

The Patriots' Truth

Flint Hills Party News

We will be postponing our monthly meeting on the 2nd Saturday of the month for the winter!! Weekly meetings will be held at McAlister's, 5:30-10pm, Wed. evenings. They are come and go, at your convenience. Bring your concerns for discussion. Your concerns are important – they are why we exist. In this publication what is in green is me, other colors are just for getting attention. Changes in font are for letting readers know it is a change of subject or person speaking. I would like to include your opinion/concerns. We must continue working, paying attention, & most of all PRAYING!! With the help of the LORD we will prevail!! The USA is too important to the world for us, yes us, to let it be destroyed – Take a deep breath, PRAY, Forge ahead, we will succeed!!! I truly believe GOD is with us. With GOD's help we won't fail. Be informed, work for the good of the USA.

Let's Start with a wakeup call from **DR. MILTON WOLF!!**



Friends, Kansans, countrymen;

I'm sure you are as disappointed as I am to learn that our own Senator Jerry Moran caved in to Democrats' pressure and became one of only three Republicans to advocate that the nomination of Barack Obama's pro-abortion, anti-Second Amendment pick for the Supreme Court "ought to go forward."

I'm also sure, after already witnessing Jerry Moran cave in to Democrats on debt ceiling hikes, spending binges and the largest tax hike in American history, that you are no more surprised than I am.

As Congressman Mike Pompeo said: He should reconsider. It's not often that a congressman [publicly rebukes](#) a senator in his own state and in his own party, but Jerry Moran deserved it.

There's a reason Kansans For Life has said Jerry Moran "[stood with Planned Parenthood](#)" and "[has a very disturbing record](#)" and there's a reason the former Kansas State Rifle Association president called Jerry Moran a "[traitor](#)."

Kansans deserve better.

For Liberty,
Milton Wolf

P.S. Below is an article I wrote for the [Conservative Review](#) about Jerry Moran. He's playing a dangerous game with the Supreme Court. Let's remind him that his job is to represent Kansas, not Washington.

What's the matter with Jerry Moran?

By Milton Wolf

The cowardice of Senator Jerry Moran is legendary in Kansas. Former state legislature colleagues tell stories of Moran avoiding tough votes by literally hiding in the state capitol building little boys' room. Former U.S. House Speaker Dennis Hastert singled out Moran in his book describing how Jerry "[ran and hid](#)" when he got scared. His [former campaign manager](#) says Moran "represents a weathervane in the US Senate, not the good people of Kansas." It's no wonder that Jerry is the butt of jokes even among his [closest allies](#).

Jerry Moran is a coward.

Last week, under the enormous, unbearable pressure of a handful of Western Kansas Democrats, Jerry Moran caved and became the third Republican to join Democrats in support of advancing President Obama's Supreme Court nominee: "[I think the process ought to go forward](#)."

Liberals salivate at the prospect of replacing the late Antonin Scalia with someone in the image of Barack Obama. The president's nominee, Merrick Garland, is pro-abortion and anti-Second Amendment. The [New York Times drools](#): "A Supreme Court with Merrick Garland would be the most liberal in decades."

And Jerry Moran says the nomination ought to go forward!

Americans came to know Jerry Moran in 2014 when he, as head of the NRSC, diverted Republicans' donations in efforts to defeat conservative Republicans in Kansas and Mississippi, even allying with liberals promoting a Democrat get-out-the-vote effort. And now Jerry Moran is joining the Democrats on a matter no less critical than the swing vote on the United States Supreme Court.

It's not by accident that Kansans For Life has said Jerry Moran "[stood with Planned Parenthood](#)" and "[has a very disturbing record](#)" and that the former Kansas State Rifle Association president called Jerry Moran a "[traitor](#)."

What's the matter with Jerry Moran?!

Kansas is a red-redder-reddest state, yet Jerry Moran is willing to risk the United States Supreme Court rather than stand up to the few remaining Democrats. It's alarming that Moran, a lawyer who's been in Washington now for decades, so profoundly misunderstands his job to believe it is -- and I quote -- his "duty" to advance Barack Obama's nominee.

The Senate Republicans overall deserve credit -- so far anyway -- for vowing to stop Obama from remaking the Court, but they've launched a horribly misguided execution. Under the auspices that Obama is a lame-duck and voters should have their say, the nomination process should be delayed until a new president is sworn in. Let's count the ways this is misguided and will surely backfire:

1. There's no constitutional basis for claiming that a president lacks the authority to be president in his last year.
2. Like it or not, the voters already did have their say in 2012 when they chose Obama, just as they had their say in 2014 when they gave Republicans the Senate in order to stop him.
3. Some Republicans are [just as hypocritical as Democrats](#), just trading places of who's for and who's against lame-duck appointments. And in the future, they'll surely flip-flop right back again. (This is why Americans hate politicians.)
4. If the next president, Republican or Democrats, nominates someone just as liberal as Merrick Garland, the Senate Republicans will have, in effect, already endorsed him and they will be politically powerless to stop any nominee, no matter how horrible.

