

The Patriots' Truth

Flint Hills TEA Party News

See us at McALISTER'S DELI, EVERY WED after 5:30pm ---- *Everyone is welcome, we ARE the Working Group. WELCOME! For monthly meetings, contact Chuck – cehenderson@cox.net or 785-236-1286. Now that the KSU home football games are over, we are back to the 2nd Sat. of the month meetings at the Manhattan Public Library, 9:30am. Always interesting & informative, join us!! Next meeting: February 9 – 9:30AM, Manhattan City Library!! We are working with several State Legislatures to accomplish our goals for the year – basically to enforce Amendment II and Amendment X. Come to our meetings, join our discussions, express YOUR concerns and views, help US all help each other with everyone's concerns. We have made headway!! We MUST keep the momentum rolling to bring our USA back to the Constitution, "We the People", and GOD!!!!*

President Obama VS. John Boehner... The Winner Is...

Posted by Michael CHILDS, Admin II on January 30, 2013 at 5:27pm in Patriot Action Alerts

It seems that the battlefield grounds may be looking ahead to daylight in the House. The Speaker of the House, John Boehner, has postponed the debt ceiling fight until May. This is a strategic choice by Boehner to make the Sequester fight, the next major engagement instead of the debt ceiling fight.

In retrospect, at the Battle at Fiscal Cliff, Boehner took President Obama to the cleaners. He did it suavely, without histrionics. While Obama churlishly, and in a politically amateurish manner, publicly strutted about having forced the Republicans to raise tax rates on “the wealthiest Americans” Boehner, quietly, was pocketing his winnings.

Dazzled by Obama’s Ozymandias-scale sneer most liberals failed to notice that Boehner quietly made 99% of the Bush tax cuts permanent. As Boehner himself dryly observed, in an interview with The Wall Street Journal’s editorial board member Steve Moore, “”Who would have ever guessed that we could make 99% of the Bush tax cuts permanent? When we had a Republican House and Senate and a Republican in the White House, we couldn’t get that. And so, not bad.” [Read More:](#)

John Boehner indeed took the creepy narcissist in the White house to the cleaners. And he is not done yet.

What’s the big deal (from a conservative/moderate) point of view of letting sequester happen? None, whatsoever.

Defense spending can always be raised back up again. There is a constituency in the country for that. But let’s see a single parasite program be brought back from the dead, after it’s been killed by sequester. Obama is, always has been, too dumb to win anything. All he can do is mindlessly posture and sulk.

He should have wished that if he had a son, he would be just like John Boehner!!

The tax rate passage is being applauded in the press. Until the press realizes that 98.5% of the public got permanent Bush tax cuts.

This article is so 100 percent right. What I find funny is how the biased liberal media still has not figured this all out.

The Democrats are like a football team that marches up and down the field, then fumbles at the goal line. You win with confidence you lose big with overconfidence. Obama is still overconfident. A little humility is just around the corner guys.

Republicans need to retake the Senate in 2014. To do this, the GOP strategy should be to force the Senate Democrats to vote for Obama’s unpopular agenda over and over again.

The first step is the sequester. Boehner should promise to carefully consider any bill cutting spending that passes the Senate.

If they can’t pass anything even close to the sequester cuts, we should take the sequester.

He should not “negotiate” with anybody, especially Obama who is the definition of bad faith negotiation.

Note that the Senate can't initiate tax bills according to the Constitution, so Obama can't try for any more taxes in Senate originated bills.

Boehner should further state that any continuing resolution passing the House will fund the government at exactly last year's level, dollar for dollar, for all discretionary items.

No extra money will be included for funding "current services."

This means that the Senate will actually have to pass the individual bills to fund the government Obama is demanding.

Also, it will educate the public that "cuts" announced by Obama are really disguised spending increases.

COLUMBINE STUDENT'S FATHER 12 YEARS LATER !!

Darrell Scott, the father of Rachel Scott, a victim of the Columbine High shootings, was invited to address the House Judiciary Committee's subcommittee. What he said to our national leaders during this special session of Congress was painfully truthful.

They were not prepared for what he was to say, nor was it received well. It needs to be heard by every parent, teacher, and politician, every sociologist, every psychologist, and every so-called expert! These courageous words, spoken by Darrell Scott are powerful, penetrating, and deeply personal. The following is a portion of the transcript:

"Since the dawn of creation there has been both good & evil in the hearts of man. We all contain the seeds of kindness or of violence. The death of my wonderful daughter, Rachel Scott, and the deaths of that heroic teacher, and the other eleven children who died must not be in vain. Their blood cries out for answers.

"The first recorded act of violence was when Cain slew his brother Abel out in the field. The villain was not the club he used. The true killer was Cain, and the reason for the murder could only be found in Cain's heart.

"In the days that followed the Columbine tragedy, I was amazed at how quickly fingers began to be pointed at groups such as the NRA. I am not a member of the NRA. I do not even own a gun. I am not here to represent or defend the NRA - I don't believe that they are responsible for my daughter's death. Therefore I do not believe that they need to be defended.

