

Why Barak Obama?

By

Dr. Mohsen El-Guindy

Before I talk about why President Barak Obama should win a second term, I want to review the disastrous and crippled legacy George W. Bush left for President Obama to inherit.

The bad policy of George W. Bush in the Middle East had dramatically affected its balance and stability. After the demolishing of its infrastructure, and the death of millions of innocent Iraqis, Bush effectively disintegrated Iraq into a Sunni-Shi'ite civil war that spread instability throughout the region. Israelis and Palestinians have descended into one of the most intractable cycles of conflict in their long struggle. In Lebanon, the national unity agreement that ended almost two decades of civil war in 1990 appears to be unraveling, as sectarian factions are again edging toward another bloodbath. The west became more hostile to Iran, and Iran is now struggling to produce its first nuclear weapon. Meanwhile, Arab autocrats remain entrenched, and Arab democrats are feeling abandoned.

Up until the week that Bill Clinton left office in January 2001, Israeli and Palestinian negotiators were still trying to work out an ambitious end-of-conflict agreement. True, Palestinian leader Yasser Arafat had unleashed an intifadah, and the Israelis were on the verge of electing Ariel Sharon — an avowed enemy of the Oslo peace process — as prime minister, but the two sides were still talking. When Bush became president, he ended crucial American mediation, repudiated Arafat and backed Sharon, who proceeded to expand Israeli settlements in the occupied West Bank. With the conflict becoming bloodier than ever, Arafat died, and Hamas, the fundamentalist party that adamantly refuses to even recognize Israel, much less

negotiate with it, ousted the late Palestinian leader's party from power. Besides angering Arab opinion, the lack of an Arab-Israeli peace process that would also address Israel's occupation of the Syrian Golan Heights has encouraged mischief-making by Damascus, which is suspected of aiding anti-U.S. insurgents in Iraq and committing political assassinations in Lebanon.

After 9/11, Bush lied to himself, to his people and to the world that Saddam Hussein had nuclear weapons and represented a mortal threat to the West. He claimed that ousting Saddam would turn Iraq into a democracy that would become the model for the rest of the Arab world. Saddam turned out not to have nuclear weapons, and Iraq turned out to be more prone to civil war than democracy. It runs the risk of becoming a failed state from which terrorists run global operations, and/or breaking into ethnic mini-states that inspire secessionist trouble throughout the region.

Just after Bush became president, Iranians reelected moderate President Mohammed Khatami, who had reached out to the U.S. and called for a "dialogue of civilizations." Bush not only refused to extend the olive branch cautiously offered by the Clinton Administration, he declared Iran part of an "axis of evil." Khatami left office under fire for the failure of his conciliatory approach, to be replaced by hard-line President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad, who proceeded to promote Iran's nuclear ambitions and call for Israel to be wiped off the map. Despite Bush's tough talk against Iran, the Iraq war has dramatically expanded Iran's influence in the country.

Bush promised to wage a "crusade" against al-Qaeda after September 11, effectively equating his war on terrorism with the crusade, an earlier Christian invasion of the Middle East that remains etched in the collective memory of Muslims. Since then, the Bush Administration's involvement in military campaigns against Iraq and

Afghanistan, and military support to Israel against the Palestinians and Hezbollah in Lebanon heightened Muslim anger at the U.S. and undermined the political position of moderate, pro-American Arabs, including old U.S. allies like Egypt, Saudi Arabia and Jordan (1).

We must not also forget the shame of Guantánamo and Abu Ghraib, and the erosion of civil liberties of American Muslims inside the United States. In Guantánamo, the Koran was defiled by the American soldiers, and in Abu Ghraib, the Arab prisoners were humiliated. In the United States the Muslim American citizens were badly treated, and the Prophet of Islam was slandered.

It is also clear that George W. Bush was very much influenced by groups known to be hostile to the Arabs, as well as Islam and Muslims - groups that brought him to power in spite of his limited capabilities. These groups form the religious and political fabric of the United States. These are: the neoconservatives, Christian Right, Judeo-Christian coalition, the Christian leaders, and later on the Tea Party. Their words of hatred and enmity towards Islam are well recorded.

In short, Bush was very clever in showing the ugly face of America to the Muslim world.

As for the economic consequences of Mr. Bush, there is no better than the article the Nobel laureate Joseph E. Stiglitz wrote (2). He openly stated that bush's successor will have to deal with yet another crippling legacy of George W. Bush. Stiglitz sees a generation-long struggle to recoup.

As Stiglitz put it, during his eight years in office, Bush tax code has become hideously biased in favor of the rich; a national debt that has grown 70 percent; a swelling cascade of mortgage defaults; a record near-\$850 billion trade deficit; oil prices that are higher than they have ever been; and a dollar so weak that for an American to buy a cup of

coffee in London or Paris—or even the Yukon—becomes a venture in high finance.

After eight years in office, the United States is now less prepared than ever to face the future. Stiglitz says, ‘We have not been educating enough engineers and scientists, people with the skills we will need to compete with China and India. We have not been investing in the kinds of basic research that made us the technological powerhouse of the late 20th century. And although the president said, ‘now we must begin to wean ourselves from oil and coal,’ we have on his watch become more deeply dependent on both.”

Stiglitz continues saying, ‘Inequality is now widening in America, and at a rate not seen in three-quarters of a century. A young male in his 30s today has an income, adjusted for inflation, that is 12 percent less than what his father was making 30 years ago. Some 5.3 million more Americans are living in poverty now than were living in poverty when Bush became president. America’s class structure may not have arrived there yet, but it’s heading in the direction of Brazil’s and Mexico’s.’

Stiglitz also adds: ‘By the time George Bush took office, the tech boom which was apparent at the time of President Clinton was over. The NASDAQ fell 15 percent in the single month of April 2000, and no one knew for sure what effect the collapse of the Internet bubble would have on the real economy. It was a moment ripe for Keynesian economics, a time to prime the pump by spending more money on education, technology, and infrastructure—all of which America desperately needed, and still does, but which the Clinton administration had postponed in its relentless drive to eliminate the deficit. Bill Clinton had left President Bush in an ideal position to pursue such policies. In the presidential debates in 2000 between Al Gore and George Bush, the two men argued over how to spend America’s anticipated \$2.2 trillion budget surplus? The country could

well have afforded to ramp up domestic investment in key areas. In fact, doing so would have staved off recession in the short run while spurring growth in the long run.

But the Bush administration had its own ideas. The first major economic initiative pursued by the president was a massive tax cut for the rich, enacted in June of 2001. Those with incomes over a million got a tax cut of \$18,000—more than 30 times larger than the cut received by the average American. The inequities were compounded by a second tax cut, in 2003, this one skewed even more heavily toward the rich. Together these tax cuts, when fully implemented and if made permanent, mean that in 2012 the average reduction for an American in the bottom 20 percent will be a scant \$45, while those with incomes of more than \$1 million will see their tax bills reduced by an average of \$162,000.

The administration claimed that the economy grew—by some 16 percent—during its first six years, but the growth helped mainly people who had no need of any help, and failed to help those who need plenty.

