

The Obama Fairy Tale

The *Obama Fairy Tale* Is Not For Kids



Fairy tales come in many flavors. Some uplift us with their inspirational messages—often with sound ethical lessons. The *Obama Fairy Tale* does not meet that

criteria. First, it was created by a politician to sell others a false story. Second, it has convinced far too many adults that the fairy tale is not a fairy tale at all, but that it is a wonderful and true story about Barack Obama, President of the United States of America. Therefor, it is not uplifting at all. It is just one more con job foisted on us by Barack Obama. Tough language? I call them like I see them.

Watch this:

Come on America, we all have to face the facts about our president. Our future and the future of our children depend on it. The truth (there really is such a thing.) is that this video does not even begin to expose the scope and reach of Barack Obama's deception. In fact, Mr. Obama's two most remarkable traits are his rhetorical gift and his habitual and disturbingly casual propensity to lie.

These are not partisan claims made by equally dishonest opponents of Mr. Obama. You just watched a video in which his dishonesty could not be more clear. But as I have said, the video barely begins to tell the whole story. In fact, my research prompted me to write an article entitled, Documented Obama Lies. You can read it and make up your own mind. You can find even more articles on Mr. Obama's dishonesty here: Obama's Dishonesty.

A personal note: I can only imagine how difficult the journey of growing up must have been for young Barack Obama. He never knew his father. His mother abandoned him at an early age. He was a bi-racial child, though identified as Black. As though these conditions were not enough to confuse and challenge him, he was raised by his grandparents who were both White. So yes, it must have been a rough ride. Perhaps he needed to create a fairy tale for himself in order to cope a little better with his many challenges. I don't know. However, none of it changes

what we must consider when we assess the qualifications we set for our presidents, and character, which includes honesty, is at the top of the list.

On The Matter Of Gay Marriage


By MacPundit

Note: President Obama has changed his position on the issue many times. His supporters like to say he has “evolved.” His detractors say he has simply flip-flopped for political expediency. This article discusses the topic more comprehensively than have the media or politicians on either side. It is the discussion I think we should be having.

Gay Marriage – What about it?

In the late '50s and early '60s, we beatniks (yes, we) scoffed at the institution of marriage, proclaiming that it was just a piece of paper. “If you want to set up house with a member of the opposite sex—or the same sex, for that matter—then you do not

need a legal document or the official approval of some religion to do it.” – we said. We argued that neither an official government document, nor the blessings of a church could enhance, protect, or sustain a commitment, which had



been freely made between two people. "As long as the relationship continues to appeal to both parties and the commitment remains strong, then we will stay together. But if our feelings or priorities change, we always have the right to end the relationship." After all, there seemed to be so many unhappy—even abusive—marriages that we stated with profound certainty that the institution of marriage was an archaic idea that sometimes caused more harm than good. For one, we said, it was too easy to get married and too hard to get divorced. It was not too many years later that hippies asserted the same position and in the ensuing years millions of Americans established de facto marriages by simply "living together."

Were we right? Well, as with many matters having to do with humans in their sometimes equivocal process of being, for some, the answer (as one of my favorite beatniks wrote) is "blowing in the wind." But if we are to develop a truly informed opinion about marriage, there are some things we need to consider—things we beatniks failed to explore too deeply, if at all. At the very least, we should know something about the origins of marriage as we know it today. At the top of the list are the reasons our ancestors created the institution of marriage and why subsequent societies have assiduously protected and honored it for so long. This knowledge will also give us an informed basis upon which we can consider the matter of "gay marriage."

Note: While human mating practices such as polygamy (many spouses) or more commonly, polygyny (many wives) can be found throughout our history they were and are the exception rather than the rule and have been associated with certain religious beliefs or practiced more often by the most powerful men in society—or when war had killed off large numbers of men. To these, we could add polyandry (one wife with many husbands), although this practice has been quite rare. But for my purposes here, I will restrict the discussion to the most common and enduring form of human mating: The civil

institution of monogamous marriage as established and administered by the state.