"I am here today to declare that Columbine was not just a tragedy -- it was a spiritual event that should be forcing us to look at where the real blame lies! Much of the blame lies here in this very room. Much of the blame lies behind the pointing fingers of the accusers themselves. I wrote a poem just four nights ago that expresses my feelings best.

"Your laws ignore our deepest needs,
Your words are empty air.
You've stripped away our heritage,
You've outlawed simple prayer.
Now gunshots fill our classrooms,
And precious children die.
You seek for answers everywhere,
And ask the question "Why?"
You regulate restrictive laws,
Through legislative creed.
And yet you fail to understand,
That God is what we need!"

"Men and women are three-part beings, consisting of body, mind, and spirit. When we refuse to acknowledge a third part of our make-up, we create a void that allows evil, prejudice, and hatred to rush in. Spiritual presences were present within our educational systems for most of our nation's history. Many of our major colleges began as theological seminaries.

"What has happened to us as a nation? We have refused to honor God, and thus, we open the doors to hatred and violence. And when something as terrible as Columbine's tragedy occurs -- politicians immediately look for a scapegoat such as the NRA. They immediately seek to pass more restrictive laws that contribute to erode away our personal and private liberties. We do not need more restrictive laws.

"Eric and Dylan would not have been stopped by metal detectors or gun laws. They spent months planning this massacre. The real villain lies within their hearts.

"As my son Craig lay under that table in the library and saw his two friends murdered before his eyes, he did not hesitate to pray in school. I defy any law or politician to deny him that right! I challenge every young person in America, to realize that on April 20, 1999, at Columbine High School, prayer was brought back to our schools. Do not let the many prayers offered by those students be in vain. Dare to move into the new millennium with a sacred disregard for legislation that violates your God-given right to communicate with Him.

"To those of you who would point your finger at the NRA -- I challenge you to examine your own heart before casting the first stone!

"My daughter's death will not be in vain! The young people of this country will not allow that to happen!"

- Darrell Scott

Do what the media did not -- let the nation hear this man's speech. Please send this out to everyone you can.

God Bless

It's good to be king—or at least the man who has to *deny* being one.

In an interview with the leading Hispanic network Univision, President Barack Obama stated, "I think it's important to remind everybody that, what I've said previously, I am not a king. I am head of the executive branch of government. I am required to follow the law, and that is what we've done."

Just last week, a [federal court ruled](#) that Obama unconstitutionally made recess appointments to the National Labor Relations Board and bypassed the Senate.

The Obama administration has also [refused](#) to enforce laws requiring the deportation 800,000 illegal aliens and [stopped defending](#) the Defense of Marriage Act while it remains federal law.

The Obama White House [forced](#) Chrysler's secured creditors to take 30 cents on the dollar, even though they were entitled to "absolute priority," while labor unions who were junior creditors received a larger return, violating bankruptcy law and the Constitution's Takings and Due Process Clauses.

The President's administration fired Inspector General [Gerald Walpin](#) without 30 days' notice, violating the Inspector General Reform Act of 2008, which Obama himself co-sponsored while still a Senator.

This is only the tip of the ice burg. How many unconstitutional things this President has done while in office can YOU tell me about. Seriously, send them to me – "Let me count the ways!!"

God Bless The USA & it's the troops that are protecting us so order the flag of the USA!!!! And display it always and correctly!!

Benghazi Does Make A Difference, Hillary

Posted by Charles Kastriot on Jan. 30, 2013 at 1:36pm

During Hillary Clinton's much delayed appearance before a Congressional committee to answer questions about the jihadist attacks on the eleventh of September last year, she snapped, "Four

Americans are dead. What difference does it make?"

Such a callous disregard for the search for the truth reveals Hillary Clinton's desire to hide any incriminating evidence, which might sink her presidential aspirations in the coming years. Despite the fact that a suspect had no role in killing anyone, it is still a crime for him/her to hide evidence or otherwise obstruct the pursuit of justice. People involved with covering up homicides can and should face punishment for their complicity in concealing those crimes. Did Hillary Clinton not learn this at Yale Law School? Perhaps she believes that she holds an exception to laws concerning obstruction of justice just as her husband claimed the privilege to commit perjury.

Hillary, how about the need to root out nincompoops in the Department of State who deny the Islamic basis for terrorist attacks Americans? The appointment of a "Special Representative to Muslim Communities" indicates the pre-occupation with "outreach" to those who loathe American freedoms. The coddling of Mohamadans with the "2012 hours Against Hate" campaign blinds them to the blatantly hateful and violent basis of Islam. Evidently, they cannot bother to read or listen to the invective, all of which is rooted in the Koran and other Islamic scriptures, spewed by Islamists at American society. Slavish adherence to multiculturalism will never overcome the reality of Islamic malignancy.

When the usefully idiotic bureaucrats rarely do acknowledge any connection between violence by Mohamadans committed against Americans, the blame falls on the Americans. An example of this "blame the victim" mentality occurred when the Egyptian-born Christian man who created a video critical of Mohamad, the inventor of Islam, faced condemnation for the coordinated assaults on American diplomatic personnel and installations on the anniversary of the jihadist attacks of the eleventh of September. After those acts of jihad, the dhimmis in the State Department spent 70,000 dollars on television commercials apologizing to Mohamadans whose turbans or burkas were in a bunch over someone criticizing the criminal who fabricated their totalitarian ideology. The State Department did disavow such linkage a month later yet the slander had already smeared this man for simply expressing his opinions. The incident also painted Americans as sniveling cowards who kowtow to savages' demands to never have their beliefs questioned.

