

The Patriots' Truth

Flint Hills Party News

We are hoping to resume our monthly meetings on the 2nd Saturday of the month after the KSU Football season. Check for updates at flinthillsteaparty.com We are now posting news items, events and the newsletters both recent and archived issues at our newly updated website. Weekly meetings are 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 you know it is a new subject or person speaking. Help me include YOU!!

We must continue working, paying attention, informing & 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, you and me and all our friends and family 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.

In the last Newsletter there was an article on voting out ALL of the Kansas Supreme Court. Here is another reason why. This was sent to me by Linda Highland, wife of Rep. Ron Highland!!

Although it may seem like we've been writing about the Kansas Supreme Court a lot of late, unfortunately they keep giving us new things to write about. The most recent example is particularly gut-wrenching. The Court has once again proven they will twist the law in any way possible to side with violent offenders at the expense of innocent victims. This time it's at the expense of children.

In 2012, 19 year old Christian McCormick and his 19 year old friend Seth LeClair invited two 13 year old girls to McCormick's basement. There, McCormick provided the two young girls with vodka until they were unconscious. Then he raped one of them. A witness who found the girls in the basement said both girls were unconscious. One was propped up against a couch completely unclothed from the waist down. The other could not wake up and had to be carried to the hospital.

At the district court level McCormick was convicted of raping one of the young girls and of unlawful hosting of minors consuming alcohol. The Kansas Court of Appeals agreed.

But when the case was appealed to the Kansas Supreme Court, the Court did what they seemingly do best by vacating McCormick's sentence on a technicality. [This time it was Justice Beier leading the charge against human decency in writing the Court's 4-3 opinion.](#)

[Over and over again the Kansas Supreme Court forces victims and their families to relive their horrific ordeals in court by vacating sentences.](#) The two 13 year old children involved in this case will live with this for the rest of their lives, and somehow, the Kansas Supreme Court has managed to make it worse. At some point we have to decide that enough is enough.

That chance will come November 8.

This is our opportunity to start over and see if we can get it right!!!

The Flight 93 Election

By [Publius Decius Mus](#) | September 5, 2016

2016 is the Flight 93 election: charge the cockpit or you die. You may die anyway. You — or the leader of your party — may make it into the cockpit and not know how to fly or land the plane. There are no guarantees.

Except one: if you don't try, death is certain. To compound the metaphor: a Hillary Clinton presidency is Russian Roulette with a semi-auto. With Trump, at least you can spin the cylinder and take your chances.

To ordinary conservative ears, this sounds histrionic. The stakes can't be that high because they are never that high — except perhaps in the pages of Gibbon. Conservative intellectuals will insist that there has been no “end of history” and that all human outcomes are still possible. They will even — as Charles Kesler does — admit that America is in “crisis.” But how great is the crisis? Can things really be so bad if eight years of Obama can be followed by eight more of Hillary, and yet Constitutionalist conservatives can still reasonably hope for a restoration of our cherished ideals? Cruz in 2024!

Not to pick (too much) on Kesler, who is less unwarrantedly optimistic than most conservatives. And who, at

least, poses the right question: Trump or Hillary? Though his answer — “even if [Trump] had chosen his policies at random, they would be sounder than Hillary’s” — is unwarrantedly ungenerous. The truth is that Trump articulated, if incompletely and inconsistently, the right stances on the right issues — immigration, trade, and war — right from the beginning.

But let us back up. One of the paradoxes — there are so many — of conservative thought over the last decade at least is the unwillingness even to entertain the possibility that America and the West are on a trajectory toward something very bad. On the one hand, conservatives routinely present a litany of ills plaguing the body politic. Illegitimacy. Crime. Massive, expensive, intrusive, out-of-control government. Politically correct McCarthyism. Ever-higher taxes and ever-deteriorating services and infrastructure. Inability to win wars against tribal, sub-Third-World foes. A disastrously awful educational system that churns out kids who don’t know anything and, at the primary and secondary levels, can’t (or won’t) discipline disruptive punks, and at the higher levels saddles students with six figure debts for the privilege. And so on and drearily on. Like that portion of the mass where the priest asks for your private intentions, fill in any dismal fact about American decline that you want and I’ll stipulate it.

