



Written by [Selwyn Duke](#) on May 11, 2012

## Obama's Marriage Move Wins Over Pseudo-elite but Loses Main Street

If a [recent Rasmussen poll](#) showing Barack Obama trailing Mitt Romney by seven points is any guide, the president's advocacy of marriage destruction is costing him support. This is no surprise.

It has been said that Obama's motivation for his announcement was the desire to raise money from his homosexual, and other radical-left, constituents, as opposed to the personal evolution he cited. (Isn't it interesting how Democrats "evolve" while Republicans "flip-flop"?) And it does appear that his actions were planned. As TheBlaze.com [pointed out](#), there's not much chance the administration could orchestrate its "major fundraising effort — complete with [ready-go-graphics](#) — in just 48 hours...." Moreover, "[One in six Obama fundraising 'bundlers' is \[homosexual\]](#) and Obama's announcement is already [paying off predictable dividends](#)," the site reports. So, if Obama's declaration supporting faux marriage was a ploy to fill his campaign coffers, it's certainly working.



But winning hearts on Main Street is a different story, despite another recent poll indicating that 50 percent of Americans support the government's sanctioning of faux marriage. I'll explain why.

Even if we accept for argument's sake that the nation is split 50-50 on the issue, the fact is that those two groups are very different passion-wise. While a subset (i.e., homosexual activists and their enablers) of the pro-marriage-destruction 50 percent is passionately for its position, the greater mass of the group is more lukewarm. Sure, many have a "Why not?" attitude, having thrown up their hands, worn down and inured to faux marriage by an incessant barrage of pro-marriage-destruction commentary and sentiments and by social pressure from pseudo-elites. It is, after all, the "fashionable" view. But these people won't fall on their swords for the cause. Obama's announcement isn't likely to win many of their votes.

It may lose him some among this group, however. Why is this so if they're lukewarm? Because it feeds into the narrative that the President is a creature of the far Left. This is why Machiavellian politicians tack toward the middle in general elections.

As for the anti-marriage-destruction 50 percent, they're quite different. It's far more difficult to oppose than to support a politically correct position; swimming against the current generally requires far more



Written by [Selwyn Duke](#) on May 11, 2012

---

*principle* than swimming with it. Consequently, a much higher percentage of citizens in this group will have their votes influenced by Obama's coming out.

Of course, it's no doubt true that most in the anti-marriage-destruction group would vote against Obama regardless. But the point is that elections often hinge on narrow margins, and the President's announcement will alienate more than it will endear.

Yet it's even worse for Obama. Those who agree with him on the marriage issue are concentrated in states he will win anyway: California, New York, Illinois, Massachusetts, Vermont, Maine, etc. But the President's announcement could help swing the swing states, places such as Virginia, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Iowa, Florida, North Carolina and New Hampshire. Moreover, it could alienate some Hispanic voters in Arizona, New Mexico and Colorado.

Whether or not Obama fully understands this, his announcement certainly smacked of fence-walking. Note his phraseology: "At a certain point I've just concluded that, um, for me, personally, it is important for me to go ahead and affirm that, uh, I think same-sex couples should be able to get married."

"Personally."

I've always been amused by that weaselly language. Usually employed by timid or opportunistic leftists when speaking about abortion, here's what it means: "I don't have the guts to state the given position unequivocally, or doing so would be a political liability, so I'll imply that it's a matter of personal preference" (much like, supposedly, sexual inclination).

But when something truly is so, we don't make grand public announcements concerning it. The President will never appear on national television and say, "At a certain point I've just concluded that, um, for me, personally, it is important for me to go ahead and affirm that, uh, I think chocolate ice cream is better tasting than vanilla." No, it's only when something is a matter of principle that we take a stand for it. And, when Obama used his bully pulpit to propound a position, it ceased being "personal."

The President's fence-straddling was also reflected in his alleged belief that "states" should decide the marriage issue. My, is this the man who laments the Constitution's dearth of "positive" rights? Is this the fellow who lusts after executive power? When did he discover the concepts of balance of power and states' rights?

Oh, yeah, that's right. He's "evolving."

Let's hope he evolves into a private-sector free agent next January.



## Subscribe to the New American

Get exclusive digital access to the most informative, non-partisan truthful news source for patriotic Americans!

Discover a refreshing blend of time-honored values, principles and insightful perspectives within the pages of "The New American" magazine. Delve into a world where tradition is the foundation, and exploration knows no bounds.

From politics and finance to foreign affairs, environment, culture, and technology, we bring you an unparalleled array of topics that matter most.



[Subscribe](#)

### What's Included?

- 24 Issues Per Year
- Optional Print Edition
- Digital Edition Access
- Exclusive Subscriber Content
- Audio provided for all articles
- Unlimited access to past issues
- Coming Soon! Ad FREE
- 60-Day money back guarantee!
- Cancel anytime.