



## STATE OF THE UNION: OBAMA V. CONSTITUTION

"The duty imposed upon him to take care, that the laws be faithfully executed, follows out the strong injunctions of his oath of office, that he will 'preserve, protect, and defend the constitution.' The great object of the executive department is to accomplish this purpose; and without it, be the form of government whatever it may, it will be utterly worthless for offence, or defence; for the redress of grievances, or the protection of rights; for the happiness, or good order, or safety of the people." --Justice Joseph Story

In the wake of Barack Hussein Obama's first State of the Union address, much of the critical analysis from Republicans posited that he should do "this" instead of "that."

Unfortunately, when there is no more constitutional authority for a president to do this rather than that, Republicans fail to distinguish themselves from Democrats since *both* parties are then advocating unlawful extra-constitutional policies.

Obama's SOTU teleprompters fed him a steady stream of poll-tested rhetoric, none of which comports with the authority granted the Executive Branch, unless, of course, one subscribes to the adulterated "living constitution" as amended by judicial diktat.

Predictably, Obama offered only Socialist solutions to all ills, and not a single suggestion that individual responsibility or the private sector economy should shoulder that burden, at least not without government "incentives," a.k.a. centralized social and economic planning.

In 6,200 words (second longest SOTU after Bill Clinton -- two narcissists who just can't hear enough of themselves), Obama referred to himself repeatedly, and alleged that he was the anointed spokesman for "we," the American people, more than 100 times.

On the other hand, he mentioned the Constitution only twice.

First, in his opening remarks Obama said, "Our Constitution declares that from time to time the president shall give

to Congress information about the state of our union."

Correct.

Second, he asserted, "We find unity in our incredible diversity, drawing on the promise enshrined in our Constitution, the notion that we're all created equal..."

As the Internet meme goes these days: FAIL! Uh, uh, uh, -- that "notion" was enshrined in our Declaration of Independence, third paragraph, first sentence. One would think that this alleged professor of "Constitutional Law" at the University of Chicago Law School would have noticed such a simple, yet substantial, error.

Our Constitution is devoted to clearly delineating the limited role of the central government from the unlimited rights of the states and the people.

To that end, James Madison, author of our Constitution, wrote, "The powers delegated by the proposed Constitution to the federal government are few and defined. Those which are to remain in the State governments are numerous and indefinite."

Accordingly, Obama mentions freedom only once, and made absolutely no reference to liberty.

Nowhere in our Constitution is there any authority or provision for these key proposals from Obama's SOTU:

1. The power to further centralize regulation of our economy.
2. The power to completely regulate our national health care system. (Note: both the Democrat *and* Republican proposals lack constitutional authority). Obama even repeated his claim that the American people are just not smart enough to get on board: "I take my share of the blame for not explaining it more clearly to the American people."
3. The power to further regulate and tax the production of CO2.

Obama reiterated his claims that the current recession was caused by "Wall Street," and then went on to insist that

the only hope for ending the recession was government “investment,” a euphemism for taxing money out of the private sector, taking bureaucratic handling fees out, then giving it to political constituencies.

To correctly interpret Obama’s SOTU, you need only filter everything he says through his foremost pledge that the his administration’s charge is the “fundamental transformation of the United States of America.”

That is a line Obama lifted from the primary architect of his Socialist platform, Robert Creamer, who had earlier proclaimed, “If Barack Obama is elected president, then we have the opportunity to fundamentally transform American politics and the economy.”

It’s likely that you’ve never heard of Bob Creamer, because Barack Obama is very adept at concealing his association with his Marxist patrons.

In his younger days, Obama was not concerned about such associations: “I chose my friends carefully,” he wrote. “The more politically active black students; the foreign students; the Chicanos; the Marxist professors and structural feminists and punk-rock performance poets.”

But when he announced his aspirations to become a U.S. senator in 2004, Obama began to cover his tracks. He stopped associating publicly with Leftist colleagues and mentors such as Jeremiah Wright, Michael Pfleger, William Ayers, Bernardine Dohrn, Khalid al-Mansour, Rashid Khalidi, Bob Creamer and others.