Conservatives spend at least several hundred million dollars a year on think-tanks, magazines, conferences, fellowships, and such, complaining about this, that, the other, and everything. And yet these same conservatives are, at root, keepers of the status quo. Oh, sure, they want some things to change. They want their pet ideas adopted — tax deductions for having more babies and the like. Many of them are even good ideas. But are any of them truly fundamental? Do they get to the heart of our problems?

If conservatives are right about the importance of virtue, morality, religious faith, stability, character and so on in the individual; if they are right about sexual morality or what came to be termed “family values”; if they are right about the importance of education to inculcate good character and to teach the fundamentals that have defined knowledge in the West for millennia; if they are right about societal norms and public order; if they are right about the centrality of initiative, enterprise, industry, and thrift to a sound economy and a healthy society; if they are right about the soul-sapping effects of paternalistic Big Government and its cannibalization of civil society and religious institutions; if they are right about the necessity of a strong defense and prudent statesmanship in the international sphere — if they are right about the importance of all this to national health and even survival, then they must believe — mustn’t they? — that we are headed off a cliff.

But it’s quite obvious that conservatives don’t believe any such thing, that they feel no such sense of urgency, of an immediate necessity to change course and avoid the cliff. A [recent article](#) by Matthew Continetti may be taken as representative — indeed, almost written for the purpose of illustrating the point. Continetti inquires into the “condition of America” and finds it wanting. What does Continetti propose to do about it? The usual litany of “conservative” “solutions,” with the obligatory references to decentralization, federalization, “civic renewal,” and — of course! — Burke. Which is to say, conservatism’s typical combination of the useless and inapt with the utopian and unrealizable. Decentralization and federalism are all well and good, and as a conservative, I endorse them both without reservation. But how are they going to save, or even meaningfully improve, the America that Continetti describes? What can they do against a tidal wave of dysfunction, immorality, and corruption? “Civic renewal” would do a lot of course, but that’s like saying health will save a cancer patient. A step has been skipped in there somewhere. How are we going to achieve “civic renewal”? Wishing for a tautology to enact itself is not a strategy.

Continetti trips over a more promising approach when he writes of “stress[ing] the ‘national interest abroad and national solidarity at home’ through foreign-policy retrenchment, ‘support to workers buffeted by globalization,’ and setting ‘tax rates and immigration levels’ to foster social cohesion.” That sounds a lot like Trumpism. But the phrases that Continetti quotes are taken from Ross Douthat and Reihan Salam, both of whom, like Continetti, are vociferously — one might even say fanatically — anti-Trump. At least they, unlike Kesler, give Trump credit for having identified the right stance on today’s most salient issues. Yet, paradoxically, they won’t vote for Trump whereas Kesler hints that he will. It’s reasonable, then, to read into Kesler’s esoteric endorsement of Trump an implicit acknowledgment that the crisis is, indeed, pretty dire. I expect a Claremont scholar to be wiser than most other conservative intellectuals, and I am relieved not to be disappointed in this instance.

Yet we may also reasonably ask: What explains the Pollyanna-ish declinism of so many others? That is, the stance that Things-Are-Really-Bad — But-Not-So-Bad-that-We-Have-to-Consider-Anything-Really-Different! The obvious answer is that they don’t really believe the first half of that formulation. If so, like Chicken Little, they should stick a sock in it. Pecuniary reasons also suggest themselves, but let us foreswear recourse to this explanation until we have disproved all the others.

Whatever the reason for the contradiction, there can be no doubt that there is a contradiction. To simultaneously hold conservative cultural, economic, and political beliefs — to insist that our liberal-left present reality and future direction is incompatible with human nature and must undermine society — and yet also believe that things can go

on more or less the way they are going, ideally but not necessarily with some conservative tinkering here and there, is logically impossible.

Let's be very blunt here: if you genuinely think things can go on with no fundamental change needed, then you have implicitly admitted that conservatism is wrong. Wrong philosophically, wrong on human nature, wrong on the nature of politics, and wrong in its policy prescriptions. Because, first, few of those prescriptions are in force today. Second, of the ones that are, the left is busy undoing them, often with conservative assistance. And, third, the whole trend of the West is ever-leftward, ever further away from what we all understand as conservatism.

