

Mark L. Melcher Publisher
melcher@thepoliticalforum.com

Stephen R. Soukup Editor
soukup@thepoliticalforum.com

THEY SAID IT

SEIU union members recruited by the Obama administration have been beating and intimidating citizens at the so called “town hall” meetings. In one case Kenneth Gladney, a black vendor outside a town hall meeting was beaten by these thugs. He was asked why he was selling “don’t tread on me” merchandise or better known as Gadsden’s flag used by the founding fathers. The thugs were quoted as saying “A “N word” shouldn’t be selling that stuff.” The beating was caught on tape and You Tube has been trying hard to censor it along with anything else the Administration might deem incriminating. The excuse often used is hate speech or racism. Some things need to be seen or this sort of thing will just continue. The violence has been happening largely at “town hall” meetings set up by the Obama Administration in partnership with SEIU, a labor union, and sister organization of ACORN, which President Obama supports.

Robert Rule, *Examiner.com*, August 9, 2009.

STUPID IS AS STUPID DOES.

We hate to say this, but in case you hadn’t noticed, some very important people in this country think that you are stupid. Yes, you. Right there in the white shirt. Stupid. In fact, nearly the entire political-media class believes this to be true, including the President of the United States and his allies in the U.S. Congress and in the press corps. There really is no way to be gentle about this. Like it or not, that’s what they think of you.

They believe that this stupidity manifests itself first and foremost in irrationality. They believe that your concern that the government is trying to take over roughly 1/6th of the national economy is over-the-top, koo-koo-banana. They believe that your belief that you are simply a concerned citizen trying to make your voice heard is delusional. Your problem is that you’re part an angry mob and don’t know it. How do we know this? Well, the White House and the Democratic National Committee told us so. Why, the DNC is even running ads about your mobbishness. The fact that the audio in the ad took place at a town hall hosted by a REPUBLICAN congressman is beside the point. According to them, you people are a mess, unworthy of the right to petition your government for redress of grievances. Clearly, in their estimation, Jefferson didn’t have you people in mind when he came up with that radical idea.

It is also obvious to them that you are not acting of your own volition; that you are being manipulated by the “Brooks Brothers Brigade,” as presidential press secretary Robert Gibbs, called them – a bunch of crazy, though snappily dressed, right-wing puppet masters who are the Edgar Bergen to your Charlie McCarthy. Everyone knows that “real” outrage doesn’t come from clean, well-groomed, well-dressed people. Seriously.

In this Issue

Stupid Is as Stupid Does.

Tick ‘Em Off, and “They Will Come.”

Subscriptions are available by contacting:

The Political Forum LLC 8563 Senedo Road, Mt. Jackson, Virginia 22842
Phone 540.477.9762 Fax 540.477.3359 melcher@thepoliticalforum.com www.thepoliticalforum.com

If there is one thing the former hippies and hippy-wannabes who populate our federal government know first hand, it's that a protest isn't really a protest if you show up clean-shaven, freshly bathed, and don't smell like the backstage of a Grateful Dead concert.

Now, we can't say that we've seen any of you carrying swastikas, as Speaker of the House Nancy Pelosi horrifyingly declared. And to the best of our knowledge, the only actual violence at any of these events was perpetrated by the left-leaning, reform-supporting members of the Service Employees International Union against a black conservative activist in St. Louis, belying the assertion by MSNBC's Keith Olbermann that you people most resemble Hamas and Hezbollah.

Still, the belief is widespread that you are crackpots and kooks, not rational, sentient beings. Indeed, your actions of late prompted the alleged comedian and leftist pop-hero Bill Maher to note just last week that this is an amazingly "stupid country." To drive home his point, Maher noted that "last election, a full one-third of voters forgot why they were in the booth, handed out their pants, and asked 'do you have these in a relaxed-fit?'" Wow. Comedy gold. As the noted political philosopher Homer Simpson might say, "it's funny 'cause it's true." You people . . .

Now if it makes you feel any better, we should note that this belief in your stupidity is not new. You may recall that President Obama, before he was President Obama, called y'all out for being "bitter" and for clinging to your guns, religion, and rejection of "the other."