For Hillary to question the need for an inquiry demonstrates her incompetency. The impotent response to the attacks on an American consulate and an American embassy serves as glaring examples of Obama's administration. Those murders of an ambassador and three others in the consulate and ransacking of diplomatic facilities qualify as acts of war by jihadis, both under international law and in common sense. In response, not one of those jihadis has been killed or captured by American forces. No one should expect anything else from members of an administration spouting Orwellian euphemisms such as "man-made disasters" instead of calling acts of jihad what they are: terrorism.

Underscoring the appalling ineptitude is the sale of F-16s to a regime run by Islamists. The Muslim Brotherhood seized power in Egypt last year. Its members have dedicated their lives to imposing their totalitarian ideology on the entire world. Their leader, Mohamad Morsi, has already issued emergency decrees, which have granted him extraordinary levels of control, a favorite tactic of dictators in the past and in the present. Supplying those barbarians with such weaponry reeks of foolishness on par with the owner of a firearms store handing a loaded high-powered rifle to a known criminal with a long history of armed robberies.

Fortunately for American interests, Hillary Clinton will resign from her post this week. Sadly for cause of justice, she will not face any punishment for her negligence. That duty will fall to the voters in the United States should she dare to seek the presidency again. She clearly lacks the competence and courage for that solemn responsibility.

IRS: Cheapest Obamacare Plan Will Be \$20,000 Per Family

Posted by Darla Dawald, National Director on February 1, 2013 at 12:08am in Patriot Action Alerts -- From Our Liberty News Team By Paul Swansen Published: Jan 31, 2013

In 2010 Barack Obama said insurance premiums will decrease by 3,000% so you should get a raise when Obamacare passes. The president also stated, "we can cut the average family's premium by about \$2,500 per year." In 2012, House Minority Leader Nancy Pelosi (D-Calif.) went so far as to say about Obamacare, "everybody will have lower rates." A simple question. Do any of these people have conversations with one another before they spout off with this nonsensical twaddle?

In a final regulation issued Wednesday, the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) assumed that under Obamacare the cheapest health insurance plan available in 2016 for a family will cost \$20,000 for the year.

Under Obamacare, Americans will be required to buy health insurance or pay a penalty to the IRS.

The IRS's assumption that the cheapest plan for family of five will cost \$20,000 per year is found in examples the IRS gives to help people understand how to calculate the penalty they will need to pay the government if they do not buy a mandated health plan.

"The annual national average bronze plan premium for a family of 5 (2 adults, 3 children) is \$20,000," the regulation says.

Bronze will be the lowest tier health-insurance plan available under Obamacare--after Silver, Gold, and Platinum. Under the law, the penalty for not buying health insurance is supposed to be capped at either the annual average Bronze premium, 2.5 percent of taxable income, or \$2,085.00 per family in 2016.

In the new final rules published Wednesday, IRS set in law the rules for implementing the penalty Americans must pay if they fail to obey Obamacare's mandate to buy insurance.

To help illustrate these rules, the IRS presented examples of different situations families might find themselves in.

In the examples, the IRS assumes that families of five who are uninsured would need to pay an average of \$20,000 per year to purchase a Bronze plan in 2016.

Using the conditions laid out in the regulations, the IRS calculates that a family earning \$120,000 per year that did not buy insurance would need to pay a "penalty" (a word the IRS still uses despite the Supreme Court ruling that it is in fact a "tax") of \$2,400 in 2016.

For those wondering how clear the IRS's clarifications of this new "penalty" rule are, here is one of the actual examples the IRS gives:

"Example 3. Family without minimum essential coverage.

"(i) In 2016, Taxpayers H and J are married and file a joint return. H and J have three children: K, age 21, L, age 15, and M, age 10. No member of the family has minimum essential coverage for any month in 2016. H and J's household income is \$120,000. H and J's applicable filing threshold is \$24,000. The annual national average bronze plan premium for a family of 5 (2 adults, 3 children) is \$20,000.

"(ii) For each month in 2016, under paragraphs (b)(2)(ii) and (b)(2)(iii) of this section, the applicable dollar amount is \$2,780 (($\695×3 adults) + ($\$695/2 \times 2$ children)). Under paragraph (b)(2)(i) of this section, the flat dollar amount is \$2,085 (the lesser of \$2,780 and \$2,085 ($\695×3))). Under paragraph (b)(3) of this section, the excess income amount is \$2,400 ($(\$120,000 - \$24,000) \times 0.025$)). Therefore, under paragraph (b)(1) of this section, the monthly penalty amount is \$200 (the greater of \$173.75 (\$2,085/12) or \$200 (\$2,400/12)).

"(iii) The sum of the monthly penalty amounts is \$2,400 (\$200 x 12). The sum of the monthly national average bronze plan premiums is \$20,000 (\$20,000/12 x 12). Therefore, under paragraph (a) of this section, the shared responsibility payment imposed on H and J for 2016 is \$2,400 (the lesser of \$2,400 or \$20,000)."