Stiglitz kept wondering: ‘In breathtaking disregard for the most basic rules of fiscal propriety, the administration continued to cut taxes even as it undertook expensive new spending programs and embarked on a financially ruinous “war of choice” in Iraq. A budget surplus of 2.4 percent of gross domestic product (G.D.P.), which greeted Bush as he took office, turned into a deficit of 3.6 percent in the space of four years. The United States had not experienced a turnaround of this magnitude since the global crisis of World War II.’

Stiglitz mentioned Bush’s erroneous spending: ‘Agricultural subsidies were doubled between 2002 and 2005. Tax expenditures—the vast system of subsidies and preferences hidden in the tax code—increased more than a quarter. Tax breaks for the president’s friends in the oil-

and-gas industry increased by billions and billions of dollars. Yes, in the five years after 9/11, defense expenditures did increase (by some 70 percent), though much of the growth wasn't helping to fight the War on Terror at all, but was being lost or outsourced in failed missions in Iraq. Meanwhile, other funds continued to be spent on the usual high-tech gimcrackery—weapons that don't work, for enemies we don't have. In a nutshell, money was being spent everywhere except where it was needed. During these past seven years the percentage of G.D.P. spent on research and development outside defense and health has fallen. Little has been done about our decaying infrastructure—be it levees in New Orleans or bridges in Minneapolis. Coping with most of the damage will fall to the next occupant of the White House.'

Bush argues that tax cuts were meant to stimulate the economy, but this was never true. The amount of stimulus per dollar of deficit—was astonishingly low. Therefore, the job of economic stimulation fell to the Federal Reserve Board, which stepped on the accelerator in a historically unprecedented way, driving interest rates down to 1 percent. In real terms, taking inflation into account, interest rates actually dropped to negative 2 percent. The predictable result was a consumer spending spree. Looked at another way, Bush's own fiscal irresponsibility fostered irresponsibility in everyone else. Credit was shoveled out the door, and subprime mortgages were made available to anyone this side of life support. Credit-card debt mounted to a whopping \$900 billion by the summer of 2007. "Qualified at birth" became the drunken slogan of the Bush era. American households took advantage of the low interest rates, signed up for new mortgages with "teaser" initial rates, and went to town on the proceeds.

All of this spending made the economy look better for a while; the president could (and did) boast about the economic statistics. But the consequences for many families would become apparent within a few years, when

interest rates rose and mortgages proved impossible to repay. The president undoubtedly hoped the reckoning would come sometime after 2008. It arrived 18 months early. As many as 1.7 million Americans are expected to lose their homes in the months ahead. For many, this will mean the beginning of a downward spiral into poverty.

Between March 2006 and March 2007 personal-bankruptcy rates soared more than 60 percent. As families went into bankruptcy, more and more of them came to understand who had won and who had lost as a result of the president's 2005 bankruptcy bill, which made it harder for individuals to discharge their debts in a reasonable way. The lenders that had pressed for "reform" had been the clear winners, gaining added leverage and protections for themselves; people facing financial distress got the shaft.

The war in Iraq (along with, to a lesser extent, the war in Afghanistan) has cost the country dearly in blood and treasure. The loss in lives can never be quantified. As for the treasure, it's worth calling to mind that the administration, in the run-up to the invasion of Iraq, was reluctant to venture an estimate of what the war would cost (and publicly humiliated a White House aide who suggested that it might run as much as \$200 billion). When pressed to give a number, the administration suggested \$50 billion—what the United States is actually spending every few months. Today, government figures officially acknowledge that more than half a trillion dollars total has been spent by the U.S. "in theater." But in fact the overall cost of the conflict could be quadruple that amount. The official numbers do not include, for instance, other relevant expenditures hidden in the defense budget, such as the soaring costs of recruitment, with re-enlistment bonuses of as much as \$100,000. They do not include the lifetime of disability and health-care benefits that will be required by tens of thousands of wounded veterans, as many as 20 percent of whom have suffered devastating brain and spinal injuries. Astonishingly, they do not include much of

the cost of the equipment that has been used in the war, and that will have to be replaced. If you also take into account the costs to the economy from higher oil prices and the knock-on effects of the war—for instance, the depressing domino effect that war-fueled uncertainty has on investment, and the difficulties U.S. firms face overseas because America is the most disliked country in the world—the total costs of the Iraq war mount, even by a conservative estimate, to at least \$2 trillion. To which one needs to add these words: so far.

It is natural to wonder, what would this money have bought if we had spent it on other things? U.S. aid to all of Africa has been hovering around \$5 billion a year, the equivalent of less than two weeks of direct Iraq-war expenditures. The president made a big deal out of the financial problems facing Social Security, but the system could have been repaired for a century with what we have bled into the sands of Iraq. Had even a fraction of that \$2 trillion been spent on investments in education and technology, or improving our infrastructure, the country would be in a far better position economically to meet the challenges it faces in the future, including threats from abroad. For a sliver of that \$2 trillion we could have provided guaranteed access to higher education for all qualified Americans.

The soaring price of oil is clearly related to the Iraq war. The issue is not *whether* to blame the war for this but simply how much to blame it. It seems unbelievable now to recall that Bush-administration officials before the invasion suggested not only that Iraq's oil revenues would pay for the war in its entirety—hadn't we actually turned a tidy profit from the 1991 Gulf War?—but also that war was the best way to ensure low oil prices. In retrospect, the only big winners from the war have been the oil companies, the defense contractors, and al-Qaeda. Before the war, the oil markets anticipated that the then price range of \$20 to \$25 a barrel would continue for the next three years or so. Market players expected to see more demand from China

and India, sure, but they also anticipated that this greater demand would be met mostly by increased production in the Middle East. The war upset that calculation, not so much by curtailing oil production in Iraq, which it did, but rather by heightening the sense of insecurity everywhere in the region, suppressing future investment.

The continuing reliance on oil, regardless of price, points to one more administration legacy: the failure to diversify America's energy resources. Leave aside the environmental reasons for weaning the world from hydrocarbons—the president has never convincingly embraced them, anyway. The economic and national-security arguments ought to have been powerful enough. Instead, the administration has pursued a policy of “drain America first”—that is, take as much oil out of America as possible, and as quickly as possible, with as little regard for the environment as one can get away with, leaving the country even more dependent on foreign oil in the future, and hope against hope that nuclear fusion or some other miracle will come to the rescue. So many gifts to the oil industry were included in the president's 2003 energy bill that John McCain referred to it as the “No Lobbyist Left Behind” bill.

America's budget and trade deficits have grown to record highs under President Bush. During the past six years, America—its government, its families, the country as a whole—has been borrowing to sustain its consumption. Meanwhile, investment in fixed assets—the plants and equipment that help increase our wealth—has been declining.

What's the impact of all this down the road? The growth rate in America's standard of living will almost certainly slow, and there could even be a decline. As confidence in the American economy has plummeted, so has the value of the dollar—by 40 percent against the euro since 2001.

