



WHO ELECTED OBAMA?

"We should never despair, our Situation before has been unpromising and has changed for the better, so I trust, it will again. If new difficulties arise, we must only put forth new Exertions and proportion our Efforts to the exigency of the times." --George Washington

Last week we answered the question "Who is Barack Obama" by posing [questions that Obama did not answer](#) during the presidential campaign. This week, we take a look at who voted for him.

On 20 January, Barack Hussein Obama will be inaugurated as the next president of our United States, according to our Constitution. However, his largest constituencies tend to view this event as either the coronation of the "royal one" or the ordination of the "holy one."

Before we further define those constituencies, here, for the record, is a recap of the survey data concerning the presidential election.

Some 136.6 million Americans voted -- a 64.1 percent turnout and the highest since 1908. Obama is the first Democrat to win a majority of the popular vote (53 percent) since Jimmy Carter. By sex, BHO's support was 49 percent male and 56 percent female. By ethnic group, his support comprised 41 percent of Whites, 61 percent of Asians, 75 percent of Latinos and 95 percent of Blacks. By age, BHO's largest support demographic was 66 percent of voters under the age of 30. By income, 52 percent of voters with more than \$200,000 in annual income voted for Obama. By education, his support came from those without a college degree and those with a post-graduate degree.

So, his victory was largely due to support from non-whites, from those under 30, from those with the

lowest income and education, and from a small number of voters at the other end of those spectrums, while those of middle age, income and education tended to support John McCain.

By religion, Obama received support from 46 percent of Protestant voters, 56 percent of Catholic voters and 62 percent of voters of other religions. BHO received 76 percent of atheist and agnostic voters.

The Barna Research Group looked at some other interesting characteristics of Obama voters: 57 percent of those who consider themselves "lonely or isolated," 59 percent of those affected by the economic decline in "a major way," and 61 percent of those who claim they are "stressed out" supported BHO.

So, considering the stats, the Democrats' strategy of fomenting dissent and disunity by promoting themes of disparity was vital to Obama's election. Indeed, the Left's political playbook has only one chapter defining their modus operandi -- "Divide-n-Conquer." No wonder their national leadership calls itself the DnC.

Obama's largest constituent groups fall under the general umbrella of "disenfranchised victims," those who feel they are ethnically or economically handicapped. Other significant constituent groups are those who identify with the disenfranchised; this includes two small but highly ideologically influential groups, the economic and academic elite.

The disenfranchised victim groups and those who identify with them have a number of common characteristics. They have a low civic IQ and virtually no understanding of our Constitutional Republic and its heritage and legacy of liberty. They have fully bought into the "[Politics of Disparity](#)" or "class warfare."

However, it is Obama's small economic and academic elite constituencies who pose the greatest danger to that heritage of liberty. They neither know nor care any more about liberty than the disenfranchised legions with which they seek to identify. They are the "king makers," those who have funded and charted Obama's course to the coronation.

Some have made a lot of "easy money," which explains why Obama received far more support from Wall Street than McCain. Others are inheritance-welfare liberals, those who value government welfare dependence because they were, themselves, dependent on inheritance throughout their formative years and never developed the character necessary to succeed on their own initiative.

Whether fast money or inheritance, neither group has direct contact with the unwashed masses other than those who keep their homes, offices and imported autos clean and in good repair. This utter dependence upon the low end of the "service sector" is perhaps the source of the insecurities that drive them to identify with the masses.

Obama's academic elite are just as insecure, but they are driven by ideology. They are Leftists, Western apologists for socialist political and economic agendas. Regular readers of this column will recognize them as "[Useful Idiots](#)" for their advocacy of Marxist-Leninist-Maoist collectivism. Like Obama, they reject constitutional authority and subscribe to the errant notion of a "[Living Constitution](#)".

Among Obama's Left elite are such Marxist radicals as [Frank Marshall Davis and William Ayers](#) and his religious mentor [Jeremiah Wright](#).

There are some characteristics that are common to many BHO supporters among both the disenfranchised and the elite.

Obama's cult-like following among these constituencies is not the result of deception. In fact, it can be attributed to something much more subtle and,

potentially, sinister, with far more ominous implications for the future of liberty.

Most of Obama's supporters identify with some part of his brokenness, his dysfunctional childhood and his search for salvation in the authority of the state. The implications of this distorted mass identity are grave, and its [pathology](#) is well defined.

Another common characteristic is that liberals tend to be very emotive. Ask them about some manifestation of their worldview -- for example, why they support candidates such as Obama or Hillary Clinton and they will likely predicate their response with, "Because I feel..."

On the other hand, ask conservatives about what they believe or support, and they invariably predicate their response with, "Because I think..."

So, the once great [Democrat Party](#) has now devolved into constituencies who view the inaugural as either a coronation or an ordination.

Of course, all the MSM print and tube outlets are fawning over BHO and calling next Tuesday's inaugural "historic." Well, it's not often that I agree with the paper media and 24-hour news cycle talkingheads, but this is truly a historic inauguration -- historic for several reasons.

First, never before has such an ill-prepared president-elect been sworn in as president. Second, never before has a more liberal president-elect been sworn into office. And third, never before has a candidate had so little regard for the constitutional oath he is taking.

Oh, and some suggest this election is historic because half of the president-elect's genetic heritage is African -- and here I thought Bill Clinton was our first "black president."

It is no small irony that the day before Obama's inauguration, the nation will pause to honor Martin Luther King. In 1963, King stood on the steps of the Lincoln Memorial and gave his most famous oration, the most well known line from which is, "I have a

dream that my four children will one day live in a nation where they will not be judged by the color of their skin but by the content of their character."

But Obama and his party have divided the nation into constituency groups judged by all manner of ethnicity and special interests rather than the individual character King envisioned.

Perhaps the most famous line from any Democrat presidential inaugural was uttered by John F. Kennedy in 1961. He closed his remarks with these words: "And so, my fellow Americans, ask not what your country can do for you; ask what you can do for your country."

Barack Obama and his party have turned that clarion call on end, suggesting that their constituents should "ask what your country can do for you."

On Tuesday, Barack Obama will repeat an oath "[to support and defend the Constitution](#)", but he has no history of honoring our Constitution, even pledging that his Supreme Court nominees should comport with Leftist ideology and "break free from the essential constraints that were placed by the founding fathers in the Constitution, at least as it's been interpreted."

Some have suggested that since the election is over and Obama is the victor, we should accord him the honor due his office. But if he does not honor his constitutional oath, why would anyone extend him the honor of its highest constitutional office? Indeed, anyone having take that oath would be in direct violation of its mandate to "support and defend THE Constitution" should they support extra-Constitutional orders from superiors who do not honor their sacred oath.