There was -- and still is -- a much better approach: Make the Constitution, not politics, the center of this conversation.

Article II Section II establishes the "Advice and Consent" power of the Senate. As [I suggested on day one](#), Senate Republicans should advise the president to nominate someone who has demonstrated strict fidelity to the Constitution and warn the president that failing to do so will result in a tireless fight against the nomination at every step in the process. This, in fact, is the sworn duty of each Senator.

In the current case, Obama's nominee rejects the Second Amendment and therefore senators are duty-bound to deny their consent. There is no constitutional, legal or moral obligation for senators to waste time with hearings if, as in the case of Garland, it's already established that the nominee is not faithful to the Constitution.

The Obama's lame-duck status is inconsequential. To paraphrase: It's the Constitution, stupid. This same principled approach should apply to every nominee whether the president is a Democrat or a Republican. No need for political hypocrisy. No need for ridiculous Washington politics. Instead simply demonstrate an unwavering commitment to our Constitution.

When the protesters scream "Do your job!", the response is then obvious: I did do my job. I advised the president to nominate a constitutionalist and he refused so this nominee will not receive my consent. Period. I will not waste the Senate's or America's time on hearings to discover what we already know. End of story.

As for Jerry Moran, the backlash from betrayed Republicans has sent him into a tizzy. Poor Jerry can't decide whom he fears more, the #NoHearingsNoVotes crowd or the #DoYourJob crowd.

After two decades in Washington, Jerry Moran is still scared of his own shadow. How else can you explain this Clintonesque DC double talk: "[I am opposed to President Obama's Supreme Court nominee](#)," and so, "[I think the \[nomination\] process ought to go forward](#)."

When the United States Supreme Court hangs in the balance, Republicans cannot count on Jerry Moran.

When the Supreme Court hangs in the balance, Republicans cannot count on a coward.

The cowardice of Senator Jerry Moran is legendary in Kansas. Former state legislature colleagues tell stories of Moran avoiding tough votes by literally hiding in the state capitol building little boys' room. Former U.S. House Speaker Dennis Hastert singled out Moran in his book describing how Jerry "[ran and hid](#)" when he got scared. His [former campaign manager](#) says Moran "represents a weathervane in the US Senate, not the good people of

Kansas." It's no wonder that Jerry is the butt of jokes even among his [closest allies](#).

Then I receive, just a very few days later, from our good friend, John D'Alola"

FYI,

My goodness, could it be that he found himself on the wrong end of a flamethrower triggered by the grass-roots?

JDA

+++++

<http://www.wibw.com/content/news/Moran-backtracks-on-SCOTUS-nominee-hearings-says-Garland-isnt-qualified-374335371.html>

WASHINGTON (AP) -- Kansas Republican Sen. Jerry Moran is backtracking on his willingness to hold a hearing and vote on President Barack Obama's Supreme Court nominee, reversing course after infuriating conservatives.

Falling in line with GOP leadership, Moran's office issued a statement Friday saying the senator has examined Judge Merrick Garland's record and doesn't need hearings to conclude that the nominee's judicial philosophy makes "Garland unacceptable to serve on the Supreme Court." (Read full statement below)

The senator relayed his views to Sen. Chuck Grassley, R-Iowa, chairman of the Judiciary Committee. Grassley welcomed Moran's change of heart, saying "I'm confident that he's committed to ensuring the American people have an opportunity to make their voices heard during this pivotal election, and that the Senate should consider the nominee submitted by the next president,"

Just last week, Moran called for a hearing and showed openness to a vote.

"I would rather have you (constituents) complaining to me that I voted wrong on nominating somebody than saying I'm not doing my job," he told a small gathering of constituents in Cimarron, Kansas, according to The Garden City Telegram.

Moran has maintained that it was extremely unlikely he'd back the nominee and expressed doubt that Senate Majority Leader Mitch McConnell, R-Ky., would let the Senate process proceed.

The senator's retreat on holding a hearing comes as Democrats and the White House are looking for cracks in the Republican firewall, led by McConnell, against hearings or votes on Garland, Obama's choice to succeed the conservative Justice Antonin Scalia, who died in February.

Moran's reversal leaves just two of 54 Republican senators — Illinois' Mark Kirk and Maine's Susan Collins — open to hearings and a vote. The Kansan faced a backlash from tea partyers and conservative groups for his initial stance.

Carrie Severino of the Judicial Crisis Network, a fierce opponent of Obama's move to fill the vacancy, welcomed Moran's switch, saying the senator "seems to have reviewed his record, listened to his constituents, and responded just as one would hope a conservative senator would respond."

Democrats claim they have gained momentum and turned the heat up on Republicans during the past two weeks of Senate recess. Opinion polls suggest the public supports hearings on Garland's nomination and senators such as Grassley have been confronted on the topic by constituents.

"We are making steady but significant progress," said Sen. Charles Schumer, D-N.Y., on a media call organized by liberal activists. "Hopefully Judge Garland will turn into Justice Garland in the coming months."