#NoBudgetNoPay Update: Senate is breaking the law by refusing to provide a budget for past 4 years.

Posted by Darla Dawald, National Director on January 29, 2013 at 3:00pm in Patriot Action Alerts

Tuesday, January 29, 2013 | [View Online](#)

RSC Update: No Budget, No Pay

From the Chairman,

American families and businesses put together a budget each and every year, but for the last four years the Senate has refused to live by those same standards. It's not only irresponsible - it's also illegal. Yet the Senate has simply ignored the law for the last four years. In order to preserve the American Dream for future generations, Washington must stop the budget gimmicks and rein in the out of control spending that is killing

American jobs and placing an unbearable mountain of debt on the backs of our children and grandchildren. It is long-past time that the Senate pass a budget as required by law. It is time to put American families first by moving the federal government towards a budget that balances within the next ten years.

Last week, the House, with the collaboration of the RSC, took the first step in halting Washington's spending addiction by voting for H.R. 325 ("No Budget, No Pay"), which places Members' salaries in escrow after April 15th until they pass a budget. "No Budget, No Pay," will force the Senate to do its job and craft a budget for the first time in four years. Since regaining control of the House of Representatives two years ago, House Republicans have passed a budget each year, but because of the Senate's lack of action, American families have suffered.

"No Budget, No Pay," was the first of many steps to put us on a path to a balanced federal budget within 10 years, but it is certainly not our last step. We must do more. Entitlement spending is out of control, accounting for about 60% of federal outlays, and we will never get our debt crisis under control until we tackle serious entitlement reform. To add insult to injury, the liberals' tax, spend and regulate approach is killing our small businesses and American jobs, further jeopardizing our ability to create economic growth for our country. Washington's old way of operating by spending now and sending the bill to our kids is over, and I am proud of the work we just started to make Washington tighten its belt so we can get our economy back on track and preserve the American Dream for the next generation.

God Bless,
Congressman Steve Scalise
Chairman, Republican Study Committee

Legislative Update No. 3 from Ron Highland, Representative of the 51st District

At last count, two hundred bills have been introduced in the House. All committees are working hard hearing testimonies for and against specific topics or bills. If the committee passes a bill, after their debate, it is then referred to the House as a committee report.

HB2023 was the first bill to come before the whole House. The bill, commonly referred to as the Paycheck Protection Act, passed by a vote of 68 to 56 and is now headed to the Senate for consideration. The bill would ban state or other units of government from making payroll deductions for employees for the purpose of contributing to their union's political action committee (PAC). Currently the state and local governments are bookkeepers for the political activities of public unions by collecting contributions to PACs. I voted yes on the bill.

During my campaign I stressed my belief in smaller government and less intrusion of the government into our lives. I also shared my philosophy of personal responsibility. It was for those reasons I voted yes. The bill does not restrict free speech or individuals from contributing to PACs. What it does do is give the person affected the personal responsibility to donate privately as much as they wish by check, cash, or automatic withdrawal from their personal banking account to the political action committee(s) of their choice.

I am hearing testimonies in the joint House and Senate Education Committees where bills are expected to be introduced beginning next week. The Education Budget Committee will begin evaluating specific budgets for post-secondary schools next week. The Energy and Environment Committee heard testimonies this week packed with detail concerning the drilling, transporting, and marketing of energy in our state. The debate over "global warming" was especially interesting and informative. Committees are discussing other bills, including a "gun owner's rights bill," one changing the process by which judges are appointed which passed in the Senate, and one strengthening the state's human trafficking statutes.

The web site, www.kslegislatiure.org, is available to all. There you are able to view the calendar for each day, the bills under consideration, committee activities and much more. It is an excellent place to learn about the process and to watch it taking place on a daily basis.

I was able to attend the Kansas Farm Bureau Annual Legislative Dinner and a Reception hosted by the Kansas Banker's Association this week. Linda and I visited with old friends and made new friends as well.

If you have concerns, issues or suggestions, please feel free to contact me at Ron.Highland@house.ks.gov or **785-296-7310**. If you know of someone who would like to receive email updates, please let me know, and if you would rather not receive these updates I need to know that as well.

With kind regards,
Ron Highland

NATIONAL SHERIFF'S ASSOCIATION ANNOUNCES THEY WILL NOT SUPPORT UNCONSTITUTIONAL GUN CONTROL LAWS –

Published on Feb 1, 2013, KING 5 News <http://MOXNews.com>

The following is taken in part from the “NATIONAL SHERIFFS’ ASSOCIATION” site at:
<http://www.sheriffs.org/content/office-sheriff>

The sheriff's office in America was much less social, had less judicial influence, and was much more responsive to individuals than the English Sheriff. The duties of the early American Sheriff were similar in many ways to its English forerunner, centering on court related duties such as security and warrants, **protection of citizens**, maintaining the jail, and collecting taxes. As the nation expanded westward, the Office of Sheriff continued to be a significant part of law enforcement. The elected sheriff is part of America's democratic fabric. In 1776 Pennsylvania and New Jersey adopted the Office of Sheriff in their Constitution. The Ohio Constitution called for the election of the county sheriff in 1802, and then state-by-state, the democratic election of sheriff became not only a tradition, but in most states a constitutional requirement. In the United States today, of the 3083 sheriffs, **approximately 98 percent are elected by the citizens of their counties or parishes**. Our Sheriffs are our last defenders against anyone and everyone, including our own Federal Government. Sheriffs do NOT have to enforce unconstitutional laws put in place by those who want nothing more than to **control all American citizens**. For the National Sheriff's Association to announce they will NOT support unconstitutional gun control laws is HUGE for the American Citizen!! Thank YOU, GOD!!!

