candidate like Bob Dole of Poppy Bush - not some Goldwater retread from SoCal.

But Reagan did win. And he won BIG. If anyone had told me in 1979 that a far-right cowboy B-movie actor who was against social security and against Medicare and against unions and against civil rights would win in almost every blue state, including Michigan, Massachusetts, New York, and yes, even Vermont, I would have told them they were CRAZY.

So go ahead. Call us crazy.

Dem Socialist Countries have highest GDP Per Capita

According to the IMF, 9 of the top 10 countries with the highest GDP per capita (used to measure a country's wealth) are Socialist Democracies: Luxembourg, Denmark, Sweden, Norway, Switzerland, Denmark, San Marino, Singapore, Australia. And the 10th country, the one that is at the BOTTOM of the list? The USA.

Electability

I would remind everyone that Bernie Sanders is a "socialist" that has been re-elected NINE (9) TIMES to Congress. As a socialist, he was re-elected Senator with 71% of the vote.

I'll say it again - as a socialist, he won with 71% of the vote.

Show me a Democratic politician who has that record, and running in a state with a higher GUN ownership rate than Nebraska, Ohio, Illinois, North Carolina and Missouri.

Electability Nr. 2 - Accomplishments

If you want to judge the worth of a politician, ask the people who know him. Sure Bernie is well liked on both sides of the aisle, and admired because of his consistency and openness. But the real measure of the man is this:

Bernie Sanders is a "socialist" that has served as a big city Mayor for 8 years; he has been elected and re-elected NINE (9) TIMES to Congress. As a socialist, he was re-elected Senator with 71% of the vote statewide, including 25% of the Republican vote.

I'll say it again - as a socialist and a Jew from Brooklyn, he won with 71% of the vote, and that from a rural state with a lot of Republicans, a lot of farmers, no socialists and less than 1% Jews.

Show me a Democratic politician who has that record, and running in a state with a higher firearm ownership rate than Nebraska, Ohio, Illinois, North Carolina and Missouri. You cannot.

That, my friend is quite an accomplishment.



Democratic Socialism is Better for Business

What most people don't know, and what will probably come as a surprise to you, is that it is much easier to start and grow a small business in "Socialist" Europe than in the US. This is due to several reasons:

1. Lower regulatory burdens - yep, it's true, according to the OECD
2. Lower taxes - again, it's true according to OECD
3. Better access to working capital (World Economic Forum)
4. Lower employee costs for healthcare (which are 0 in the EU because they have Single payer nationalised health care)

Small business's share of the U.S. economy is slowly shrinking and is less significant than in many European economies. This is because of crony Capitalism and "laissez-faire" attitude that believes in the so-called "Free Market" - when there is no such thing. Europe's political and economic system is from the 20th century, and America's is from the 18th. Viewed in those terms, it is not hard to believe that the European-style "Democratic Socialism" that Bernie is pushing is the way to go for entrepreneurs and believers in free enterprise.

But don't take my word on it - this is all from BusinessWeek:

http://www.businessweek.com/smallbiz/content/dec2010/sb20101210_839038.htm

More info here: <http://www.euroyankee.com>

Quick Response – Anti-Socialist Hypocrisy

OK –you are anti-socialism – we get it. So will you promise everyone here and now that you won't cash your Social Security checks? I mean, you wouldn't be part of that socialist scheme, would you? Making the people who are working pay for your retirement? Horrible! And Medicare? Promise us all right now that you will NOT go on Medicare, because that, my friend, is the largest program of socialized medicine in the world!

I also assume that you do not send your kids to public school, because why should their education be paid for with other people's taxes?

Will you affirm all these points, or are you just another reactionary hypocrite?

*Quick Response – Your definition of socialism is outdated

The problem with most of you who criticise Sanders because he is a "socialist" is that you are referencing a definition of Socialism that goes back to a time when "negroes" were only 3/5 of a person, and "democracy" meant you had to be a white, male property owner in order to vote. Doesn't sound much like the "democracy" that people like to cheer about today, does it? Well, socialism has evolved since the 1800's as well.

The "democratic socialism" that Bernie Sanders is promoting only means that the PEOPLE have a bigger say in how the government is run and above all, how our tax dollars get spent. It is about rewriting the rules and, in its most simplistic sense, it is about reversing the right wing extremist rules that got written in the 1980's, when all the wealth started flowing from the middle and working classes to the top 1%.



***Quick Response – If socialism always fails, how do you explain China?**

If it is true that "socialism" that always makes a country unsuccessful, how do you explain China? They are a Socialist/Communist government and yet many would say that they are beating America at its own "capitalist" game. They have 9% economic growth and are expanding into markets all over the world. They are "buying" America's debt. Donald Trump says, "China is killing us." How can China be killing us if they have a socialist government?

The "democratic socialism" that Bernie Sanders is promoting only means that the PEOPLE have a bigger say in how the government is run and above all, how our tax dollars get spent. It is about rewriting the rules and, in its most simplistic sense, it is about reversing the right wing extremist rules that got written in the 1980's, when all the wealth started flowing from the middle and working classes to the top 1%.

Possible GOP Attacks on Bernie as a Socialist – NOT CREDIBLE

Yes, I would dearly LOVE to see the GOP attack Bernie's "socialist" positions. I would HOPE to see them attack the expansion of Social Security, which 65% of Americans support. I would ENCOURAGE them to condemn single payer "Medicare for all", which 67% of Americans support; I would BEG them to dismiss tuition free state colleges, which 63% of Americans support; I would EXPECT them to oppose raising corporate taxes, which 64% of Americans support, just as I would EXPECT them to oppose raising taxes on the wealthy, which 61% of American support. And last, but not least, I would WELCOME them to attack the \$15 minimum wage, which 63% of Americans support.

Yes, by all means, the GOP attack machine would go into overdrive against Bernie, and if you somehow think that the GOP will not go into overdrive attacking Hillary you must have been in a coma the past 30 years.

The difference is that with Bernie the attacks would backfire because Bernie - and Bernie alone - can get those new voters, independents and disaffected Republicans out to vote for him. Hillary cannot.

***Social Security is not Socialist ?**

The first SS beneficiary to receive monthly check was Ida May Fuller, who worked worked for three years under the Social Security program. The accumulated taxes on her salary during those three years was a total of \$24.75. Her initial monthly check was \$22.54. During her lifetime she collected a total of \$22,888.92 in Social Security benefits. Who paid in the money she collected?

***Americans are used to Socialism – thanks to FOX**

Oh, the delicious irony. Oh, the poetic justice! The American people have been told for 8 years that Obama is a "socialist" ... FOX, the Tea Party, the Koch Brothers and their minions – they have spent the last 8 years comparing Obama to Mao, Stalin, Hitler, etc. – and screaming "socialist", "communist" and "Marxist" all the while. And after 8 years under the brutal heel of Obama's Socialist Oppression, the stock market is at a record high, corporate profits are obscenely high, and the unemployment rate is only 5%. Now, not all Americans may be happy with Obama or the Obama economy, but they do know that things are better than they were when

he took office, and so maybe Socialism is not the disaster people say. Americans are now inured to the term “socialist” and the Right Wing have collectively cried “wolf” too many times to use it as an effective weapon against Bernie.

Fascism

Definition of Fascism (from Wikipedia):

“Fascism operated from a Social Darwinist view of human relations. The aim was to promote superior individuals and weed out the weak. In terms of economic practice, this meant promoting the interests of successful businessmen while destroying trade unions and other organizations of the working class. Fascist governments encouraged the pursuit of private profit and offered many benefits to large businesses, but they demanded in return that all economic activity should serve the national interest. Historian Gaetano Salvemini argued in 1936 that fascism makes taxpayers responsible to private enterprise, because “the State pays for the blunders of private enterprise... Profit is private and individual. Loss is public and social.”

More info here: <http://www.euroyankee.com>

Sanders vs. Clinton

*Why Sanders will win in Iowa and NH

The polls in IA and NH are going up and down, but there are some factors that will give Bernie an edge that is not measured in polls:

1. Only 8% of Democrats vote in the Primaries. This is about 16 million voters
2. Bernie has about 1 million individual campaign donors who have given him money.
3. If each one of his donors commits to getting another 8 people to vote for Bernie, he can win. Seems achievable to me.
4. Many, many articles have been written now (latest by the NYT last week) about the "enthusiasm gap" among Clinton supporters. There is a lack of enthusiasm generally as well as among specific demo groups such as gays, black women, women in general, and union workers.
5. Will Clinton voters be willing to go out on a dark and wintry night and spend several hours in a caucus - possibly going to midnight and beyond?
6. Will Clinton voters be willing to brave the ice and snow in New Hampshire in February (avg. temp. 7-8 deg. F) to vote for Hillary?

I am a Sanders supporter, and I can tell you that we all Feel the Bern, and we will crawl over broken glass in a blizzard to vote for our guy.

*I am NOT Attacking Hillary Personally

I may attack Hillary, but never personally. I attack her for her positions, her actions, her votes.

To point out that she has flip-flopped on many issues is not a personal attack: it is a factual observation. To suggest that Hillary's flip-flopping makes me less inclined to believe her sincerity or commitment to the most recently adopted position - especially if it is a simple co-opting of her opponent's position - is not to call her a liar.

Calling her an Establishment Politician is not an insult; it is a fact. The many and myriad endorsements that her supporters constantly crow about is definitive proof that she is the pre-ordained choice of the "Political Establishment".

Her many millions - both in personal wealth and in her Super PAC - are proof that she is also the appointed standard bearer of the "Economic Establishment."

When Bernie says that "neither Establishment Economics nor Establishment Politics can solve the problems that face this country" is he talking about Hillary Clinton? You bet he is. Does that make his statement a personal attack? No. And does it make his statement any less true? NO.

***Philosophical Difference between Hillary and Bernie**

Bernie makes concrete policy proposals, while Hillary says "we need to look at this" and "we need to think about that" and proposes small incremental changes. She is not proposing anything big, she is not proposing any fundamental changes. She assumes that things will stay the same, with GOP gridlock and so on. She keeps saying she will "fight" for families and children and women. This indicates a worldview in which the GOP is still on the offensive, and she is selling herself as the "defender in chief". That defensive attitude is how - and why - the Dems keep losing.

Hillary's defensive posture is a holdover no doubt from her days in the Democratic Leadership Council. Bill Clinton was Chairman of the DLC, whose whole philosophy was based on the idea that liberal politics were "dead" and no one would vote for liberal ideas anymore. And so in order to win elections, Democrats had to become more like Republicans, and "triangulate" or co-opt GOP conservative issues and talking points in order to win elections.

DLC veterans like Hillary still believe that a truly progressive agenda cannot win in American politics, so she continues to fight a rear-guard action trying to "defend" women's rights and other progressive advancements made before 1980. She is not about changing the political landscape or promoting progressive ideals that she thinks do not have a majority of votes in the current voting electorate. So she will "defend" Social Security, and "defend" Medicare" and make college "more affordable".