Republican senators insist they will hold no hearings or a confirmation vote on the nomination in a presidential election year, and the next president should get to choose the next justice. Some GOP lawmakers have expressed a willingness at least to meet Garland. Kirk met Garland this past week, while two more GOP senators will next week, Collins and John Boozman of Arkansas. Ohio Sen. Rob Portman said Friday he is talking to the White House to arrange a meeting with the nominee.

Obama insists the Senate has a constitutional responsibility and plenty of time to consider Garland, and heads to a law school next week to push the nomination.

Obama adviser Brian Deese said Friday that Obama will return Thursday to the University of Chicago Law School to argue for Senate consideration of the appeals judge's nomination. Obama taught constitutional law at the university for several years before he entered politics. It's also the political backyard of Kirk, who is in a competitive re-election race.

Garland has mostly met Democratic senators on Capitol Hill and has a full roster of them lined up next week. Schumer noted that pro-Republican groups have been running ads criticizing Garland as a liberal.

"If they want to debate his record or qualifications to be a justice, that's great," Schumer said. "Let's do it in a hearing."

Here is the full statement from a senior Moran aide:

As Senator Moran has said, he is opposed to President Obama's Supreme Court nominee. He has examined Judge Garland's record and didn't need hearings to conclude that the nominee's judicial philosophy, disregard for Second Amendment Rights and sympathy for federal government bureaucracy make Garland unacceptable to serve on the Supreme Court. Senator Moran remains committed to preventing this president from putting another justice on the highest court in the land.

Putting your phone away & Paying Attention to those Talking to you? There's an App for that it's called "RESPECT". --- Incredible

I know this, or at least part of it, if an old story. I was NOT aware that our Federal Government "provided tens of thousands of taxpayer dollars in legal support". Why has our Congress allowed this to happen? This type of happening is only part of what Congressional members such as Speaker John Boehner and Senate Leader Harry Reid & their followers allowed Obama to STEAL, YES, STEAL, from the American people. Read & understand what the Democrats were doing to American citizens. Just a refresher.

OBAMA ENFORCING SHARIA LAW IN U.S.

After Muslim Truckers Refuse to Deliver Beer ... Obama Does the Unbelievable By: Bill Callen - Oct 27, 2015
Barack Obama just sided with Muslims to enforce Islamic Sharia Law on an American business, leaving many outraged and two Fox News anchors absolutely stunned.

Two Muslim truck drivers — former Somali "refugees" — refused to make deliveries of beer to stores for their employer. So they were understandably fired. They claimed it was a violation of their religious beliefs — even though Islam bars only the consumption of alcohol. And, as the employer pointed out, the workers knew they would have to deliver alcohol before they took the job.

So guess what Barack Obama did.

He SUED the employers on behalf of the pair, Mahad Abass Mohamed and Abdkiarim Hassan Bulshale, claiming religious discrimination.

Obama's Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) represented them in the case, providing tens of thousands of taxpayer dollars in legal support, judicial filings and court appearances against the employer who was hopelessly outgunned by the Federal government.

And this week the Muslims were awarded a stunning \$240,000 by a jury, presided over by an Obama appointee who stunned analysts by allowing the case to go forward at all.

Listen to Megyn Kelly and Andrew Napolitano:

Fox News hosts Megyn Kelly and Andrew Napolitano were flabbergast

https://www.youtube.com/watch?feature=player_embedded&v=I3q61Y85oCw

"The Obama administration actually represented the two Muslims in this case. But has sometimes taken a very different position in the case of Christians trying to assert their religious beliefs."

She then said to Fox News senior judicial analyst Andrew Napolitano: "So in the case of the Muslim truck drivers, the Obama administration through the EEOC is all in.

"This is what they said: 'We are proud to support the rights of workers to equal treatment in the workplace without having to sacrifice their religious beliefs or practices; it's fundamental to the American principles of religious freedom and tolerance.'

"But when it comes to the Christian bakers, it's not as fundamental."

Napolitano was equally perplexed: "That's correct. It's unfortunate when the government interferes in a private dispute over religious views, and takes sides, and chooses one religion over another." To their point, the Christian owners of "Melissa's Sweet Cakes" were fined \$135,000 by the state of Oregon for refusing to bake a wedding cake for a lesbian couple. And Kentucky clerk Kim Davis was jailed for refusing to issue same-sex marriage licenses.

Napolitano offered an explanation for the administration's interest in the Muslim truck driver case:

"The way the feds intervened ... they wanted this case because they wanted to make the point that they've now

made.”

The U.S. Government and the courts can't legally have one set of laws for Christians and another set of laws for Muslims and other religious groups. But now they do. Obama's actions and this court's ruling throws into relief that not all Americans are legally recognized as possessing religious liberty and freedom of conscience.

As George Orwell might put it, Obama has now established that Muslims are more equal than Christians in America.

SHARE this if you are outraged by Obama's push to enforce Sharia Law in America...

We need stricter background checks for American gun owners – OK

We need stricter background checks for Syrian Refugees – VETO

Is Anyone Paying Attention?