If your answer — Continetti's, Douthat's, Salam's, and so many others' — is for conservatism to keep doing what it's been doing — another policy journal, another article about welfare reform, another half-day seminar on limited government, another tax credit proposal — even though we've been losing ground for at least a century, then you've implicitly accepted that your supposed political philosophy doesn't matter and that civilization will carry on just fine under leftist tenets. Indeed, that leftism is truer than conservatism and superior to it.

They will say, in words reminiscent of dorm-room Marxism — but our proposals have not been tried! Here our ideas sit, waiting to be implemented! To which I reply: eh, not really. Many conservative solutions — above all welfare reform and crime control — have been tried, and proved effective, but have nonetheless failed to stem the tide. Crime, for instance, is down from its mid-'70s and early '90s peak — but way, way up from the historic American norm that ended when liberals took over criminal justice in the mid-'60s. And it's rising fast today, in the teeth of ineffectual conservative complaints. And what has this temporary crime (or welfare, for that matter) decline done to stem the greater tide? The tsunami of leftism that still engulfs our every — literal and figurative — shore has receded not a bit but indeed has grown. All your (our) victories are short-lived.

More to the point, what has conservatism achieved lately? In the last 20 years? The answer — which appears to be “nothing” — might seem to lend credence to the plea that “our ideas haven't been tried.” Except that the same conservatives who generate those ideas are in charge of selling them to the broader public. If their ideas “haven't been tried,” who is ultimately at fault? The whole enterprise of Conservatism, Inc., reeks of failure. Its sole recent and ongoing success is its own self-preservation. Conservative intellectuals never tire of praising “entrepreneurs” and “creative destruction.” Dare to fail! they exhort businessmen. Let the market decide! Except, um, not with respect to us. Or is their true market not the political arena, but the fundraising circuit?

Only three questions matter. First, how bad are things really? Second, what do we do right now? Third, what should we do for the long term?

Conservatism, Inc.'s, “answer” to the first may, at this point, simply be dismissed. If the conservatives wish to have a serious debate, I for one am game — more than game; eager. The problem of “subjective certainty” can only be overcome by going into the agora. But my attempt to do so — the blog that Kesler mentions — was met largely with incredulity. How can they say that?! How can anyone apparently of our caste (conservative intellectuals) not merely support Trump (however lukewarmly) but offer reasons for doing so?

One of the Journal of American Greatness's deeper arguments was that only in a corrupt republic, in corrupt times, could a Trump rise. It is therefore puzzling that those most horrified by Trump are the least willing to consider the possibility that the republic is dying. That possibility, apparently, seems to them so preposterous that no refutation is necessary.

As does, presumably, the argument that the stakes in 2016 are — everything. I should here note that I am a good deal gloomier than my (former) JAG colleagues, and that while we frequently used the royal “we” when discussing things on which we all agreed, I here speak only for myself.

How have the last two decades worked out for you, personally? If you're a member or fellow-traveler of the Davos class, chances are: pretty well. If you're among the subspecies conservative intellectual or politician, you've accepted — perhaps not consciously, but unmistakably — your status on the roster of the Washington Generals of American politics. Your job is to show up and lose, but you are a necessary part of the show and you do get paid. To the extent that you are ever on the winning side of anything, it's as sophists who help the Davoisie oligarchy rationalize open borders, lower wages, outsourcing, de-industrialization, trade giveaways, and endless, pointless, winless war.

All of Trump's 16 Republican competitors would have ensured more of the same — as will the election of Hillary Clinton. That would be bad enough. But at least Republicans are merely reactive when it comes to wholesale cultural and political change. Their “opposition” may be in all cases ineffectual and often indistinguishable from support. But they don't dream up inanities like 32 “genders,” elective bathrooms, single-payer, Iran sycophancy, “Islamophobia,” and Black Lives Matter. They merely help ratify them.

