

Subject: THANK YOU NOTE!

THANK YOU AMERICA!



Dear American Taxpayer

For only the second time in my adult life, I am not ashamed of my country. I want to thank the hard working American people for paying \$242 thousand dollars for my vacation in Spain.

My daughter Sasha, several long-time family friends, my personal staff and various guests had a wonderful time. Honestly, you just haven't lived until you have stayed in a \$2,500..00 per night private 3-story villa at a 5-Star luxury hotel.

Thank you also for the use of Air Force Two and the 70 Secret Service personnel who tagged along to be

sure we were safe and cared for at all times. By the way, if you happen to be visiting the Costa del Sol, I highly recommend the Buenaventura Plaza restaurant in Marbella; great lobster with rice and oysters! I'm ashamed to admit the lobsters we ate in Martha's Vineyard were not quite as tasty, but what can you do if you're not in Europe, you have to just grin and bear it?

Air Force Two (which costs \$11,351 per hour to operate according to Government Accounting Office reports) only used 47,500 gallons of jet fuel for this trip and carbon emissions were a mere 1,031 tons of CO₂. These are only rough estimates, but they are close. That's quite a carbon footprint as my good friend Al Gore would say, so we must ask the American citizens to drive smaller, more fuel efficient cars and drive less too, so we can lessen our combined carbon footprint.

I know times are hard and millions of you are struggling to put food on the table and trying to make ends meet. So I do appreciate your sacrifices and do hope you find work soon.

I was really exhausted after Barack took our family on a luxury vacation in Maine a few weeks ago. I just had to get away for a few days.

Cordially,

Michelle (Moochelle) Obama

P.S. Thank you as well for the \$2 BILLION dollar trip to India from which we just returned!

ps. Each trip, @ \$11,351 per hour,????? don't know how many, short trips the president has taken since being elected, to go to different business, just the sake of talking, talk to different companies, and it is usually shown on TV. Why doesn't he just talk to them from the White House and save those \$\$\$\$\$\$ when evidencing no jobs added for the American people!!

P.S. Thank you, too, for that vacation trip to Martha's Vineyard; it was fabulous. And thanks for that second smaller jet that took our dog Bo to Martha's Vineyard so we and the children could have him with us while we were away from the White House for eleven days. After all, we couldn't take him on Air Force One because he might pee on some wires or something.

P.SSS. Oh, I almost forgot to say thanks also for our two-week trip to Hawaii at Christmas. That 7,000 square foot house was great!

Love ya!

Remember we all have to share the pain of these economic times equally! Love to -redistribute- share- the wealth.

ps. Each trip, @ \$11,351 per hour,????? don't know how many, short trips the

president has taken since being elected, to go to different business , just the sake of talking to different companies, and the speech is usually shown onTV. Why doesn't he just talk to them from the White House and save those \$\$\$\$\$\$ when evidencing no jobs added for the American people!!

SEND THIS TO EVERY AMERICAN NOW

STAND UP, SPEAK UP. NEVER SURRENDER!!!!

From: "Dale

Sent: Thursday, July 14, 2011 6:30:10 PM

Subject: Re: THANK YOU A MUST READ

my old classmate,

I will send you a response I just sent one of my distant relatives that has been sending my mother these reactionary chain letters until my mom responded with;

"Another nasty hateful propagandizing political chain letter." I elaborated on her concise sentence for better communication.

You can send me more of these rabid chain letters, but only if you read the analysis I return.

In this case you can just substitute your name for

Hi

We all know how easy it is to let irritations build into anger. Being chronically exposed to chain e-mail designed to instigate a political lynching has that effect on many people. Passing on these insensitive hit pieces goes beyond just expressing your opinion, it is offensive. Usually we try to remain polite and keep quiet, but every word that mom wrote in disgust about this brand of chain mail is true, unlike the veracity of the chain mail's contents.

Nasty:

2. Morally offensive; indecent. See Synonyms at [offensive](#).
 3. Malicious; spiteful: "*Will he say nasty things at my funeral?*" (Ezra Pound).
 4. Very unpleasant or annoying: *nasty weather; a nasty trick*.
- <http://www.thefreedictionary.com/nasty>

The manipulation and fabrication of facts to exploit resentment, anger, and distrust, for purposes of character assassination for political gain, fits the definition of nasty. Exploiting alleged abuse of privilege by the first lady, while supporting tax breaks for the wealthy in spite of the fact that [10% of the country owns 90% of the wealth](#), is ad hominem scapegoating, a double dose propaganda technique. Michelle bashing is a slam dunk for influencing prejudiced people who don't know they are prejudiced. Prejudice makes it easy to blame her for wasteful spending instead of the rich elite for their unprecedented avarice that crashed our economic system and starved government revenue. It is called shifting the blame, or scapegoating.

Ad hominem

A Latin phrase that has come to mean attacking one's opponent, as opposed to attacking their arguments.

<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Propaganda>

the bulk of the trip—the hotel stay and all meals—were paid for by the Obamas and their close friends who joined them. “Any additional footprint,” says a White House aide, “including additional rooms needed for security support, falls under the same rules as have applied to any previous first-family travel: the costs

are split appropriately, with private expenses paid for privately; government expenses are paid for by the government."