Bernie actually FOUNDED the Progressive Caucus in the House in 1991. He is a true believer and a true liberal, and he believes that a liberal agenda can WIN if enough people come out to vote. So he is for "expanding" Social Security" and offering "Medicare for all" and making college "tuition free." These are bold steps that will change America fundamentally and put the Republicans on the defensive.

So while Hillary talks about "fighting" Bernie talks about "winning." And THAT is the difference

***What a Clinton Victory will Mean**

A Hillary Clinton victory will set back the cause of Progressivism by a generation. I

would much rather see a REAL Republican in the WH than have a fake Democrat suck all the air out of the Left for another 8 years. A Clinton win will solidify and greatly strengthen the stranglehold that the New Democrats and DLC have on the Democratic Party.

It will be business as usual for Wall Street and the Big Banks and these massive "institutions" will only gain in strength and influence under a Clinton Administration. I honestly believe all the economics experts that say another financial crisis is coming, and a Clinton Administration will do **absolutely nothing** to stop it happening.

The Military and the MI complex will also continue to expand, with more bombs, more boots on the ground, and more \$\$\$\$ going towards a quagmire rather than education and infrastructure.

The TPP and other bad trade deals will move forward, hurting the American middle class and transforming geopolitics through a huge increase in corporate power. We will no longer have "multinational corporations" - we will have "SUPRANATIONAL corporations."

Hillary is not for expanding Social Security and Medicare, and she has indicated that she favors "reform" - meaning she is willing to accept the calculus that there is just not enough money to support these programs, and so cuts will be "inevitable." At the first Democratic debate, she was pressed to say whether she, like Bernie, wanted to expand Social Security. "I fully support Social Security and the most important fight we're going to have is defending it against continuing Republican efforts to privatize it," Clinton said, after hesitating.

Fight. Defend. Protect.

These are the words of defeat, part of the DLC-driven strategy to scare the Left into supporting "moderate" positions because when there is so much to LOSE you dare not even consider WINNING.

Against all these horrific scenarios: financial meltdown; eternal, expensive and deadly military quagmire, continued destruction of the American middle class, cutbacks and possible privatisation of Social Security and Medicare, we are being asked to "think of the Supreme Court." While adding another conservative or to the mix may seem like a catastrophe, I do not think it is disastrous enough to warrant setting the causes of justice, peace and prosperity back for another generation.

And having a true right-wing government will allow the Left to regroup and re-launch a new campaign to take our country back - if not in 4 then in 8 years.

Nixon's Watergate allowed Carter to win; Bush's failures helped make a President Obama possible; maybe a Trump Presidency will result in giving us a President Warren.

***Hillary Clinton avoids giving answers -1**

The fact is, no one knows what a Clinton presidency would look like, and Hillary is doing her best to make sure no one will know. She famously dodged a question

about Keystone by saying "ask me when I am President." This seems to be her basic response to everything. She is saying, in effect:

"You cannot assume I will be more hawkish than Obama just because I have acted so in the past."

"You cannot assume that I will support the TPP just because I used to call it 'the gold standard of trade deals'."

"I do not support Keystone anymore, but I am not against it for environmental reasons, so you'll just have to guess where I will stand on future projects like this."

"I don't support private prisons even though the private prison industry is supporting my campaign."

"Just because I defended Wall Street and represented their interests as a Senator does not mean that I will continue to do so as President, and you will just have to trust me on that."

"Just because certain special interests and industries are financing my campaign does not mean that I will be favorable to them as President."

"Just because certain industries have made me a multi-millionaire does not mean I am beholden to them in any way."

She'd rather tell anecdotes about moms and kids and express outrage at the the things that we all find outrageous. She does not deserve to hold office.

***Hillary Clinton avoids giving answers - 2**

He makes concrete policy proposals, while Hillary says "we need to look at this" and "we need to think about that" and proposes small incremental changes. She is not proposing anything big, she is not proposing any fundamental changes. She assumes that things will stay the same, with GOP gridlock and so on. She keeps saying she will "fight" for families and children and women. This belies a worldview in which the GOP is still on the offensive, and she is selling herself as the defender in chief.

That defensive attitude is how the Dems keep losing. This is a holdover no doubt from her days in the Democratic Leadership Council. Bill was Chairman of the DLC, whose whole philosophy was based on the idea that liberal politics could no longer win, and so in order to win elections, Democrats had to become more like Republicans, and "triangulate" or co-opt GOP conservative issues and talking points in order to win elections.

DLC veterans like Hillary still believe that a truly progressive agenda cannot win in American politics, so she continue to fight a rear-guard action trying to "defend" women's rights and other progressive advancements made before 1980. She is not about changing the political landscape or promoting progressive ideals that she thinks do not have a majority of votes in the current voting electorate.

Bernie actually FOUNDED the Progressive Caucus in the House in 1991. He is a true believer and a true liberal, and he believes that a liberal agenda can WIN if



enough people come out to vote.
So while Hillary talks about "fighting" Bernie talks about "winning." And THAT is the difference

***Hillary Clinton Flip Flops**

<https://youtu.be/l3EneuJFwDs>

Hillary Clinton Wins Primary Against Bernie Sanders, But Can't Beat GOP

She barely wins against Trump, but loses to all the other frontrunners.

<http://www.ibtimes.com/hillary-clinton-wins-primary-against-bernie-sanders-cant-beat-gop-poll-2112072>

Positions held / Votes Taken

The Invasion of Iraq ~> Sanders: No. Clinton: Yes.
The Bank Bailout ~> Sanders: No. Clinton: Yes.
The Patriot Act ~> Sanders: No. Clinton: Yes.
The War on Drugs ~> Sanders: No. Clinton: Yes.
"No Child Left Behind" ~> Sanders: No. Clinton: Yes.
Charter Schools ~> Sanders: No. Clinton: Yes.
Walmart Board of Directors member ~ Sanders: No. Clinton: Yes.
Supported NAFTA ~> Sanders: No. Clinton: Yes.
Marched with MLK ~> Sanders: Yes. Clinton: No.
Wall Street Reform ~> Sanders: Yes. Clinton: No.
Student Loan Reform ~> Sanders: Yes. Clinton: No.

More info here: <http://www.euroyankee.com>

***Hillary Clinton Opposes Ending the Death Penalty**

Bernie Sanders has introduced legislation for an end to the Death Penalty, but Hillary opposes abolishing it ... she is NOT a progressive!

<http://www.nytimes.com/politics/first-draft/2015/10/29/on-senate-floor-bernie-sanders-calls-for-ending-the-death-penalty/>

***Guns – Bernie and Hillary have IDENTICAL Positions**

"I respect the Second Amendment. I respect the rights of lawful gun owners to own guns, to use their guns, but I also believe that most lawful gun owners whom I have spoken with for many years across our country also want to be sure that we keep those guns out of the wrong hands. And as president, I will work to try to bridge this divide, which I think has been polarizing and, frankly, doesn't reflect the common sense of the American people. We will strike the right balance to protect the constitutional right but to give people the feeling & the reality that they will be protected from guns in the wrong hands."

- Hillary Clinton in 2008 Primary Debate in Philadelphia

Bernie is the True Democrat

During the 1980's and 1990's, the Democrats became Republicans on all the issues relating to economics. The past 30 years have been about great "social arguments" -

Gay Marriage, Abortion, Gun Control - it was only on those issues that you could tell a Democrat from a Republican - and meanwhile, no one was looking out for the Middle Class anymore. Americans were divided against each other, battling the so-called "culture wars", while BOTH parties conspired to transfer wealth from the middle class upward, and to feather their respective nests with donations from their billionaire "donors"...

Hillary Clinton is the very epitome, the poster-child, for the "New Democrat" ideals her husband championed with his deregulation of Wall Street, his destruction of the Welfare system, and his "tough on crime" legislation that has led DIRECTLY to the problems of mass incarceration that we see today. All the while collecting MILLIONS in speaking fees and in campaign donations from the big banks on Wall Street.

Bernie is here to take us back to where we were a thriving country, with a robust middle class, where we all did better when we all did better. Back to the idea that America is great because of its middle class.

Bernie is no more of a socialist than FDR was with his New Deal, or Lyndon Johnson was with his Great Society. And in that sense, BERNIE IS THE TRUE DEMOCRAT.

Numbers among Blacks

Hillary's numbers among black Americans: in one month, from June to July, her Favorable rating among blacks declined from 81% to 66%, unfavorable went from 3% to 15%. IN JUST ONE MONTH. This from a WSJ/NBC Poll published in August: <http://blogs.wsj.com/washwire/2015/08/04/hillary-clinton-loses-ground-with-white-women-wsjnbc-poll/>

Why Hillary is Running

Hillary Rodham Clinton wants to be President of the United States. THAT is why she is running. It is her turn, she has suffered ignominy and shame, countless slings and arrows, standing by Bill and toughing it out, so that she could arrive at long last at this point in history, where it is HER moment, where it is HER time, where it is HER right to be President. It is, in the end all about HER - Hillary Rodham Clinton. By contrast, Bernie Sanders is about helping people, he is running not for himself, but for the average American. and THAT is the difference.

More info here: <http://www.euroyankee.com>

Hillary Clinton is not Viable – 3 factors

There are several key factors to consider:

1. As has been written several places and most recently by James Carville, Hillary supporters would also be happy with Bernie Sanders. BUT THE REVERSE IS NOT TRUE. Many Bernie supporters are virulently anti-Hillary, and still others are simply not attracted to her, so they would just stay home on election day - and we know that is bad for Democrats.
2. Indeed, in a recent Quinnipiac Poll, 11% of Democrats avowed that there was "no way" they would vote for Hillary. <http://www.quinnipiac.edu/news-and-events/quinnipiac-university-poll/national/release-detail?ReleaseID=2274>
3. Bernie is pulling in Independents and even Republicans. The "Republicans for

Bernie Sanders" page on Facebook has 6000 "Likes". By contrast, the "Republicans for Hillary Clinton" page on Facebook has 4.

4. I would remind everyone that Bernie Sanders is not just a socialist guy with an agenda – he is a sitting US Senator who has been re-elected NINE (9) TIMES to Congress. As a socialist, he was re-elected Senator last round with 71% of the vote – including a large cohort of Republicans: <http://www.alternet.org/news-amp-politics/why-surprising-numbers-republicans-have-been-voting-bernie-sanders-vermont>

If the Democrats are to retake the reins of government and really turn the country around, they will need to attract not only Independents, but that large cohort we used to call "Reagan Democrats" -- Bernie Sanders can do this, Hillary Clinton quite clearly cannot. FEEL THE BERN!!!

Democrats Need a Big Turnout, Not Hillary

I really believe the old maxim, "Democrats fall in love, Republicans fall in line." In my 50+ years experience, this has always proven to be true: Democrats cannot win an election unless they have a *charismatic candidate* that is beloved by the base, so that the base turns out in force on Election Day.