THE PATH TO SAVING THE REPUBLIC: JUST SAY ‘NO’

from American Thinker by Michael Finch on January 31, 2013

Our nation is in crisis. The Obama administration is centralizing power at a level unmatched in American history with grave consequences for our future liberty and freedom. Of that there is not much debate among conservatives. Conservatives, however, are always waiting for the next Ronald Reagan, wondering if Marco Rubio, Paul Ryan or someone will win in 2016 and save the country from Obama. This is a fool's errand. Rubio and Ryan are fine men, good leaders and very important for our cause. But they can't save our Republic. There is no "one" and we need to stop looking to the next federal election to solve our problems.

So, is there a way to restore the Republic? There is good news; the first salvos have already been fired in the battle to save America. And no, they weren't fired from anywhere in Washington D.C., from members of Congress or from Republican Party headquarters.

The shots being fired, the first movements in a war to save our republican form of government are coming from the most unheralded of places. What is happening in Topeka, Austin, Ogden, Billings, Richmond and many other locales is just the beginning of a movement that will sweep this nation in the next four years. The people, in the form of their respective States and their State legislatures, are learning and relearning the lessons that Jefferson and Madison taught us over 200 years ago.

The lesson resides in one word: Just say "No."

When the Democratic Governor of Montana claims that any Federal government ban on the right to bear arms will not take hold in his State or when the Republican Governor of Texas says that there are sections of the Obamacare law that will not hit the ground in his State, they are not espousing a new, radical and revolutionary theory of American self-governance. They are speaking from an over 200 year history that traces its roots back to the Founding of our great nation and codified by the pens of none other than Thomas Jefferson and James Madison. They are the kernels of the coming restoration of America.

The Kentucky and Virginia Resolutions of 1798 were a protest against the Alien and Sedition Acts. It is hard to find a scholar alive that will find those Acts Constitutional. In these resolutions, the authors, Thomas Jefferson and James Madison, argued that "the states" have the right to interpret the Constitution and can declare federal laws unconstitutional when the federal government exceeds its delegated powers. Thus, we have the theories of nullification and interposition. Of this, there is little historical debate, but the rest has been left to

the time of history, to Court challenges, the Civil War, and varying interpretations of what was meant, what was the impact and relevance of these theories espoused in 1798.

The obstacles come not just from the Left on this issue. The vast majority of constitutional scholars, on the left and right, are dead set opposed to the theory of nullification. The scholars say that not only is the theory wrong, dead and long since decided, but even a discussion of the theory is verboten. Raise the issue and you are guaranteed of one thing: you will be called some version of a "pro-slavery, neo-confederate, Jim [Crow](#) loving racist." And that is if they are feeling charitable. The bottom line for legal scholars is that the debate over nullification ended in 1865.

The Civil War settled one thing for certain; that the attempt on the part of Southern States to secede from the rest of the United States failed. Everything that flowed from that, the freeing of the slaves, reconstruction and the future of the South, the centralization of power in the Federal Government etc., were consequences of the war. Why is that important in this debate? Because the theory of nullification, the discussion of the theory, the ideas of Jefferson and Madison, again, did not die at Appomattox, Virginia in 1865. If you are going to be honest, the theory of secession didn't die in 1865 either, just the attempt at it did. Remember, secession was never put on trial to be decided in a constitutional court.

Further, to answer the critics, the theory of nullification was not created or used in defense of slavery; in fact it had been used by the anti-slavery cause. The great Nullification debate of 1832 in South Carolina was over the issue of tariffs. The most well-known Supreme Court case on the issue of nullification was Ableman v. Booth, the Wisconsin case that was notable for the State of Wisconsin's resistance to the decision made in Dred Scott, the pro-slavery Supreme Court case of 1857. We are not arguing the legitimacy here, the Carolinians certainly seemed to overstep in saying that the passage of a tariff act violates the Constitution. But it is critical to restate this, nullification was not about slavery.

Granted, the legal arguments against nullification are long; the Supreme Court has repeatedly come down against the theory in numerous cases. Kentucky and Virginia were alone in their resolutions, no other States have ever signed up so explicitly as those two. Recent history, scholars, politicians and parties are all stacked against this theory.

But our history has often been moved by the people, not solely by scholars, political parties and their leaders. The purpose here is to simply open the debate. If one feels that our nation is facing a critical crossroads, that our very liberty is threatened and under attack, then don't we owe ourselves to look at ideas from our Founders?

