

# You May Be a Racist If...

☒ Just about every week I see a headline where someone is calling someone else a racist. It's boring, tedious, and tiresome. Those that bandy around the "R" word are just intellectually challenged. First, they probably don't even know the meaning of the word "racist" and, second, it's much easier to stop a conversation in its tracks by calling someone a name (like many of us probably did on the playground when we were 7 years old) than trying to get your point across in a coherent, succinct, meaningful dialogue.

Of course you're a "racist" if you don't like President Obama's policies. That's where my reference to boring, tedious and tiresome comes in.

Next, I remember reading years ago some nonsense that it was "racist" to teach students how to balance a checkbook because it wasn't part of their life experience at home. Although I don't, I do know plenty of people who rely on their banks to keep their balances through online banking. But when did simple adding and subtracting become "racist"? Even if you don't have a checking account, you're still buying stuff. If you go to McDonalds and the cashier says, "that'll be \$6.39" and you hand them a \$10 bill, the cashier presses the right buttons and comes up with \$3.61 change. Don't you count the change when it's handed to you? I certainly do.

Currently, there's the big brouhaha going on about Voter IDs. Requiring people to have photo IDs is somehow "racist." I don't get this at all. We carry IDs when we travel on airplanes, we carry IDs in our vehicles, and you even had to have a photo ID to watch Mrs. Obama autograph her book *American Grown: The Story of the White House Kitchen Garden and Gardens Across America*. This summer, Eric Holder, speaking at a NAACP conference said that the Texas voter ID law is "racist" but, yet, it was reported that the NAACP

required all media in attendance to present a "government-issued photo I.D. (such as a driver's license) as well as valid media credentials." Does that make Mrs. Obama and the NAACP racist? I don't think so. It makes security a top priority. I don't understand why providing proof of citizenship and that you're a registered voter is racist and not merely insuring that those entitled to vote are voting and those not entitled to vote are not voting. It's that simple.

Then there's the website MEDIAite's report on a Mitt Romney political sign, "Obama's Not Working." Well, to me that's about as straightforward as it comes. But the far left ignores Mr. Obama's lack of leadership and chooses, instead, to deflect those shortcomings by playing the race card at every opportunity. Here's what they had to say, "The slogan is a multiple entendre, but one of those entendres, intentionally or not, is evocative of a nasty racial stereotype about black men." Can you believe this garbage?

Well, I thought I'd seen enough of the "R" word until my husband recently sent me a link to an article with the headline, "'White Privilege'? Portland Principal Claims PB&J Sandwiches Could Hold Racist Connotations." When I first read it, I actually thought it was a joke. I went to the truthorfiction.com and snopes.com websites to make sure this wasn't made up.

In the article, the principal, Verenice Gutierrez, says that "using the example of a peanut butter sandwich in classroom lessons is technically a problematic and discriminatory move...What about Somali or Hispanic students, who might not eat sandwiches?"

Is this nonsense ever going to end? This is still the United States. If someone living in this country can't wrap their head around the fact that Americans eat peanut butter and jelly sandwiches, then I have to say politely, "please leave."

Right now, I'm following the adventures of family friends who decided to move to Uganda with their two children to do what I would consider missionary work with a Christian organization. Their children are the only two white students in their classes. They've posted on their website their meals and activities and never once did either the mother or father claim that their village is racist because they're not providing "American"-style food to them. The family has completely immersed themselves in the culture and they're excited to be a part of it all.

In my own experience, I've never traveled in a foreign country and asked for a peanut butter and jelly sandwich. I've eaten whatever is customary in the country in which I'm travelling. End of story. If I wanted to eat PB&J sandwiches my whole life, I wouldn't travel.

But that's not good enough for the folks in Portland, Oregon. Here are children who, I'm presuming, intend to stay in this country and the principal doesn't think they should assimilate and understand that PB&J sandwiches are a way of life here? If I were in a Mexican school, I'd expect to hear about tortillas. IF I were in a Ethiopian school, I'd expect to hear about injera. If I were in a French school, I'd expect to hear about crepes. If you're in America, expect to hear about peanut butter & jelly sandwiches on WHITE bread!

I don't get it, but if you do, God bless you.

---

## **Listen Up: I'm Not a Racist!**

☒ Every time I turn around, someone is calling me a racist. A Facebook "friend" constantly ranted about the tea party people, calling them racists because they disagreed with our

President. Not being a tea party member, but agreeing with a lot of what they're about, I "unfriended" her after I got sick and tired of hearing it. She never asked me why I unfriended her, but she'll mention it every time she sees my husband. He tells her, "don't get me involved."

Just about every week, some "celebrity" is spouting off and calling anyone who doesn't think our President walks on water a racist. You can also hear this mantra from the likes of Chris Matthews over at MSNBC.

Just for the record, I am not a racist.

I don't care if President Obama is all black, all white, half black, half white, Native American, part Asian, all Asian or any other race, creed, nationality or religion.

I don't care where he was born or in what country he was raised. I'm not interested that he ate dog as a child in Indonesia. I don't care who his mother was or whether his father was from Africa. I don't care his grandparents raised him or that he lived in Hawaii.

Where he went to school, how well he did or didn't do, what kind of education he received, what degrees he earned or the fact he was the editor of the Harvard Law Review doesn't impress me.

I do care that his friends included America-haters Bill Ayers and Jeremiah Wright only to the extent they shaped the President's views of America.

