

The Obamas Live Like Royalty

Who, exactly, is out of touch with average Americans?

Obama says rich man, Mitt Romney, is out of touch with average Americans. But wait a minute, the Obamas Live like royalty! So who exactly is out of touch?

Watch this video to learn about the lavish lifestyle of Barack and Michelle Obama.

Hypocritical? We need a bigger, louder word!

I think it was just a few weeks ago that I saw the Obama Media shills falling over themselves to characterize Ann Romney as an out of touch rich woman. They showed a photo of her wearing an expensive designer blouse. Really? Well now, that does indeed tell us all we



need to know about the Romneys. Are you with me on this? Ann Romney buys expensive clothes! It's disgusting. Outrageous. Hasn't anyone told her that she is required to buy her clothes at Walmart or Goodwill or, you know, where we the people buy ours.

But I have a few bothersome little questions for the Obama Media shills. Wasn't FDR a rich man? Yeah, I know he was because I'm up on this stuff and I even visited his estate in Hyde Park, NY years ago. Yes, he was a very rich man. So why didn't that bother the media? Oh yes, then there is John F. Kennedy. The Democrats and their media refer to him as JFK. (Ever notice how they like to use initials for their big stars?) Anyway, why didn't JFK's millions bother the media? Then of course there is John Kerry. He's another super rich guy. (They couldn't use "JFK" for Kerry. It was already taken.) So why didn't that bother the media? Come to think about it, our richest presidents were all Democrats! Oh, I get it, it doesn't count if you are a Democrat. Stupid me.

Listen, this is about as pure as hypocrisy can get. Our very first president, George Washington, was one of the richest men in the country. Hmm, wonder where he bought his clothes? Does anyone really think that Franklin Roosevelt or John Kennedy shopped for clothes in bargain basements? Do you think that

John Kerry or any other rich people do? The Obamas certainly don't and the Romneys should not be expected to either. Would you if you were rich? It's ridiculous.

This is just one more bogus political trick from Barack Obama. These "rich man" charges that Obama and his henchmen keep throwing at Romney are part of a Marxist style class warfare strategy designed to divide our nation and pit Americans against Americans. It is right out of Saul Alinsky's *Rules For Radicals*, which, by the way, Barack Obama used to teach. It is sad but true: Our president will say and do virtually anything to stay in power. It is not about what is best for our country, it is about Barack Obama and his plan to "transform" America into something entirely different than what has served us so well for 236 years—what has made us the greatest nation in world history.

So every time you hear him or his henchmen attack Mitt Romney for being rich, think of the video you saw here and what you read here. Remember all the rich Democrat presidents and presidential candidates. Remember how Barack and Michelle Obama live. Oh and while I'm at it, did you know that Mitt Romney gave far more to charity than Barack Obama and Joe Biden, combined? Just saying. No, I didn't get that information from the Obama Media.

**The Media Hide Obama
Associations**

The Media Hide The Truth From The Public



One of the most remarkable things that distinguished Election 2008 from all other presidential elections was the media's blatant policy of hiding the real history and past associations of a presidential candidate.

It is undeniable that if a Republican presidential candidate had even one association with a radical right-wing activist, he or she would not have become the Republican nominee. First, the Republican Party would not have allowed it and, second, the media would have launched a relentless campaign to destroy him or her, politically.

Yet, not only did the Democratic Party nominate a man who for over twenty years almost exclusively surrounded himself with extreme anti-American, radical activists, the American media were as determined to hide this truth from us as they would have been determined to reveal such associations if the candidate were a Republican. We may as well be living in a fascist country in which the media is strictly controlled by the political party in power. The result is the same.

For all who may object to this line of criticism, I can only wonder why. It is fact, not speculation that the media hide Obama associations along with virtually anything negative that could harm his presidency or his bid for reelection. If you think it is unfair or harmful in some way to report all the

facts, then I suggest that you do not understand how our political system works. The health of our nation depends on an informed citizenry. Beginning with George Washington, our founders as well many leaders since then have warned of the consequences of an uninformed public. Politicians can manipulate ignorant people but not well informed people.