Origins And Reasons

The concept and definition of marriage as the practice of committed, monogamous, legalized mating of men and women able to produce children is, in fact, ancient. A case can be made that some form of it existed in early civilizations that predated written history. But what is more relevant is that *the formal establishment of marriage as a state-decreed institution predates all three major religions*. In other words, marriage was not originally established for religious reasons. It was not created in order to satisfy the moral tenets of a church or other formalized set of religious beliefs. Therefore, any informed argument designed to consider the idea of *legalized civil gay marriage* should not be framed as a religious or moral one. Such moral judgments must be considered separately because *the history of marriage is solidly established as a civil expedient*. Simply put: Religious faith is not a prerequisite to legal marriage.

The origin of civil marriage is well-documented and its purpose is clear. Around 1750 B.C., Sumerian traditions were codified by Hammurabi, the king of Babylonia. Widely known as "Hammurabi's Laws" or "Hammurabi's Code," customs and traditions developed and practiced by the Sumerians, were formally organized and written into law. This meant that the state could prosecute on its own behalf those who broke the law. Among these new laws and as an essential element of a larger need to organize, sustain, and preserve their cultures and states, and to create a secure environment to ensure the perpetuation of the species, Babylonia and other ancient societies established the institution of marriage.

Consequently and most importantly, as a legal institution, marriage organized and made secure the granting of property

rights and the protection of bloodlines. In time, as the needs of various societies required, such matters as the delineation and enforcement of personal responsibility for the protection and welfare of one's legal mate and children were added to and became common elements of the legal institution of marriage.

“Gay Marriage” is an oxymoron

The reasons for the establishment of the institution of marriage as a legally codified set of laws are unambiguous: *Marriage was created to organize, protect, and sustain society for the very practical, important reasons given above.*

Therefore, when we consider the dictates of nature and the reasons for the institution of marriage, the concept of gay marriage is incongruous with all of them. The purposes and intent for legalizing and documenting marriage were and still are very practical and are by their very nature, applicable only to members of the opposite sex. It is nature itself—not man, nor the state—that requires the union of two members of the opposite sex to ensure the perpetuation of the species. So, for what purpose would a responsible government expand marriage laws to include members of the same sex? *Same-sex marriage by definition is not only a fatuous notion; it is an oxymoron.*

Marriage is not a civil right

So far as marriage-as-law goes, gay-marriage advocates in the United States correctly argue that marriage is a civil matter, not a church affair. But they abuse all logic when they further argue that since marriage is a civil matter, it is therefore a civil right and that because it is a civil right, it is unconstitutional to deny homosexual couples the right to marry. This is a fallacious argument. First, as shown earlier, civil marriage was created for rigidly practical reasons having to do with child-bearing members of the opposite sex,

only. Second, while marriage is a civil matter, it is not a constitutionally-protected civil right. Where in the Constitution are we given the “Right to Marry?”

Equal Protection

To deal with this argument, gay-rights advocates attempt to include marriage under the constitutional principles of equal protection and equal treatment. In other words, if opposite-sex partners can marry then so can we, they argue, because the Constitution guarantees equal protection and equal treatment. Yet this is merely a specious assertion. Is this what our founders intended when they wrote the Constitution? If so, what else should be included? How about polygamy? Or what if someone wants to marry his or her comatose mother or father or their three year old daughter or, for that matter, their pet? Or consider business partners that seek equal treatment before the law in an attempt to change their legal status from a business partnership to a marriage—in which case they could not be required to testify against each other.

The clear purpose of civil rights protections is to provide and assure every citizen of equal treatment *when such equal treatment conforms to the intent of laws that are based on social realities and are designed to enhance and promote the general welfare of the people*. But when the right to equal protection is invoked in a manner and for a purpose, which would controvert the intent of a good law, it should not be recognized or applied. Instead, if a society determines through diligent consideration that a law no longer serves to enhance and promote the general welfare of the people then it can and should (through lawful process) change the law. Again, good laws are created to improve and advance the general well-being of a society and the institution of marriage has for almost four thousand years, done just that.

It follows, then, that to brashly and suddenly dilute,

diminish, or demote such a time-tested, socially critical law that has served countless civilizations so well for thousands of years without proper knowledge of either the reasons for the establishment of the law or the consequences, which would ensue should the law be functionally altered in such a way as to literally remove the sound reasons for which it was created, would be grossly irresponsible.

