



## OBAMA'S GAY POLITICAL PLAY

"Marriage is ... in its origin a contract of natural law... It is the parent, and not the child of society; the source of civility and a sort of seminary of the republic." --Justice Joseph Story

There was much gayety among some political constituencies this week.

In advance of his annual proclamation of June as "National Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender (LGBT) Pride Month," or more accurately, "[Gender Confusion Month](#)," Barack Hussein Obama ceremonially announced his support for so-called "gay marriage." I note "ceremonially" because while this purely political announcement had no effect on the legal status of homosexual relationships, it certainly moved the needle to the left in regard to the moral status of such "unions."

This proclamation came on the heels of North Carolina joining 29 other states by resoundingly approving a state constitutional amendment affirming the natural definition of marriage. Obama barely won North Carolina in 2008, and Democrats are holding their national convention there this year as they endeavor to retain that state's electoral votes and pick up some around it. Thus, one would think his



Gay Days at the White House

announcement was ill-timed, unless there is a larger strategy in the works -- and indeed there is.

So why did Obama really go public with his support for the gay marriage agenda?

Certainly not to win the votes of homosexuals -- Obama already has them kowtowing in reverence, particularly after repealing the military's "[Don't Ask, Don't Tell](#)" ban, and refusing to enforce the Defense of Marriage Act as duly passed by Congress and signed into law in 1996 by none other than Bill Clinton.

Most certainly not to win the votes of his [sycophantic socialist cadres](#) -- they will vote for Obama regardless of his position on social issues as long as his political platform is bent on redistributing wealth from income earners and delivering it to his most loyal constituents, those enslaved on the Democrats' [government welfare plantation](#).

The calculus behind Obama's endorsement of "gay marriage" is twofold. First, he genuinely supports and identifies with homosexuals, and they with him -- indeed one in six of Obama's big-money "bundlers" is homosexual. He first signaled his desire to redefine this building block of human civilization back in 1996. But his identification with homosexuals is subordinate to his second motive, a political calculation that he believes will ensure his 2012 re-election -- and that re-election is critical to his macro agenda of "fundamentally transforming the United States of America."

Let's analyze Obama's reasoning on both counts.

Regarding his personal motive for promoting the homosexual agenda, Obama is an archetypal case study of [Narcissistic Pathology Disorder](#), the almost

universal underlying [pathology of Leftist political leaders](#). Obama most certainly has a dominant though closeted homosexual predisposition, the ultimate expression of his unmitigated narcissism.

This psychological profile will shock mostly those who are blinded, either by their cultish devotion to Obama or their shared pathology.



Newsweek Magazine certainly affirmed this diagnosis with its cover this week "outing" Obama's homosexual proclivity. It featured a photo of BO sporting a rainbow halo and the caption, "[The First Gay President](#)," as homosexual activist Andrew Sullivan concludes. In reality, however, there is nothing

"gay" about [gender disorientation](#).

Attempting to justify his homosexual advocacy by wrapping it in the context of "faith," Obama said, "[Michelle and I] are both practicing Christians and ... you know, when we think about our faith, the thing at root that we think about is not only Christ sacrificing himself on our behalf, but it's also the Golden Rule, you know, treat others the way you would want to be treated. ... I was sensitive to the fact that for a lot of people, the word 'marriage' was something that evokes very powerful traditions, religious beliefs and so forth."

He continued, "But I have to tell you ... when I think about members of my own staff who are in incredibly committed monogamous same-sex relationships, who are raising kids together -- when I think about those soldiers or airmen or Marines or sailors who are out there fighting on my behalf, and yet feel constrained even now that 'Don't Ask, Don't Tell' is gone because they're not able to commit themselves in a marriage ... it is important for me to go ahead and affirm that I

think same-sex couples should be able to get married."

Responding to his remarks, I'd be negligent if I didn't challenge Obama's incredibly narcissistic assertion that "soldiers or airmen or Marines or sailors [are] fighting on my behalf," rather than correctly understanding that they are fighting in accordance with their solemn oaths to "[support and defend](#)" our Constitution. Obama, of course, has affirmed the same obligation by oath but has vigorously refused to honor it.

To the substance of his remarks, the problem with Obama's "golden rule" reasoning is that his "faith" as a "practicing Christian" was mentored by another pathological narcissist, Jeremiah "G-d Damn America" Wright, with whom Obama identifies most closely as "a father figure." Wright inculcated Obama with the "[Marxist social gospel](#) of hate, the antithesis of genuine Christianity. Thus, Obama's understanding of Christianity assumes that [Jesus was a socialist](#).

Moreover, as with all narcissists, the faith expression of Wright and Obama is self-centered -- nothing more than a manifestation shaped by their own deity.

