

## Yankee Steve's Column

for the Week of January 29, 2010

### Looking Back in History

When Barak Obama was inaugurated there was a “carnival of gaiety” the likes of which Washington, DC, has never seen. Giddy people danced the night away. The media was happier than a pig in slop. Their favorite had won.

Because this is America, the event was cast in a religious light. The Bible was quoted and prayers were said. We were told to feel good about ourselves because America had sworn in its first black president. Now we can have the respect of the Euro-trash, the same people who to this day operate Indonesian textile sweatshops and South African diamond mines.

A party followed the inauguration, a \$45 million bash! Not even a Texas oil man like W spent more than the junior senator from Illinois.

Who cares about budgets during a time of financial crisis? Six hundred democrats parked their carbon-emitting jets on Washington runways with nary a protest from Al Gore.

While all this was going on, my mind went back to the restoration of the English monarchy under Charles II on May 29, 1660. That is the day in which Britain's fate was sealed. It would never become a republic. Likewise perhaps when we elected Obama we sealed our fate. We may become a Socialist republic.

Charles' subjects were delirious. Historian Alexander Smellie said it was a

carnival of gaiety... Charles saw little else than the waving of scarves and the flashing of rapiers, and behind these the laughing and tears of his subjects: the ways all strewn with flowers, bells ringing, steeples hung with tapestries, fountains running with wine, trumpets, music, and myriads of people flocking; and two hundred, thousand horse and foot brandishing their swords, and shouting with inexpressible joy.

The king was heard to say that he wished he had “come back sooner.”

All that mirth changed over time for those who thought they would live in a free society. The Puritans lost their livings, and what Charles ridiculed as those “brawling sects” soon discovered that the king was as much a pope as he was a king. Decree after decree followed. Religion would not threaten his administration.

The leaders managed to rob the nation of its liberties, check its social progress, stifle its love of religion, and even make the English and Scots rethink the meaning of patriotism.

One bishop described it as “a mad roaring time.” The royalist parliament which restored the king took on the nickname of the Drunken Parliament. Anything they deemed necessary, or anything the king demanded, received their backing. Will the same thing happen in our Congress?

What part of “no” doesn’t Congress understand? Obama has gotten a free pass on everything so far. Do we have a drunken Congress?

It seems as if Obama thinks that he will get his way by pleading for national unity. The idea is that if we come together and adopt a stimulus plan (Obama’s liberal plan) we will emerge from our present crisis.

As far as I am concerned we should fight Obama every inch of the way. National unity is a euphemism for Socialism. We must not lie down but stand tall. After all, the liberals got America into this economic mess by not applying economic principles that the Austrian School of Economics have repeatedly shown us will work. Instead the liberals chose Socialism which has a failure rate of one hundred percent!

### **The Mighty Pen of Obama**

No sooner had the festivities ended than our newly anointed king and pope began issuing his decrees. In American parlance these are called Executive Orders. Obama issued more of these in his first two days as president than any president in recent history. I am sure this was a heady experience even for a Harvard man. All he had to do is pick up his pen, and the earth moves beneath him.

His pen will never run dry. Obama is determined to outstrip everyone who has come before him. Why not? He is Obama. As a matter of fact, if a reporter in a press conference begins to ask substantive questions, Obama, true to form, will shut him down immediately. You dare not contradict the most treasured man in America who speaks *ex cathedra*.

This is the way it is with all plutocrats; they are like that unapproachable college professor who would not let you deface his image by questioning his reasoning. It’s all about image.

Obama now sits where no one can buck him. However, he also sits where the buck stops, which means that just like every other president he will be judged by his performance. This is what Obama must reckon with, and here he will be unable to avoid the verdict of history, or the fact that Americans will turn on him when they realize that he is fluff and not substantive. Just look at his stimulus bill (\$850 billion) which is padded and never could stimulate the economy.

### **What Did We Really Get When America Inaugurated Obama?**

According to film director Spike Lee, Obama has come to us from God. Are you sure Mr. Lee? How could you know that so soon after the inauguration?

Liberals think that Obama is the smartest man in the room because he is a Harvard man.

And so what if he is smart? Socrates distinguished between intelligence and wisdom. Harvard graduates and faculty are intelligent enough, but they frequently lack wisdom and at times integrity. What Teddy Roosevelt said about Harvard still holds true. There was **“scarcely a great conspiracy against the public welfare that did not have Harvard brains behind it.”**

To liberals Obama is a saint, a semi-divine avatar. In his inaugural address he went so far as to talk about things he does not understand. He could do this because he is incapable of being wrong.

Americans were told that they should no longer think of America as if it were a Christian nation. His remarks were reminiscent of a speech made by the Queen Elizabeth II of England who brought up the subject of diversity. She implied that every culture was as good as every other and so we must accept those who are different from us. Apparently they share a common interest in what we call syncretism.

If we are not a Christian nation, what are we then? Are we Muslim or Jewish or Hindu or agnostic or atheistic, which might mean that we ought to delete religion from our national heritage.

In other words, those who teach history and civics, and those who want to follow the example of the Supreme Court which prohibited prayer in public schools, [1963] should be allowed to dictate policy because we are nothing; we have no national or religious identity. We are an empty shell. Or should we let free thinkers have the last word? I am told that the free thinker's lash is just as painful as the Inquisitors.

Just what are we, if we are not a Christian nation? We are Christian in the sense that those who prepared our most important legal documents at the founding of our nation were conscious that the people thought that their constitution should not conflict with the teachings of the Bible, especially when it came to justice? This is still the case, so in that respect America remains a Christian nation even though fewer of its citizens look to the Bible for guidance.

In the eighteenth century the constitution of one state was referred to as a “heavenly flame” by Samuel Cooper [circa 1780], because he knew that it contained nothing within it that could be construed in anyway as unjust or hellish. It could not because it drew upon the Bible for its inspiration.

In that same vein Samuel McClintock [1784] said that we should seek God most of all not in times of war or famine, but when we are drawing up a constitution. The constitution must take into account the fact that God has revealed Himself in the Bible.

Now when it comes to legislating in accordance with the Bible I have to bring up the subject of abortion because Obama has gotten out that pen of his. Apparently, he doesn't consult the Bible before he pulls out his pen.

At a time when America is \$13 trillion in debt (give a take a few billion) Obama thinks that we should start paying for abortions in other countries. One of his first Executive Orders opened the way for American taxpayers to shell out for the planned parenthoods of the world.

You know there is a difference between intelligence and wisdom.

Ever yours,

Steve Cakouros  
oldlineconservative.com