The administration's basic contempt for global institutions was underscored in 2005 when it named Paul Wolfowitz, the former deputy secretary of defense and a chief architect of the Iraq war, as president of the World Bank. Widely distrusted from the outset, and soon caught up in personal controversy, Wolfowitz became an international embarrassment and was forced to resign his position after less than two years on the job.

The owners of the mortgages find themselves holding worthless pieces of paper. The originators of these problem mortgages had already sold them to others, who packaged them, in a non-transparent way, with other assets, and passed them on once again to unidentified others. When the problems became apparent, global financial markets faced real tremors: it was discovered that billions in bad mortgages were hidden in portfolios in Europe, China, and Australia, and even in star American investment banks such as Goldman Sachs and Bear Stearns. Indonesia and other developing countries—innocent bystanders, really—suffered as global risk premiums soared, and investors pulled money out of these emerging markets, looking for safer havens. It will take years to sort out this mess.

Meanwhile, we have become dependent on other nations for the financing of our own debt. Today, China alone holds more than \$1 trillion in public and private American I.O.U.'s. Cumulative borrowing from abroad during the six years of the Bush administration amounts to some \$5 trillion. Most likely these creditors will not call in their loans—if they ever did, there would be a global financial crisis. But there is something bizarre and troubling about the richest country in the world not being able to live even remotely within its means. Just as Guantánamo and Abu Ghraib have eroded America's moral authority, so the Bush administration's fiscal housekeeping has eroded our economic authority.

And in any case there's more to be done. What is required is in some ways simple to describe: it amounts to ceasing our current behavior and doing exactly the opposite. It means not spending money that we don't have, increasing taxes on the rich, reducing corporate welfare, strengthening the safety net for the less well off, and making greater investment in education, technology, and infrastructure.

When it comes to taxes, we should be trying to shift the burden away from things we view as good, such as labor and savings, to things we view as bad, such as pollution. With respect to the safety net, we need to remember that the more the government does to help workers improve their skills and get affordable health care the more we free up American businesses to compete in the global economy. Finally, we'll be a lot better off if we work with other countries to create fair and efficient global trade and financial systems. We'll have a better chance of getting others to open up their markets if we ourselves act less hypocritically—that is, if we open our own markets to their goods and stop subsidizing American agriculture.

Some portion of the damage done by the Bush administration could be rectified quickly. A large portion will take decades to fix—and that's assuming the political will to do so exists both in the White House and in Congress. Think of the interest we are paying, year after year, on the almost \$4 trillion of increased debt burden—even at 5 percent, that's an annual payment of \$200 billion, two Iraq wars a year forever. Think of the taxes that future governments will have to levy to repay even a fraction of the debt we have accumulated. And think of the widening divide between rich and poor in America, a phenomenon that goes beyond economics and speaks to the very future of the American Dream (2).

Barak Obama and what he achieved for America and the world during his four years in the White House

In his article describing the disastrous consequences of Mr. Bush on the American economy Joseph Stiglitz said: “Whoever moves into the White House after Bush will face an unenviable set of economic circumstances. Extricating the country from Iraq will be the bloodier task, but putting America’s economic house in order will be wrenching and take years. The most immediate challenge will be simply to get the economy’s metabolism back into the normal range. That will mean moving from a savings rate of zero (or less) to a more typical savings rate of, say, 4 percent. While such an increase would be good for the long-term health of America’s economy, the short-term consequences would be painful.’

As we have seen from the analysis of Joseph Stiglitz of Bush’s era, Bush has left behind a warring world characterized by economical disaster. This shows clearly that Barak Obama is the most unfortunate American President that has ever come to the White House. The man has inherited a misfortune which has already struck the economy dead. Obama is going to face a dead economy that needs surpassing and illimitable efforts in order to be resurrected.

Now let’s find together the immense work Obama did for spreading peace in a warring world and to revive the already dead economy.

1- Obama and Foreign Policy

Obama announced a new chapter in U.S. Mideast diplomacy. He committed himself and his Administration to a foreign policy that ensures the safety of the American people. Obama called for a new beginning between the United States and Muslims around the world. The President emphasized that the U.S is ending the war in Iraq, creating partnerships to isolate violent

extremists in Afghanistan, and pursuing a two-state solution that recognizes the rights and security of Palestinians and Israelis.

To speak most convincingly to Muslims globally requires recognition of the importance and role of identity politics. While one can compare the distinctiveness of elements of Barack Obama's speech with those of his predecessors in the White House, there can be no comparison when it comes to the ground-breaking and powerful religious dimension of Obama's address to the Muslim world.

In stark contrast with Bush's administration, Barack Obama was now dramatically reflecting a different kind of Christianity, an empathetic understanding that paves the way for accepting Muslims in America as valued citizens who have fought in America's wars, excelled in businesses, universities, and sports, who won Nobel prizes and lit the Olympic torch. He creatively noted that the first Muslim American recently elected to Congress took his oath to defend the American constitution using the Koran that Thomas Jefferson kept in his personal library.

In Cairo Obama demonstrated his personal knowledge and experience of Islam, as well as his appreciation of Islamic religion and culture. He addressed his audience with the traditional Muslim greeting, *asalaamu alaykum* (Peace be upon you). He spoke glowingly of Islamic civilization, identifying Cairo's Al-Azhar University as the oldest and most authoritative seat of Islamic learning. He said: "carried the light of learning through so many centuries, paving the way for Europe's Renaissance and Enlightenment." He praised the innovation of Muslim communities concretely citing numerous achievements, including development of "the order of algebra; magnetic compass and tools of navigation; mastery of pens and printing; our understanding of how disease spreads and how it can be healed." He noted the "majestic arches and soaring spires; timeless poetry and cherished music; elegant calligraphy and places of peaceful contemplation" that Islamic culture has contributed to the world. Finally he held up the "symbol of Andalusia, a period when Jews, Christians and Muslims lived

together under Muslim rule and culture flourished." concluding that "throughout history, Islam has demonstrated through words and deeds the possibilities of religious tolerance and racial equality."

Nothing could have been more welcome for many Muslims frustrated with the equation of their faith with the rants and acts of terrorism of Osama bin Laden and other terrorists and the growth of Islam phobia in America and Europe, than to hear Obama call for a partnership between America and Islam "based on what Islam is, not what it isn't" and to assert his responsibility as President of the United States "to fight against negative stereotypes of Islam wherever they appear."

Obama spoke both as American president and a Christian believer. But he also described his personal connections to Islam, his Muslim father and members of his family; his schooling, memories of hearing the call to prayer and experiencing Muslim culture in Indonesia. Obama deftly cited the Koran, spoke of Islam as one of the three Abrahamic religions and respectfully referred to the linkage between Muhammad, Moses and Jesus, seen by Muslims as the bearers of God's revelation in the Torah and gospels. In naming these prophets Obama followed Muslim practice by adding the phrase, "Peace and blessings be upon them."