Hillary is not that candidate.

Sure, "Email-gate" may pass, but Hillary's favourability ratings as well as her "trustworthiness" ratings are in the toilet. You simply cannot depend on her to galvanize and excite an Obama-like coalition to save the day on November 8, 2016.

Let's face it: such phrases as "*she's the only viable candidate*", "*she's better than what the GOP has*" and worst of all, "*think about the Supreme Court*" are simply NOT the rallying cries that will get the Democratic base to the polls. And we all know that when people stay home, Democrats lose.

The irony, of course, is that we have seen this all before. Remember the catchphrase from the 2004 election: "Dated Dean. Married Kerry" --?

We all know how well that "sensible choice" turned out. Let's not make that mistake again, Democrats! FEEL THE BERN!!

***Hillary will be Conservative Catnip if she is on the ballot**

We had better hope that Bernie is the nominee, because Hillary is actually the unelectable one. Everyone assumes that she is more "electable" than Sanders, but where is the proof? Her unfavorables nationwide are a solid 60%+. She polls in single digits among Independents. Bernie is the only candidate with a "net favorable" nationwide and he gets 45% among Independents. Where is your evidence that Hillary will do better than Bernie? Where? At long last, WHERE????

The woman elicits hatred and vitriol more than any other politician in America - especially on the Right. Having Hillary on the ticket will be Conservative Catnip -it will be like having a Gay Marriage ban, an Abortion ban, and a Mandatory School Prayer on the ballot all at the same time. The Right wing base will be out in droves!!

Meanwhile, disenchanted Democrats asked to once more "hold their nose and think

of the Supreme Court" will mostly stay home on Election Day. Sure there will be diehard Hillary supporters and the rank and file "party faithful" who will come out, but you need more than that to win an election. And when people stay home, Democrats lose.

So if you were happy about the turnout in 2010 and 2014, by all means vote for Hillary. But if you want to WIN, vote for Bernie!!

FEEL THE BERN, brothers and sisters!

The Email Scandal – Why it REALLY Matters

One thing that gets missed in the Clinton "email scandal" is that regardless of whether or not Hillary transmitted or received classified material, the idea that she would use ONLY her personal email account for both personal and official State Department correspondence is frankly unbelievably stupid. There had to have been a reason. It was an unprecedented decision. Even Colin Powell was smart enough to have two different accounts. So that raises flags.

And then her explanation that she just "didn't think about it" when she started at State, that she really wasn't paying attention or that she did not put much thought into it - is frankly unbelievable. Remember, this was 2009 -- we were well, well into the digital age at that point. The NSA spying programs that Hillary loves so much were well underway at that point, the Russians and the Chinese were already known to be hacking and conducting cyber-ops... and yet, she just couldn't be bothered to give any thought to email security. Is THAT what we are to believe?

She is either an extremely incompetent woman with very, very poor judgment or she is a bald-faced liar. Either way not good.

Hillary: Progressive or Centrist?

In the first Democratic Debate, Hillary proclaimed that she was a "progressive." But 4 weeks earlier she had proudly "pled guilty" to being a "Moderate-Centrist."

<https://youtu.be/LTL767hKxHo>

Quinnipiac Poll August 2015

Major takeaways:

1. Sanders, Clinton and Biden all beat each of the GOP nominees in a head-to-head.
2. 39% of respondents, including 38% of Democrats, said they had not heard enough about Bernie to have an opinion
3. Bernie had a favorability rating of POSITIVE 4 (+42/-38)
4. Hillary had a favorability rating of NEGATIVE 12 (+39/-51)
5. Bernie Sanders was judged TRUSTWORTHY by 21 points (+44/-23)
6. Hillary Clinton was judged UNTRUSTWORTHY by 27 points (+34/-61)
7. When asked the first word that came to mind about Hillary, 30% said "untrustworthy", "deceitful", "criminal" or something synonymous.

<http://www.quinnipiac.edu/news-and-events/quinnipiac-university->

poll/national/release-detail?ReleaseID=2274

Hillary on Crime

If anyone should be “held accountable for her actions” (as the BlackLivesMatter protesters shout) then it is Hillary Clinton, not Bernie Sanders. Hillary was an ardent and vocal supporter of her husband’s welfare “reform” and “tough on crime” bills that devastated black families and led to the mass incarceration of black youths.

To wit:

“We need more police, we need more and tougher prison sentences for repeat offenders. The ‘three-strikes-and-you’re-out’ for violent offenders has to be part of the plan. We need more prisons to keep violent offenders for as long as it takes to keep them off the streets.”

- Hillary Clinton, speaking on the 1994 Crime Bill.

“We already imprison more people per capita than any other country, and all of the executions in the world, will not make that situation right. We can either educate or electrocute. We can create meaningful jobs, rebuilding our society, or we can build more jails. Mr. Speaker, let us create a society of hope and compassion, not one of hate and vengeance.”

- Bernie Sanders, speaking on the same 1994 Crime Bill.

***Hillary on the TPP - 2012**

“... This TPP sets the gold standard in trade agreements to open free, transparent, fair trade, the kind of environment that has the rule of law and a level playing field. And when negotiated, this agreement will cover 40 percent of the world’s total trade...”

- Hillary Clinton to an Australian Trade Group in 2012h
- <http://www.state.gov/secretary/20092013clinton/rm/2012/11/200565.htm>

***Hillary on the TPP - 2015**

“... I am against it now, but we’ll see: if there is any kind of significant changes ... if Congress adopted my work and wage proposals, I would be pretty excited ... but that will have to wait until I am actually there as President.”

<https://youtu.be/D8pcUKboeA8>

So – Hillary is not opposing TPP because of the enormous power it gives to corporations or the tremendous clout and huge profits it gives to Big Pharma at the expense of sick people, or that COLA will be banned, or the fact that companies can sue governments for “lost future profits” ... she is only concerned with “work and wages” ...

***Hillary’s Timeline of Flip-Flops on the TPP**

In a 2012 speech, Clinton said the TPP, “sets the gold standard in trade agreements to open, free, transparent, fair trade, the kind of environment that has the rule of law and a level playing field.”

On October 7, 2015 Clinton wrote, "Based on what I know so far, I can't support this agreement. The bar here is very high and, based on what I have seen, I don't believe this agreement has met it."

On October 13, 2015, Clinton said: "I'm against it now, but we'll see whether there is any kind of significant changes," Clinton said to Javier Palomarez in San Antonio for a U.S. Hispanic Chamber of Commerce Q&A.

<http://freebeacon.com/issues/after-announcing-opposition-clinton-leaves-door-open-to-supporting-tpp-later/>

SO - when Bernie says that he will have the same position on the TPP tomorrow, that is an important difference in position - not just an accusation of flip-flopping. Bernie is saying that there are no circumstances under which he would support the TPP. Hillary Clinton however DOES NOT hold that view!

Online Presence: YouTube and Facebook

Aside from the famous Subreddit supporting Sanders:

Hillary Clinton has 1 YouTube Channel, Bernie has 4, plus 6 additional fan channels.

The "Republicans for Bernie Sanders" Facebook page has about 13,000 "Likes", whereas the "Republicans for Hillary" page has just 249. This is a huge difference.

Hillary the Darling of Wall Street

Lloyd Blankfein, CEO of Goldman Sachs, is on record saying: "I very much was supportive of Hillary Clinton the last go-round," he said. "I held fundraisers for her." is on record saying that he would be just as happy whether Jeb Bush or Hillary Clinton were President.

<http://www.politico.com/story/2014/04/wall-street-republicans-hillary-clinton-2016-106070>

Blankfein paid Hillary \$400,000 in speaking fees in 2014 to give speeches to Goldman Sachs audiences, and Goldman has contributed \$500,000 to her campaign.

More praise from Wall Street: "If it turns out to be Jeb versus Hillary we would love that and either outcome would be fine," one top Republican-leaning Wall Street lawyer said over lunch in midtown Manhattan last week. "We could live with either one. Jeb versus Joe Biden would also be fine."

http://www.huffingtonpost.com/h-a-goodman/president-hillary-clinton_b_5525235.html

***Hillary is a NeoCon Warhawk**

Hillary is an interventionist and to the Right of Obama on foreign policy. The Clintons were well-known members of the DLC, the Democratic Leadership Council. This was the conservative, right-leaning group of so-called "New Democrats" that rejected economic populism and "triangulated" Republican positions on social issues – as well as Foreign Policy. The DLC was part of and supported the PNAC – the cabal of right wing neoconservatives that laid the foundation for Bush's Iraq war.

Robert Kagan, a famous neocon under Bush and an architect of the Iraq war who has advised Clinton on foreign policy, says: "If she pursues a policy which we think she will pursue ...it's something that might have been called neocon, but clearly her supporters are not going to call it that; they are going to call it something else."
http://www.nytimes.com/2014/06/16/us/politics/historians-critique-of-obama-foreign-policy-is-brought-alive-by-events-in-iraq.html?_r=0

Hillary never met an intervention she didn't like. Her soulmate in the Senate was John McCain.

She is a neocon hawk and agreed with McCain on everything, even the great "success" in Iraq. In 2005 she also pronounced that the Iraqi insurgency was "dying." "The fact that you have these suicide bombers now, wreaking such hatred and violence while people pray, is to me, an indication of their failure," Clinton said. "It's regrettable that the security needs have increased so much. On the other hand, I think you can look at the country as a whole and see that there are many parts of Iraq that are functioning quite well," Clinton said.
http://usatoday30.usatoday.com/news/world/iraq/2005-02-19-iraq-senators_x.htm

She continued to get it all wrong. But she is a neocon, and that is what they do.

***Hillary is a NeoCon Warhawk – Long Version**

Let's make no mistake: Hillary is an interventionist and to the Right of Obama on foreign policy. Hillary was a staunch member of the Democratic Leadership Council, an organisation of so-called "New Democrats" of which Bill Clinton was Chairman. The DLC rejected economic populism and believed in "triangulation" – i.e., the option of Conservative social and economic positions in order to win votes among what they perceived to be a conservative-leaning electorate. The DLC was fully behind the disastrous domestic policies that the Clintons pushed (Tough On Crime Bill, DOMA, Destruction of Welfare/dissolution of AFDC).

But on Foreign Policy, the DLC was also very conservative, and the DLC signed on with and supported the Project for a New American Century (PNAC) – the cabal of neoconservatives that were behind the Iraq War. And indeed, support for Bush's invasion of Iraq was the official policy position of the DLC!

Robert Kagan, a famous neocon under Bush and an architect of the Iraq war who has Hillary is an interventionist and to the "If she pursues a policy which we think she will pursue," he added, "it's something that might have been called neocon, but clearly her supporters are not going to call it that; they are going to call it something else." Kagan served on Clinton's foreign policy advisory board when she was Secretary of State, and he has deep neocon roots. He was part of the Project for a New American Century (PNAC), which as you recall was the organization that included Wolfowitz, Cheney, Feith, Peypes, and pushed for seizing upon 9/11 as "the new Pearl Harbor" to galvanize America into a massive expansionist military campaign that started with the Iraq invasion.