A Hillary presidency will be pedal-to-the-metal on the entire Progressive-left agenda, plus items few of us have yet imagined in our darkest moments. Nor is even that the worst. It will be coupled with a level of vindictive

persecution against resistance and dissent hitherto seen in the supposedly liberal West only in the most “advanced” Scandinavian countries and the most leftist corners of Germany and England. We see this already in the censorship practiced by the Davoisie’s social media enablers; in the shameless propaganda tidal wave of the mainstream media; and in the personal destruction campaigns — operated through the former and aided by the latter — of the Social Justice Warriors. We see it in Obama’s flagrant use of the IRS to torment political opponents, the gaslighting denial by the media, and the collective shrug by everyone else.

It’s absurd to assume that any of this would stop or slow — would do anything other than massively intensify — in a Hillary administration. It’s even more ridiculous to expect that hitherto useless conservative opposition would suddenly become effective. For two generations at least, the Left has been calling everyone to their right Nazis. This trend has accelerated exponentially in the last few years, helped along by some on the Right who really do seem to merit — and even relish — the label. There is nothing the modern conservative fears more than being called “racist,” so alt-right pocket Nazis are manna from heaven for the Left. But also wholly unnecessary: sauce for the goose. The Left was calling us Nazis long before any pro-Trumpers tweeted Holocaust denial memes. And how does one deal with a Nazi — that is, with an enemy one is convinced intends your destruction? You don’t compromise with him or leave him alone. You crush him.

So what do we have to lose by fighting back? Only our Washington Generals jerseys — and paychecks. But those are going away anyway. Among the many things the “Right” still doesn’t understand is that the Left has concluded that this particular show need no longer go on. They don’t think they need a foil anymore and would rather dispense with the whole bother of staging these phony contests in which each side ostensibly has a shot.

If you haven’t noticed, our side has been losing consistently since 1988. We can win midterms, but we do nothing with them. Call ours Hannibalic victories. After the Carthaginian’s famous slaughter of a Roman army at Cannae, he failed to march on an undefended Rome, prompting his cavalry commander to complain: “You know how to win a victory, but not how to use one.” And, aside from 2004’s lackluster 50.7%, we can’t win the big ones at all.

Because the deck is stacked overwhelmingly against us. I will mention but three ways. First, the opinion-making elements — the universities and the media above all — are wholly corrupt and wholly opposed to everything we want, and increasingly even to our existence. (What else are the wars on “cis-genderism” — formerly known as “nature” — and on the supposed “white privilege” of broke hillbillies really about?) If it hadn’t been abundantly clear for the last 50 years, the campaign of 2015-2016 must surely have made it evident to even the meanest capacities that the intelligentsia — including all the organs through which it broadcasts its propaganda — is overwhelmingly partisan and biased. Against this onslaught, “conservative” media is a nullity, barely a whisper. It cannot be heard above the blaring of what has been aptly called “The Megaphone.”

Second, our Washington Generals self-handicap and self-censor to an absurd degree. Lenin is supposed to have said that “the best way to control the opposition is to lead it ourselves.” But with an opposition like ours, why bother? Our “leaders” and “dissenters” bend over backward to play by the self-sabotaging rules the Left sets for them. Fearful, beaten dogs have more thymos.

Third and most important, the ceaseless importation of Third World foreigners with no tradition of, taste for, or experience in liberty means that the electorate grows more left, more Democratic, less Republican, less republican, and less traditionally American with every cycle. As does, of course, the U.S. population, which only serves to reinforce the two other causes outlined above. This is the core reason why the Left, the Democrats, and the bipartisan junta (categories distinct but very much overlapping) think they are on the cusp of a permanent victory that will forever obviate the need to pretend to respect democratic and constitutional niceties. Because they are.

It’s also why they treat open borders as the “absolute value,” the one “principle” that — when their “principles” collide — they prioritize above all the others. If that fact is insufficiently clear, consider this. Trump is the most liberal Republican nominee since Thomas Dewey. He departs from conservative orthodoxy in so many ways that National Review still hasn’t stopped counting. But let’s stick to just the core issues animating his campaign. On trade, globalization, and war, Trump is to the left (conventionally understood) not only of his own party, but of his Democratic opponent. And yet the Left and the junta are at one with the house-broken conservatives in their determination — desperation — not merely to defeat Trump but to destroy him. What gives?