Perhaps the most striking statement, one that would echo across the Muslim world was Obama's mention of Jerusalem, one of the great sacred cities of Islam and a major hurdle in Palestinian-Israeli negotiations. Only shortly after Benjamin Netanyahu appealed to a belief that Jerusalem is the eternal capital of Israel and will remain solely under Israeli control, Obama described the Holy Land of three great faiths, the place of peace that God intended, and identified a radically different goal, a Jerusalem that is the secure and lasting home for Jews, Christians and Muslims, a place for all of the children of Abraham (3).

2- Create immediate long – term programs and partnerships that seeks to improve the daily lives of Muslim people around the world

Obama realized that his policy in the Middle East and South West Asia will have to deal with the root causes of terrorism such as poverty. Military might is no longer the sole arbiter; economic, diplomatic and multilateral tools now must be used to a greater degree.

All agencies and departments – from NASA and the Small Business Administration to the Department of State and USAID – have worked together to implement a number of programs in the areas of education, entrepreneurship, health, and science and technology. For example, after holding thousands of listening sessions around the world, the U.S. has expanded exchange programs and online opportunities, forged a global recovery effort to create jobs in all regions of the world, launched a Global Technology and Innovation Fund to invest in technological development in the Middle East, Africa, and Asia, worked with Saudi officials to address H1N1 to prepare for Hajj, and partnered with the Organization of the Islamic Conference (OIC) to eradicate polio.

3- Trade, not Force, will drive democratic reform in the Muslim World

President Obama completely differed from the worldview of his neo-conservative predecessors that freedom and progress in the Muslim world was a top-down project: you change the regime and the democratic effects would somehow filter down. This school of thought also held that Islam – or at least the conservative interpretations of it – was also part of the problem. Understandably, this view had little traction in the Muslim world. The alternative view is one where trade, not force, may drive democratic reform in that part of the world. Sustainable democracy and social reform can only be built where there is a strong middle class and a thriving private sector. Liberal human values such as freedom of speech, the rule of law and fair elections – can only be established if an upwardly-mobile middle class of entrepreneurs professionals and consumers who operate mainly in the private sector and are keen on good relations with the west to facilitate business, trade and prosperity. They have their own blend of Islam and capitalism. It is commerce and rising prosperity amongst the ordinary

classes that leads to social and democratic change – not vice versa.

Obama sees that the west can help Muslim societies develop by increasing trade and opening up American markets to their goods. Integrating the Muslim world more into the global economy makes business sense too. They constitute almost a quarter of the world's population with significant purchasing power. Current trade flows are low. Setting aside oil and weapon sales, US trade with the entire Arab world in 2007 was \$20bn. For comparison, in 2008, US trade with India amounted to \$44bn and with Latin America, it was \$255bn. Mutual trade brings countries and peoples together in a far more profound way than military aid or preaching democracy (4).

4- National Security Strategy of America

President Obama released the National Security Strategy of America in May 27, 2010. It lays out a strategic approach for advancing American interests, including the security of the American people, a growing U.S. economy, support for American values, and an international order that can address 21st century challenges.

Among the points of the National Security strategy of the United States are important issues that take into account the interest and security of the Middle East and the Muslim world in general:

- a- Ending the combat mission in Iraq.
- b- Prohibiting the use of torture.
- c- Call for a new beginning between the United States and Muslims around the world.
- d- New strategy for Pakistan and Afghanistan.
- e- Promoting peace and security in Israel and the Middle East, by supporting the goal of two states, Israel and a Palestinian state, living side by side in peace and security.
- f- The Obama administration has been genuinely committed to achieving a two-state solution before it is too late. This policy is not an act of hostility toward Israel; on the contrary, it is an act

of extraordinary friendship for Obama to keep this difficult item on an already overcrowded agenda. As former Prime Minister Ehud Olmert and current defense minister Ehud Barak have warned: If the two-state solution fails, the Palestinians will be occupied forever and Israel will become an apartheid state. Instead of helping Israel drive itself off a cliff -- as George W. Bush did -- the Obama administration is trying to prevent that disastrous outcome. And because Obama's team understands that the relentless expansion of Israel's illegal settlements is making a two-state solution increasingly difficult to realize, they believe that a halt to settlement building is a key part of a successful peace process. That includes East Jerusalem, whose annexation by Israel in 1967 is regarded as illegal by the rest of the world, including the United States.

- g- Achieving a two-state solution is obviously in America's strategic interest as well, because it would remove one of the major sources of anti-Americanism in the Arab and Muslim world. The vast majority of Muslims reject al Qaeda and its murderous methods, for example, but they share its harsh views about U.S. policy towards the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. A two-state solution won't solve all of the problems in the region, of course, but it would make a lot of them easier to address. It's clear that the U.S. military, which now has a lot of experience in the region, thinks so too. A two state solution is also the best guarantee of Israel's long-term future. By showing real backbone this time and explaining to the American people why his approach is right, Obama could be a true friend to the Jewish state.

Netanyahu, AIPAC and the rest of the "status quo" lobby don't get that, and neither do narrow-minded politicians like Joe Lieberman or John McCain. They seem to think it is okay for Israel to keep expanding its control over Palestinian lands and that the United States should back Israel's actions no matter what it does. When disputes arise they should be handled

privately, because, as Lieberman put it, the U.S. and Israel are "family." Not true, of course: the United States and Israel are separate countries whose interests are not always identical, and sometimes it makes sense to air those differences in public. The "Christian Zionists" are even worse: They think Israel should control these lands forever in order to fulfill their wacky interpretation of Old Testament prophecy and bring the "end-times" closer. Never mind what happens to Israel itself in the process.

In fact, these people are false friends of Israel, because their recommended course of action will keep it on its current dangerous path. So when you hear them defend the special relationship, or when they accuse Obama or Mitchell or Biden or Clinton of putting unwarranted pressure on Israel, ask them what their long-term solution is. Do they think Israel should control all the territory that once was Mandate Palestine? If so, do they favor a one-party democracy in which Jews and Arabs get equal voting rights, or an apartheid state in which Jews rule over stateless Palestinians? Or are they in favor of ethnic cleansing, or perhaps they support Netanyahu's bizarre version of "two-states," where Israel keeps all of Jerusalem and confines the Palestinians to a handful of dismembered Bantustans under Israeli control? Those are the only alternatives to a viable two-state solution, and if you don't like them, then you should give Obama credit for his efforts to achieve a two-state solution.

h- Re-energizing America's alliances by resolving disagreements between the United States and its allied nations and work towards shared interests. Failing to do so would "plant the seeds for future unrest." President Obama lavished praise on the spirit of people power that has animated "Arab spring" but also made clear that direct US involvement in the region would remain selective.

5- Obama and the Arab Spring

Billions of dollars in debt relief and loans for post-revolutionary Egypt and Tunisia will be a boost for their troubled economies.

The president's ringing declaration of support for Arab human rights was tempered by careful anticipation of the charge that US policies are inconsistent or selective.

Obama had harsh words for Bashar al-Assad of Syria, where hundreds have been killed by the security forces.