The historical interpretation of the American Founding has gone down two tracks. The Left, of course, couldn't care less about the Founders; the Constitution is a dead letter that needs to be scrapped and made anew. This new "living" Constitution gives us one assurance; that we are being led down a path of tyranny and oppression. The American experiment is over.

But from the Right, when we speak of the Constitution and the Founding, we trap ourselves in a box. We won't allow discussion of the theories behind the Constitution, we no longer listen to the fears that many had in the enacting of our Constitution and therefore the safeguards that were put in place. Lost in history are other theories, such as those espoused in the Kentucky and Virginia resolutions that may offer a way to fight the growing federal unconstitutional tyranny that is taking shape.

It is ironic, but we, and rightly so, call out the Left for its manner of shutting out debate through name calling. You raise an issue and you are a bigot, racist, homophobe, Islamophobe, you name it. But the Right, in discussing this issue does the same, hence the ridiculous "neo-confederate" charge over the issue of nullification. With all due respect to the great legal scholars on the right today, I won't turn a deaf ear to the words and writings of Jefferson and Madison. Not under our present conditions.

Consider this hypothetical: what if five years from now, we are in either a third term of Obama (don't discount it) or the first term of say, Hillary. Scalia and Thomas are long gone from the Court; we are dealing with seven Sotomayors against two of our holdouts. A case comes before the Court on the 2nd Amendment. The Court decides that [the Amendment](#) pertains, not to an individual right, but only to state regulated militias, and not

even states in our federal sense, but the State, the national government. What do we do?

The law is clearly unconstitutional, no matter what the Court says. Do we have a redress? Do we take the streets and revolt? Maybe eventually, but our founding fathers gave us another way. It is not the clearest way, not every Founder believed in it, the history is sketchy. Scholars are lined against it. But there can be no doubt what Thomas Jefferson and James Madison meant when they penned the Kentucky and Virginia Resolutions. The States, therein the people, can, and must, say one word to the Federal government in this, and other, unconstitutional instances: **No.**

Michael Finch is the Chief Operating Officer at the David Horowitz Freedom Center.

Sandy Hook: “This Must End NOW” Disability Policy & Mental Health Reform Now By VOR, An Adversary Group Speaking Out For People With Intellectual & Developmental Disabilities Taken from Manhattan Free Press, Vol. 21 Number 26, Thur., Dec. 20, 2013

VOR joins the chorus of heartfelt sympathy expressed for the families and friends of the victims of the Sandy Hook tragedy.

With so much “politics” (you name the issue) dividing our country, VOR prays that this tragedy finally unites parents, families, advocates, professionals, organizations, and policymakers in a way never before experienced.

There can be no real justice for the senseless killings in Connecticut and elsewhere, but uniting as a nation will get as close to healing as possible and will help prevent such senseless tragedy in the future.

As the President stated “We can’t tolerate this any more,” he added. “These tragedies must end, and to end them, we must change. We will be told that the causes of such violence are complex, and it is true. No single law, no set of laws can eliminate evil from the world or prevent every senseless act of violence in our society. But that can’t be an excuse for inaction. Surely we can do better than this.”

VOR agrees and central to necessary change is disability policy and mental health reform. Too many people, who need help have nowhere to go, are turned away, are displaced from specialized care, or are not adequately treated and monitored. Patient’s rights have trumped almost completely safety “to self and others – in the name of “deinstitutionalization” and “integration”. As stated by the Treatment Advocacy Center (TAC) (Dec. 14, 2012): “Our mental health system has completely failed individuals with severe mental illness and their communities,” said Doris A. Fuller, [TAC] executive director. “We have emptied the nation’s hospitals, gutted state and local mental health programs, and turned involuntary treatment into a debate point instead of using it as a viable option to prevent tragedy involving those too ill to help themselves.”

The Washington Post (Dec. 17, 2012), also quoting TAC added – “treating the rest in the least-restrictive settings possible, the thinking went [in 1963], we would protect the civil liberties of the mentally ill and hasten their recoveries... But in the decades since, the sickest patients have begun turning up in jails and homeless shelters with a frequency that mirrors that of the late 1800s. “Were protecting civil liberties at the expense of health and safety.” Says Doris A. Fuller, the executive director of the Treatment Advocacy Center, a nonprofit group that lobbies for broader involuntary commitment standards.

“Deinstitutionalization has gone way too far.” (emphasis added).

A mother of a young man with serious mental illness agreed, writing this in her blog: “With state-run treatment centers and hospitals shuttered, prison is now the last resort for the mentally ill.” Rikers Island, the LA County Jail, and Cook County Jail in Illinois housed the nation’s largest treatment centers in 2011.

“We can’t tolerate this anymore.”

For 30 years, VOR has been calling on Congress to support specialized treatment options for people with profound intellectual and developmental disabilities.

Decades of deinstitutionalization has resulted in the depletion of an adequate safety net for people who need our help.

Tragedies will continue to befall people with I/DD, children, adults, and citizens if our laws and policies continue to support deinstitutionalization, depriving people with disabilities of needed specialized, residential care and treatment.