Oh, right — there’s that other issue. The sacredness of mass immigration is the mystic chord that unites America’s ruling and intellectual classes. Their reasons vary somewhat. The Left and the Democrats seek ringers to form a permanent electoral majority. They, or many of them, also believe the academic-intellectual lie that America’s inherently racist and evil nature can be expiated only through ever greater “diversity.” The junta of course craves cheaper and more docile labor. It also seeks to legitimize, and deflect unwanted attention from, its wealth and power by pretending that its open borders stance is a form of noblesse oblige. The Republicans and the “conservatives”? Both of course desperately want absolution from the charge of “racism.” For the latter, this at least makes some

sense. No Washington General can take the court — much less cash his check — with that epithet dancing over his head like some Satanic Spirit. But for the former, this priestly grace comes at the direct expense of their worldly interests. Do they honestly believe that the right enterprise zone or charter school policy will arouse 50.01% of our newer voters to finally reveal their “natural conservatism” at the ballot box? It hasn’t happened anywhere yet and shows no signs that it ever will. But that doesn’t stop the Republican refrain: more, more, more! No matter how many elections they lose, how many districts tip forever blue, how rarely (if ever) their immigrant vote cracks 40%, the answer is always the same. Just like Angela Merkel after yet another rape, shooting, bombing, or machete attack. More, more, more!

This is insane. This is the mark of a party, a society, a country, a people, a civilization that wants to die. Trump, alone among candidates for high office in this or in the last seven (at least) cycles, has stood up to say: I want to live. I want my party to live. I want my country to live. I want my people to live. I want to end the insanity.

Yes, Trump is worse than imperfect. So what? We can lament until we choke the lack of a great statesman to address the fundamental issues of our time — or, more importantly, to connect them. Since Pat Buchanan’s three failures, occasionally a candidate arose who saw one piece: Dick Gephardt on trade, Ron Paul on war, Tom Tancredo on immigration. Yet, among recent political figures — great statesmen, dangerous demagogues, and mewling gnats alike — only Trump-the-alleged-buffoon not merely saw all three and their essential connectivity, but was able to win on them. The alleged buffoon is thus more prudent — more practically wise — than all of our wise-and-good who so bitterly oppose him. This should embarrass them. That their failures instead embolden them is only further proof of their foolishness and hubris.

Which they self-laud as “consistency” — adherence to “conservative principle,” defined by the 1980 campaign and the household gods of reigning conservative think-tanks. A higher consistency in the service of the national interest apparently eludes them. When America possessed a vast, empty continent and explosively growing industry, high immigration was arguably good policy. (Arguably: **Ben Franklin would disagree.**) It hasn’t made sense since World War I. Free trade was unquestionably a great boon to the American worker in the decades after World War II. We long ago passed the point of diminishing returns. The Gulf War of 1991 was a strategic victory for American interests. No conflict since then has been. Conservatives either can’t see this — or, worse, those who can nonetheless treat the only political leader to mount a serious challenge to the status quo (more immigration, more trade, more war) as a unique evil.

Trump’s vulgarity is in fact a godsend to the conservatives. It allows them to hang their public opposition on his obvious shortcomings and to ignore or downplay his far greater strengths, which should be even more obvious but in corrupt times can be deliberately obscured by constant references to his faults. That the Left would make the campaign all about the latter is to be expected. Why would the Right? Some — a few — are no doubt sincere in their belief that the man is simply unfit for high office. David Frum, who has always been an immigration skeptic and is a convert to the less-war position, is sincere when he says that, even though he agrees with much of Trump’s agenda, he cannot stomach Trump. But for most of the other #NeverTrumpers, is it just a coincidence that they also happen to favor *Invalidate the World, Invite the World*?

Another question JAG raised without provoking any serious attempt at refutation was whether, in corrupt times, it took a... let’s say... “loudmouth” to rise above the din of *The Megaphone*. We, or I, speculated: “yes.” Suppose there had arisen some statesman of high character — dignified, articulate, experienced, knowledgeable — the exact opposite of everything the conservatives claim to hate about Trump. Could this hypothetical paragon have won on Trump’s same issues? Would the conservatives have supported him? I would have — even had he been a Democrat.