Along this line we need stricter background checks for Presidential & Congressional positions (Applications).

> **A FLORIDA COURT SETS ATHEIST HOLY DAY**

In Florida, an atheist created a case against Easter and Passover Holy days. He hired an attorney to bring a discrimination case against Christians and Jews and observances of their holy days.

The argument was that it was unfair that atheists had no such recognized days. The case was brought before a judge. After listening to the passionate presentation by the lawyer, the judge banged his gavel declaring, "Case dismissed!"

The lawyer immediately stood and objecting to the ruling saying, "Your honor, How can you possibly dismiss this case? The Christians have Christmas, Easter and others. The Jews have Passover, Yom Kippur and Hanukkah, yet my client and all other atheists have no such holidays..."

The judge leaned forward in his chair saying, "But you do. Your client, counselor, is woefully ignorant."

The lawyer said, "Your Honor, we are unaware of any special observance or holiday for atheists."

The judge said, "The calendar says April 1st is April Fool's Day. Psalm 14:1 states, 'The fool says in his heart, there is no God.'

Thus, it is the opinion of this court, that, if your client says there is no God, then he is a fool. Therefore, April 1st is his day.

Court is adjourned..."

You gotta love a Judge that knows his scripture!

I received this from a friend – I won't guarantee this actually happened – it is a comforting thought that there is a Judge in Florida that is this acknowledgeable about Scripture, but there are no guarantees. THINK POSITIVE!!! Be with us, LORD, and make this true!!!

Trying to describe a liberal is like trying to convince someone that you can hand pick dog poop from...the CLEAN end!

Would any one of you expect anything less of a woman who has stated she hates America????????????? As my wife says Michele Obama sees herself as an African not an American since America is so evil.

Subject: Gotta love the First Lady

Michelle Obama reminded attendees of a Naturalization Ceremony Wednesday that the Founding Fathers weren't born in America. The ceremony for 50 new U.S. citizens was held at the National Archives in Washington, D.C.

She said during her speech, referring to the Declaration of Independence, "It's amazing that just a few feet from here where I'm standing are the signatures of the 56 Founders who put their names on a Declaration that changed the course of history, and like the 50 of you, none of them were born American - they became American."

Excuse me? Did she actually mean that those who signed the Declaration of Independence and participated in the drafting of the Constitution were not born in America?

Benjamin Franklin was born in Pennsylvania.

Thomas Jefferson, George Washington, and James Madison were born in Virginia.

John Adams was born in Massachusetts.

Only eight of the 56 were not born in America. Surely she knew this.

But, then again, maybe not. After all, she is a Harvard graduate. Isn't she?

As John Wayne said "Life's tough. It's tougher when you're stupid."

And by the way, THE CONSTITUTION WAS NOT SIGNED IN WASHINGTON D.C.! It was signed in Philadelphia!

I guess it's true, you just can't fix stupidity.....

Consider this: Both the President and his wife are college graduates – from Law Schools, with the ability to practice law in the Courts of the USA, no less. Somehow, Someway they both have had the ability to practice Law in the United States taken away from them. We all know that is no small thing and a huge mistake, goof-up had to be made for the ability to practice law to be taken away from a person. We, the American citizen, did not have this info for the first election. Yet having all of this information the American people elected this man to continue leading our Country. How ignorant is that? Actually, he was not reelected by the vote of the majority of American citizens. He was elected by a huge number of American citizens NOT VOTING. Each and every legal citizen of the USA MUST vote in the coming election. This is only the tip of the ice burg . I could go on and on about her ignorance on American history, but why? Let's just get rid of her and her husband's policies of USA ignorance. The USA was founded on the Christian religion and to keep the USA as our Founders intended we must bring Christianity back to our Country, schools, and general population.

Please, GOD, be with us and guide us back to Christianity!!!



April 11, 2016

Dear Friend,

There are countless reasons Hillary Clinton should not be president. Benghazi. Mishandling classified information. Support for Expanding Obamacare.

And last week she appeared on Meet the Press and The View to speak out in favor of unlimited abortion-on-demand.

In both appearances Hillary admitted that an unborn baby is a person but claimed an unborn person had no Constitutional rights. That's right, the standard bearer for national Democrats in 2016 claimed that in America a baby girl, even just one second before birth, has no rights. In fact, Hillary Clinton believes foreign terrorists held at Guantanamo Bay have Constitutional rights, but babies do not.

Regardless of Supreme Court rulings to the contrary, our Founding Fathers recognized the God-given right to life in both the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution. **So I could not sit quietly and let her absurd claim go unchallenged.** I spoke out forcefully in support of life and our Constitutional right

And who did the [New York Times quote](#) as a leading conservative opposing Hillary's position? **Me.** The liberal so-called "newspaper of record" in America knows I am a leading pro-life voice in Congress.

On life, fiscal responsibility, amnesty, Obamacare, I have a proven conservative record and everyone in Washington knows it. I am not afraid to speak out and fight for our values, even when others won't. It's exactly

what I said I would do when I asked you to send me to Congress six years ago.