This concern is a real and present one. Just last month (Nov. 2012), the National Council on Disability, an independent federal agency, released a 300-page policy document and toolkit recklessly calling for the closure of all specialized homes of four or more residents for people with disabilities. For several years, the U.S. Department of Justice's Civil Rights Division has pursued more than 30 legal actions which at their core aim to displace individuals from specialize care options. In 2010, the Justice Department and the State of Georgia entered a federal settlement agreement which will displace 9,000 people with mental illness from psychiatric facilities by 2015, and nearly 1,000 people with I/DD by 2015.

VOR urges the President to use "whatever power this office holds," to address senseless tragedies with meaningful disability policy and mental health reform and re-think the purported virtues of "deinstitutionalization," beginning with the actions of his own federal agencies.

"This must end."

VOR is a national organization that advocates for high quality care and human rights for people with intellectual and developmental disabilities.

Once upon a time Kansas was home to one of the best Mental Hospital and Treatment Centers in the Country and perhaps the world. Since it closed/moved away, Kansas (and obviously the rest of the country) has been very negligent in the treatment of those with intellectual and developmental disabilities.

Obviously, the need is still present in our society. We have the "Special Needs" teaching in our schools, but not providing for this segment of society beyond school age is, basically, akin to not having Cancer Centers or Dental Treatment for citizens after school age. In the last few years it has become an increasing problem within our Military and, now we are realizing, in American society in general. Another problem to work on – there seems to be no end to the problems, but that doesn't make any one of them unsolvable. With GOD's help we can solve this problem along with the many others. Join together, Americans, we *can* do it!!

DO THEY HAVE THE RIGHT TO ENDANGER EVERYONE ON THE ROAD?

WHO DO THEY THINK THEY ARE?

FYI,

Another example of the 'above the law' attitude of the Federal government.

JDA

+++++++++

<http://www.foxnews.com/politics/2013/02/02/postal-service-says-its-immune-from-local-traffic-laws-report-says/>

A government lawyer is attempting to get dismissed almost \$700 in traffic tickets given to U.S. Postal Service employees in Cleveland, claiming it is immune from state and local regulations, Yahoo! News reported.

Postal Service attorney Jennifer S. Breslin says the infractions, which include speeding citations and red-light infractions, should be ignored.

"In providing mail service across the country, the Postal Service attempts to work within local and state laws and regulations, when feasible," she said in a letter responding to a summons for payment, according to Cleveland.com.

"However, as you are probably aware, the Postal Service enjoys federal immunity from state and local regulation," Breslin wrote.

The attorney for American Traffic Solutions, the company that enforces East Cleveland's camera citations, referenced the Postal Service's own safety manual, which says truck drivers should and have been held accountable, Yahoo! News reported.

"By attempting to hide behind an immunity claim, you are aiding and abetting your drivers in their blatant disregard for the traffic laws in East Cleveland, which have endangered other drivers, pedestrians and school children," ATS attorney George Hittner said in a response to Breslin.

East Cleveland Mayor Gary Norton told Cleveland.com he questions why the Postal Service did not decide to make their drivers pay for the infraction.

The mayor said he is unsure about the validity of the agency's immunity claims.

"I was unaware that the post office doesn't have to stop at red lights or obey the speed limit," he told Cleveland.com. "But since they are, I wish I'd get my mail faster."

How ridiculous!! Most business' require the offending driver to pay the fine and it is "on him/her" just as if they were driving their private vehicle. Why should it be any different for postal workers? It just goes on and on – there is no end!

Gun control: Katie, bar the door!

Not enough Democrats in Congress will vote to help the Dear Leader nullify the 2d Amendment. So watch for the Obama Administration to push for the U.S. Senate to ratify the U.N. Small Arms Treaty. Ratified treaties trump our Constitution and would allow the U.N. to decide who, if anyone, in this country can "keep and bear arms."

For convenience of reference, we can call the Dear Leader's coalition of gun-grabbers the National Association of Intensely Vociiferous Endeavors (NAIVE). The problem with NAIVE is that they think the 2d Amendment has something to do with killing deer. Wrong.

Back in 1791, when the Bill of Rights was adopted, virtually every family had firearms to put meat on the table. There were no gun-grabbers like NAIVE. So, the actual purpose of the 2d Amendment was to guard against the advent of another tyrannical government like the recently-expelled British, to enable the citizens and local militia to repel attacks by hostile natives, and to protect against infringements of the 3d Amendment which says: "No Soldier shall, in time of peace be quartered in any house, without the consent of the Owner, nor in time of war, but in a manner to be prescribed by law."

You see, prior to the American Revolution, the colonists were required by Great Britain to provide room and board for the King's soldiers. Suffice it say to that "couth" was unknown to the common British soldier. The colonists took exception to the loutish British military swilling down their food and drink at the family dinner table. They took exception to the soldiers' attempts to rape their wives and daughters. They took exception to the soldiers slaughtering their cattle, taking the milk from their cows, and grilling their chickens. Picky, those colonists.