So the critical importance of an honest, professional media cannot be overstated. We depend on them to honestly and objectively inform us, yet to our detriment, far too many of them are nothing more than agenda-driven propagandists. All Americans should be outraged by this because their dishonesty endangers us all. It cuts into the very fabric of our constitutional republic and weakens the foundational principles upon which the survival of our nation depends. Today, they may favor the Left, yet tomorrow they may lean Right, so do you see the problem?

See also:

- Obama Friends And Associations
 - Reverend Jeremiah Wright
 - William "Bill" Ayers
 - Obama Lied About Bill Ayers
 - Bernadine Dohrn
 - Frank Marshall Davis
 - Louis Farrakhan
 - Tony Rezko
 - George Soros
 - Rashid Khalidi
-

Is President Obama Smart?



You decide

The Democrats fell over themselves to find any excuse to call President George W. Bush dumb. Like nasty little kids, they jumped at any and every perceived misstep and when they couldn't find any, they simply made them up.

The really interesting thing is that when it comes to Barack Obama, "the smartest president ever", there is no need to look hard for missteps or to make anything up. He does it all by himself and it's all real. So I wonder: Is President Obama smart?

To Democrats: I know it's really hard for you, but do try to be honest and objective; you might actually learn something valuable. So why not give it try? Here's a fair "Bush versus Obama" little dumb contest.

Some things to consider ...

- If George W. Bush had said he had visited 57 states and he had one more to go, would you have wondered if he was a U.S. Citizen? Would you have brushed it off as something irrelevant? Really? The man wanted to be our president! What could Obama have been thinking? Did he mean 47 states and one to go? Nope, that wouldn't work either. Then what?

- If George W. Bush had pronounced the word “corpsman” three separate times in a speech to military corpsman the way it is written instead of [kawr-muhn] – the correct pronunciation – would you have continued to insist that Harvard graduate, Barack Obama, was “the smartest president ever?”
- If George W. Bush had given Prime Minister of Great Britain, Gordon Brown, a set of inexpensive and incorrectly formatted DVDs, when Gordon Brown had given him a thoughtful and historically significant gift, would you have approved?
- If George W. Bush had given the Queen of England an iPod containing videos of his speeches, wouldn't you have thought this embarrassingly narcissistic and tacky?
- If George W. Bush had bowed to the King of Saudi Arabia , would you have approved? No, no, no, don't even try to spin it. Our president, Barack Obama, did bow to the King of Saudi Arabia.
- If George W. Bush had visited Austria and made reference to the non-existent “Austrian language,” would you have brushed it off as a minor slip?
- If George W. Bush had filled his cabinet and circle of advisers with people who cannot seem to keep current on their income taxes, would you have approved?
- If George W. Bush had been so Spanish illiterate as to refer to Cinco de Cuatro in front of the Mexican ambassador when it was the fourth of May (Cuatro de Mayo), and continued to flub it when he tried again, wouldn't you have winced in embarrassment? Should I mention that Bush speaks Spanish fluently? Now I can hear you Democrats saying, “Too bad he can't speak English fluently.” But of course he did and he does. He just chooses to not sound like a condescending, effete academic.
- If George W. Bush had misspelled the word “advice” (after being Harvard educated) wouldn't you have hammered him for it for years like Dan Quayle and

'potatoe' as proof of what a dunce he is?

- If George W. Bush had burned 9,000 gallons of jet fuel to go plant a single tree on Earth Day, wouldn't you have concluded he's a hypocrite?
- If George W. Bush's administration had approved a flight of Air Force One to fly low over millions of people followed by a jet fighter in downtown Manhattan causing widespread panic, wouldn't you have wondered whether he actually got what happened on 9-11?
- If George W. Bush had been the first President to need a teleprompter installed so he could get through a press conference, wouldn't you have laughed and said this is more proof of how incapable he is on his own—and perhaps controlled by smarter people behind the scenes? But it gets worse: Obama actually used a teleprompter in front of a class of elementary students! Okay kids, if you want to look smart, this is how to do it.
- If George W. Bush had failed to send relief aid to flood victims throughout the Midwest with more people killed or made homeless than in New Orleans wouldn't you want it made into a major ongoing political issue with claims of racism and incompetence?
- If George W. Bush had ordered the firing of the CEO of a major corporation, even though he had no constitutional authority to do so, would you have approved?
- If George W. Bush had proposed to double the national debt in one year, which had taken more than two centuries to accumulate, would that have been OK with you?
- If George W. Bush had then proposed to double the debt again within 10 years, would you have applauded his knowledge of economics?
- If George W. Bush had reduced your retirement plan holdings of GM stock by 90% in order to give the unions a majority stake in GM, would you have thought that was a good idea? Wouldn't you have cried "crony capitalism?" Wouldn't you have called him corrupt?