Will you help me keep fighting for our values by making your most generous contribution right now? Whether it's \$25, \$50, \$100, or \$250, your donation will make a difference.

The Washington Elites may not like it and Hillary doesn't want to hear it. But I'm not about to stop now.

Yours in Liberty,

Tim Huelskamp

P.S. Like you, I oppose what Hillary Clinton stands for and will do whatever I can to make sure she and Bill do not go back to the White House. Please make a contribution of \$25 or more right now to help me keep fighting for our values.

Kansas for Life Blog

Largest Pro-Life Organization in Kansas

KS Supreme Court takes up dismemberment appeal

Kansas Supreme Court ruling will impact the nation

April 12, 2016 by Kathy Ostrowski

Last April, Kansas became the first state to pass legislation barring the barbaric dismemberment method abortions. Now, under challenge by pro-abortionists, that first-of-its-kind law, which is on hold, is about to be reviewed by the Kansas Supreme Court. This ban prohibits the gruesome abortion method of tearing apart fully-formed, living babies—limb by limb—until they bleed to death.

The **Unborn Child Protection from Dismemberment Abortion Act**, model legislation drafted by the National Right to Life Committee, has since been enacted by Oklahoma, West Virginia, and (soon) Mississippi. This vital legislation has also been introduced in Pennsylvania, Minnesota, Idaho, Nebraska, Missouri, Louisiana, Rhode Island, and Utah. Thus the impact of the ruling by our Supreme Court will extend beyond our state borders. The premise of the Unborn Child Protection from Dismemberment Abortion Act comes from the U.S. Supreme Court *Gonzales* ruling. In that 2007 decision, the justices upheld a ban on partial-birth abortions by acknowledging that,

"the State may use its regulatory power to bar certain procedures and substitute others, all in furtherance of its legitimate interests in regulating the medical profession in order to promote respect for life, including life of the unborn."

Abortion supporters have thus sought to find and secure in state constitutions a broader and more unassailable "right" to abortion.

That's what happened in Kansas last June, when Shawnee District Court Judge Larry Hendricks blocked the ban on dismemberment abortions from going into effect. Hendricks adopted abortion attorney arguments—literally—asserting that the Kansas state Constitution protects abortion even more fundamentally than the standard established by the 1973 *Roe v. Wade* decision.

The temporary injunction was obtained by the New York-based Center for Reproductive Rights on behalf of Kansas' father-daughter abortionists at the Center for Women's Health in suburban Kansas City.

The injunction allows three Kansas abortion businesses to continue to perform these grisly procedures — 629 last year — at a cost of up to \$2,000 each.

That activist ruling by Judge Hendricks was left standing when the full Kansas Court of Appeals reviewed it and announced on January 22 that they were divided, 7-7.

However, pro-life Attorney General Derek Schmidt appealed the appellate decision to the state's highest court. Schmidt argued that **the appellate ruling does not make precedent and current abortion lawsuits remain in limbo** without clear guidance. Yesterday, it was announced the appeal will be heard. (*documents here*) Here are the three questions that the

state of Kansas has posed for the state Supreme Court to rule on:

1. Does the Kansas Constitution create a right to abortion?
2. If that right exists, does it clearly prevent government from regulating dismemberment abortions?
3. Did the Court of Appeals wrongly accept the lower court's facts and legal standard?

Our state Constitution was **enacted in 1859, when abortion was illegal in Kansas and across the nation.** Yet one radical judge of the Kansas Court of Appeals, G. Gordon Atcheson (writing to concur with the injunction against the dismemberment abortion ban) believes that the state Constitution is an "evolving" document with an "ever more enlightened understanding of humanity" and women's "self-determination."

Mary Kay Culp, KFL executive director commented, *"The challenge we face is whether a majority of the Kansas Supreme Court will follow the U.S. Supreme Court's holding that allows states to ban barbaric abortion methods, or whether it will follow Appellate Judge Atcheson's opinion that the dismembering of unborn children comports with an 'enlightened understanding of humanity'."*

Like

Be the first to like this.

Related

High stakes hearing on Dismemberment Abortion ban In "Kansas Abortion Law"

Kansas judge: abortion protected by state constitution In "Kansas Abortion Law"

Kansas Dismemberment abortion ban slated for 1st hearing In "Kansas Abortion Law"

It has always been way beyond my comprehension how anyone could even consider abortion let alone dismemberment abortion. How can the Mother even consider it or the Dr. do it???? Think about it!! Any abortion is bad, MURDER, but cutting the living baby into pieces??? How Horrible!!! GOD BE WITH THE BABIES!!!

Obama Makes Bizarre Statement on Hillary's Email Scandal by Constitution.Com on 4/11/16

Obama's recent statement to Fox News' Chris Wallace about his former Secretary of State, **Hillary Clinton's email scandal** is reminiscent of **the 1998 Impeachment** of her husband, former president Bill Clinton. Bill Clinton's response to one question will never be forgotten for its absurdity then, now, or in the future. He infamously replied, "It depends on what the meaning of the word, 'is,' is."