Obama used the "huge blow" of the death of "mass murderer" Osama bin Laden to note rightly that al-Qaida's message had become irrelevant as Arabs had taken their fate into their own hands so that "strategies of repression and diversion" would no longer be effective.

The president used the language of realism to note that there was a difference between "the world as it is compared to the world as it should be" but he reiterated that there were still "core principles" the US would stand by, including opposing the use of violence and repression (5).

President Barack Obama placed the United States squarely on the side of democratic reform in the Middle East and North Africa, declaring that the wave of change sweeping the region "cannot be denied."

Obama condemned the use of force against Arab Spring protesters by longtime allies and adversaries alike.

Barack Obama has asked U.S. allies gathered at the G8 summit to back his calls to provide financial assistance to Tunisia and Egypt, countries at the forefront of the Arab Spring uprisings. Both countries will need help stabilizing

and modernizing their economies as they attempt to transition to democracy. The eruption of demands for greater opportunity in Arab nations could be used to kick-start stalled Israeli-Palestinian peace talks (6)

6- On the Internal and International Level

On the internal level, Obama succeeded to pass a healthcare reform and improvements to the US economy. On the international level Obama concluded the nuclear arms treaty with Russia.

7- Barak and the economy

Less than four years have passed since Barack Obama's inauguration; now that the masses have come down from the Obama opiate, they are anxiously awaiting this promise of change. So what Barack Obama really did to improve the American economy? Let's look at his major solutions to what he calls the "worst financial crisis" since the Great Depression.

a- Rising Unemployment

Shortly after taking office, Obama signed the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, endeavoring to create approximately 3.5 million new jobs while simultaneously providing tax cuts to families earning less than 200,000 dollars. This stimulus act ostensibly bridges the gap between what consumers are spending and what they need to be spending in order to improve the economy. Note: George Bush signed two stimulus Acts at the end of his presidency and we can see how well that worked.

b- Housing Solution

Whether you believe the fault lies with the individuals who signed on to home loans they couldn't afford, or with the

lenders who gave credit to these individuals; the reality is that home foreclosures have adversely affected our economy. A total of \$12.7 Billion dollars has been allocated (primarily to the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD))The new housing program assists families in refinancing their homes at lower mortgage rates, modernizes public housing and assists people in becoming home owners.

c- New Investments

The Obama Administration believes if they focus on investments such as Healthcare, Education and Sustainable Energy, they will see a return in the long run. The new Healthcare bill, if passed, will apparently include millions of new people, which will help them to get out of debt. Additionally, the Administration has increased the amount of money students can borrow with Federal Stafford Loans, which will allow students to continue their education and defer payments while attending college. Additionally, Pell Grants were increased from \$4,731 to \$5,350 per year.

These plans to improve the economy have been largely criticized by Economists who (in short) do not believe that more Government spending is the answer. Surprisingly, the initiatives are not so popular with Obama's constituency either-approval ratings have dropped 30 percent since Obama took office. According to a study conducted by the Wall Street Journal, most Americans don't believe that Obama will even reduce the current deficit by half by the end of his term. When President Obama took office, the economy was losing more than 700,000 jobs per month. President Obama acted quickly to pass the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, which cut taxes for small businesses and 95 percent of working families. It also included emergency funding to support about 300,000 educator jobs, more than 4,600 law enforcement positions, and investments in the clean energy sector that supported 224,500 jobs through 2010. Through February 2012,

the economy has added more than 3.9 million private sector jobs over 24 consecutive months of job growth.

President Obama knows we still have more work to do. That's why, in his State of the Union address, the President laid out a blueprint for an economy that's built to last—an economy built on American manufacturing, American energy, skills for American workers, and a renewal of American values.

Jobs

d- Creating the National Export Initiative

President Obama created the National Export Initiative, an effort to help businesses compete in the global marketplace and double the nation's exports by 2015—a target America is on track to meet. To level the playing field for American businesses and workers, President Obama signed trade agreements with South Korea, Colombia, and Panama. Together, the agreements are estimated to increase exports by approximately \$13 billion and support more than 70,000 American jobs.

e- Investing in Manufacturing and Innovation

President Obama wants to grow high-technology U.S. manufacturing capacity and supply clean energy projects with American-made parts and equipment. That's why he's provided tax incentives to and made investments in clean energy technologies such as wind turbines and advanced car batteries.

President Obama launched the Advanced Manufacturing Partnership, a national effort to invest in technologies that will create high-quality manufacturing jobs and enhance America's global competitiveness. President Obama signed the America Invents Act, historic patent reform legislation that will help American entrepreneurs bring inventions to market sooner, helping to create new businesses and new jobs.

f- Supporting small business

Small businesses are the engine of job creation—responsible for two out of every three new jobs in the United States. That’s why President Obama has passed tax cuts for small businesses 18 times and streamlined the patent process, providing a new fast track option to cut wait times by two-thirds and help small business innovators move ideas from the lab to market. The Affordable Care Act also supports small businesses by giving them better affordable health care options for employees, simpler administrative operating rules, and billions of dollars in tax relief.

g- Jobs – Reviving the manufacturing Industry

400,000: Jobs added in the manufacturing sector since February 2010.

207,000: Jobs added in the auto industry over the last two and a half years.

100%: The percent of investment in plants and equipment that businesses could expense under a tax cut extension President Obama proposed, which would spur investment in the United States.

18%: Tax deduction President Obama has proposed for domestic advanced manufacturing technologies—which would double the current 9 percent deduction.

20%: Income tax credit the President has proposed providing to companies on expenses related to moving operations back to the United States.

h- Reforming Wall Street and protecting consumers

President Obama passed the Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act to hold Wall Street accountable, prevent future financial crises, and end the era of “too big to

fail.” Wall Street reform ensures that if a financial company fails, it will be Wall Street that pays the price—not the American people—and sets ground rules for the riskiest financial speculation. President Obama also enacted a Credit Card Bill of Rights to protect consumers from unfair and deceptive practices, like over-the-limit charges and hidden costs.

Through Wall Street Reform, President Obama created the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau. The agency defends consumers from unfair and abusive financial practices and makes sure that credit card companies and mortgage and payday lenders follow the rules. The President appointed Richard Cordray as director of the CFPB to serve as a watchdog with one job: to look out for the best interests of American consumers.

i- Rescuing the U.S. auto industry

President Obama made the tough and politically unpopular decision to extend emergency rescue loans to the American auto industry, saving more than 1.4 million jobs and preventing the loss of over \$96 billion in personal income—and the collapse of manufacturing in the Midwest. GM and Chrysler were required to cut labor costs and overhaul their business models in exchange for emergency loans, guaranteeing their accountability to taxpayers—and both repaid their outstanding loans years ahead of schedule.

Today, the Big Three (Chrysler, GM, and Ford) are all profitable for the first time in years, adding shifts and facilities across the country. The industry has added 200,000 jobs in the last two-and-a-half years, and GM is once again the top-selling automaker in the world—posting its largest-ever annual profit in 2011.

j- Protecting American Workers

In this year's State of the Union address, President Obama laid out a plan to provide tax incentives for companies that bring jobs back to the United States (7).