- If George W. Bush had spent hundreds of thousands of dollars to take Laura Bush to a play in NYC, would you have thought that was romantic and charming?

So is Obama smart? Tell me again, what is it about Obama that makes him so brilliant and impressive? Can't think of anything? Don't worry. He did all this in 9 months. Now, almost three more years have gone by and when I get a chance, I'll update this fabulous record of our brilliant president. The good news is that I don't have to even make this stuff up. Not that I would anyway—like some people I know.

No-common-sense, naive, uninformed voters put this man in office. Let's hope they wake up before our country is completely destroyed. So much for empty "Hope and Change" slogans.


On The Matter Of Gay Marriage

By MacPundit

Note: President Obama has changed his position on the issue many times. His supporters like to say he has "evolved." His detractors say he has simply flip-flopped for political expediency. This article discusses the topic more comprehensively than have the media or politicians on either side. It is the discussion I think we should be having.

Gay Marriage – What about it?

In the late '50s and early '60s, we beatniks (yes, we) scoffed at the institution of marriage, proclaiming that it was just a piece of paper. "If you want to set up house with a member of the opposite sex—or the same sex, for that matter—then you do not



need a legal document or the official approval of some religion to do it." – we said. We argued that neither an official government document, nor the blessings of a church could enhance, protect, or sustain a commitment, which had been freely made between two people. "As long as the relationship continues to appeal to both parties and the commitment remains strong, then we will stay together. But if our feelings or priorities change, we always have the right to end the relationship." After all, there seemed to be so many unhappy—even abusive—marriages that we stated with profound certainty that the institution of marriage was an archaic idea that sometimes caused more harm than good. For one, we said, it was too easy to get married and too hard to get divorced. It was not too many years later that hippies asserted the same position and in the ensuing years millions of Americans established de facto marriages by simply "living together."

Were we right? Well, as with many matters having to do with humans in their sometimes equivocal process of being, for some, the answer (as one of my favorite beatniks wrote) is "blowing in the wind." But if we are to develop a truly informed opinion about marriage, there are some things we need to consider—things we beatniks failed to explore too deeply, if at all. At the very least, we should know something about the origins of marriage as we know it today. At the top of the list are the reasons our ancestors created the institution of

marriage and why subsequent societies have assiduously protected and honored it for so long. This knowledge will also give us an informed basis upon which we can consider the matter of “gay marriage.”

Note: While human mating practices such as polygamy (many spouses) or more commonly, polygyny (many wives) can be found throughout our history they were and are the exception rather than the rule and have been associated with certain religious beliefs or practiced more often by the most powerful men in society—or when war had killed off large numbers of men. To these, we could add polyandry (one wife with many husbands), although this practice has been quite rare. But for my purposes here, I will restrict the discussion to the most common and enduring form of human mating: The civil institution of monogamous marriage as established and administered by the state.

Origins And Reasons

The concept and definition of marriage as the practice of committed, monogamous, legalized mating of men and women able to produce children is, in fact, ancient. A case can be made that some form of it existed in early civilizations that predated written history. But what is more relevant is that *the formal establishment of marriage as a state-decreed institution predates all three major religions.* In other words, marriage was not originally established for religious reasons. It was not created in order to satisfy the moral tenets of a church or other formalized set of religious beliefs. Therefore, any informed argument designed to consider the idea of *legalized civil gay marriage* should not be framed as a religious or moral one. Such moral judgments must be considered separately because *the history of marriage is solidly established as a civil expedient.* Simply put: Religious faith is not a prerequisite to legal marriage.