Similarly, Obama told Wallace, "there's classified and then there's classified."

What does that mean, exactly?

Jeff Dunetz at the LidBlog.com suggests,

"It seemed as if the President said she mishandled classified information but it wasn't that bad, or that it really didn't matter."

Wallace began the segment with Obama's claim in October 2015:

Wallace: Last October, you said that Hillary Clinton's private e-mail server did not jeopardize national secrets.

Obama (on video): I can tell that you this is not a situation in which America's national security was endangered.

Wallace: Since then, we've learned that over 2,000 of her e-mails contained classified material, 22 of the e-mails had top-secret information. Can you still say flatly that she did not jeopardize America's secrets?

Obama: I've got to be careful because, as you know, there have been investigations, there are hearings, Congress is looking at this. And I haven't been sorting through each and every aspect of this.

Here's what I know: Hillary Clinton was an outstanding Secretary of State. She would never intentionally put America in any kind of jeopardy.

And what I also know, because I handle a lot of classified information, is that there are — there's classified, and then there's classified. There's stuff that is really top secret top secret, and there's stuff that is being presented to the president or the secretary of state, that you might not want on the transom, or going out over the wire, but is basically stuff that you could get in open source.

Dunetz writes: "It's time to check the fine print of the 'protecting classified information' non-disclosure agreement Hillary Clinton signed when she became Secretary of State.

"Did it say she had to protect classified information or just classified information?"

"Or is Obama trying to support Hillary by justifying the illegality of her emails?"

He adds, that the crime of mishandling classified information isn't predicated on the intent of the act; intent is not necessary

for conviction.

My heart's desire is to see Hillary in an orange jumpsuit and handcuffs on her way to court!!! Throw the book at her!!

Here is another reason to support Representative Tim Huelskamp:

April 15, 2016

Dear Friend,

Hearing the words "April 15th" should not strike fear into the hearts of Americans and the IRS should not be considered a four letter word. But the tax code is impossibly complicated. It contains more words than the Bible and only a horde of lawyers and lobbyists could even attempt to understand its 74,000 pages.

President Obama used the IRS to impose the Obamacare penalty on millions of Americans who can no longer afford health insurance.

And worse, Obama used his IRS to target, attack and cripple conservative organizations as his political enemies. And the IRS Commissioner has done everything in his power to hinder the Congressional investigation into these illegal actions.

The IRS is even failing to properly protect taxpayers' personal information and has sent out millions in refunds to the thieves - many of them illegal - who have stolen the identities because of IRS incompetence.

Regular people just trying to go about their daily lives should not need an accountant to file their taxes or live in fear that the IRS cannot protect their personal information from hackers. And Conservative organizations who dare to do things like talk about the Constitution should not have to keep a lawyer on retainer to fight for their rights.

Friends, it's time to scrap the tax code and abolish the IRS.

[If you agree with me, please make a contribution to my campaign right now so I can keep fighting in Washington for real tax reform. Every \\$250, \\$100, \\$50, \\$25 or whatever you can afford to give will make a difference.](#)

For once, it is time for the IRS to fear us, the American People.

Yours in Liberty,

Tim Huelskamp

P.S. In Congress I have signed on to legislation what would abolish the IRS, sunset the tax code, and force Washington insiders to replace it with something fairer, simpler, flatter. [Please make your most generous contribution of \\$25, \\$50 or \\$100 today so I can keep up the fight.](#)

Rep. Huelskamp is supporting Ted Cruz who says he will initiate the "Fair Tax". All I have to say about taxes is: I know nothing about Tax Plans, but any plan that eliminates the IRS can't be ALL bad!! I am not a person who readily understands tax plans, so will NOT go there – here or elsewhere.

Splendor in the Grassley

April 07, 2016 – Thursday from FRC Action

If anyone's relieved to be back in session, it's Senator Jerry Moran (R-Kans.). The Kansas Republican got an earful back home when he unexpectedly broke ranks with his fellow Republicans and called for action on President Obama's Supreme Court pick. "I think we have a responsibility to have a hearing [on Merrick Garland]," he said, to the astonishment of both voters and his party. Within hours, the Tea Party, state activists, and even national groups like FreedomWorks sprang into action, calling the suggestion "outrageous" and vowing to primary Moran. By last Friday, the senator's office was flooded by more than **28,000 emails** blasting the conservative for stepping out of line.

Kansas Republicans were determined to make an example of Moran -- but they never got the chance. After a potential challenger accused him of "folding like a lawn chair," Moran thought better of it. Sheepishly, **he retreated back into the fold**, more evidence of the Republicans' steely resolve on the Scalia's replacement. If other conservative senators were weighing similar moves, they've almost certainly reconsidered. While liberals spend wads of cash on attack ads railing against Republicans for a position they held just one administration ago, their pressure is no match for voters'. Even *the Washington Post* called **the Left's efforts doomed**: "Right-leaning activists care more about the Supreme Court vacancy right now than liberals do. In the current climate, most conservatives -- even in blue states -- have no appetite for compromise."