Back on planet earth, that flight of fancy at least addresses what to do now. The answer to the subsidiary question — will it work? — is much less clear. By “it” I mean Trumpism, broadly defined as secure borders, economic nationalism, and America-first foreign policy. We Americans have chosen, in our foolishness, to disunite the country through stupid immigration, economic, and foreign policies. The level of unity America enjoyed before the bipartisan junta took over can never be restored.

But we can probably do better than we are doing now. First, stop digging. No more importing poverty, crime, and alien cultures. We have made institutions, by leftist design, not merely abysmal at assimilation but abhorrent of the concept. We should try to fix that, but given the Left’s iron grip on every school and cultural center, that’s like trying to bring democracy to Russia. A worthy goal, perhaps, but temper your hopes — and don’t invest time and resources unrealistically.

By contrast, simply building a wall and enforcing immigration law will help enormously, by cutting off the flood of newcomers that perpetuates ethnic separatism and by incentivizing the English language and American norms in the workplace. These policies will have the added benefit of aligning the economic interests of, and (we may hope) fostering solidarity among, the working, lower middle, and middle classes of all races and ethnicities. The same can

be said for Trumpian trade policies and anti-globalization instincts. Who cares if productivity numbers tick down, or if our already somnambulant GDP sinks a bit further into its pillow? Nearly all the gains of the last 20 years have accrued to the junta anyway. It would, at this point, be better for the nation to divide up more equitably a slightly smaller pie than to add one extra slice — only to ensure that it and eight of the other nine go first to the government and its rentiers, and the rest to the same four industries and 200 families.

Will this work? Ask a pessimist, get a pessimistic answer. So don't ask. Ask instead: is it worth trying? Is it better than the alternative? If you can't say, forthrightly, "yes," you are either part of the junta, a fool, or a conservative intellectual.

And if it doesn't work, what then? We've established that most "conservative" anti-Trumpites are **in the Orwellian sense** objectively pro-Hillary. What about the rest of you? If you recognize the threat she poses, but somehow can't stomach him, have you thought about the longer term? The possibilities would seem to be: Caesarism, secession/crack-up, collapse, or managerial Davoisie liberalism as far as the eye can see... which, since nothing human lasts forever, at some point will give way to one of the other three. Oh, and, I suppose, for those who like to pour a tall one and dream big, a second American Revolution that restores Constitutionalism, limited government, and a 28% top marginal rate.

But for those of you who are sober: can you sketch a more plausible long-term future than the prior four following a Trump defeat? I can't either.

The election of 2016 is a test — in my view, the final test — of whether there is any virtù left in what used to be the core of the American nation. If they cannot rouse themselves simply to vote for the first candidate in a generation who pledges to advance their interests, and to vote against the one who openly boasts that she will do the opposite (a million more Syrians, anyone?), then they are doomed. They may not deserve the fate that will befall them, but they will suffer it regardless.

Ref: <http://www.claremont.org/crb/basicpage/the-flight-93-election/>

The Patriot Post

Sept. 24, 2016

The question came up this week at a political panel: Why don't people like Hillary Clinton?

Why do they always believe the worst? Why, when some supposed scandal breaks and someone says she's hiding something, do people, including many of her supporters, assume it's true?

The answer is that Mrs. Clinton has been in America's national life for a quarter-century, and in that time people watched, observed and got an impression of her character.

If you give the prompt "Clinton scandal" to someone under 30, they might say "emails," or "Benghazi" or "Clinton Foundation," or now "health questions." But for those who are older, whose memories encompass the Clinton era, the scandals stretch back further, all the way to her beginnings as a national figure.

Seventeen years ago, when word first came that Mrs. Clinton might come to New York, a state where she'd never lived, and seek its open U.S. Senate seat, I wrote a book called "The Case Against Hillary Clinton." It asserted that she would win and use the Senate to run for president, likely in 2008. That, I argued, was a bad thing. In the previous eight years she'd done little to elevate our politics and much to lower it. So I laid out the case as best I could, starting with the first significant scandal of Bill Clinton's presidency.