Before that, Obama's predecessor as Democratic presidential nominee, John Kerry, noted, in a wildly high-larious joke, that only stupid people (like you'ens) join the military and get stuck in places like Iraq. And speaking of Kerry, immediately after he lost, a supporter (albeit a foreign one) named Keith Reade summed up the anger that he and his domestic fans must have been feeling with the following, published in London's *Daily Mirror*:

Were I a Kerry voter, though, I'd feel deep anger, not only at them returning Bush to power, but for allowing the outside world to lump us all into the same category of moronic muppets. The self-righteous, gun-totin', military-lovin', sister-marryin', abortion-hatin', gay-loathin', foreigner-despisin', nonpassport ownin' red-necks, who believe God gave America the biggest d*** in the world so it could urinate on the rest of us and make their land "free and strong."

Good stuff.

But why did Kerry lose in the first place? Same reason Gore did, because you simpletons allowed yourselves to be fooled by the mighty wizard Karl Rove. As is usually the case, you didn't know what the hell you were doing, and you were fooled by Rove into voting for somebody who doesn't care about you and doesn't care even marginally about your real problems. They "tricked" you with that social issue hokum. As Reade notes above, you loathe gays. And because you do, Rove and his minions played on your fears and convinced you that a vote for the other side would lead inevitably to federal government mandates requiring that the Boy Scouts hire transvestite predators to teach your kids how to put condoms on a banana. Or something like that. We don't recall exactly.

But we do know that you fell for it. Relaxed-fit indeed.

Now, once again, you don't have to take just our word for this. Much admired leftist truth-seeker and *The Wall Street Journal's* resident liberal columnist Thomas Frank wrote a book about all this silliness called *What's the Matter with Kansas?* In 2004, Frank's book spent 18 weeks on the *New York Times* Best Seller List – and it's easy to see why. Frank puts it all down in black and white, making a clear and concise case that regular, working-class Americans should be voting for Democrats, who represent their true interests, but are instead conned into voting Republican – year after

year – by unscrupulous “Christers” who prey upon the unintelligent and the cultural traditionalists (as if there’s any difference). As Frank put it:

All they [that’s you] have to show for their [your] Republican loyalty are lower wages, more dangerous jobs, dirtier air, a new overlord class that comports itself like King Farouk – and, of course, a crap culture whose moral free fall continues, without significant interference from the grandstanding Christers whom they send triumphantly back to Washington every couple of years.

There are some on the right – some of your heroes, like Peggy Noonan and Jonah Goldberg – who think that this focus on your stupidity shows desperation and fear on the part of the Obama administration and its friends in Congress. Or as Goldberg put it: “The Democratic party is panicking, lashing out like a cornered animal, all because its effort to take over the health-care industry is coming apart like so much wet toilet paper.”

That’s a nice theory, certainly. But it’s also wrong. Anyone who has paid even the remotest bit of attention to American politics over the last few decades knows full well that this is anything but panic. Noting the stupidity, ignorance, and credulousness of the American people is and has been standard practice on the political left for years, decades even.

Obviously, we’ve already discussed Karl Rove and his hideousness. But before him, you may recall that back in the early ‘90s, *The Washington Post* noted that conservative Christians – the folks who led the then-impending Republican Revolution – are, generally speaking, “poor, uneducated, and easily led.” And before that, nearly the entire political class acknowledged that George H.W. Bush won election over Michael Dukakis only because he and his “vile” proto-Rovian campaign manager, Lee Atwater, played on the racial fears of stupid Americans, convincing them that Dukakis was the kind of guy who would let a convicted murderer out on a weekend furlough to commit assault, armed robbery, and rape – never mind that the charge was flatly and undeniably true.

Before that, according to these leftist geniuses, Reagan also played on the racism of stupid voters by launching his 1980 campaign in Philadelphia Mississippi, blowing a sort of “dog whistle,” letting the dumb Americans know that their animosity towards minorities would be accepted and even welcomed by the real nuts from California. Not that any of this should have surprised anyone, since everyone knows that the only way Republicans were able to make any advances at all against the Democrats was by duping the “poor, uneducated, and easily led” and playing on their racial ignorance. And when we say that “everyone knows,” we mean EVERYONE knows. This is part of the fabric of our legend as a nation. Why, just last week the manifestly not-stupid Nobel Prize winning liberal Paul Krugman wrote the following:

The driving force behind the town hall mobs is probably the same cultural and racial anxiety that’s behind the “birther” movement, which denies Mr. Obama’s citizenship. Senator Dick Durbin has suggested that the birthers and the health care protesters are one and the same; we don’t know how many of the protesters are birthers, but it wouldn’t be surprising if it’s a substantial fraction.