It is one thing to say that her Iraq vote was a simple "mistake." But if you consider that she was indeed a neocon and being influenced and advised by the DLC and the

PNAC, then the more plausible explanation emerges: she supported the Iraq war because she believed in the underlying neocon principles that had driven the decision to invade in the first place - the same principles and ideology **that influenced Bush and Cheney.**

There has never been a possible military intervention that Clinton has opposed. She is on record as a war hawk and has always pushed for the use of military force, from the Libya campaign up through her latest push to set up a “no fly zone” in Syria. She maintains that a No Fly Zone would not involve those infamous “boots on the ground”, but in the case of Iraq, the NFZ was simply an extended prelude to invasion.

While in the Senate, Hillary crossed the aisle to vote with Republicans to defeat a bill that would have prohibited the use of cluster bombs in areas where civilians are likely to be killed by them.

Hillary is also a well-known supporter of Israel and the Likud Party and has opposed Obama in saying that Netanyahu was indeed ready for a 2-state solution, and she has condemned Jimmy Carter’s assessment that the occupied territories represent a new “apartheid”. She has also worked to block Palestine’s recognition as a state in the UN. Where does this vehement support for Israel come from? It could come from a very strong religious context. In June 2014 Hillary told the NY Times in an interview that the Bible was the most important book to her.

“At the risk of appearing predictable, the Bible was and remains the biggest influence on my thinking. I was raised reading it, memorizing passages from it and being guided by it. I still find it a source of wisdom, comfort and encouragement.”
Will she, like Bush, start going on about Gog and Magog when it comes to Middle East policy?

I don’t know if Clinton’s bellicosity arises from a fear of being perceived as “weak” or “womanish” on foreign policy, or whether she is just another Israel-loving neocon who believes that the US should intervene wherever Israel wants them to. But one thing is sure, and that is she is always the first, it seems to push for a military option, and in this way she is a true student of the neoconservatism. If she is president, it is most likely, as Kagan says, that she will pursue what the PNAC called a “Reaganite policy of military strength and moral clarity.”

One thing is beyond dispute: Hillary Clinton will be to the right of Obama on Foreign Policy. She is anxious to confront Putin, she will continue to give Israel a free hand in all that it wants to do, she will coddle the MI complex, she will continue to support the kingdoms that have given so generously to her foundation, and she will be the first to jump in with a military option should any region become a flashpoint that she perceives to threaten any of those stakeholders.

When it comes to foreign policy, Bernie can always be expected to give the line that he delivered on Tuesday night:

"I happen to believe from the bottom of my heart that war should be the last resort"
Many may be tempted to dismiss this statement as oratory or simply stating a platitude rather than arguing a position. But in reality, when he is up there compared with Hillary Clinton, we must realize that it is a serious declaration of a major difference in their approach to Foreign Policy. That simple sentiment that “war is a



last resort” may seem axiomatic to us, but it is by no means a given with Hillary Clinton.

READ:

http://www.nytimes.com/2014/06/16/us/politics/historians-critique-of-obama-foreign-policy-is-brought-alive-by-events-in-iraq.html?_r=0

http://www.nytimes.com/2014/07/06/opinion/sunday/are-neocons-getting-ready-to-ally-with-hillary-clinton.html?_r=0

Hillary: Bible is “Biggest Influence on my Thinking”

In June 2014, when Hillary thought she was going to have a cakewalk to the nomination, and was worried about seeming too liberal, she took a page out of the Trump playbook and told the NY Times in an interview that the Bible was the most important book to her.

“At the risk of appearing predictable, the Bible was and remains the biggest influence on my thinking. I was raised reading it, memorizing passages from it and being guided by it. I still find it a source of wisdom, comfort and encouragement.” Will she, like Bush, start going on about Gog and Magog when it comes to Middle East policy?

http://www.nytimes.com/2014/06/15/books/review/hillary-rodham-clinton-by-the-book.html?ref=review&_r=1

Hillary’s Net Worth puts her in the Top 1%

USA Today published a summary of the Net Worth of all the Presidential candidates. It shows that Hillary ranked No. 4 – right behind Jeb Bush – with a Net Worth of **\$15.3 million-\$55 million**. Bernie Sanders ranked No. 10 with a Net Worth of only **\$110,000-\$550,000**.

<http://www.usatoday.com/story/news/politics/elections/2015/08/26/24-7-wall-st-net-worth-presidential-candidates/32409491/>

Hillary’s Donor Base

<http://www.truth-out.org/speakout/item/32165-comparing-hillary-clinton-s-top-donors-to-bernie-sanders-top-donors>

Bernie better against GOP

"Hillary Clinton Wins Primary Against Bernie Sanders, But Can't Beat GOP: Poll"

<http://www.ibtimes.com/hillary-clinton-wins-primary-against-bernie-sanders-cant-beat-gop-poll-2112072>

Banks v. Guns - A Tale of Two Constituencies

Hillary goes after Bernie on guns; Bernie goes after Hillary on Wall Street and the Big Banks. It’s political tit-for-tat, right?

Unfortunately for Hillary, these arguments are not equal in terms of scope and substance.

As a Congressman and Senator from rural Vermont, Sanders was representing his constituents - hunters and other conservative gun-owners -when he voted the way

he did. Likewise, as the junior Senator from New York, Clinton had Wall Street banks as her own constituents, and so one might have understood the fact that she was obligated to represent their interests in the Senate.

The question to be considered NOW, however, is whether a President Sanders would adopt a stronger position gun control when he represents all Americans, and whether a President Clinton would be tough on Wall Street once in the Oval Office. This question is best answered simply:

- To date, Hillary Clinton has received over \$3.5 million in donations from Wall Street banks, with Goldman Sachs giving her almost \$1 million for this election alone.
- To date, Bernie Sanders has received \$0 from the NRA, and has a D- rating by that group.

THIS outlines the big difference between the two candidates: Hillary Clinton is willing to rant and rave all day about Gun Control, Abortion Rights, Gay Rights, Civil Rights and Climate Change because that is what her rich, elite donor base want her to do. The last thing they want is for Hillary to actually do something to curb their power, influence or wealth.

***GOP Attacks on Bernie as a Socialist – NOT CREDIBLE**

Yes, I would dearly LOVE to see the GOP attack Bernie's "socialist" positions. I would HOPE to see them attack the expansion of Social Security, which 65% of Americans support. I would ENCOURAGE them to condemn single payer "Medicare for all", which 67% of Americans support; I would BEG them to dismiss tuition free state colleges, which 63% of Americans support; I would EXPECT them to oppose raising corporate taxes, which 64% of Americans support, just as I would EXPECT them to oppose raising taxes on the wealthy, which 61% of American support. And last, but not least, I would WELCOME them to attack the \$15 minimum wage, which 63% of Americans support.

Yes, by all means, the GOP attack machine would go into overdrive against Bernie, and in every case the move would backfire, because Bernie - and Bernie alone - can get those 60%+ majorities to come out to the polls. Hillary cannot.

***Hillary is VERY Conservative (summary post)**

As a young woman, Hillary was a "Goldwater Girl" who canvassed for that right-wing Republican, who was running on a platform to reverse the Civil Rights Act

Hillary went to the very prestigious Wellesley College outside Boston, where she was President of the Wellesley Young Republicans.

Hillary is on record as a neocon, and has neocon advisers like Robert Kagan that had previously been the architects of the Iraq war. Hillary has never met a war she didn't like – she has always – ALWAYS – been for putting American boots on the ground. The Iraq vote was not an outlier – it fit perfectly a pattern of right-leaning



bellicosity that has been Hillary's trademark since she entered national politics. More recently, she called for establishing a UNILATERAL "no-fly-zone" over Syria. The US should, according to her, act alone to set up this no-fly zone. I am sure that would have gone over really well when the Russians started flying sorties two weeks later. Yes, I know she has walked back that position, saying that we would have a "coalition" – but when she says "coalition" she is talking like Bush – IOW, Vanuatu and the Solomon Islands will join us.

Hillary's conservative ties to Wall Street are well known and well-documented. Her biggest donors are Citigroup, Goldman Sachs, JPMorgan Chase and Morgan Stanley. Suffice it to say that the great Financiers on Wall Street like Lloyd Blankfein at Goldman Sachs do not see any difference between a Hillary Clinton Administration, or a Jeb Bush Administration. "Both would be fine," said Blankfein.

Hillary is on record with the NY Times claiming that the Bible "influenced her thinking" the most. What are we supposed to take away from that?

Hillary supports the prison industry and mass incarceration. The for-profit prison lobby is out raising money for her campaign.

Hillary is blasé when it comes to racial injustice – she actually was one of the first to say that "All Lives Matter" – when she travelled to Ferguson Mo. In June and gave a speech in an historic black church there:

<http://www.nytimes.com/politics/first-draft/2015/06/24/hillary-clintons-all-lives-matter-remark-stirs-backlash/>

***Hillary on DOMA**

Hillary is rewriting history and the people who were there have all weighed in to say that it was a politically expedient move and there was no talk of a possible Amendment. But you see this is what the Clintons are all about. I cannot believe that people are discussing Bill and Hillary as if there never was a Democratic Leadership Council, as if Bill was never Chairman of the DLC, and as if Hilary herself wasn't a card carrying true believer in the DLC. As you know, the DLC "triangulated" and co-opted Republican positions just to get more votes. These people are NOT liberal, folks!!!

CASE IN POINT: DOMA - this is Hillary in 2004:

"I believe marriage is not just a bond but a sacred bond between a man and a woman. I have had occasion in my life to defend marriage, to stand up for marriage, to believe in the hard work and challenge of marriage. So I take umbrage at anyone who might suggest that those of us who worry about amending the Constitution are less committed to the sanctity of marriage, or to the fundamental bedrock principle that it exists between a man and a woman, going back into the midst of history as one of the founding, foundational institutions of history and humanity and civilization, and that its primary, principal role during those millennia has been the raising and socializing of children for the society into which they are to become adults."

Watch the video - it is obvious that she truly believes this - to the extent that she "truly" believes in anything.

<https://youtu.be/6I1-r1YgK9I>



***The BIG DIFFERENCE between Hillary and Bernie**

No one begrudged the Roosevelts their wealth, nor the Kennedys theirs. Even Mitt Romney was generally considered to have “earned” his fortune. And Donald Trump has become famous almost solely for his success as a businessman. In other words, they “earned” their money in the American way.

But the Clintons? They are simply “America’s Political Family.” They have never done anything else. And yet they have amassed a fortune of \$55 million, and they travel in the same circles as the Trumps and the Bushes, etc.. Indeed, it is now widely known that the Clintons went to Trump’s last wedding, and Trump’s daughter Ivanka is best friends with Chelsea Clinton.