Chances of Obama to win a second term.

Five days after US Navy Seals shot and killed Osama bin Laden at his secret compound in Abbottabad, Pakistan, US President Barack Obama is enjoying a significant boost in public approval, as well as a transformation in his public image.

The question on most people's minds is what he will do with the new political capital he has gained.

On this, he is being given a great deal of gratuitous advice – from accelerating the timetable for the US withdrawal in Afghanistan that is scheduled to begin July 1, to pushing his own peace plan on Israel and the Palestinians, to pressing Republicans much harder on the necessity for tax increases to reduce the yawning budget deficit.

The end of bin Laden has given Obama a rare chance for a new beginning," according to Leslie Gelb, president emeritus of the Council on Foreign Relations (CFR). "It gives him the power to get hard things done."

Polls taken since the operation have shown increases in his public- approval ratings to around 50 per cent – a strong reversal of a trend that had slowly dragged his poll percentages down to the mid-to-low 40s.

The well-respected Gallup organization, which Thursday released a three-day-tracking poll, found a six per cent increase in the president's public-approval rating during the

three days after the raid in what it called Obama's first "rally event" – a positive reaction to a major international or domestic crisis.

While that was extremely modest compared to the all-time record 35- per cent increase George W. Bush received in his ratings after the 9/11 attacks on New York and the Pentagon, the consensus among even right-wing commentators is that Obama has emerged as a more-formidable political force primarily because he has demolished, at one blow, the increasingly widely accepted notion that he is a cautious, even timid, politician who instinctively favors the safest political option and who sees his foreign-policy role as managing the inevitable decline of US power in the world.

The rate of support for Obama in opinion polls conducted by Gallup over the three days from 21 to 23 December / January/2012 (47%) compared with the refusal rate has reached45%. The rate of support for Obama was 41% and 51% rejecting it at the beginning of this month.

The Democratic president signed a tax cuts on wages for two months after pushing the Republicans to support the demands and only for the increased taxes in the first January.

The increase reflected in the popularity of Obama's Gallup poll has shown the results of other polls pointed to the increasing popularity with the public support him in a bitter dispute for extending the tax cuts of about 160 million, equivalent to about U.S. \$ 40 fee every two weeks.

This is the first time that exceeds the rate of support of the President of the U.S. refusal rate since the survey was conducted last July.

The U.S. economic data is also more positive to some extent in recent weeks.

Mitt Romney and his claim that: 'President Obama has failed the American people'

It is a big mockery to see that the Republican presidential candidate Mitt Romney is defending the policies of former President George W. Bush -- "I am convinced that history will judge President Bush far more kindly," he said -- and pushing back on the idea that Republicans are the "party of no", more willing to obstruct than do work for the American people.

This unreasonable and irresponsible support of Bush's disastrous policies shows clearly that Romney is totally separated from actual facts. I would recommend that he reads the analysis of the leading economic educator and Nobel laureate Joseph Stiglitz regarding the disastrous consequences of Bush's policies in the economy and foreign policy.

Moreover, after all the great achievements of President Obama mentioned above in all domains, Romney claims that Obama 'failed the American people'!

"It is right and praiseworthy to say no to bad things," Romney argued, noting that Republican opposition to cap and trade, the Employee Free Choice Act and "government health care" were in line with the opposition of the American people to such proposals. "You see, we conservatives don't have a corner on saying 'no'", Romney said. "We're just the ones who say it when it is the right thing to do."

Romney derided President Barack Obama for having "failed" to deliver on the promises of his administration and sought to

paint Republican obstruction as a beneficial thing for the country.

"President Obama, Nancy Pelosi, Harry Reid and their team have failed the American people, and that is why their majority will soon be out the door," Romney told the audience at the CPAC conference, an annual get-together of conservative activists and leaders.

Romney used the word "fail" no fewer than a dozen times to describe the shortcomings of the current president and the opportunity before Republicans. "The people of America are looking to conservatives for leadership, and we must not fail them," Romney said.

"Obama's energy should have been focused on fixing the economy and creating jobs and to succeeding in our fight against radical violent jihad," said Romney. "Instead, he applied his time and political capital to his ill-conceived health care takeover and to building his personal popularity in foreign countries. He failed to focus, and so he failed."

Mitt Romney therefore deliberately blinded his vision from seeing the achievements of Obama, and he rather preferred to contradict with opposing arguments and by saying 'no' to Obama's achievements that are clear to everyone who cares to see.

Now let us see what Romney has to say.

Romney outlined his own governing vision based on three thematic pillars: strengthening the economy, strengthening security and strengthening the family.

On the economy specifically, Romney proposed cutting taxes, making the dollar stronger and "opening markets to America

goods" and, broadly, encouraging invention and innovation in the private sector.

"We will insist on greatness from every one of our citizens and rather than apologizing for who we are or for what we have accomplished, we will celebrate our nation's strength and goodness," Romney said in one of his speeches. (8).

Comments on Mitt Romney's plan for the economy

According to recent analysis the economic plan offered by presidential candidate Mitt Romney would deliver a massive \$6.6 trillion tax cut that would primarily benefit the very wealthy and corporations. After accounting for the added interest costs that we'll have to pay, the total cost of Romney's plan grows to \$7.8 trillion over the next 10 years.

Romney lays out several tax policies, all of which primarily benefit the super wealthy (by this he is but imitating Bush's policy).

– Extend all the Bush tax cuts: While everyone got a tax cut from President Bush, the extremely wealthy got the lion's share of the benefit. In 2010, fully half of the entire benefit from all of the Bush tax cuts flowed to the richest 5 percent of Americans. Extending them all (plus indexing the Alternative Minimum Tax to inflation) will cost nearly \$4 trillion, not including interest costs.

– Eliminate capital gains taxes for middle income households: Capital gains tax rates are already extraordinarily low, but middle class Americans don't enjoy much benefit from that. According to the Tax Policy Center, 67 percent of the entire benefit from lower capital gains tax rates goes to millionaires. Romney's proposal won't cost much because it won't benefit many people.

– Cut corporate taxes: Romney’s proposal to cut the corporate rate by about a third would cost more than \$900 billion. Needless to say, this cut would benefit mainly the very rich and corporations.

– Eliminate estate taxes: Right now, only the very biggest, richest fraction of a percent of all estates pay any tax at all. Eliminating even this paltry amount would cost about \$175 billion, and would, of course, only benefit a few extremely wealthy heirs and heiresses.

These, along with some other tax changes suggested by Romney (repealing the Affordable Care Act, for example) would result in federal revenue averaging just 16.7 percent of gross domestic product. That’s far below the 20 percent of GDP that Romney says he wants to spend (though, of course, he neglected to lay out what he would cut to get there). It’s even below the levels suggested by House Republican Budget, which abolished Medicare as we know it, slashed Medicaid, and still didn’t balance the budget until 2040.