And cynical political operators are exploiting that anxiety to further the economic interests of their backers.

Does this sound familiar? It should: it’s a strategy that has played a central role in American politics ever since Richard Nixon realized that he could advance Republican fortunes by appealing to the racial fears of working-class whites.

Got that? Ever since 1968, the “Rethuglicans” have been manipulating us shallow, ignorant types with subtle racial cues, convincing us to vote not *for* them but *against* the party that represents the nation’s downtrodden. Southern Strategy, bay-bee! And we’ve just fallen in line, lemmings that we are.

Had enough? No? Well, if that's not enough to convince you that they think you're stupid and that this supposition on their part is anything but a "panicked" response to your success, we'll continue.

The fact of the matter is that for the Washington in-crowd, the presumption of stupidity is not just a campaign tactic or a means by which to discredit political opposition. It is a fundamental and foundational principle of governance. Why else do you think that they think that we need a new health care system managed by qualified government professionals? Well, because they do not really think that you're smart enough to make your own decisions about life, death, and how to spend your money. That's why.

If you look closely at all Progressive and liberal movements down through the ages, you will notice that they are premised on the idea that decisions about governance are far too important to be made by ordinary citizens working together under the auspices of a democratic government. From Woodrow Wilson's artificially constructed politics-administration dichotomy to the current debates over energy and health care policy, the driving goal has been to remove power and responsibility from the people and to place the decision-making responsibilities with the elites, with professionals expressly trained and directed to ensure that outcomes suit the "common good," whether the population at large likes it or not. In their minds, individuals (that's you) are too selfish, too self-driven, too ignorant of the complicated and intricate nuances of policy and procedure to be allowed to make the important decisions or even – as Wilson so carefully articulated – influence those who make the decisions. "Choice" is a fine slogan when discussing reproductive rights, but it is hardly a reasonable tenet on which to base the governance of a complicated modern nation.

Just within the context of the health care debate it is easy to see the importance of experts and the exercise of expert control to the smooth operation of contemporary society. If our new and glorious health care system is to function properly, you people will have to manage yourselves properly, which is to

say that the government will have to manage your appetites and your proclivities for you, since you are clearly incapable of managing them for yourselves.

If you are looking for a model as to how this will be accomplished and justified, you needn't look very hard. Tobacco is the archetype.

Now, you may recall that for years and years, you all were warned about the hazards of smoking. The little labels there on the package warned you that it was bad for you. You were told that smoking would increase your health problems and, by extension, your health care costs. But you wouldn't listen. And so when Washington wanted to get serious, it concluded that you *couldn't* listen, that your inability to deal with your problems was someone else's fault. And that someone, of course, was and is the tobacco companies, who dupe you simple fools into thinking that smoking is cool – what with their seductive camel cartoons and such – and then keep you smoking by increasing those aspects of the habit that make it pleasurable. Given this, someone has to take care of you. And, as of two months ago, *that* someone is the Food and Drug Administration.

What's nice is that the man who pioneered this approach to blaming your problems on someone else and chalking it all up to your inability to handle your own personal business is back at it, hoping to help save the government some money by once again saving you folks from your own weaknesses.

First, a little background. In addition to being stupid, you people are fat. Or so we are told. And as fatties, you're driving up health care costs. Heart disease, cholesterol problems, ill-fitting clothes – all these are related to your heftiness. And it's getting worse.

If government is going to give you your health care for "free," then you're going to have to do your part by eradicating your man-breasts and growing pecs, like Obama. Or Putin. This will save the government money, or, as the *Washington Post* columnist and blogger Ezra Klein put it: "health reform is in the works. And the administration is desperately looking for ways to

cut costs without denying care. One way to do that is to make people healthier so they need less care. And one way to do *that* is to avert the obesity epidemic.”

Now, as *The Weekly Standard's* Andrew Ferguson notes, Klein apparently “doesn’t know the meaning of ‘avert . . .’” But that’s beside the point. You’re fat. That’s expensive. So you have to stop being fat. Got it?