Other arguments

What about love?

Should not people of the same sex have the right to love each other in the same manner as heterosexual couples? Of course all people should have the right to love whoever they choose—and in America, they do. We should all acknowledge that love enhances and makes better all things human. Yet, while we are guaranteed the right to love whoever we choose (the pursuit of happiness), it does not follow that the presence of love gives us the right to legally marry whoever we love. It is a matter of fact that love never had anything to do with the creation of the civil institution of marriage. It is also a fact that while the institution of marriage is strictly limited to one man and one woman, this does not prevent others from loving whoever they choose.

Hospital visitation

In states where this is an issue, we need to design fair and wise mechanisms (laws?) to allow appropriate members of clearly defined, established caring relationships such as visitation rights.

To oppose gay marriage is a homophobic

reaction

In some instances, it may very well be. Yet, to say that everyone who opposes gay marriage is homophobic is, factually, incorrect. At worst, it is clear that such accusations are often designed to cast aspersions on the opposition in an effort to eliminate them as legitimate participants in the discussion. “I am unable to sustain my argument intellectually, so I will assign false motives to you or destroy your character instead.” – comes to mind.

But whether opposition to gay marriage is engendered by homophobia or by moral or religious beliefs the central argument against gay marriage remains intact. In other words, such things as homophobia are irrelevant to the historically sound reasons presented here for the preservation and maintenance of legalized civil marriage between one man and one woman.

Homosexuality is unnatural and/or immoral

As stated earlier, opposition to gay marriage based on these reasons is another matter entirely and they have no place in this discussion.

Anti-gay marriage is anti-gay

Again, for almost four thousand years, civil marriage has applied to heterosexual couples only and to oppose gay marriage for the reasons given here does not in any way pass judgment on homosexual behavior. So to say that anyone who opposes gay marriage is anti-gay simply reveals one more attempt by gay marriage advocates to misdirect the discussion away from the real issues toward disingenuous, inflammatory accusations, which they hope will arouse base emotions in those people who are woefully ignorant of the four thousand year history of civil marriage—why it was established in the first place and why it has endured for so long.

Recently, I watched a clip on television of the actor, Sean Penn, in which he shamed all Californians who voted for Proposition 8—a California ballot proposition passed in the November 4, 2008 general election that changed the state Constitution to restrict the definition of marriage to opposite-sex couples and eliminated same-sex couples' right to marry. Penn's patently judgmental and demagogic diatribe was clearly intended to accuse all Californians who voted for Proposition 8 of being anti-gay, homophobic bigots of the worst kind. Instead of engaging them in an informed and intelligent discussion he self-righteously and unfairly condemned them all.

As is too often the case, instead of choosing to engage in intelligent, informed, constructive debate Penn chose to appeal to the prejudices, emotions, or special interests of his audience rather than their intellect or reason. It is an old and deplorable tactic—particularly of the Left. Unfortunately, and to the detriment of our society, this tactic is a standard practice of many Liberals in America. To be fair, however, we must not underestimate the level of ignorance on both sides of the political landscape in the U.S. There is hardly a day that finishes without having heard more than one statement or accusation that is grossly inaccurate. So who knows, maybe Penn actually believes that anyone who opposes gay marriage must be a homophobic bigot. Whatever the case, the result is the same: We simply continue to talk past each other; nothing meaningful is accomplished and the integrity of our society is diminished.

Some final thoughts

A case can be made that we Americans are currently experiencing a kind of collective, cultural Attention Deficit Disorder. The news cycle is such that often news is old within hours. The Internet, cell phones, and other technologies have dramatically increased the pace of virtually everything we do.

Unfortunately, one debilitating unintended consequence of this phenomenon is that we too often fail to take enough time to seriously consider important issues of the day. Perhaps worse, is that this lack of inspection extends to our media who regularly fail to do the kind of comprehensive reporting that would provide us with the information we need in order to form intelligent opinions. Instead, our major media outlets produce biased news and commentary, which amount to nothing more than agenda-driven propaganda. As a result, the American electorate has never before been so uninformed and misinformed as it is today. It is for this reason that bloggers like myself do what we can to inform and expand discussions on important matters that affect us all.