<http://www.newsweek.com/blogs/the-gaggle/2010/08/06/the-faux-scandal-of-michelle-obama-s-spain-trip.html>

hateful:

1. Eliciting or deserving hatred.
2. Feeling or showing hatred; malevolent.

<http://www.thefreedictionary.com/hateful>

The primary emotion evoked by this missive is undoubtedly hateful malevolence wrapped in self righteous indignation. The hate is palpable by all those who are not caught up in its clutches. I must admit, slandering the first lady elicits a bit of my hatred toward the hater, and I think mom felt that way too.

propagandizing:

1. The systematic propagation of a doctrine or cause or of information reflecting the views and interests of those advocating such a doctrine or cause.
2. Material disseminated by the advocates or opponents of a doctrine or cause:

<http://www.thefreedictionary.com/propaganda>

This call to action defiantly pushes the limits in the cause of a political agenda.

political chain letter:

This may have started as a blog post at <http://www.teapartypatriots.org/BlogPostView.aspx?id=ddb71f73-ddc3-4003-81a3-a031ecd9a5a8>

since the first four paragraphs were first posted 8-30-10.

This blog was copied and elaborated on in this chain mail and found its way to <http://stutteringmessiah.wordpress.com/2011/07/09/michelle-obama-thanks-american-taxpayers/> on 7-9-11 among many others.

In the mean time, this email has been passed from a political operative, on through a large chain of people linked by a conservative

political ideology, and on to those who they hope may be influenced by persuasion techniques like the bandwagon effect, yet another trick in the propaganda tool kit.

propaganda:

As opposed to [impartially](#) providing information, propaganda, in its most basic sense, presents information primarily to influence an audience. Propaganda often presents facts selectively (thus possibly [lying by omission](#)) to encourage a particular synthesis, or uses loaded messages to produce an emotional rather than rational response to the information presented. The desired result is a change of the attitude toward the subject in the target audience to further a political agenda. Propaganda can be used as a form of [political warfare](#).

<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Propaganda>

We all tend to look for information that supports our world view, but that path leads to self deception when not resisted. I don't expect to change your mind on anything, but I would like to suggest you check out other information sources. Try the link below for a whole different take on the subject of Michelle's Spain vacation. It is on a web site run by a former conservative political operative.

Conservative media's attacks on Spain vacation based on falsehoods

First, some numbers. Mrs. Obama did not travel with 40 friends, a number used by some news outlets.

She vacationed with two women, one of them a longtime Chicago pal, Anita Blanchard, who is the obstetrician who delivered Sasha and Malia. Blanchard

is married to Marty Nesbitt -- President Obama's buddy and the treasurer of Obama's presidential campaign fund.

There was one other woman. Total: four daughters among the three women. They paid for their hotel rooms and other personal and travel expenses.

The trip involved six White House advance staffers and two East Wing staffers, deputy Chief of Staff Melissa Winter and Mrs. Obama's personal assistant, Kristen Jarvis, according to Mrs. Obama's spokeswoman Catherine McCormick Lelyveld.

Mrs. Obama does travel with significant security -- and in a trip like this, three shifts of uniformed and plain-clothes agents and military personnel flew with her on a big Air Force 757. No matter where she goes -- domestic or international -- any first lady gets protection and she does not decide how many agents are needed.

So why did Mrs. Obama go to Spain at this time? She's not tone-deaf politically. What was behind the "mother-daughter" vacation?

A White House source told me that Blanchard's father passed away and Mrs. Obama was not able to make the funeral at the beginning of July. Blanchard had promised her daughter she would take her to Spain for her birthday. She asked Mrs. Obama and Sasha to come with. (Malia is at overnight camp.)

"She felt it was important as a dear friend to do this," I was told.

<http://mediamatters.org/research/201008090041>

Sincerely, Dale

On Jul 15, 2011, at 7:30 PM, my old classmate wrote:

i only sent it because all info was fact checked..nothing like the truth

From: Dale

Date: July 16, 2011 6:59:18 PM

All the info was fact checked? Please elaborate. By whom? Do you have any references at all? One way to tell there is a problem with veracity is that there is no author attributed and no references provided. All we have is an anonymous accusation.

Yes jets are costly, but for the 2,500 mile round trip, at 5 gallons per mile ([Boeing says its 747 burns about 5 gallons of fuel per mile.](#)) the gas usage would only be 12,500 gallons, not the 47,500 gallons claimed.

The writer claimed to get the facts from the GAO, but no linking reference was provided. I tried to glean the same info from the GAO web site and got nothing from multiple search engine results.

Even if one conceded the facts presented, and I don't, a good propagandist can start with a fact, and end with a completely false conclusion, if the reasoning in the middle is dishonest.

The cost of protecting the first lady has never been an issue until now.

The author has no respect, so judges by new rules. The costs were conflated as wasteful indulgence and exaggerated to imply we payed for her luxury vacation when the government payed only for security as usual. Building resentment about the cost of security of the first lady is also a good example of a half truth. Even if it costs as much as \$11,000 an hour to operate Air Force One, when you multiply that by every large jet in military service, it gives you a better perspective of the costs of doing business in the U.S. gov.

"the truth is that the U.S. military is the single largest consumer of energy

in the world. But as a wise man once said, don't confuse facts with reality. The reality is that even U.S. Department of Defense (DoD) does not know precisely where and how much energy it consumes.

The DoD per capita[2] energy consumption (524 trillion Btu) is 10 times more than per capita energy consumption in China, or 30 times more than that of Africa.

Total final energy consumption (called site delivered energy by DoD) of the DoD was 844 trillion Btu in FY2006.

FACT 2: Defense Energy Support Center (DESC) sold \$13 billion of energy to DoD services in FY2006. More than half of it was to Air Force."

<http://www.energybulletin.net/node/29925>

....., this email panders to racist conservative Republicans. It reinforces preconceived resentment, with disinformation and insinuation. It is contemptible. If you can't see that, it is because you have already drunk the cool aid.

Dale