Enter David Kessler, the man who was FDA chairman during much of the 1990s and the genius who pioneered the effort to blame your smoking on the tobacco companies. Kessler is back with a new problem and a new villain. Andrew Ferguson explains:

Kessler the man of government recognizes that the old idea of personal responsibility undercuts the case for governmental regulation, which at least in theory is designed to prevent harm being done to one party by another. So Kessler the man of science enlists Kessler the man of pudge to testify to the helplessness a fat person feels. The blame can still be shifted. All those fat Americans may not be victims of screwy metabolisms or genetics, Kessler says, but we can still think of them as helpless victims. And where there’s a victim, a victimizer must be found.

The primary victimizer is, of course, the American food industry. Kessler believes that the products it offers its customers are irresistible. This is a common view and getting commoner. As our Baby Boomers age, the famous ardor they once felt for sexual intercourse has been transferred to food, which at their time of life is more easily attainable and requires less fuss. Kessler’s tortured encounters with one foodstuff after another are described in a prose that is nearly Jackie Collins-like in its sensual intensity. Embarrassed readers may wonder whether they shouldn’t just leave

the room. Here is the author at a Panera Bread outlet, encountering a shapely little thing called a “cinnamon crunch bagel.”

The topping gave the bagel a crunchy sweetness, which contrasts nicely with the soft interior. The aroma of cinnamon was pleasant and persistent, and the vanilla chips offered appealing bursts of flavor. As I chewed, the bagel was quickly transformed into a moist wad in my mouth, with the crunch becoming finer as it dissolved. It was easy to chew and to swallow and its sweetness lingered yet didn’t overwhelm the other flavors. Well lubricated by its fat content and mixed with my saliva, the wad of bagel melted perfectly in my mouth.

Hungry yet? “Panera,” he concludes, “had figured out how to put the fat, sugar, and other flavor enhancements together to provide exactly the sensory experience I wanted.”

You’d think he’d be grateful. Instead he’s offended. Never before in history, he says, has food been this tasty, this available, this seductive. Worst of all, that flavor, that texture--they’re premeditated. Citing advertising and personal testimony, much of it anonymous, Kessler goes to great lengths to prove what nobody could have doubted: The food industry tries very hard to make products that customers will like. This is the way market transactions are supposed to work, but Kessler believes that when food is at issue, the process is sinister and manipulative--just as it is with SUVs, tobacco, and other products that progressives hope to regulate in making our lives better. “The food industry is the manipulator of the consumers’ minds and desires,” he says, and it’s been so successful it’s rendered its customers powerless to resist.

Now, we know what you're thinking: Kessler is crazy. Crazy like a fox, we say. Between soda pop taxes and fast food surcharges, the retribution against the evil food companies has already begun. And you should get used to it. And you should get used to eating what is good for you – what the government says is good for you.

Coincidentally, the government will make you healthier by making the world healthier. They've already given away billions in free cash to save the planet by eliminating old SUVs. And soon, they'll have to conclude that the next step is eliminating or reducing beef production. Cows "make" methane, which contributes to global warming. And cow meat (aka beef) plugs your colon and makes you costlier . . . errr . . . unhealthier. Cows are bad for Gaia. And they're bad for you.

You know what else is bad for you? Of course you don't. If you did, we wouldn't be having this conversation. But never fear. Someone is watching, waiting to take care of you, however you may screw up and endanger your health or that of your loved ones. Smoking, drinking, eating, driving old or big cars, raising cattle (AHEM!), reading children's books – all these are bad for you. But they're just the start.

What's that? You don't know about the children's books? Of course you don't. Fortunately, the Manhattan Institute's Walter Olson will walk you through it:

It's hard to believe, but true: under a law Congress passed last year aimed at regulating hazards in children's products, the federal government has now advised that children's books published before 1985 should not be considered safe and may in many cases be unlawful to sell or distribute. Merchants, thrift stores, and booksellers may be at risk if they sell older volumes, or even give them away, without first subjecting them to testing—at prohibitive expense. Many used-book sellers, consignment stores, Goodwill

outlets, and the like have accordingly begun to refuse new donations of pre-1985 volumes, yank existing ones off their shelves, and in some cases discard them en masse.

Don't blame the government. If you people could just keep your kids from eating the books you give them, everything would be fine. But nooooooooo . . .

In any case, the list of unacceptable behaviors, products, items, acts, and thoughts is sure to grow. And that's how it goes when people have the unmitigated temerity to act freely and/or stupidly.

