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Before I begin, I should issue a few qualifiers. First, I’m not an apologist for the president. I believe that President Obama’s performance has been consistent with—and in the case of foreign affairs, exceeded—what we would expect from a Democratic president. However, his compromises with the Republicans and his refusal to prosecute the bankers whose predatory mortgage and securities schemes triggered this recession shows weakness that can be attributed to a lack of experience, an overuse of his advisors or both. Second, I don’t believe that a person who calls someone else a racist is a racist, too; that’s a logical fallacy. It’s akin to saying that calling someone fat means that you are fat, too—it just not true. What it means is that the person that is calling the names is tactless; but, in this corrosive political climate, tact is not what we need.

What we need, first and foremost, is brutal honesty; and the honest truth is that the current Republican agenda—both in the Presidential campaign and in general—is one of identity. The Republican Party’s presidential and national platforms are based on race and gender inequality, primarily and exclusively.

From the Senate’s Minority Leader [Mitch McConnell’s repeated declaration](http://www.rawstory.com/rs/2011/07/10/mcconnell-stopping-obamas-re-election-still-single-most-important-goal/) that defeating the president’s re-election plans is the Senate Republicans’ number one priority to [Republicans’ support of the American Legislative Exchange Council’s (ALEC) voters suppression legislation](http://www.prwatch.org/news/2011/05/10711/voter-suppression-bills-sweep-country) to the House Republicans’ unilateral tactic to initially oppose anything the president supports—even if it is their legislation—the Republicans have made clear their opposition to this president and their charge to ensure that another Obama would never be elected to president again. While Republicans and Democrats have never played well together on the federal stage, this level of acrimony have never been seen before; and as the president entered the White House with only two years of federal service behind him, only three bills to his credit that he co-sponsored, and a clear-cut centrist background, the only valid conclusion for the Republicans’ immediate distaste for him must be based on race; he didn’t have enough policy history to dislike him professionally.

The Obama administration has ran a centrist operation that—have a Republican did the same—would lead to much chest-pounding from the right. Republican candidate for president Mitt Romney’s chameleon-like campaign platform reflects this; Romney does not dismiss anything the president did (except for healthcare, which is ironic, actually), but bemoans the tone and target of his actions. Romney’s unofficial campaign slogan of “Not Enough” suggests that he favors a top-down financial approach: that is, make the rich richer and they would create the jobs that would support the poor. This type of austerity is the main reason for the financial collapse in Europe, but, more soberly, this is a full 180from his well-documented and well-lauded approach as governor of Massachusetts. From an open-willingness to raise taxes for social issues, support of same-sex unions, and the implementation of the first state-sponsored public healthcare plan, Mitt Romney was considered a well-established moderate—a rarity in the Republican Party. In order to run for president, Romney became a conservative—which is absolutely unheard of. When Ronald Reagan left the Democratic Party to become a Republican, he remained right-of-center. One does not change their political alignment; that would suggest a complete change of personality and beliefs.

So, Romney is either lying now or lied then; either way, he’s a liar. This begs the question: why does the Republican Party support him? In reality, they don’t; but, they do not have a better candidate to defeat the president, and he has the three characteristics they need to make him a viable candidate: he’s a white man, he’s rich, and at one point he was a real threat to the president poll-wise.

The current struggle politically among the Republican Party can best be titled “the White Man’s Struggle”. There has been a panic forming in conservative circles that control of the nation has been ebbing away from the white man for some time now, which can be seen in the number of “minorities” in key positions currently. As of recently, there has been a massive pushback against women’s rights, social services, voter access laws and Internet neutrality laws from the Republican Party to undercut the Democratic fringe’s ability to support the party’s core like it did in 2006 and 2008. The reality is that the percentage of white men in the population has been decreasing readily for some time now. By 2050, it is predicted that there will be more Latinos in America than whites, and this is driving many to overreact. In addition, the growing strength of women and the idea that in many households the woman is the bread-winner is shattering “traditional” views of the family, and challenging the ideology of classical Republican thought.

In other words, the Republicans have made themselves into a bunch of bullies.

It is imperative that we fight back against a bully, particularly this one. Of all elections, this one is the most important, because the Republicans are seeking validation for their actions over the last four years. If, through their actions, they win the Senate or the White House, this bullying will become the Republican’s Party key tactic.

It’s time to give these bullies a time-out.