And this brings us to the Big Difference. Bernie Sanders is a true believer. He is motivated by a genuine desire to help people, to speak truth to power, and as he says so often in his speeches, he wants to use his political position to “*take on the billionaire class.*”

Hillary Clinton, on the other hand, has used her political positions and connections to *become PART of that “billionaire class.”* And she revels in it. And that is, I think, why people in the US don’t like her. She literally embodies all that is wrong with the calcified, corrupt and money-driven political system that is running America today. She is, in essence, the poster-girl for Bernie’s “political revolution” and that fact will come out over the course of the campaign.

***The Clintons and the Trumps are Good Friends**

Please, please understand that the Clintons and the Trumps are all FRIENDS. Their children are BFFs and they swim in the same waters, go to the same restaurants, tan on the same beaches – and all rendezvous at Martha’s Vineyard, the Hamptons and so forth for recreation.

We need to break the grip of the ruling political elite – and that is what Bernie Sanders wants to do. Make no mistake – the “Billionaire Class” is a ruling elite in America, and it actually has its supporters among the American populace. During the 2000 Presidential Election, the media was all aflutter, wondering whether the Bush family would have a “frosty” Thanksgiving dinner if Jeb, who was Governor of Florida at the time, would fail to deliver Florida for his older Brother George in the November election. How difficult for them!!

And the prospect of a Clinton-Trump race would also bring no doubt concern over whether the two daughters would have their friendship put to the test as their parents fought it out to see who would be the leader of the free world. My goodness, if Hillary won maybe Chelsea would have to “un-friend” Ivanka!

This is madness, and it is sick. Hillary is, in essence, the poster-girl for why we need Bernie’s “political revolution” and that fact will come out over the course of the campaign.

***Clinton-Trump Friendship and The BIG DIFFERENCE w/Bernie**

Please, please understand that the Clintons and the Trumps are all FRIENDS. Their children are BFFs and they swim in the same waters, go to the same restaurants,

tan on the same beaches – and all rendezvous at Martha’s Vineyard, the Hamptons and so forth for recreation. We need to break the grip of the ruling political elite – and that is what Bernie Sanders wants to do.

No one begrudged the Roosevelts their wealth, nor the Kennedys theirs. And Donald Trump has become famous almost solely for his success as a businessman. In other words, they “earned” their money in the American way. But the Clintons? They are simply “America’s Political Family.” They have never done anything else. And yet they have amassed a fortune of \$55 million, and they travel in the same circles as the Trumps and the Bushes, etc..

Indeed, it is now widely known that the Clintons went to Trump’s last wedding, and Trump’s daughter Ivanka is best friends with Chelsea Clinton.

And this brings us to the Big Difference. Bernie Sanders is a true believer. He is motivated by a genuine desire to help people, to speak truth to power, and as he says so often in his speeches, he wants to use his political position to “take on the billionaire class.” Hillary Clinton, on the other hand, has used her political positions and connections to become PART of that “billionaire class.” And she revels in it. And that is, I think, why people in the US don’t like her. She literally embodies all that is wrong with the calcified, corrupt and money-driven political system that is running America today.

She is, in essence, the poster-girl for Bernie’s “political revolution” and that fact will come out over the course of the campaign.



Figure 2: Ivanka Trump and Chelsea Clinton embrace



Figure 3: The Clintons and the Trumps having a laugh together at Trump's wedding

First Democratic Debate

Why Bernie Sanders Won the First Democratic Debate

Bernie Sanders made his debut the national stage – literally – in the first Democratic Debate in Las Vegas, and it was, as the Senator would say, a “YUGE” success.

The pundits of course were all about optics: would Bernie appear “presidential”; would he stand up to Clinton’s “polished” persona and national debate expertise; would just “letting Bernie be Bernie” be enough?

The answer is that Bernie really needed to do something else: he needed to introduce himself to the 40% of Americans and the Democratic electorate who had no idea who he was. More importantly, he needed to appeal to the black community, which makes up such a large cohort of the Democratic electorate in states like South Carolina.

When viewed in the more precise and practical context of those goals, Bernie hit it out of the park.

Banks v. Guns - A Tale of Two Constituencies

Hillary goes after Bernie on guns; Bernie goes after Hillary on Wall Street and the Big Banks. It’s political tit-for-tat, right?

Unfortunately for Hillary, these arguments are not equal in terms of scope and substance.

As a Congressman and Senator from rural Vermont, Sanders was representing his constituents - hunters and other conservative gun-owners -when he voted the way he did. Likewise, as the junior Senator from New York, Clinton had Wall Street banks as her own constituents, and so one might have understood the fact that she was obligated to represent their interests in the Senate.

The question to be considered NOW, however, is whether a President Sanders would adopt a stronger position gun control when he represents all Americans, and whether a President Clinton would be tough on Wall Street once in the Oval Office. This question is best answered simply:

- To date, Hillary Clinton has received over \$3.5 million in donations from Wall Street banks, with Goldman Sachs giving her almost \$1 million for this election alone.
- To date, Bernie Sanders has received \$0 from the NRA, and has a D- rating by that group.

THIS outlines the big difference between the two candidates: Hillary Clinton is willing to rant and rave all day about Gun Control, Abortion Rights, Gay Rights, Civil Rights and Climate Change because that is what her rich, elite donor base want her to do. The last thing they want is for Hillary to actually do something to curb their power, influence or wealth.

Hillary: Progressive or Centrist?

In the first Democratic Debate, Hillary proclaimed that she was a “progressive.” But 4 weeks earlier she had proudly “pled guilty” to being a “Moderate-Centrist.”

<https://youtu.be/LTL767hKxHo>

Hillary believes “All Lives Matter”

It was Hillary Clinton who was tone deaf this summer, when she travelled to Ferguson Mo. In June and gave a speech in an historic black church there, saying “All Lives Matter.”

<http://www.nytimes.com/politics/first-draft/2015/06/24/hillary-clintons-all-lives-matter-remark-stirs-backlash/>

Hillary is a Hypocrite on College Tuition

Hillary has said that she had to work when she went to college, but that is only because she chose to attend Wellesley College, a prestigious all-female college outside Boston. As a resident of Illinois, she could have gone to the University of Illinois in 1965 TUITION FREE. This is because that school was a Land Grant school chartered to provide free tuition for in-state students. It was not until the 70’s that the UI started charging tuition to in-state students.



***Bernie is the One who “Gets Things Done” (Legislation)**

According to the Congressional Record, Bernie has Sponsored or Co-Sponsored over 6,000 bills; he Introduced 5,286 of those bills; 704 made it out of Committee; 206 became law - <https://www.congress.gov/member/bernard-sanders/S000033>

Moreover he was the “Amendment King” in that he passed more Amendments than any other member of Congress = and they were all Progressive.

<http://www.alternet.org/election-2016/bernie-gets-it-done-sanders-record-pushing-through-major-reforms-will-surprise-you>

***Climate Change IS the Biggest Threat to National Security**

Climate change ‘urgent and growing threat’ to national security: Pentagon
<http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2015/jul/29/climate-change-urgent-security-threat-pentagon/>

Pentagon: Climate change a national security threat
<http://thehill.com/policy/energy-environment/220575-pentagon-unveils-plan-to-fight-climate-change>

Climate Change an 'Immediate Risk,' Pentagon Says
<http://www.livescience.com/48295-pentagon-climate-change-roadmap.html>

Pentagon report calls for military to prepare for climate change
<http://www.earthmagazine.org/article/pentagon-report-calls-military-prepare-climate-change>

Pentagon Report: U.S. Military Considers Climate Change a 'Threat Multiplier' That Could Exacerbate Terrorism
<http://www.newsweek.com/pentagon-report-us-military-considers-climate-change-immediate-threat-could-277155>

Debate Results: Polls

<u>Outlet</u>	<u>Bernie</u>	<u>Hillary</u>
MSNBC	63%	13%
TIME	55%	11%
Sacramento Bee	78%	11%
Daily Kos	56%	38%
FOX 5 San Diego	77%	16%
WRIC ABC 8 Richmond	71%	16%
Palm Beach Post	81%	12%
AL.COM Alabama	77%	16%
Fox2 St. Louis	80%	14%



AVERAGE:	71%	16%
Focus Groups	Bernie	Hillary
Fusion Focus group	75%	25%
FOX Focus Group (Luntz)	100%	0%
CNN Facebook Live Survey	75%	25%
CNN Focus Group	70%	30%
AVERAGE:	80%	20%

Figure 4: Table of Post-Debate Poll and Focus-Group Results

***Response to a “Hillary won” article or post**

The problem with the “Hillary crushed it” narrative is that it simply does not reconcile with the facts. Every single poll taken after the debate showed Bernie defeating Hillary by 50 points or more. Many say that Internet polls are unreliable and could be just a showing of the enthusiasm among the Sanders base. And I agree, it could be that the Hillary supporters, while greater in number, could just believe that her nomination is so inevitable that they do not have to go out and “root” for her. But how then do we explain that every single focus group also voted in huge majorities for Bernie as the winner – with one group in Florida going 100% for Senator Sanders.

Yes, Hillary appeared “polished” but there is a reason for this: When asked why there were not more debates scheduled, Debbie Wasserman Schultz, Chairwoman of the DNC, explained that they did not want to “distract” the candidates from their campaigns and “force them to come off the trail” in order to debate. Ms. Schultz, a Hilary supporter who was National Co-Chair of the Clinton candidacy in 2008, was undoubtedly referring to the weeks and weeks of debate “prep” that the former Secretary of State had done in the lead-up to this Tuesday’s debate. With the help of stand-ins to act out the role of her rivals, Ms. Clinton practiced her remarks, rehearsed every nuanced gesture, memorized every retort to every possible question or challenge. This is in stark contrast to her main opponent, Senator Bernie Sanders, who did virtually zero “debate prep.” Indeed, Bernie could have stepped out of the shower on any day of any year and delivered the same blisteringly genuine, hard-hitting and direct debate that he did this week.

Statistics tell us that only 8% of Democrats vote in Primaries. This means that Bernie Sanders only needs to have 1 in 20 Democrats come out to vote for him in order to win the Primary race.

So ask yourself: who will make up that 8%? I believe that the Clinton supporters who are secure in their belief in her “inevitable win” will stay home if it is raining, or snowing, or they have too much to do. And their complacency will only be further strengthened by articles such as this one.

The so-called “Sandernistas” and Berniebots” however will crawl over broken glass in a blizzard to vote for their guy. I know because I am one of them.

8% of the Democratic base is equal to 16 million voters. Bernie has almost 700,000 donors. If every donor to Bernie's campaign will commit to getting another 11-12 people to come out and vote for Bernie, then Sanders wins.

Think about that - because I know Hillary's people are.