Finally, the fact that civil marriage was created in order to assign personal responsibility to child-bearing couples for each other and for the children they bear is undeniable. Without such regulation, societies decline, inexorably, into chaos and eventually fall. Whenever the integrity of the family unit—a child bearing man and woman—has been compromised, nations fail. Therefore, anything that would or could diminish the intrinsic value of the naturally imposed (by nature) family unit and its time-tested critical role in maintaining the overall integrity of a society should be avoided at all costs. The very idea of gay marriage is anomalous with the fundamental intent of civil marriage. Its adoption can add nothing of practical value to our society and could in reality weaken the purpose of that which has served countless societies so well for so long.

Obama Broken Promises

By MacPundit

He may have set a new record!

In Texas there is a saying that goes like this: "He's all hat and no cattle."

Texans use it to describe someone who may look good, sound good, and impress



people who don't know any better, but the person is not exactly who he wants you to think he is. President Obama is "All hat and no cattle." He impresses people who don't know any better. So here's a wake up call for those people. The next time you hear him tell you that he is going to do this or that wonderful thing, think again because his record of keeping his promises is as bad as it gets in politics—and that is really bad.

Take a look at this list of 83 Obama broken promises from PolitiFact. They are all well documented. After more than 4 years, Barack Obama has kept less than half of his promises.

The following are rated as "Broken Promises" by PolitiFact.com as of April 17, 2013. You can see full explanations at PolitiFact.com.

1. **Eliminate all oil and gas tax loopholes – BROKEN**

2. Require publicly traded financial partnerships to pay the corporate income tax – **BROKEN**
3. Close loopholes in the corporate tax deductibility of CEO pay – **BROKEN**
4. No family making less than \$250,000 will see “any form of tax increase.” – **BROKEN**
5. Close the Guantanamo Bay Detention Center – **BROKEN**
6. Negotiate health care reform in public sessions televised on C-SPAN – **BROKEN**
7. Allow five days of public comment before signing bills – **BROKEN**
8. Introduce a comprehensive immigration bill in the first year – **BROKEN**
9. Centralize ethics and lobbying information for voters – **BROKEN**
10. Tougher rules against revolving door for lobbyists and former officials – **BROKEN**
11. Re-establish the National Aeronautics and Space Council – **BROKEN**
12. Support human mission to moon by 2020 – **BROKEN**
13. Provide an annual report on “state of our energy future” – **BROKEN**
14. Recognize the Armenian genocide – **BROKEN**
15. Increase the capital gains and dividends taxes for higher-income taxpayers – **BROKEN**
16. Expand the child and dependent care credit – **BROKEN**
17. Create a foreclosure prevention fund for homeowners – **BROKEN**
18. End income tax for seniors making less than \$50,000 – **BROKEN**
19. End no-bid contracts above \$25,000 – **BROKEN**
20. Repeal the Bush tax cuts for higher incomes – **BROKEN**
21. Phase out exemptions and deductions for higher earners – **BROKEN**
22. Sign the Employee Free Choice Act, making it easier for workers to unionize – **BROKEN**
23. Forbid companies in bankruptcy from giving executives bonuses – **BROKEN**
24. Allow workers to claim more in unpaid wages and benefits in bankruptcy court – **BROKEN**
25. Allow imported prescription drugs – **BROKEN**
26. Mandate insurance coverage of autism treatment – **BROKEN**
27. Direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to conduct a comprehensive study of federal cancer initiatives – **BROKEN**