Unlike the Left, which seems intent on ramming a nominee through the process in the twilight of Obama's term,

most people would prefer to take their time filling the seat. Based on the GOP's internal polling, [54 percent of people](#) "were more concerned about a liberal justice being chosen to replace Scalia, compared to the nearly 41 percent of respondents who were more worried about the seat being open for a year or more." That's a big gap -- big enough to give Republicans the confidence they need to hold their ground. Obviously, the American people share their concerns that Obama's only interest in filling the seat is finding a lifetime surrogate on the Court. No wonder stalwarts like Senator Roy Blunt (R-Mo.) are reiterating that they have "no plans" to meet with the president's nominee.

That hasn't stopped the Court itself from weighing in. Chief Justice John Roberts stuck his nose in the Senate's business before Scalia died, [arguing that](#) "the [confirmation] process is not functioning very well." That's interesting, fired back Judiciary Chairman Chuck Grassley (R-Iowa), since his Court's decision is partially to blame. "Many of my constituents believe, with all due respect, that the chief justice is part of the problem," [Grassley said yesterday on the Senate floor](#). "They believe that [a] number of his votes have reflected political considerations, not legal ones." "The chief justice has it exactly backwards," Grassley also said. "The confirmation process doesn't make the justices appear political. The confirmation process has gotten political precisely because the court itself has drifted from the constitutional text and rendered decisions based instead on policy preferences."

It was the perfect response -- one, ironically, that echoed the sentiments of the very man they're replacing. Justice Scalia talked about this very thing in his dissent of *Casey v. Planned Parenthood* 24 years ago! "If nominees are now treated in a crude and political manner," he wrote, "it's because the Supreme Court itself has asked for it... Value judgments, after all, should be voted on, not dictated; and if our Constitution has somehow accidentally committed them to the Supreme Court, at least we can have a sort of plebiscite each time a new nominee to that body is put forward."

Look, for example at the Court's opinions in *King v. Burwell*, which twisted the statute to mean something it didn't, or *NFIB v. Sebelius* (which contorted the Constitution)—both decision designed to "save" Obamacare (which isn't the Court's job!). Roberts played a key role in both these decisions. And while he isn't the only villain in a judicial system that has by and large politicized itself, his Court has certainly ventured into social activist territory. As a result, people on both sides of the aisle are realizing the over-importance of the Court. In the last primary, Wisconsin's, [52 percent of all voters](#) said they feel betrayed by the GOP. Thanks to the leadership of Majority Mitch McConnell, Chairman Grassley, and others, the Senate is doing its best to change that.

If you haven't read FRC's Travis Weber's take on the SCOTUS debate, check out his piece in the *Philadelphia Inquirer*, "[Voters Right to Worry about Court Vacancy](#)" [here](#).

End Included File: WA16D14.cfm

Tony Perkins' Washington Update is written with the aid of FRC senior writers.

'We Are in World War III'

April 07, 2016 - Thursday

"Had we taken religious freedom seriously earlier, after the war, under Bush, then this [ISIS persecution] would not have happened. And we can't afford to not take it seriously now." That was just one of the sobering statements at yesterday's policy lecture on the religious persecution around the world.

Former Congressman Frank Wolf joined FRC to talk about his recent trip to Nigeria, highlighting areas of concern and violence by radical Islamists that far too few seem willing to talk about and stand up to. Not only do we need to stop radical Islamist killing of Christians, he pointed out, but we need to care for the girls who have been kidnapped and are traumatized from being raped by their captors. They need proper care and attention; this component is as much a human trafficking problem as it is a religious freedom problem.

Pervez Rafique, a Pakistani activist and politician, gave insight into the unique problems in Pakistan, such as a culture whipped into a frenzy by radical Islamist teachers. While that government has its own problems, when it does want to bring people to justice for murder of those accused of apostasy, radical Islamist mobs often intercept and murder the accused, while praising the killers! Such are the problems we face from failing to encourage and foster reform *from within* Islam. Right now the largest number of victims of radical Islamists are other Muslims. If more Muslim communities are going to promote religious freedom, representatives of that faith community must be encouraged (and protected) as they speak out. They need all the help they can get.

Yet we do them no favors by failing to call out radical Islam for what it is, and failing to address it as the root of

many religious freedom problems in the world today. We need our government and all governments to properly name the problem before addressing it, as panelist Tom Farr noted. Dr. Farr also commented on possible solutions in the Middle East now that the United States recognized the genocide occurring there. One solution would be a protected zone, strictly monitored to ensure that different religious communities are living in peace with one another. This could serve as a model for other trouble spots around the world.

Panelist Tina Ramirez also spoke about what her organization Hardwired Global is doing to promote religious freedom in the Middle East: bringing together key activists from diverse religious communities and having them work together in interactive training sessions designed to help them understand their need for religious freedom. Many of these individuals have never interacted with those of other faith communities. Yet as they engage personally, perspectives shift and they see the need for each other's need for the same protection. This is an important component of the effort to ensure that the freedom to believe and live out one's beliefs is protected for all faiths everywhere around the world.