The columnist Mark Steyn has argued over and over again that government-sponsored health care forever changes the relationship between the government and the governed. Once the government is in charge of health, it is in charge of everything, to some degree or another, which is to say that the tradeoff for "free" health care is freedom itself. And that's sorta the point.

If you think all of this whining and fussing about how the anti-health care protestors are stupid is a mere coincidence, you are wrong. Stupidly wrong. Every school boy knows that the first phase of any successful military campaign is to dehumanize and demonize the enemy – make the enemy look evil (carrying swastikas) and stupid. Once that is done, no one will care what you do to them – even if what you do is to impinge greatly on their freedom and even if "them" is us.

The Democratic leaders in Washington are many things, but one of them is not stupid – at least not by any conventional definition of the word. They know full well what they're doing. And what they're doing is laying the groundwork.

Just you watch.

Or is that just stupid?

TICK 'EM OFF AND "THEY WILL COME."

In case you hadn't noticed, it's crunch time. If the Obama administration succeeds in its current effort to nationalize the nation's health care system, the battle against the tyranny of collectivization will have been lost and with it that which Lincoln described as the last best hope of earth.

Are we exaggerating the importance this battle over health care? Well maybe. But the White House clearly doesn't think so. In fact, it appears to be using every weapon at its disposal, both legal and illegal, to win this war. Besides enlisting the support of the thugs at the Service Employees International Union (SEIU) and Acorn to physically intimidate opponents of the plan at Town Hall meetings and elsewhere, the White House last week posted a notice on its website asking Americans to send in the names of anyone circulating "fishy" information that is critical of its plan to nationalize health care.

The White House did not say how it intended to deal with the purveyors of such "fishy" information, but it clearly knew that requesting and assembling such a list was illegal. And it further knew that there isn't a damn thing any ordinary citizen can do about it, given that Obama stooge, and former Clinton stooge, Eric Holder is the "chief law enforcement officer in the land." In any case, the fact that the White House is assembling a list of the enemies of its latest, noble project was clearly designed to warn the less committed and most fearful of its opponents that perhaps they should stay on the sidelines in this fight. The notice read as follows:

There is a lot of disinformation about health insurance reform out there, spanning from control of personal finances to end of life care. These rumors often travel just below the surface via chain emails or through casual conversation. Since we can't keep track of all of them here at the White House, we're asking for your help. If you get an

email or see something on the web about health insurance reform that seems fishy, send it to flag@whitehouse.gov.

While we are conservatives and always vote Republican, we are also patriots, so our first instinct when our country calls is to try to help. So, one of us sent the following e-mail in reply to the White House call for public participation.

Please enter my name on the list of Americans who have questioned, in casual conversation and elsewhere, the White House's honesty over the issue of national health insurance. It would probably be a good idea to put a 24 hour tail on me because I am very likely to continue this heinous practice of saying what I believe to be true. I might even buy the surveillance team a beer, if I can spot them. My name is Mark Melcher. I raise cattle in the Shenandoah Valley. My address is 8563 Senedo Road, Mount Jackson, Virginia. If your guys can't find me at home, I'll probably be drinking beer at the local Moose Lodge, where the subject of the growing government impingement on the rights guaranteed to Americans by the Constitution is routinely discussed in terms that are not flattering to the Obama administration. In fact, you might want to bug the place. Subversive doesn't even begin to describe it. Whoooooooo!

PS: People own guns around here too. You should come get them.

Needless to say, Mark has heard nothing from the White House. But he did hear from a surprising number of friends and clients who, after reading his jocular missive, questioned whether it was wise to tweak the nose of a President who was weaned on Chicago's crooked politics, Saul Alinsky's bare-knuckle brand of "neighborhood organizing," the Reverend

Jeremiah Wright's hate-based spirituality, and whose chief of staff, Rahm Emanuel, once mailed a dead fish to a pollster who had angered him. In fact, one old friend of Mark's, who happens to be a lawyer, said the following: "I promise to defend you in court when they come get you; *and they will come.*" (emphasis added)

Now it should be noted that all of the cautionary comments that Mark received were offered in a light hearted manner. Yet, all contained a very real and undeniable hint of concern about whether the Obama White House might possibly use the extraordinary power of the executive branch to teach Mark that it is not wise to mess around with the "chosen one."