28. Create a National Commission on People with Disabilities, Employment, and Social Security – **BROKEN**
29. Change federal rules so small businesses owned by people with disabilities can get preferential treatment for federal contracts. – **BROKEN**
30. Form international group to help Iraq refugees – **BROKEN**
31. Reinstate special envoy for the America – **BROKEN**
32. Double the Peace Corps – **BROKEN**
33. Double funding for after school programs – **BROKEN**
34. Urge states to treat same-sex couples with full equality in their family and adoption laws – **BROKEN**
35. Allow bankruptcy judges to modify terms of a home mortgage – **BROKEN**
36. Restore Superfund program so that polluters pay for clean-ups – **BROKEN**
37. Pay for the national service plan without increasing the deficit – **BROKEN**
38. Limit term of director of national intelligence – **BROKEN**
39. Give annual “State of the World” address – **BROKEN**
40. Reduce earmarks to 1994 levels – **BROKEN**
41. Enact windfall profits tax for oil companies – **BROKEN**
42. Create cap and trade system with interim goals to reduce global warming – **BROKEN**
43. Require plug-in fleet at the White House – **BROKEN**
44. Allow penalty-free hardship withdrawals from retirement accounts in 2008 and 2009 – **BROKEN**
45. Create a public option health plan for a new National Health Insurance Exchange – **BROKEN**
46. Provide option for a pre-filled-out tax form – **BROKEN**
47. Create a mortgage interest tax credit for non-itemizers – **BROKEN**
48. Require automatic enrollment in 401(k) plans – **BROKEN**
49. Require automatic enrollment in IRA plans – **BROKEN**
50. Create a retirement savings tax credit for low incomes – **BROKEN**
51. Create a \$60 billion bank to fund roads and bridges – **BROKEN**
52. Lift the payroll tax cap on earnings above \$250,000 – **BROKEN**
53. Prevent drug companies from blocking generic drugs – **BROKEN**
54. Allow Medicare to negotiate for cheaper drug prices – **BROKEN**

55. Appoint federal-level coordinator to oversee all federal autism efforts – **BROKEN**
56. Double federal funding for cancer research – **BROKEN**
57. Provide the CDC \$50 million in new funding to determine the most effective approaches for cancer patient care – **BROKEN**
58. Fully fund the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) – **BROKEN**
59. Reduce the threshold for the Family and Medical Leave Act from companies with 50 employees to companies with 25 employees – **BROKEN**
60. Provide a \$1.5 billion fund to help states launch programs for paid family and medical leave – **BROKEN**
61. Require employers to provide seven paid sick days per year – **BROKEN**
62. Expand the Family Medical Leave Act to include leave for domestic violence or sexual assault – **BROKEN**
63. Work with Russia to move nuclear weapons off hair-trigger alert – **BROKEN**
64. Develop an alternative to President Bush's Military Commissions Act on handling detainees – **BROKEN**
65. Secure ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) – **BROKEN**
66. Seek to negotiate a political agreement on Cyprus – **BROKEN**
67. Seek independent watchdog agency to investigate congressional ethics violations – **BROKEN**
68. Create a public "Contracts and Influence" database – **BROKEN**
69. Expose Special Interest Tax Breaks to Public Scrutiny – **BROKEN**
70. Expand the Employment Non-Discrimination Act to include sexual orientation and gender identity – **BROKEN**
71. Sign the Deceptive Practices and Voter Intimidation Prevention Act into law – **BROKEN**
72. Increase the minimum wage to \$9.50 an hour – **BROKEN**
73. Support tax deduction for artists – **BROKEN**
74. Reduce the number of middle managers in the federal workforce – **BROKEN**
75. Strengthen the Age Discrimination in Employment Act – **BROKEN**
76. Work to ban the permanent replacement of striking workers – **BROKEN**
77. Use revenue from cap and trade to support clean energy and

environmental restoration – **BROKEN**

78. Require more flex-fuel cars for the federal government – **BROKEN**

79. Mandate flexible fuel vehicles by 2012 – **BROKEN**

80. Double federal program to help “reverse” commuters who go from city to suburbs – **BROKEN**

81. Require energy conservation in use of transportation dollars – **BROKEN**

82. Sign the Freedom of Choice Act – **BROKEN**

83. Give the White House’s Privacy and Civil Liberties Board subpoena power – **BROKEN**

Whew! That’s a lot of broken promises! It just might be a record. I don’t know, it’s probably a close race between Obama and Jimmy Carter. No matter, it’s depressing. Just don’t let President Obama tell you that it’s all the Republican’s fault because they block everything he tries to do. The Democrats controlled both houses of Congress for the first two years of his presidency. They could have done virtually anything he wanted them to do. No excuses, Mr. President, you’re a big “promiser” but you’re a lousy deliverer.