Taken together, Romney’s fiscal policies would be even worse than the House Budget. His spending levels are the same — though he provides few details as to what he would cut to accomplish this — but his revenue levels are even lower. The result would be continued unsustainable deficits and more debt. In fact, Romney’s plan would yield approximately \$6.5 trillion in deficits from 2013 through 2021.

Given these facts, it is odd that Mitt Romney also supports an amendment to the U.S. constitution that would require balanced federal budgets. Romney’s plan doesn’t even come close to balancing the budget, instead resulting in unsustainable deficits and growing debt.

So, how does Romney deal with the fact that his own fiscal plan would be unconstitutional if President Romney got his way? He doesn't. Either he hasn't done the math, or he's hoping you won't notice his numbers don't add up. Either way, it doesn't reflect all that well on him or his economic "plan." (9).

In another analysis Charles Riley explains that Mitt Romney's economical plan relies on rebuilding the foundations of the American economy on the principles of free enterprise, hard work, and innovation. His plan emphasizes critical structural adjustments rather than short-term fixes. It seeks to reduce taxes, spending, regulation, and government programs. It seeks to increase trade, energy production, human capital, and labor flexibility. It relinquishes power to the states instead of claiming to have the solution to every problem.

The plan does not increase the size of the federal budget or bureaucracy. To the contrary, it cuts spending and streamlines regulation. It does not promise the immediate creation of some imaginary number of jobs, because government cannot create jobs—at least not productive ones that contribute to our long-term prosperity. It is economic growth, not government growth that provides productive opportunities for American workers. That is the lesson of these past three years, and one that America has learned well even if the White House has not.

Any American living through this economic crisis will immediately recognize the severity of the break that Mitt Romney proposes from our current course. He is calling for a fundamental change in Washington's view of how economic growth and prosperity are achieved, how jobs are created, and how government can support these endeavors. It is at once a deeply conservative return to policies that have served our nation well and a highly ambitious departure from the policies of our current leadership. In short, it is a plan to get America back to work (10).

Mitt Romney claims that he will fix the economy. But the fact is: his economic plan misses key policy details.

Romney wants Americans to pay lower income taxes, but hasn't said what the new rates will be, what the bracket structure will look like, or when he wants them to take effect. He wants to cut government spending to 20% of GDP, but is cloudy on exactly how that will happen.

And his economic plan barely even mentions housing -- one of the economy's biggest drags.

"These plans are always long on promise and short on numbers," said Robert Bixby, the executive director of The Concord Coalition. "And this is no exception."

Comments on Romney's tax plan also shows big tax cuts and a corresponding reduction in federal revenue. The plan eliminates taxes on interest, dividends and capital gains for taxpayers who make less than \$200,000. It also calls for the elimination of the estate tax, and a reduction in the tax rate paid by corporations from 35% to 25%.

Both the official economic plan and the Romney campaign website say the candidate wants to "maintain current tax rates on personal income."

That means a 35% tax rate on top-earning Americans. But in a debate last week, he suggested he would lower the top rate to 25% or even 20% when asked to identify the highest rate any American should pay.

"More than 25%, I think, is taking too much out of our pockets," Romney said.

Without giving a timetable, Romney has said in the past that he would like to move to a "fairer, flatter, simpler tax structure" in

the long run. But when these lower rates would go into effect is unclear.

And what about Americans who are not at the top end of the pay scale? The campaign has not released any details on Romney's eventual plans for those tax brackets.

A campaign spokeswoman told CNNMoney that while Romney "has not yet released the specifics of his plan, he believes a top rate of 25% is reasonable in principle; it is consistent with a flatter, fairer, simpler approach."

Romney's competitors have been more specific. Newt Gingrich, for example, has proposed an optional 15% flat tax on income.

Regarding spending, like many politicians, Romney falls short when it comes to naming specific budget cuts that back his ambitious goals for cutting back on federal spending. Romney says he would cap spending at 20% of GDP, immediately reduce non-security discretionary accounts by 5% and pursue a balanced budget amendment. With federal spending currently at around 24% of GDP, that means huge cuts.

Romney wants to cut funding for relatively small programs like Amtrak, the National Endowment for the Arts, foreign aid, the Corporation for Public Broadcasting and Title X family planning.

Romney does detail a few bigger ticket items, like a 10% reduction in the size of the federal workforce, which would mean around 250,000 fewer jobs. He also calls for a modification to Medicaid that would turn it into a block grant program. These cuts were described as "mere trinkets." To reach 20% of GDP, more spending reductions will be needed, and Romney is light on the details.

"It gets very difficult to cut spending to match today's tax levels."

As for a balanced budget, Romney's tax plan would sharply reduce government revenue, something that when coupled with an opposition to cutting Pentagon spending, makes a balancing of accounts all but impossible.

As for housing, the housing market remains tied in knots. One in every 69 homes had at least one foreclosure filing last year, while 804,000 homes were repossessed. In total, more than 4 million homes have been lost to foreclosure over the past five years. (Has Obama's housing policy failed?)

His official plan is virtually silent on the subject, but Romney has briefly commented on the housing crisis in other venues, offering prescriptions that critics have labeled insufficient. "The best way to get this economy going again is to get the overhang of all these foreclosures pushed through the system, come out the other end, letting people get back into homes at reasonable prices and renegotiate them."

In an October interview with the Las Vegas Review-Journal editorial board, Romney criticized the Obama administration for interfering in the market, thereby exacerbating the foreclosure glut, and characterized the first-time home buyer tax credit as an "ineffective idea."

In the same interview, Romney expressed a willingness to consider a program that would help individuals refinance their mortgages as a way to help keep their homes, a strategy the Obama administration has deployed with marginal success. But even that is to be announced.

"I'm not signing on," Romney said, "until I find out who's going to pay and who's going to get bailed out, and that's not something which we know all the answers to."

As it seems there are some big holes in Romney's economical plan. Romney's team will have to fill in the gaps as the campaign drags on. There is a lot that falls into the category of 'still to come'.

It is obvious that the democrats are characterized by a wider vision with regard to foreign policy and economical reform. President Carter concluded the outstanding Egypt-Israeli peace Treaty. And until this very moment we see him in many parts of the restless world trying to settle peace between the fighting parties. Bill Clinton was one of the greatest presidents of the United States. He revived the economy and was very wise in handling the foreign policy of the United States. As for Barak Obama, his achievements internally and world-wide are clear to the watchers – America is not only a super power but also a partner, and a supporter to all those who want to live freely on their land - a man respecting the other, and not an international cop subduing the world to the American hegemony.

Now let us look at the Republicans. Since the Florida Republican Allen West has become a congressman and he is attacking Muslims and Islam. He calls Islam not a religion but a "theocratic political ideology" that's a threat to America.

Republican presidential and Tea Party candidate, Newt Gingrich whose image was seriously damaged in 1997 when he was fined \$300,000 for ethic violations announced in May of 2011 that he would seek the Republican nomination for president in 2012. In order to beg for the Jewish votes he announced that the Palestinians are an invented people!