***Gravis Marketing Poll showing Clinton won debate**

This poll appeared on One America News Network, and was paid for by Charles Herring and Herring Networks, a FOX wannabe and the originator of "Wealth TV." Herring also founded One America News Network.

The poll itself was done by Gravis Marketing, and here is a snippet from their website (Gravis Marketing Clients):

"Gravis Marketing has worked with several of today's leading political names including, Rick Santorum, Newt Gingrich, The Alberta Party in Calgary Elbow, Cox Media, The District of Columbia, The Libertarian Party, RNC, Chris Christie's NJ Campaign and more. Our non-partisan political affiliation ..."

*"One America News Network's National Top 10 GOP Candidate Poll, conducted on July 30th and reported on air, is **100% consistent** with Fox News Channel/RNC Debate Top 10 Candidates ...One America News Network contracted Gravis Marketing for the polling for the purposes of independently confirming the top 10 candidates." - Charles Herring, Herring Networks.*

OANN does not cite the original source data or link to the report itself -- a big flag. In addition the poll was completely dominated by females with a post grad education 18-49 years old.

Hmmm. I wonder who they would prefer?

***HuffPost/YouGov Poll – Biased by Mainstream Media**

This poll was published 2 days after the debate itself, and so after a 48 hour blitzkrieg of pro-Hillary bias in the mainstream media, purported to show that 55% of respondents thought Hillary won the debate. WHAT THEY DON'T TELL YOU is that only 22% of the respondents actually watched the full debate. And among those who "voted" for the debate winner, more than half (54%) had only seen clips or highlights in the media. So this poll is really only useful in describing how effective the mainstream media was in prejudicing and influencing public opinion.

The more interesting data points in this poll were as follows:

- Almost HALF (48%) of Democratic-leaning Independents "would prefer to see someone other than Hillary Clinton as the Democratic nominee."
- Almost HALF (46%) of voters under 30 would like to see someone other than Hillary as the nominee
- Of the Independents that watched the debate, more said that their opinion of Bernie Sanders improved as a result, as did those who said their opinion of Hillary improved (26% to 22%)

- Of the Republicans that watched the debate, almost TWICE as many said that their opinion of Bernie Sanders improved as a result, as did those who said their opinion of Hillary improved (16% to 9%)
- When asked whether the debate caused their opinion about a candidate to worsen, Hillary scored much worse than Bernie:
 - Democrats: 12% thought worse of Hillary, 5% thought worse of Sanders
 - Independents: 36% thought worse of Hillary, 22% thought worse of Sanders
 - Republicans: 48% thought worse of Hillary, 36% thought worse of Sanders
 - Voters under 30: 32% thought worse of Hillary, 8% thought worse of Sanders

SUMMARY: The poll's results are biased with regards to the debate, because the majority of the opinions were based on what the media had portrayed and not what was actually seen in the debate. Moreover, the underlying data shows that Hillary continues to have problems with younger voters and non-Democratic voters, and she continues to have dangerously high negative ratings among all voters, while Bernie continues to be the candidate with the most "pull" among Independents and even Republicans.

***NBC/SurveyMonkey Poll – Another self-referentially biased poll**

This poll was also published in the wake of the massively of pro-Hillary campaign in the mainstream media, and claimed that 56% of respondents thought Hillary won the debate. WHAT THEY DON'T TELL YOU is that 60% of the respondents had NOT watched the debate, but only based their opinion on the coverage they had seen in the news.

Jefferson Jackson Dinner

***Barack Obama and Bernie Sanders in the same position (eerily)**

In 2007 Barack Obama said this at the JJ Dinner:

"telling the American people what we think they want to hear instead of telling the American people what they need to hear just won't do. Triangulating and poll-driven positions ... just won't do. "

At this point Obama was losing to Clinton **50% to 21%**

In 2015 Bernie Sanders said this at the JJ Dinner:

"I promise you tonight as your president I will govern based on principle not poll numbers."

At this point Sanders is "only" losing to Clinton **50% to 25%**

<http://www.gallup.com/poll/102277/gallup-election-review-october-2007.aspx>



***Gallup Poll from October 2007 – Past as Prologue**

In October 2007 Gallup said this:

“Gallup’s 2007 national presidential polling strongly points to Clinton winning the 2008 Democratic nomination. Barring something unusual or otherwise unexpected, she is well positioned for the 2008 Democratic primaries. Obama has not been an insignificant rival: he came within single digits of tying Clinton for the lead ... But he has recently lost ground ...”

“Clinton holds a commanding lead among nearly every major subgroup of potential Democratic primary voters. Some of her strongest showings are among women, nonwhites, those in lower-income households, those with less formal education, and Southerners.”

“Democrats also rate Clinton as the candidate most likely to defeat the Republican in the general election -- a key perceptual advantage given that primary voters are trying to distinguish among candidates with largely similar issue positions.”

Sound familiar? This is probably why Gallup are not polling the Primary races this time !

<http://www.gallup.com/poll/102277/gallup-election-review-october-2007.aspx>

***Hillary’s Speech (typical)**

Bernie gave a real barn-burner (or “berner”) of a speech, but when Hillary spoke, half the room was empty because so many Bernie supporters just walked out. It was a very flat speech which was similar to all her speeches these days, and it basically goes like this:

"I am a woman and a mother and a grandmother and I get targeted because I am a woman and people accuse me of playing the gender card because these men just don't understand us women, you know (wink wink), and Bernie has accused me of shouting because he is just an old sexist and cannot handle a strong woman, but I want to be a role model for the women and girls in America and because I am a woman I want to be the woman that smashes the glass ceiling at the White House and become the first woman President so vote for ME!!!! - and did I mention I was a woman?"

***Hillary on DOMA**

Hillary is rewriting history and the people who were there have all weighed in to say that it was a politically expedient move and there was no talk of a possible Amendment. But you see this is what the Clintons are all about. I cannot believe that people are discussing Bill and Hillary as if there never was a Democratic Leadership Council, as if Bill was never Chairman of the DLC, and as if Hilary herself wasn't a card carrying true believer in the DLC. As you know, the DLC “triangulated” and co-opted Republican positions just to get more votes. These people are NOT liberal, folks!!!

CASE IN POINT: DOMA - this is Hillary in 2004:

"I believe marriage is not just a bond but a sacred bond between a man and a woman. I have had occasion in my life to defend marriage, to stand up for marriage, to believe in the hard work and challenge of marriage. So I take umbrage at anyone who might suggest that those of us who worry about amending the Constitution are less committed to the sanctity of marriage, or to the fundamental bedrock principle that it exists between a man and a woman, going back into the midst of history as one of the founding, foundational institutions of history and humanity and civilization, and that its primary, principal role during those millennia has been the raising and socializing of children for the society into which they are to become adults."

Watch the video - it is obvious that she truly believes this - to the extent that she "truly" believes in anything.

<https://youtu.be/6l1-r1YgK9I>

***TPP – Bernie and Hillary actually DO NOT agree**

When Bernie says that he will have the same position on the TPP tomorrow, that is an important difference in position - not just an accusation of flip-flopping. Bernie is saying that there are no circumstances under which he would support the TPP. Hillary Clinton however DOES NOT hold that view!

On October 7, 2015 Clinton said, "Based on what I know so far, I can't support this agreement. The bar here is very high and, based on what I have seen, I don't believe this agreement has met it."

On October 13, 2015, Clinton told the U.S. Hispanic Chamber of Commerce: "I'm against it now, but we'll see whether there is any kind of significant changes ... I mean, if Congress adopted my ... proposals ..."

Clinton to Javier Palomarez in San Antonio for a Q&A.

<http://freebeacon.com/issues/after-announcing-opposition-clinton-leaves-door-open-to-supporting-tpp-later/>

So – Hillary is not opposing TPP because of the enormous power it gives to corporations or the tremendous clout and huge profits it gives to Big Pharma at the expense of sick people, or that COOL will be banned, or the fact that companies can sue governments for "lost future profits" ... she is only concerned with "work and wages" ... whatever that means? Bernie is unequivocally against the deal.

South Carolina Democratic Forum

***Hillary Equivocates and does not give real answers**

Bernie Sanders was much more substantive, he resonated more with the audience, and he actually answered the questions - Hillary did nothing but equivocate, mouth platitudes and throw out fluff lines like "we need to look at that" and "we need to think

about this" and "we should figure out how to do this" – Instead of laying out concrete positions and presenting real ideas, she'd rather tell anecdotes about moms and kids and express outrage at the the things that we all find outrageous.

Bernie already has answers, he already has positions, because he has been pushing the same issues for 40 years!

The fact is, no one knows what a Clinton presidency would look like, and Hillary is doing her best to make sure no one will know. She famously dodged a question about Keystone by saying "ask me when I am President." This seems to be her basic response to everything. She is saying, in effect:

"You cannot assume I will be more hawkish than Obama just because I have acted so in the past."

"You cannot assume that I will support the TPP just because I used to call it 'the gold standard of trade deals'."

"I do not support Keystone anymore, but I am not against it for environmental reasons, so you'll just have to guess where I will stand on future projects like this."

"I don't support private prisons even though the private prison industry is supporting my campaign."

"Just because I defended Wall Street and represented their interests as a Senator does not mean that I will continue to do so as President, and you will just have to trust me on that."

"Just because certain special interests and industries are financing my campaign does not mean that I will be favorable to them as President."

"Just because certain industries have made me a multi-millionaire does not mean I am beholden to them in any way."

Second Democratic Debate

No Focus Groups?

Just as with the first Dem Debate in Las Vegas, the mainstream media are saying Hillary won while all the online polls are saying Bernie won by a landslide. They will of course dismiss the online polls as unreliable, just as they did after the first debate. But what was harder to dismiss after the Las Vegas debate was the fact that every single focus group said Bernie won, and by huge margins – the group in Florida actually went 100% for Sanders.

Such actual results from voters who watched the debate in real time are hard to dismiss or sweep under the rug.

The solution, it seems, is to simply have NO MORE FOCUS GROUPS. I mean, seriously, where are they?



Jane Sanders

<http://www.bloomberg.com/politics/articles/2015-05-12/getting-to-know-jane-sanders-wife-of-bernie>

Fraud Case

In reality, it appears that in listing the donor pledges needed to secure a \$10 million loan, Jane Sanders may have overstated the amount of money pledged by some \$35,000. This by a Vermont investigative publication:

<http://vtdigger.org/2015/09/13/jane-sanders-overstated-donation-amounts-in-loan-application-for-burlington-college/>

Bernie vs. Trump

Not Equivalent/ No Story

Why do people insist on comparing Bernie Sanders with Donald Trump? I can think of no comparison that is less legitimate. Trump is leading in the polls, Bernie is behind; Trump is a businessman, Bernie is a longtime politician; Trump has never run for office or won an election, Bernie has served 25 years in Congress and is repeatedly reelected with 70% of the vote; Trump spews vague vitriol and attacks his competitors; Bernie offers specific policies and proposals, and steadfastly refuses to attack any of his competitors. In short, they are unlike in EVERY WAY.