So how does he get away with it? First, because his followers want to believe him so much that they don’t bother to check up on him to see if he keeps his promises. Second, because the so-called mainstream media don’t tell you the truth. Here’s another thing to remember: Barack Obama depends on your ignorance. Don’t think so? Then why does he continue to make empty promises? Even worse, there is hardly a day that goes by that he doesn’t say things that are outright lies. I know, you may think I dislike him or his policies or that I am some kind of a right wing nut. Well, you would be wrong—except for not liking his policies. But even if you were right, it would not change the facts. He does have a horrible record of broken promises and he does lie—a lot. Many of his lies are well documented elsewhere on this site and many are videos so you can hear him lie in his own words.

Listen, I am not happy about reporting such negative things

about my president. But if we really want an honest government we need to accept the truth about our leaders, especially our president. So like it or not, I call them like I see them. And just for the record, how many broken promises does it take before you stop believing someone? Two? Four? How about 83? Would that do it?

Obama Blames Bush For Our Financial Crisis



Is Bush to blame?

President Obama blames Bush for our financial crisis. Is he right? The simple answer is no. However, since the full story is long and rather complex, I recommend that you read this post and watch these videos first. You should then read *Obama's Biggest Lie* for a more complete understanding of what really happened. Taken together, these two posts refute the false claim of Obama and the Democrats that Bush's economic policies caused our current financial crisis and they expose the culprits who actually did trigger the financial meltdown.

If there was a single most important "trigger" of the

financial meltdown, it was the lack of regulation and reform at Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac. Also, it is important to know that what Barack Obama is telling us is patently untrue.

Below, are three videos that, irrefutably, tell the truth. It is important to watch all three to fully understand what triggered our financial crisis, who warned us, and who blocked reform that could have prevented it.

Video 1 of 3

Video 2 of 3

Video 3 of 3

Let's summarize:

- For years, the Bush Administration and Republicans warned repeatedly about an impending financial disaster and pushed for reform in order to head it off while the Democrats dishonestly accused them of setting off false alarms. (See Bush Warned Us Of A Potential Financial Crisis)
- Democrats repeatedly blocked reform, declaring that there was nothing wrong. Their reason for doing so was simple: The recipients of the bad mortgage loans, which were being pushed by Fannie and Freddie, were virtually all Democratic voters. So once again, the Democrats put the pursuit of power before the good of the country. Now, without skipping a beat, the very same people who are most culpable for our current financial and economic problems, lie to us and blame "Bush economic policies" for the financial meltdown.
- Democrats praised Franklin Raines for his stewardship of Fannie Mae while Mr. Raines was in the process of destroying that organization.

- Even Bill Clinton correctly and honestly placed the blame on the Democrats.
- Astonishingly, even after Franklin Raines was forced out of Fannie Mae in disgrace, Barack Obama asked him to join his campaign as an adviser on mortgage and housing policy!

Here's what the *Washington Post* had to say:

The Obama Campaign Has Solicited Franklin Raines, Who "Stepped Down As Fannie Mae's Chief Executive Under The Shadow Of A \$6.3 Billion Accounting Scandal," For "Advice On Mortgage And Housing Policy." "In the four years since he stepped down as Fannie Mae's chief executive under the shadow of a \$6.3 billion accounting scandal, Franklin D. Raines has been quietly constructing a new life for himself. He has shaved eight points off his golf handicap, taken a corner office in Steve Case's D.C. conglomeration of finance, entertainment and health-care companies and more recently, taken calls from Barack Obama's presidential campaign seeking his advice on mortgage and housing policy matters." (Anita Huslin, "On The Outside Now, Watching Fannie Falter," The Washington Post, 7/16/08)

"Two Members Of Mr. Obama's Political Circle, James A. Johnson And Franklin D. Raines, Are Former Chief Executives Of Fannie Mae." (Editorial, "Tough Decision Coming," The Washington Post, 8/28/08)

Note: Most of our media have been conspicuously silent on this matter. If they mention it at all, it is with mitigating caveats that serve to veil its true significance. They simply did not report in full anything that would harm Barack Obama. Of course, the so-called "mainstream media" no longer serve us. They serve Barack Obama, their "Messiah." After all, we are not to be trusted with the truth so we can decide for ourselves. They think they know best.