Creamer is a member of Obama’s Chicago mob, a fellow “community organizer” and disciple of Saul Alinsky. Like all of Obama’s Chicago benefactors, Creamer believes that he is above the law, or, more appropriately, that he *is* the law in today’s age of the rule of men. But like Tony Rezko, another of Obama’s slick Chicago political backers, Creamer was caught with his hand in the till and was convicted of a felony (bank fraud) back in 2004 when Obama was a state senator. Creamer got a softball sentence, though: five months in a minimum-security facility for white-collar criminals and another 11 months of house arrest.

With all that time on his hands, Creamer authored a book, “How Progressives Can Win,” which, along with Alinsky’s “Rules for Radicals,” serves as the template for Obama’s campaign to “fundamentally transform” America.

Obama didn’t use the word “transform” in his SOTU, but

he did insist that government must “lay a *new foundation* for long-term economic growth,” under the pretense of “reform,” in order to “give our people the government they deserve.”

“I campaigned on the promise of change, change we can believe in. I know there are many Americans who aren’t sure if they still believe that I can deliver it. I never suggested that change would be easy ... and when you try to do big things and make big changes, it stirs passions and controversy.”

And well, it should.

Though Obama’s efforts to nationalize the nation’s health care sector have been temporarily stalled, he has no intention of giving up, announcing that he is redoubling his efforts to expand central government controls over the private sector under cover of “economic crisis.” As White House Chief of Staff Rahm Emanuel said, “Never let a good crisis go to waste.”

Leading up to his SOTU, Obama endeavored to portray himself as a fiscal conservative: “We can’t continue to spend as if deficits don’t have consequences, as if waste doesn’t matter, as if the hard earned tax dollars of the American people can be treated like monopoly money, that’s what we’ve seen time and time again, Washington has become more concerned about the next election than the next generation.”

This is subterfuge.

Obama endeavors to portray himself as a constitutional conservative: “We will lead in the observance of ... the rule of law. ... Don’t mock the Constitution. Don’t make fun of it. Don’t suggest that it’s not American to abide by what the Founding Fathers set up. It’s worked pretty well for over 200 years.”

This is deception.

Obama endeavors to portray himself as a resolute commander in chief. Regarding Operation Iraqi Freedom he decreed, “Let me say this as plainly as I can: By August 31st, 2010, our combat mission in Iraq will end.” On Operation Enduring Freedom in Afghanistan, he declared, “After 18 months, our troops will begin to come home.” On the treatment of captive terrorists, he says, “I will restore America’s moral standing.” On the Long War with Jihadistan, Obama claims, “The United States is not, and will never be, at war with Islam.”

This is farce.

Obama is a dangerous neophyte in matters of national security, and he shows no signs of improving.

If Republicans really want to defeat Obama's Leftist agenda, they need to adopt the tried and true conservative message founded on Essential Liberty. Only then can they truly take control of the debate.

And while Virginia Governor Bob McDonnell's response to Obama's SOTU address was encouraging, the current crop of Republican leaders continues to play by Democrat rules, attempting to sell a dangerous and debilitating elixir: "We don't offend the Constitution as bad as they do."

Bottom line: Republicans must refocus on First Principles and govern accordingly.

Republicans can best distinguish themselves from Democrats by, first and foremost, honoring their sacred oath to "support and defend" our Constitution.

To that end, Obama declared, "If you abide by the law, you should be protected by it."

True, but on the other hand, if you are not going to abide by the law, you should be impeached.

P.S. If you are going to seat two police officers next to your wife in the gallery, the two who brought down the Ft. Hood jihadi terrorist, you might at least acknowledge them.

Semper Vigilo, Fortis, Paratus et Fidelis!

Mark Alexander  
Publisher, PatriotPost.US

Veritas vos Liberabit -- Semper Vigilo, Fortis, Paratus, et Fidelis! Mark Alexander, Publisher, for *The Patriot Post's* editors and staff. Read online at <http://patriotpost.us>

(Please pray for our Armed Forces standing in harm's way around the world, and for their families -- especially families of those fallen Soldiers, Sailors, Airmen, Marines and Coast Guardsmen, who granted their lives in defense of American liberty.)