It's his business who he married except when she tries to get into my kitchen and tells me what to eat. I couldn't care less if he's a good husband, how many children he has, or whether he's a good father. I don't care whether he had girlfriends before he was married or whether he has any friends.

I don't care whether he can bowl, likes beer, looks good in a tuxedo or on the beach, can read from a teleprompter, likes Al Green or Paul McCartney, likes basketball, whether people think he's "cool," or whether he can sing or dance or slow jam the news.

I don't like his policies. Plain and simple.

I didn't like him in 2008 when he wanted to "spread the wealth" as he told Bill O'Reilly in an interview back then, and I still don't like him in 2012 because he still wants to "spread the wealth" by taxing millionaires, which, by the way, isn't going to make even a dent in our horrendous debt.

I don't like that he's spending us into bankruptcy. I don't like that he's raised our national debt over \$4 trillion since taking office less than four years ago.

I didn't like his stimulus package which cost the American taxpayer over \$800 billion dollars with very little to show for it. I don't like his philosophy that government creates jobs (except, of course, government jobs which continue to grow under his administration).

I don't like Obamacare. I don't like the government telling me I have to buy something. I can only hope the Supreme Court will overturn this debacle.

I don't like that he's turned a Constitutional issue regarding freedom of religion into a "war on women."

I don't like that in 1996 as a candidate for State Senator, Mr. Obama supported same-sex marriage, then while running for President in 2008 said his views were evolving and now in 2012, he's come out of the closet and says he supports same-sex marriage. I'm with the 67% of those surveyed, in a recent NY Times poll, who believes his change of heart is politically motivated. (Being opposed to same-sex marriage, I've now subjected myself to a double-whammy. Too some, I'm now a

racist homophobe.)

Let me say it one more time. I don't like his policies. Period.

---

## They See Racists Everywhere ...

✘ So I'm reading the op-eds in the Sunday New York Times and the headline catches my eye: "What's Race Got to Do With It?" I roll my eyes and say to myself, Here we go again.

The column is by Lee Siegel, an opinion writer of the liberal persuasion, whose main point is – and these are his exact words – "Mitt Romney is the whitest white man to run for president in recent memory."

"Of course," he says, "I'm not talking about a strict count of melanin density. I'm referring to the countless subtle and not-so-subtle ways he telegraphs to a certain type of voter that he is the cultural alternative to America's first black president."

Bet you didn't see that one coming. Just kidding.

Romney's "whiteness," says Siegel, is "grounded in a retro vision of the country, one of white picket fences and stay-at-home moms and fathers unashamed of working hard for corporate America."

Sounds good to me. But Siegel's not-so-subtle point is that this was also racist America.

So what's he getting at? Simple, that Romney offers "millions of Americans" who are unwilling to accept Mr. Obama as someone who legally and morally deserves to sit in the White House

“the white solution of the problem of a black president.” He goes on to say that, “I am sure that Mr. Romney is not a racist. But I am also sure that, for the many Americans who find the thought of a black president unbearable, he is an ideal candidate.”

Ok, so let's review: According to Lee Siegel, Mitt Romney is not a racist, but he appeals to millions of racists in America – because of his whiteness – and this whiteness “could well put him over the top in the fall.”

This is not political analysis. It is something mean and shallow that is only masquerading as political analysis. Are there racists in a country of some 310 million people? Unfortunately, yes. Do some of these bigots like Romney because he's white and Mr. Obama is black? Probably. But in a big country like ours there are also black racists who also see things through a prism of color. That's not Barack Obama's fault; and the white racists aren't Mitt Romney's fault.

It's true that Siegel never blames Romney for the racists out there. But like a drive-by gangster he sprays his bullets recklessly. After all, what are we to think of a white man who appeals to bigots?

A few weeks ago, Andrew Rosenthal, the paper's editorial page editor, published a blog about white racism in America, or at least his view of it, saying that, “There has been a racist undertone to many of the Republican attacks leveled against President Obama for the last three years, and in this dawning presidential campaign.”

He even goes further than Siegel and accuses Romney of “oblique” racism because Romney has said that president Obama wants to create an “entitlement society.”

So merely saying that the president believes in big government, with its many programs that “spread the wealth

around” – which strikes me as nothing more than a run-of-the-mill political accusation – somehow, in the liberal mind, is racist.

My friend Bill O’Reilly believes these people are saying these inane things in order to energize the black vote. I don’t think so. I think they’re saying these inane things because a) they honestly believe that conservatives have bigotry running through their DNA and b) these pundits, despite their SAT scores, are not very smart people.

They fancy themselves progressives, but they haven’t progressed at all from the bad old days of segregation and Jim Crow. They still live in 1955 America. They see racism everywhere. In a strange and sad way, this warped view of America makes them feel better about themselves. They’re the good ones, they can tell themselves. The ones who aren’t racists.

And I’m starting to think that the liberal nonsense that dresses itself up as analysis is the face of a growing fear among the liberal elite. Fear that their messiah may fall. They could never accept that he may be rejected because of his policies or because of incompetence. That would be too painful, given how much of their own hopes and dreams they have invested in him. It must be something else. And what else could it be, except for racism?

Inside their comfy, liberal elite bubble, the only reason the great Barack Obama could lose is because of the rampant bigotry in America. It’s nonsense, for sure. But it’s a lot easier for them to take than reality.

---

# **Bernie Is On Fire!**

[bitsontherun efU1Tg4V]