Not only is Obama's faith deeply flawed in regard to homosexuality, but many people of authentic Christian upbringing are also confused about this issue. For a brief but comprehensive perspective on how Christians should respond to the notion of "gay marriage," I invite those of any political stripe who wrestle with this issue to read [Gender Identity, The Homosexual Agenda and The Christian Response](#).

Regarding Obama's second and more important reason for announcing his support for the homosexual marriage agenda, Leftist Sen. Dick Durbin (D-ILL) concluded, "I don't think it was a political calculation. ... I think it was a matter of conscience." Of course, Durbin knows that this was *both* "a matter of conscience," as outlined previously, and "a political calculation."

The Obama campaign's internal polling numbers are not looking good, especially with the one group of voters who have represented more than half of all votes cast since 1960 -- women. The female vote will [determine the victor](#) in the 2012 presidential election.

Though a female majority elected Obama in 2008, the Democrats' gender advantage is declining. In the 2010 midterm elections, for the first time in recent history, a majority of women voted Republican. Given the estimate that women drive more than 60 percent of financial decisions in the home, Obama's dismal approval ratings on issues related to economic recovery may cost him the election. That is, unless he can regain a majority of women voters by diverting their focus to other issues -- especially what he sees as a "winning" issue among women, homosexual advocacy.

At its core, Obama's gay political play, cynically assumes that a majority of women are too stupid to rise above their emotive compassion for, and in many cases identity with, effeminate men -- like Obama. The Obama campaign is betting large that a majority of women voters respond out of individual compassion, rather than rising above the emotional context and recognizing the political agenda, which demands that all Americans and their respective states confer upon homosexual relationships the same moral and legal standing as marriage between a man and woman -- the foundation of family and by extension, the foundation of society.

This "stupid women" assumption is the overarching political strategy behind Obama's announcement, and it is confirmed beyond reasonable doubt by Demagogue Senator Dianne Feinstein (D-CA), who fallaciously insists that "there's no political calculus" behind Obama's gay marriage endorsement. If Feinstein's lips are moving, you know she is lying.

Confirming that Obama's gay play was targeting women, he went on a promotional tour courting women, stopping first at Barnard, an elite women's college, where he tag-teamed with Evan Wolfson, founder of a "same-sex marriage" group. Then he

made an appearance on "The View," a daytime TV yackfest for women, and was prompted by host Barbara Walters to next fight for repeal of the Defense of Marriage Act, requiring every state to recognize "gay marriage" with the same standing and status as normal marriage. Obama did not commit to take on repeal of DOMA, but one may assume that his position is similar to that he conveyed to Russian leader Dmitri Medvedev regarding his plan to undo NATO's missile defense: "After my election I'll have more flexibility."

In addition to his attempt to dupe female voters, Obama's gay play is a flaming red herring his socialist cadres are betting will divert voter attention from his efforts to break the back of free enterprise, so he can complete the transformation to a socialist economy.

How important is this strategy to Obama's long-term political objective?

The transformation of our nation into a Socialist state is predicated on the success of Obama's effort to destabilize the three pillars of [Essential Liberty](#): Constitutional Liberty, Economic Liberty and Individual Liberty.

The Obama administration has done more to [undermine constitutional Liberty](#) than any Leftist since Woodrow Wilson.

The Obama administration has done more to [undermine Economic Liberty](#) than any Leftist since Franklin Roosevelt, with a plethora of policies designed to [break the back of free enterprise](#) and replace it with [Democratic Socialism](#).



"Gay" flag flying left at Federal Reserve Bank

As for the third pillar, Obama knows that the most effective method of undermining Individual Liberty is to erode the integrity of [faith and family](#). To the degree that our nation's faith foundation is undermined, the principle that Liberty is "endowed by our Creator" is enfeebled. To the extent that the "Laws of Nature and of Nature's God" are abjectly violated by redefining marriage, which in turn upends the basic building block of a free society, the family, the consequence is the decay of individual Liberty.

The notion that marriage and family are the foundation of society is older than Christ's teaching on the subject. In the words of Marcus Tullius Cicero (circa 50 B.C.), "[T]he first principle of society

consists in the marriage tie, the next in children, the next in a family within one roof, where everything is in common. This society gives rise to the city, and is, as it were, the nursery of the commonwealth."

The bottom line for Obama and his Leftist cadres: Female voters *will* determine the outcome of the 2012 presidential election. Beyond all the topical rhetoric about redefining marriage, if Obama is correct in his calculation that a majority of women voters can be distracted from critical issues like Liberty and economy, his gambit on the gay political play will be a winner.

I am not going to take that bet.