With these worries in mind, Mark sent a second e-mail to flag@whitehouse.gov. To wit:

Dear Sir or Madam,

Yesterday, I sent an e-mail to you guys asking to be added to the list you are keeping of critics of your national health insurance program. Several friends with whom I shared this e-mail expressed concern that I would be subject to various forms of retaliation by the White House, ranging from outright harassment to a tax audit. I assured them that that would not happen in the United States, given the Constitution and all. But they are not convinced and remain concerned about my welfare. Some wanted me to "go into hiding till it to blows over." Could you please send me an e-mail response that would be put them at ease. You know, like explaining that the only thing you will do is put my name on an "enemies list," but not do anything to drastically to hurt me physically. Not only would that be a kind gesture, but it would greatly increase the number of responses you are likely to get from your request to get people to squeal on their friends and neighbors. You know, if people can have some assurance

that they won't be injured in some way for doing so. Sincerely, Mark Melcher, 8563 Senedo Road, Mount Jackson, Virginia.

PS: You might consider sending some of your Acorn and labor union goons down here to prevent people from voting Republican in the upcoming gubernatorial race. That would be great theatre.

So, what is one to think? Is Mark in danger? More importantly and to the point, would the Obama White House actually violate the law by compiling lists of enemies and encouraging the actions of the thugs at SEIU and Acorn? And if so, would it matter if it did?

Well, think of it this way. The threat of a tax audit by the IRS, as a consequence of angering a vindictive administration, pales in comparison to the threat that is implicit in the power of a governmental health ministry that ultimately decides who gets to be first in line for a kidney transplant, for a new hip, for a cancer operation, for access to the best brain surgeon in the nation, and most especially for high priced "end of life" care. And would anyone in their right mind want to live in a society in which Rahm Emanuel, or someone of his sleazy ilk, could intervene in this decision-making process with a simple phone call?

Better yet, could a money manager in such a society trust the "research" from a brokerage firm that is effectively controlled by a government with that sort of power over its citizens and the willingness to use it?

Listen!

In July 2001, *Barron's Magazine* published an article entitled "Bomb Thrower, Political analyst Mark Melcher falls victim to Prudential's PC sword."

The article noted that Melcher had been fired by the recently named head of Prudential Securities, John Strangfeld, "because his opinions didn't match up with those of the company brass." In support of this

contention, *Barron's* quoted from a U-5 filing Prudential made with state regulators, which said that Melcher's "work product exhibited a difference in philosophy from that of firm management."

Now get this. *Barron's* went on to say that "the irony [in this situation] is that Strangfeld has been telling everyone within earshot about the firm's intention of letting its analysts 'call them like they see them' without fear of alienating clients." Indeed, the article stated, "*Fortune Magazine* last month praised Strangfeld's gambit, stating, 'Investors, at last, will be served by Wall Street Research.'"

Of course, this was garbage. Clearly, Prudential's "brass" were not inclined to let their research analysts "call them like they see them" if these calls clashed with their views, particularly if their views involved the Clinton White House. As *Barron's* pointed out in the same article, the then Chairman of Prudential Arthur Ryan had been recently "hobnobbing with President Clinton aboard Air Force One."

Of course, Prudential research quickly went downhill under Strangfeld's direction and eventually closed its doors. Naturally, Strangfeld was rewarded for this display of leadership by being promoted to Chairman and CEO of the parent company. This was a tragedy for the good folks who worked there at the time, but at least the firm's clients no longer had to be concerned about whether the management's liberal politics influenced the views of its research analysts.

Yet, the problem of the close ties between this White House and the Wall Street brass is much worse today than it was back then. Indeed, the coziness between this White House and the top present and former brass of such Wall Street power houses as Goldman Sachs is a veritable breeding ground for both domestic and geopolitical corruption and, please believe this, will worsen tremendously if the Obama White House gets the power to decide who among us lives and who dies.

But don't say anything or "they will come."

Copyright 2009. The Political Forum. 8563 Senedo Road, Mt. Jackson, Virginia 22842, tel. 540-477-9762, fax 540-477-3359. All rights reserved.

Information contained herein is based on data obtained from recognized services, issuer reports or communications, or other sources believed to be reliable. However, such information has not been verified by us, and we do not make any representations as to its accuracy or completeness, and we are not responsible for typographical errors. Any statements nonfactual in nature constitute only current opinions which are subject to change without notice.