The origin of civil marriage is well-documented and its purpose is clear. Around 1750 B.C., Sumerian traditions were codified by Hammurabi, the king of Babylonia. Widely known as "Hammurabi's Laws" or "Hammurabi's Code," customs and traditions developed and practiced by the Sumerians, were formally organized and written into law. This meant that the state could prosecute on its own behalf those who broke the law. Among these new laws and as an essential element of a larger need to organize, sustain, and preserve their cultures and states, and to create a secure environment to ensure the perpetuation of the species, Babylonia and other ancient societies established the institution of marriage.

Consequently and most importantly, as a legal institution, marriage organized and made secure the granting of property rights and the protection of bloodlines. In time, as the needs of various societies required, such matters as the delineation and enforcement of personal responsibility for the protection and welfare of one's legal mate and children were added to and became common elements of the legal institution of marriage.

"Gay Marriage" is an oxymoron

The reasons for the establishment of the institution of marriage as a legally codified set of laws are unambiguous: *Marriage was created to organize, protect, and sustain society for the very practical, important reasons given above.*

Therefore, when we consider the dictates of nature and the reasons for the institution of marriage, the concept of gay marriage is incongruous with all of them. The purposes and intent for legalizing and documenting marriage were and still are very practical and are by their very nature, applicable only to members of the opposite sex. It is nature itself—not man, nor the state—that requires the union of two members of the opposite sex to ensure the perpetuation of the species. So, for what purpose would a responsible government expand marriage laws to include members of the same sex? *Same-sex*

marriage by definition is not only a fatuous notion; it is an oxymoron.

Marriage is not a civil right

So far as marriage-as-law goes, gay-marriage advocates in the United States correctly argue that marriage is a civil matter, not a church affair. But they abuse all logic when they further argue that since marriage is a civil matter, it is therefore a civil right and that because it is a civil right, it is unconstitutional to deny homosexual couples the right to marry. This is a fallacious argument. First, as shown earlier, civil marriage was created for rigidly practical reasons having to do with child-bearing members of the opposite sex, only. Second, while marriage is a civil matter, it is not a constitutionally-protected civil right. Where in the Constitution are we given the "Right to Marry?"

Equal Protection

To deal with this argument, gay-rights advocates attempt to include marriage under the constitutional principles of equal protection and equal treatment. In other words, if opposite-sex partners can marry then so can we, they argue, because the Constitution guarantees equal protection and equal treatment. Yet this is merely a specious assertion. Is this what our founders intended when they wrote the Constitution? If so, what else should be included? How about polygamy? Or what if someone wants to marry his or her comatose mother or father or their three year old daughter or, for that matter, their pet? Or consider business partners that seek equal treatment before the law in an attempt to change their legal status from a business partnership to a marriage—in which case they could not be required to testify against each other.

The clear purpose of civil rights protections is to provide and assure every citizen of equal treatment *when such equal*

treatment conforms to the intent of laws that are based on social realities and are designed to enhance and promote the general welfare of the people. But when the right to equal protection is invoked in a manner and for a purpose, which would controvert the intent of a good law, it should not be recognized or applied. Instead, if a society determines through diligent consideration that a law no longer serves to enhance and promote the general welfare of the people then it can and should (through lawful process) change the law. Again, good laws are created to improve and advance the general well-being of a society and the institution of marriage has for almost four thousand years, done just that.

It follows, then, that to brashly and suddenly dilute, diminish, or demote such a time-tested, socially critical law that has served countless civilizations so well for thousands of years without proper knowledge of either the reasons for the establishment of the law or the consequences, which would ensue should the law be functionally altered in such a way as to literally remove the sound reasons for which it was created, would be grossly irresponsible.

Other arguments

What about love?

Should not people of the same sex have the right to love each other in the same manner as heterosexual couples? Of course all people should have the right to love whoever they choose—and in America, they do. We should all acknowledge that love enhances and makes better all things human. Yet, while we are guaranteed the right to love whoever we choose (the pursuit of happiness), it does not follow that the presence of love gives us the right to legally marry whoever we love. It is a matter of fact that love never had anything to do with the creation of the civil institution of marriage. It is also a fact that while the institution of marriage is strictly

limited to one man and one woman, this does not prevent others from loving whoever they choose.