Likewise, the profiles of Trump and Sanders supporters are 100% diametrically opposed. The "core" Trump supporters are poorly educated, knuckle-dragging racists, whereas the "core" Bernie supporters (as the press constantly points out) are well educated white liberals.

Finally, and most importantly - Trump, like Hillary, has amazingly high unfavorability ratings, whereas Bernie is the ONLY CANDIDATE that tilts positive when comparing his favorable to unfavorable ratings. This means Trump has 0% chance of becoming President, whereas Bernie already has a viable path to victory.

THERE IS NO EQUIVALENCY!!
PLEASE STOP TRYING TO MAKE THIS A STORY!!!

More info here: <http://www.euroyankee.com>

Bernie is an Elected Senator

“Political outsider” ??????

I would remind everyone that Bernie Sanders has been re-elected NINE (9) TIMES to Congress. As a socialist, he was re-elected Senator last round with 71% of the vote – including a majority of Republicans: <http://www.alternet.org/news-amp-politics/why-surprising-numbers-republicans-have-been-voting-bernie-sanders-vermont>

Donald Trump has never ever been elected to office.



That fact alone should be enough to kill this ridiculous meme about Trump and Sanders – but the media seem to be ignoring the fact that Bernie is not some random guy with a socialist agenda. He is a sitting United States Senator with a socialist platform that continues to get him re-elected again and again, and with huge margins.

Racial Injustice

Racial Position/Platform

Hmmm. Regarding African-Americans: Bernie has become very active here, and published a sweeping platform to address racism. I have searched and searched for Hillary Clinton's own "Plan to combat racial inequality" but I cannot find anything anywhere. It must not exist. How can THAT be, when the Black Lives Matter people are steering so far clear of her, and giving her a free pass when she says things like "all lives matter" ? She actually said that in Charleston, and what did we hear from Black Lives Matter? Crickets.

Granted, writing such a "racial justice" plan would be problematic for Hillary, because it would have to start with rolling back and dismantling all of the horrible things she and her husband did to the Black Community in the 1990's – abolishing AFDC, decimating the social safety net, and promoting mass incarceration of minorities through the "Clinton Crime Bill."

<http://www.truth-out.org/opinion/item/31065-will-hillary-clinton-abolish-the-prison-state-her-husband-created-don-t-count-on-it>

If "Black Lives" REALLY mattered to these people they would be camped out in front of Hillary's office in Brooklyn (not the one in Harlem – she is never there because her big rich donor friends don't like to come uptown).

Response to articles or assertions that "Bernie has a Race Problem"

This is such a blatant and obvious hatchet job by yet another Clintonista. Have you not been following? Bernie has a 97% rating from the NAACP. Hillary only has 96%.

According to a profile article in Essence, Bernie met with Symone Sanders just days after being shouted down at the Netroots Nation in mid-July. During their initial meeting, the two had an hour-long conversation about how the Senator could stay in touch with the #BlackLivesMatter movement. She told him that there was a strong link between racial inequality and economic equality, which he has since integrated into his campaign. Bernie offered Symone the job as his Press Secretary at the end of their meeting. I would imagine her first job was helping to draft his platform on racial equality, which he has now published.

A few days later, on 25 July, Bernie addressed the Southern Christian Leadership Council, one of the premier African-American civil rights organizations, of which MLK was head. I urge you to read Bernie's address to the SCLC here:



<https://berniesanders.com/remarks-senator-sanders-southern-christian-leadership-conference/> .

So Bernie was doing his homework, he was eating his vegetables. He was doing what he needed to do. HE GOT IT.

He did not deserve to be ambushed by some self-described “agitators” in Seattle, who have since been denounced by BLM itself as well as other black groups (most recently Larry Wilmore). In short, you are wrong, and you should stick to writing about whatever you know about rather than shilling so pathetically and transparently for Hillary Clinton.

Hillary is no friend to black folks, and you should know that. Her husband set blacks back a generation. <https://thoughtmerchant.wordpress.com/2007/10/05/how-bill-clinton-hurt-poor-blacks-and-how-hillary-might-to/>

Hillary on Crime

If anyone should be “held accountable for her actions” (as the BlackLivesMatter protesters shout) then it is Hillary Clinton, not Bernie Sanders. Hillary was an ardent and vocal supporter of her husband’s welfare “reform” and “tough on crime” bills that devastated black families and led to the mass incarceration of black youths.

To wit:

“We need more police, we need more and tougher prison sentences for repeat offenders. The ‘three-strikes-and-you’re-out’ for violent offenders has to be part of the plan. We need more prisons to keep violent offenders for as long as it takes to keep them off the streets.”

- Hillary Clinton, speaking on the 1994 Crime Bill.

“We already imprison more people per capita than any other country, and all of the executions in the world, will not make that situation right. We can either educate or electrocute. We can create meaningful jobs, rebuilding our society, or we can build more jails. Mr. Speaker, let us create a society of hope and compassion, not one of hate and vengeance.”

- Bernie Sanders, speaking on the same 1994 Crime Bill.

50 Year Record

Bernie has been campaigning for civil rights for 50 years - he protested segregation, got arrested for protesting police brutality, he marched with MLK.

Bernie has a 97% rating from the NAACP. Hillary only has 96%.

I can understand that maybe he hasn’t communicated on this topic as much as he needed to - but on the other hand, given his 50 years of activism on behalf of African Americans, and his rock solid voting record and history of supporting black causes, he might be forgiven for having thought that he did not have to “prove himself” today. And indeed, this “what have you done for me lately?” attitude that I am picking up from the black community is not becoming.

The fact is, Hillary is no friend of the Black Community, and neither was her husband - not by a long shot! So stop picking on Bernie, get your head on straight and realise who really has your back - cos it ain’t Hillary!

<https://thoughtmerchant.wordpress.com/2007/10/05/how-bill-clinton-hurt-poor-blacks-and-how-hillary-might-to/>



Apology for Slavery

“Obviously nobody in this generation is involved in slavery, but as a nation, slavery is one of the abominations that our country has experienced. There’s no excuse. It was horrific, It killed millions of people, It destroyed just the lives of so many people,” So as a nation ... we have got to apologize for slavery ... As a nation, we have got to apologize for slavery and of course the president is the leader of the nation.”

- *Bernie Sanders on the Joe Madison Show, July 8, 2015*

“And I will also say, that as a nation — the truth is a nation that in many ways was created, and I’m sorry to have to say this from way back, on racist principles, that’s a fact.”

- *Bernie Sanders speaking at Liberty University, September 14, 2015*

Hillary believes “All Lives Matter”

It was Hillary Clinton who was tone deaf this summer, when she travelled to Ferguson Mo. In June and gave a speech in an historic black church there, saying "All Lives Matter."

<http://www.nytimes.com/politics/first-draft/2015/06/24/hillary-clintons-all-lives-matter-remark-stirs-backlash/>

Racial Justice Platform

<https://berniesanders.com/issues/racial-justice/>

Polls Show Bernie Gaining Among Blacks as Hillary “Plunges”

Hillary’s popularity among the African American Community is plummeting, according to a poll by USA Today and Suffolk University on 01 October.

<https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/the-fix/wp/2015/10/01/hillary-clintons-support-from-black-voters-plunges-in-a-new-poll/>



Vote preference among Democrats

In Suffolk University/USA Today polling from July 2015 and September 2015.




Figure 5: Chart shows massive drop in HRC polls among Blacks, whites, all Dems

DNC and Media Conspiracy

Only 6 Debates

The DNC has scheduled only 6 primary debates this year, and the first one is not until October. This is very unusual. In the 2008 race, in which Hillary lost to Obama, the DNC scheduled their first debate in April 2007, and had already held 13 debates by the beginning of October (when this year's first debate is scheduled). This lack of debate and of public exposure, explains why Bernie Sanders is not doing as well against Hillary everywhere. Still, the fact that the DNC is limiting the debates to only 6, and starting them so late in the process, is an indicator of the perceived weakness of Hillary Clinton as a candidate, and a recognition of her lack of charm and her weakness as a debater. In short, the DNC and their Chairman, Debbie Wasserman Schultz (who was National Co-Chair of the Hillary Clinton Campaign in 2008), are desperately trying to avoid a repeat of 2008.

Of course, the last time a party limited debates to only 6 was in 1980, when the GOP was afraid of the insurgent Conservative Ronald Reagan and so limited the debates to protect the "establishment" candidates. How did that work out? :))))



***Bernie has no chance of winning – detailed answer**

There are a few things you should know.

First, when Bernie started he had about 6% name recognition and 4% support. He has come a VERY long way in 7 months.

Second, the polls that show Hillary leading are conducted among mostly older people who are considered "likely voters" - that means they voted Democratic in 2012 and/or 2014. This leaves out most of what is becoming Bernie's base - independents, you people and the "self-disenfranchised" who have not voted since 2008 or maybe ever.

Third, Bernie has a donor base of 800,000+ small donors. He raised practically the same amount of money as Hillary did in Q3. But Hillary's donors are all tapped out; they cannot give more. whereas Bernie can raise \$2.5 million LITERALLY OVERNIGHT just by doing a \$3 "whip-around" among his massive donor base.

Finally, do not underestimate the ability of Clinton to self-destruct. It has, after all, happened before. In October 2007 Gallup said this:

"Gallup's 2007 national presidential polling strongly points to Clinton winning the 2008 Democratic nomination. Barring something unusual or otherwise unexpected, she is well positioned for the 2008 Democratic primaries. Obama has not been an insignificant rival: he came within single digits of tying Clinton for the lead ... But he has recently lost ground ..."

"Clinton holds a commanding lead among nearly every major subgroup of potential Democratic primary voters. Some of her strongest showings are among women, nonwhites, those in lower-income households, those with less formal education, and Southerners."

"Democrats also rate Clinton as the candidate most likely to defeat the Republican in the general election -- a key perceptual advantage given that primary voters are trying to distinguish among candidates with largely similar issue positions."

And one last point, as this article implies, the "Republicans for Bernie Sanders" Facebook page has almost 15,000 likes, the similar page for Hillary has 276.

Bernie's "stats" are EXTREMELY good, and far, far better than Obama's "stats" in 2007.

USSR

Russian Flag in Office

The City of Burlington has a sister city in Russia called Yaroslavl – this is still a big thing:

<http://burlingtonyaroslavl.com>

Sanders had their flag in his office, and the Mayor of Yaroslavl probably had a US flag in his - remember, this was all done under Gorbachev's Glasnost and Perestroika in the late 80's just before the Wall fell. And yes, Bernie went to Russia in 1988 to meet his mayoral counterpart in Yaroslavl, and yes, he took his wife along and turned the trip into a honeymoon. Now, you might criticize Bernie for mixing official business with his personal life, but that's about all you can do.