“Remember, there was no Palestine as a state. It was part of the Ottoman Empire,” Gingrich said. “And I think that we've had an invented Palestinian people, who are in fact Arabs, who are

historically part of the Arab community. And they had a chance to go many places and for a variety of political reasons, we have sustained this war against Israel now since the 1940s," the GOP candidate said. "I think it's tragic."

The Palestinian Authority and the PLO, incidentally, explicitly recognized Israel's right to exist in 1993. But Gingrich and Israel of course deny not only Palestine's right to exist in actual fact; they deny Palestinians the right to exist—in history, in culture, in textbooks, and of course in the most important state of them all: in a state of their own.

Gingrich's cynical efforts to attract attention to himself with divisive and destructive statements will not help his presidential ambitions, since they are aimed at putting the peace between Israel and the Palestinians that Americans yearn for even further out of reach than it is today." Gingrich's announcements are apparently cynical, destructive, racist and a cheap stunt to get votes.

Gingrich showed his ignorance in even simple politics. He should have known that the vast majority of American Jews and the Israeli government are committed to a two-state solution in which Israelis and Palestinians live side-by-side as neighbors and in peace. Many in Israel support the idea of an independent Palestine alongside Israel and recognize the Palestinian struggle for independence.

Gingrich also called Palestinians "terrorists." The comments struck at the heart of Palestinian sensitivities about the righteousness of their struggle for an independent state. Applying the label "invented" suggests that the Palestinian quest for independence is not legitimate.

Gingrich comments were apparently made for political gains. It is a cheap attempt to get more votes. Gingrich by his

irresponsible and destructive announcements sold America's interests by denying international Law and democratic principles.

What's good for America is secondary to the extremists like Gingrich and those who listen to him. The only thing that matters to him is to implement an extreme right-wing agenda.

Gingrich and those who follow him — represent a clear and present danger to the United States of America and they must be stopped before it is too late. No wonder he lost his race to presidency.

Willard Mitt the candidate for the 2012 Republican Party presidential nomination rapped President Obama before a group of Jewish Republicans on the issue of the U.S. relationship with Israel.

Romney, who's been sharply critical throughout the primary campaign of Obama's handling of Israel, fired up attendees of the Republican Jewish Coalition at the group's conference in D.C.

"I don't think he understands America," Romney said, and promised, as he did in the most recent debate: "I will travel to Israel on my first foreign trip. I will reaffirm as a vital national interest Israel's existence as a Jewish state."

"In three years in office, he hasn't found the time or interest to visit Israel, our ally, and our friend." he said.

Romney *et al.* are vying with each other in their belligerency toward Iran. If any of them ever makes it to the White House, he will have far more executive authority to wage war than any governing Islamist party ever would in the emerging Arab parliamentary democracies. And given the American arsenal,

he would have far more power to cause human catastrophe (as in Iraq).

Michele Bachmann has a rather bizarre view of the protests which swept the Arab world starting in January, and which so far have led to the downfall of three dictators:

Michele Bachmann condemned the Arab Spring and blamed President Obama for allowing it to happen by “showing weakness” and by compromising the United States’ relationship with Israel.

Why you think there was an Arab Spring, she asked at a GOP fund-raiser at a local barbecue restaurant here. She went on to tie the uprisings to what she described as signals from the White House that America was abandoning Israel.

Republican presidential hopeful Herman Cain says President Barack Obama has been on the wrong side of nearly every situation in the Arab world and the United States has mishandled the uprisings in the region.

Other Republicans, too, were tough on Obama's handling of Libya, Egypt and Yemen during Saturday night's debate on foreign policy. Former House Speaker Newt Gingrich says the United States wrongly dumped overnight an ally in Syria, while Mitt Romney says it is time for the regime of Syrian President Bashar Assad to end.

Rep. Ron Paul of Texas says it would be wrong for the United States to take active stands in the region. He says it's up to each country to determine its future.

Herman Cain said during Saturday night's GOP debate on foreign policy that President Barack Obama's reaction to the Arab Spring, the democratic uprisings in several Arab countries

earlier this year, has allowed the movement to go in the wrong direction -- a surprising statement against democratic movements.

"You have to look at Libya, Egypt, Yemen and all of the revolutions that are going on and how the administration has mishandled them," he said. "As a result, this has gotten totally out of hand."

He said the revolution in Egypt, where citizens ousted long-time President Hosni Mubarak, could strain relations between the United States and Egypt, and he warned against the increased power of opposition group the Muslim Brotherhood, which formed a political party earlier this year.

"Our relationship with Egypt may not survive," he said. "It turned out that the opposition was more of the Muslim Brotherhood, which could end up with a majority of control of this new government."

With a backward economy with zero standing in the world, Mitt Romney is still speaking arrogantly: "This century must be an American century. In an American century, America has the strongest economy and the strongest military in the world. God did not create this country to be a nation of followers. America is not destined to be one of several equally balanced global powers. America must lead the world, or someone else will."

No, Mr. Romney. America has not alone the strongest military in the world. Russia has it also and can destroy the world hundreds of times as America can. No, Mr. Romney. America has not the strongest economy in the world, but China has it now. America must strive hard to cope with the rising powers and economies.

We had enough of these arrogant Republicans and their void words. We want a man who is not influenced by religious or political groups – a man who believes that America is not only for the rich but also for the poor - a man accepting the other without bias - a man who think, watch and contemplate - a man responding to the poor, the needy and the oppressed. We want to see high consideration, compassion and mutual understanding. We want to see relationships based on responsibility, respect and equal footing. We want to see a man who believes in equality and justice - a man who thinks that the welfare and good of America is strongly correlated with the welfare and good of her allies and not the opposite - A man who knows that leadership is a huge responsibility and that the ruler is a servant of the people - a man who knows that as a ruler he is going to appear before his Creator on the Day of Judgment and account for his reign.

This we have found in Obama. I vote for Obama and so do my world.

References

(1) **The Five Fatal Mistakes of Bush's Mideast Policy.** By Scott Macleod/Cairo. Tuesday, Nov. 28, 2006). www.time.com).

(2) **The Economic Consequences of Mr. Bush.** By: Joseph Stiglitz, a leading economic educator, is a professor at Columbia. Anya Schiffrin and Izzet Yildiz assisted in the research of this article.

www.vanityfair.com/politics/features/2007.

(3) John Esposito: Obama revising Christian Right's Damage to Islam.

(4) By: Vali Nasr, Obama's advisor, in his book Meccanomics: The march of the new Muslim middle class (published in the US as Forces of Fortune).

(5) Ian Black, Middle East editor guardian.co.uk, Thursday 19 May 2011 21.22 BST.

(6) Alan Silverleib and Yom Cohen, CNN, may, 19, 2011.

(7) How Does Barack Obama Plan to Improve Our Economy? By: Maggie Eliot. Break Studios Contributing Writer. 19 March, 2010. www.mademan.com

(8) Chris Cillizza February 18, 2010.
Voices.Washingtonpost.com

(9) Michael Linden, director of tax and budget policy at the Center for American Progress Action Fund.

(10) Three holes in Romney's economic plan. By Charles Riley @CNMoney. January 25, 2012: 5:25 AM ET.