Hospital visitation

In states where this is an issue, we need to design fair and wise mechanisms (laws?) to allow appropriate members of clearly defined, established caring relationships such visitation rights.

To oppose gay marriage is a homophobic reaction

In some instances, it may very well be. Yet, to say that everyone who opposes gay marriage is homophobic is, factually, incorrect. At worst, it is clear that such accusations are often designed to cast aspersions on the opposition in an effort to eliminate them as legitimate participants in the discussion. "I am unable to sustain my argument intellectually, so I will assign false motives to you or destroy your character instead." – comes to mind.

But whether opposition to gay marriage is engendered by homophobia or by moral or religious beliefs the central argument against gay marriage remains intact. In other words, such things as homophobia are irrelevant to the historically sound reasons presented here for the preservation and maintenance of legalized civil marriage between one man and one woman.

Homosexuality is unnatural and/or immoral

As stated earlier, opposition to gay marriage based on these reasons is another matter entirely and they have no place in this discussion.

Anti-gay marriage is anti-gay

Again, for almost four thousand years, civil marriage has applied to heterosexual couples only and to oppose gay marriage for the reasons given here does not in any way pass judgment on homosexual behavior. So to say that anyone who opposes gay marriage is anti-gay simply reveals one more attempt by gay marriage advocates to misdirect the discussion away from the real issues toward disingenuous, inflammatory accusations, which they hope will arouse base emotions in those people who are woefully ignorant of the four thousand year history of civil marriage—why it was established in the first place and why it has endured for so long.

Recently, I watched a clip on television of the actor, Sean Penn, in which he shamed all Californians who voted for Proposition 8—a California ballot proposition passed in the November 4, 2008 general election that changed the state Constitution to restrict the definition of marriage to opposite-sex couples and eliminated same-sex couples' right to marry. Penn's patently judgmental and demagogic diatribe was clearly intended to accuse all Californians who voted for Proposition 8 of being anti-gay, homophobic bigots of the worst kind. Instead of engaging them in an informed and intelligent discussion he self-righteously and unfairly condemned them all.

As is too often the case, instead of choosing to engage in intelligent, informed, constructive debate Penn chose to appeal to the prejudices, emotions, or special interests of his audience rather than their intellect or reason. It is an old and deplorable tactic—particularly of the Left. Unfortunately, and to the detriment of our society, this tactic is a standard practice of many Liberals in America. To be fair, however, we must not underestimate the level of ignorance on both sides of the political landscape in the U.S. There is hardly a day that finishes without having heard more

than one statement or accusation that is grossly inaccurate. So who knows, maybe Penn actually believes that anyone who opposes gay marriage must be a homophobic bigot. Whatever the case, the result is the same: We simply continue to talk past each other; nothing meaningful is accomplished and the integrity of our society is diminished.

Some final thoughts

A case can be made that we Americans are currently experiencing a kind of collective, cultural Attention Deficit Disorder. The news cycle is such that often news is old within hours. The Internet, cell phones, and other technologies have dramatically increased the pace of virtually everything we do. Unfortunately, one debilitating unintended consequence of this phenomenon is that we too often fail to take enough time to seriously consider important issues of the day. Perhaps worse, is that this lack of inspection extends to our media who regularly fail to do the kind of comprehensive reporting that would provide us with the information we need in order to form intelligent opinions. Instead, our major media outlets produce biased news and commentary, which amount to nothing more than agenda-driven propaganda. As a result, the American electorate has never before been so uninformed and misinformed as it is today. It is for this reason that bloggers like myself do what we can to inform and expand discussions on important matters that affect us all.

Finally, the fact that civil marriage was created in order to assign personal responsibility to child-bearing couples for each other and for the children they bear is undeniable. Without such regulation, societies decline, inexorably, into chaos and eventually fall. Whenever the integrity of the family unit—a child bearing man and woman—has been compromised, nations fail. Therefore, anything that would or could diminish the intrinsic value of the naturally imposed (by nature) family unit and its time-tested critical role in

maintaining the overall integrity of a society should be avoided at all costs. The very idea of gay marriage is anomalous with the fundamental intent of civil marriage. Its adoption can add nothing of practical value to our society and could in reality weaken the purpose of that which has served countless societies so well for so long.