Travis Weber, moderating the panel, reminded us all of the importance of the personal connection. When Christians here in the United States see persecution of believers overseas as a personal attack against them, they will feel their pain, which will translate into action. One story that is particularly heartwarming is [that of Damaris Atsen](#), a Nigerian widow whose husband was killed by Boko Haram but who extended forgiveness and grew closer to God through the experience.

To watch the lecture in its entirety, click below. If your church isn't participating in the April 17 Stand with the Persecuted emphasis, [please visit FRC.org/Stand](#) and see how you can get involved helping those who are targeted for their faith in Jesus Christ. Also, check out this great coverage [from the Christian Post](#).

OUR EDUCATION SYSTEM

“Everybody is a genius. But if you judge a fish by its ability to climb a tree, it will live its whole life believing that it is stupid.”

By Albert Einstein

KY GOVERNOR SETTLES MARRIAGE LICENSE ISSUE

APRIL 15, 2016

Kentucky's Governor signed a bill that is an effective compromise to the same-sex marriage license issue that landed Kim Davis in jail. Bottom line – the clerk now does not have to sign the form.

I can't help but laugh when y'all elect a guy, TWICE, named Barak Hussain Obama, and get mad when he supports Muslims!!

HELLO!!!!

I found this article online. It is titled:

Very Interesting Facts About People With Guns

I really do not know if these statements are true, but even if they are not true, still makes for interesting reading. :-)

This may explain why there has never been an attempt on Obama.

In 1865 a [Democrat](#) shot and killed Abraham Lincoln, President of the United States.

In 1881 a left wing [radical Democrat](#) shot James Garfield, President of the United States, who later died from the wound.

In 1963 a radical [left wing socialist](#) shot and killed John F. Kennedy, President of the United States.

In 1975 a left wing [radical Democrat](#) fired shots at Gerald Ford, President of the United States.

In 1983 a [registered Democrat](#) shot and wounded Ronald Reagan, President of the United States .

In 1984 James Hubert, [a disgruntled Democrat](#), shot and killed 22 people in a McDonalds restaurant.

In 1986 Patrick Sherrill, [a disgruntled Democrat](#), shot and killed 15 people in an Oklahoma post office .

In 1990 James Pough, [a disgruntled Democrat](#), shot and killed 10 people at a GMAC office.

In 1991 George Hennard, [a disgruntled Democrat](#), shot and killed 23 people in a Luby's cafeteria in Killeen, TX.
 In 1995 James Daniel Simpson, [a disgruntled Democrat](#), shot and killed 5 coworkers in a Texas laboratory.
 In 1999 Larry Asbrook, [a disgruntled Democrat](#), shot and killed 8 people at a church service.
 In 2001 [a left wing radical Democrat](#) fired shots at the White House in a failed attempt to kill George W. Bush, President of the US.

In 2003 Douglas Williams, [a disgruntled Democrat](#), shot and killed 7 people at a Lockheed Martin plant.
 In 2007 a [registered Democrat](#) named Seung - Hui Cho, shot and killed 32 people in Virginia Tech.
 In 2010 a mentally ill [registered Democrat](#) named Jared Lee Loughner, shot Rep. Gabrielle Giffords and killed 6 others. .

In 2011 a [registered Democrat](#) named James Holmes, went into a movie theater and shot and killed 12 people.

In 2012 Andrew Engeldinger, [a disgruntled Democrat](#), shot and killed 7 people in Minneapolis.

In 2013 [a registered Democrat](#) named Adam Lanza, shot and killed 26 people in a school in Newtown, CT.

As recently as Sept 2013, [an angry Democrat](#) shot 12 at a Navy ship yard.

Clearly, there is a problem with Democrats and guns.

Not one NRA member, Tea Party member, or Republican conservative was involved in any of these shootings and murders.

SOLUTION: IT SHOULD BE ILLEGAL FOR DEMOCRATS TO OWN GUNS!

This is much too easy, but it does answer a lot of questions. And it just might actually explain the statement at the beginning. Why would anyone want people thinking like these people in the Country let alone in the White House. The Republicans may not be a lot better, but even a smidge is an improvement. We need every improvement we can get!!

If you would like to forward this Newsletter as is on to others – be my guest.

If you would like to send comments to the editor – be my guest.

If you have an editorial to submit – be my guest.

Flint Hills TEA Party contact information: www.flinthillsteaparty.com; fhttp@flinthillsteaparty.com or facebook – Flint Hills TEA Party; Manhattan contact – Chuck Henderson, 785-236-1286; Sylva Nichols, editor, email: sylva@gemsandwood.com. Sylva sends the snail mail. Newsletter; Flint Hills TEA Party Snail Mail: Flint Hills TEA Party of KS, 1228 Westloop Place, PMB #326, Manhattan, KS 66502-2840. All donations for the Educational Fund (payable to “Educational Fund”) will also be accepted at this address and is tax deductible.

Reprinting of this Newsletter may be done in whole, however, copying any part requires permission given by the persons listed above☐