The King's rationale was that he was providing protection to the colonists from the French and from the Indians. Therefore, the colonists should be grateful. But the colonists already had firearms for home defense. Via their local militia organizations, the colonists could defend themselves from Indian attacks. As for the French, the colonists weren't worried about them. Also, the French had much better table manners

Today, NAIVE puts forth the specious argument that only one or two bullets are needed to kill a deer. True. But if your home is attacked by some madman, or a violent gang, or a government gone hog-wild, you will need lots of bullets to defend your family. Without firearms for home defense, about all you can say is: "Katie, bar the door!"

©2013. William Hamilton.

I hadn't considered having to defend ourselves from the U.N. forces, but if that is what it takes, then that is what it takes!! We must defend ourselves from whoever it takes – what stance will our own US Armed take? Will our soldiers fire on or defend the United States Citizens?

Most of us realize and understand that the "election" of last November 6, 2012 voted Barack H. Obama into his second term as President of the United States of America by extreme fraud – illegal voting or fraudulent counting of the votes. The following article would be a way to be sure this never happens again. Think about it ---let me know what you think!!

Dear Conservative,

Would you like to end voter fraud forever? Would you like to end the era of major cities dominating elections?

[I know how to do it. But I need your help.](#)

Here's the problem conservatives face: **Republicans are at a structural disadvantage within the Electoral College.** Democrats start out with California and New York in their column, and 220 electoral votes in the bag every single election.

The path to reaching 270 electoral votes is very simple for Democrats. By contrast, after two billion dollars spent on the GOP side, we still only won 206.

That's the road to being a permanent minority party.

Republicans can fix this by switching to "Winner take all by Congressional district." For example, in Virginia alone, Romney would have split Virginia's congressional districts with Obama. 7-4.

This would in no way dismantle the Electoral College. This is not a call for direct democracy. It's totally Constitutional. This is Federalism at its best. It ends voter fraud, preserves the Electoral College, and empowers the states. In fact, Maine and Nebraska already do this.

You see, State Legislatures have been given the power by Article Two, Section One of the Constitution to award their electors in the manner in which they see fit. James Madison said states should award their Electors in a way that derive the most benefit for their states.

For America's first 150 years, states awarded electors in various ways; winner take all for the whole state, winner take all by Congressional District, Proportionally, sometimes, even the Legislatures themselves would just decide who would get their Electoral votes.

It wasn't until the early 20th century that Progressives popularized the "Winner Take All" rule that we have

in most states today. In other words, if you win the popular vote in a state, you get all the Electors in that state. Conservatives have been paying the price ever since.

Michigan, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Virginia, and Wisconsin alone would have shifted around 65-70 electoral votes into Romney's column depending on how you look at the map. And that doesn't even account for Florida.

Let me put it another way: If those states had operated this way, Mitt Romney would have won the Election.

These states have GOP Governors and legislators. They could do it today if they wanted. [We can get it done right now, with your help.](#)

What the current system has given us is ten "Battleground States" deciding the election every year.

This has lead to a Federal Government empowered to trample on the rights of citizens in non-battleground states without political consequence, while they buy off the voters in the Battleground States.

Here are some examples of what I'm talking about:

The pro-free-trade George W. Bush was trying to win West Virginia in 2000 when it was a Battleground. And yet he came out for steel tariffs that helped WV. This ran contra to everything else he said on trade, but he did it anyway. Why? Because he wanted to win that Battleground state.

Fast forward to this last term. West Virginia was no longer a battleground, and Barack Obama's EPA closed the largest coal plant in the state. Why did he do that? Because he was never going to win WV anyway. It did not matter to him what people in West Virginia thought.

The Gulf oil spill happened. Obama didn't go visit Louisiana for the first 32 days. On Day 36, oil started lapping up on the shores of Florida, and suddenly, Obama was down there visiting Florida. Why? Because Florida mattered electorally to Obama and Louisiana didn't.

Imagine how much differently our politicians would behave if the voters in all 50 states could hold them accountable.

Now, back to voter fraud...

There is so much pressure to win the statewide popular vote. There is huge incentive to steal votes in major cities. "Winner take all by Congressional district" would effectively end that.

"You want to win Philly by a million votes? Great, knock yourself out. But you're still only getting two Congressional Districts out of it."

There would be zero incentive from a Presidential election standpoint to steal votes any longer!

It would no longer matter how many votes the Democrats racked up in major cities.

Romney won the election everywhere but in the major cities. The fact is, the divide between urban and rural America has never been larger than it is right now. People in rural America have different priorities, hopes, and criteria for what they are looking for in a candidate. But urban America is picking the president for them. In Oregon, you can win every party of the state but lose Portland and you still lose the election.

Here's why this is so urgent today...

Michigan, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Virginia and Wisconsin all have Republican Governors and control of the Legislature right now. That will likely never happen again in our lifetime. The Virginia Legislature is considering this measure this week.

We are going to flood the Virginia Legislature with calls and letters in support of this bill, [and let these Legislators know that this bill has our support.](#)

We have a historic opportunity right now to put another 65-70 electoral votes into the GOP column and hold our leaders accountable.

This is great politics, it's great policy, and we don't need a single Democrat vote to get it done.

[But you and I must act now!](#)

We are also going to barnstorm through these states and put together full scale lobbying efforts.

Please join me today.

Ken Blackwell
Chairman, Tea Party Victory Fund