***Russian Honeymoon**

In 1988, when Sanders was mayor of Burlington, the city formed a "twin" city relationship with a Russian city called Yaroslavl - Remember, this was one year before the Berlin Wall fell, at the height of Gorbachev's Perestroika and the thawing of

East-West relations. The program was a total success and is still going on today - see <http://burlingtonyaslavl.com>.

That year Sanders traveled on an official trip to meet his counterpart, the mayor of Yaroslavl. The trip, which was made with 10 other people, including prominent businesspeople and city officials, was scheduled for the day after his wedding, so he invited his wife to come along. Now, you can say he was a maybe he should not have taken his wife on a trip for official city business, but you cannot make any more out of it than that.

*Nicaragua

*Support for Sandinistas

Bernie famously said "Just because Ronald Reagan dislikes these people, doesn't mean that people in their own nations feel the same way."

This was certainly true about Nicaragua. The FSLN (Sandinistas) were not our enemy, and let's not forget they were battling the Contras, whom Reagan funded by selling arms to Iran.

The Contras were murdering nuns. Those were the kinds of guys Reagan was supporting. A Sandinista militiaman interviewed by The Guardian stated that Contra rebels committed these atrocities against Sandinista prisoners after a battle at a Sandinista rural outpost:

"Rosa had her breasts cut off. Then they cut into her chest and took out her heart. The men had their arms broken, their testicles cut off. They were killed by slitting their throats and pulling the tongue out through the slit."

You know when the side you are backing is guilty of mass murder of clergy and cutting off women's' breasts and men's testicles, maybe - just maybe - you are on the wrong side!!

In any case, Nicaragua filed a suit against the USA in the International Criminal Court and the USA was found guilty. Likewise the Contras were found by Human Rights Watch to be guilty of a plethora of crimes from raping women to torturing and killing civilians.

And, in the end, Bernie was right: While the Contras have long since been relegated to the "dustbin of history," the FSLN is a major political force in Nicaragua, and Daniel Ortega is a popular leader who won re-election in 2006 and again in 2011. That is because they are and were always on the side of the Nicaraguan people, while the US and the Contras were on the side of United Fruit.

*Cuba

*Response to Posts about people "fleeing" Cuba for America

So you recognise the proof that 50 years of a US-led trade embargo hurt the Cuban

people and made their lives difficult? Good for you!!

But if the number of people fleeing to enter the US is the way we judge a country's government, then we should be embargoing MEXICO!

***The Cubans have nothing**

People are "forced" to drive old cars because there was a US-led embargo against Cuba and Cuban goods for 50 years! Anything the Cubans do not have is because of the US and its embargo. Duh.

***Quality of Life is Good in Cuba**

Life expectancy in Cuba is 79, the same as it is in the US
Literacy rates in Cuba is almost 100% (99.8%); in the US it is 99%
Homicide rate in Cuba is 4.2/100K inhabitants; in the US it is 4.7.
By contrast, the homicide rate in Mexico is 22/100K, and life expectancy is only 77 years. So as a poor Caribbean country, Cuba is doing pretty damn good and a hell of a lot better than its neighbors.

Iran

History / Coup

Look, the Iranians have a good reason to hate and distrust America. They elected a moderate "socialist" secular government in 1953. The government wanted to nationalize the oil industry in Iran, so the CIA had the legitimate, elected leader and his government ousted in a coup, and brought back the Shah, who established a dictatorship with the most vicious secret police the world has ever seen, the SAVAK. Iranians suffered under this regime, and it was open knowledge that this odious regime was forced on them by the US. In yet another instance of "unintended consequences" arising from US intervention in the Middle East, the extreme cruelty and violence of the American puppet, the Shah, led to the rise of the Mullahs.

Just like the US-backed Maliki government in Iraq led to the rise of ISIS.

That is why Bernie is wise to support diplomacy and avoid another disastrous military adventure that will inevitably backfire.

***Denmark**

***Forbes says Denmark is the "No. 1 Best Country for Business"**

Bernie is often criticised for saying that the US should learn from Denmark. In the first Democratic debate, Hillary famously said "we are not Denmark."

Well, Forbes recently did a study to rank countries in terms of how business friendly they were, and that study Denmark ranked No. 1 for "Best Country for Business."

"Denmark is one of the most entrepreneurial countries in the world. The government streamlines the startup process with only four procedures needed to start a new

business and at minimal costs. The regulatory climate is also one of the most efficient.”

“One of the keys to Denmark’s pro-business climate is the flexible labor market known as “Flexisecurity,” where companies can easily hire and fire workers with out-of-work adults eligible for significant unemployment benefits. Unemployed workers are also eligible for training programs. It creates one of the most productive workforces in Europe.”

No, Hillary, we are not Denmark. As a matter of fact, the US ranked 18th in this same Forbes study. Bernie is right, we could stand to learn a thing or two from the Danes.

<http://www.forbes.com/sites/kurtbadenhausen/2014/12/17/u-s-slides-again-as-denmark-tops-forbes-best-countries-for-business/>

***Market Cap Comparison**

Many Americans – especially those on the Right – love to talk about “American exceptionalism.” They describe the US as “the greatest country on Earth” and the “world’s only Superpower” – and even Bernie himself acknowledges that the US is “the richest country in history.” The argument Bernie is making is NOT that the US should become one big Denmark. The point is that the greatest, and richest country in the history of the world should be able to do what a teeny tiny country of 5 million Danes have been able to achieve.

The Danish Stock Exchange has a market cap of \$230 Billion, or \$41,000 per person. The NYSE and NASDAQ have a market cap of \$20 TRILLION, or \$63,000 per person.

The US is indeed the richest nation on earth. It’s time we started acting like it.

Quick Responses for Online Commenting

Misc. Snippets

Inflation / Tuition

Inflation: my Harvard tuition in 1977 cost \$8000, adjusted for inflation it should be \$28,000. But instead it’s \$60,000.

In 1968, it cost \$300 a year to go to the University of California. Adjusted for inflation, it should now cost \$2014 a year. Instead it costs \$15,000.

Liberty University

I think Bernie Sanders will find a very receptive audience at Liberty University. It is a Christian school, so these kids are already used to absorbing the teachings of a socialist Jew :-)
GO BERNIE!

Pope Francis Video

Bernie Sanders discusses Pope Francis and his views. Amazing, truly amazing!!
https://youtu.be/9_LJpN893Vg

The VOX Interview

<https://youtu.be/S5vOKKMipSA>

Bible Supports Socialism

Mark 12:17:

Regarding Taxes: "Give back to Caesar what is Caesar's and to God what is God's."

Matthew 25:40:

On welfare: "Truly I tell you, whatever you did for one of the least of these brothers and sisters of mine, you did for me."

Mark 10:25, Matthew 19:24, Luke 18:25:

Wealth and income inequality: "It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than for someone who is rich to enter the kingdom of God."

Matthew 21:12:

On Banking and Finance: "And Jesus entered the temple and drove out all who sold and bought in the temple, and he overturned the tables of the money-changers"

Jesus was most definitely a socialist. A socialist Jew, like Bernie.

Ann Coulter Spills the Beans: GOP want HRC to run

From Breitbart.com:

Ann Coulter declared, "I wish Fox News would go a little easier on Hillary Clinton. She's the one we want to run against" on "Lou Dobbs Tonight" on the Fox Business Network. Coulter argued, "I wish Fox News would go a little easier on Hillary Clinton. She's the one we want to run against. Could you guys just back off? Because I feel like I'm living through this, I feel like this is déjà vu again. We used to say, 'Oh, the next president isn't going to be a guy named Barack Hussein Obama.' Our next president could be **Sen. Bernie Sanders (I-VT)** if you people keep this up."

<http://www.breitbart.com/video/2015/08/12/coulter-go-a-little-easier-on-hillary-because-shes-the-one-we-want-to-run-against/>

*Bernie's Legislative accomplishments

According to the Congressional Record, Bernie has Sponsored or Co-Sponsored over 6,000 bills; he Introduced 5,286 of those bills; 704 made it out of Committee; 206 became law - <https://www.congress.gov/member/bernard-sanders/S000033>

Moreover he was the "Amendment King" in that he passed more Amendments than any other member of Congress.



<http://www.alternet.org/election-2016/bernie-gets-it-done-sanders-record-pushing-through-major-reforms-will-surprise-you>

Bernie's Plan will NOT cost \$18 Trillion

The economist that calculated the \$18 Trillion figure actually concluded that Americans would SAVE \$5 Trillion over the 10 year period. The WSJ hit piece is debunked here:

<https://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/plum-line/wp/2015/09/15/no-bernie-sanders-is-not-going-to-bankrupt-america-to-the-tune-of-18-trillion/>

Private Prisons

Private Prison Lobbyists Are Raising Cash for Hillary Clinton <http://interc.pt/1Jhpxww>

Here's why:

"We need more police, we need more and tougher prison sentences for repeat offenders. The 'three-strikes-and-you're-out' for violent offenders has to be part of the plan. We need more prisons to keep violent offenders for as long as it takes to keep them off the streets."

- Hillary Clinton, speaking on the 1994 Crime Bill.

By contrast;

"We already imprison more people per capita than any other country, and all of the executions in the world, will not make that situation right. We can either educate or electrocute. We can create meaningful jobs, rebuilding our society, or we can build more jails. Mr. Speaker, let us create a society of hope and compassion, not one of hate and vengeance."

- Bernie Sanders, speaking on the same 1994 Crime Bill.

Rape

Give me a break. This was a satirical essay written in 1972, and it was meant to expose the deleterious effects of gender stereotypes on both men and women. Bernie has commented: "It was intended to attack gender stereotypes of the '70s, but it looks as stupid today as it was then."

<http://www.npr.org/sections/itsallpolitics/2015/05/29/410606045/the-bernie-sanders-rape-fantasy-essay-explained>

Bernie is NOT a Warmonger: He is Historically Anti-Defense Spending

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Vabeos-F8Kk&feature=share>

70% of Americans support for Bernie's Positions

<http://reverbpress.com/politics/datalog/americans-agree-bernie-sanders/>

Only 2% of Sanders Supporters are "Anti-Hillary"

<http://www.desmoinesregister.com/story/news/politics/iowa-poll/2015/08/29/iowa-poll-democrats-august/71387664/?hootPostID=f566866239310c78a602dd7712a622da>

***The Social Election**

<http://thesocialelection.tumblr.com>

Did Bernie Suggest Psychological Factors Cause Cancer?

Yes, according to a NY Times article. However, this is not a crackpot theory – see this study by the Journal Oncology:

<http://www.cancernetwork.com/oncology-journal/role-psychological-factors-cancer-incidence-and-prognosis>

***A Great Source of Information**

<https://pplswar.wordpress.com>

***Tweet about Elizabeth Warren and Clinton’s Link to the Banks**

Elizabeth Warren in 2003: “Big banks were now part of Senator Clinton’s constituency,” WAPO details the corruption:

<http://wapo.st/1N18sZ9>