It is worth revisiting to make a point about why her poll numbers on trustworthiness are so bad.

It was early 1993. The Clintons had just entered the White House after a solid win that broke the Republicans' 12-year hold. He was a young and dashing New Democrat. She too was something new, a professional woman with modern attitudes and pronounced policy interests. They had captured the national imagination and were in a strong position.

Then she — not he — messed it up. It was the first big case in which she showed poor judgment, a cool willingness to mislead, and a level of political aggression that gave even those around her pause. It was after this mess that her critics said she'd revealed the soul of an East German border guard.

The Clinton White House was internally a dramatic one, as George Stephanopoulos later recounted in "All Too Human," his sharply observed, and in retrospect somewhat harrowing, memoir of his time as Mr. Clinton's communications director and senior adviser. He reported staffers and officials yelling, crying, shouting swear words and verbally threatening each other. It was a real hothouse. There was a sense the gargoyles had taken over the cathedral. But that wouldn't become apparent until later.

On May 19, 1993, less than four months into the administration, the seven men who had long

worked in the White House travel office were suddenly and brutally fired. The seven nonpartisan government workers, who helped arrange presidential trips, served at the pleasure of the president. But each new president had kept them on because they were good at their jobs.

A veteran civil servant named Billy Dale had worked in the office 30 years and headed it the last 10. He and his colleagues were ordered to clear out their desks and were escorted from the White House, which quickly announced they were the subject of a criminal investigation by the FBI.

They were in shock. So were members of the press, who knew Mr. Dale and his colleagues as honest and professional. A firestorm ensued.

Under criticism the White House changed its story. They said that they were just trying to cut unneeded staff and save money. Then they said they were trying to impose a competitive bidding process. They tried a new explanation — the travel office shake-up was connected to Vice President Al Gore's National Performance Review. (Almost immediately Mr. Gore said that was not true.) The White House then said it was connected to a campaign pledge to cut the White House staff by 25%. Finally they claimed the workers hadn't been fired at all but placed on indefinite "administrative leave."

Why so many stories? Because the real one wasn't pretty.

It emerged in contemporaneous notes of a high White House staffer that the travel-office workers were removed because Mrs. Clinton wanted to give their jobs — their "slots," as she put it, according to the notes of director of administration David Watkins — to political operatives who'd worked for Mr. Clinton's campaign. And she wanted to give the travel office business itself to loyalists. There was a travel company based in Arkansas with long ties to the Clintons. There was a charter travel company founded by Harry Thomason, a longtime friend and fundraiser, which had provided services in the 1992 campaign. If the travel office were privatized and put to bid, he could get the business. On top of that, a staffer named Catherine Cornelius, said to be the new president's cousin, also wanted to run the travel office. In his book "Blood Sport," the reporter James B. Stewart described her as "dazzled by her proximity to power, full of a sense of her own importance." Soon rumors from her office, and others, were floating through the White House: The travel office staff were disloyal crooks.

The White House pressed the FBI to investigate, FBI agents balked — on what evidence? — but ultimately there was an investigation, and an audit.

All along Mrs. Clinton publicly insisted she had no knowledge of the firings. Then it became barely any knowledge, then barely any involvement. When the story blew up she said under oath that she had "no role in the decision to terminate the employees." She did not "direct that any action be taken by anyone." In a deposition she denied having had a role in the firings, and said she was unable to remember conversations with various staffers with any specificity.

A General Accounting Office report found she did play a role. But three years later a memo written by David Watkins to the White House chief of staff, recounting the history of the firings, suddenly surfaced. ("Suddenly surfaced" is a phrase one reads a lot in Clinton scandal stories.) It showed Mrs. Clinton herself directed them. "There would be hell to pay," he wrote, if staffers did not conform "to the first lady's wishes."

Billy Dale was indicted on charges including embezzlement. The trial lasted almost two weeks. Mr. Dale, it emerged, could have kept better books. The jury acquitted him in less than two hours. In the end he retired, as did his assistant. The five others were given new government jobs.

So — that was the Clintons' first big Washington scandal. It showed what has now become the Clinton Scandal Ritual: lie, deny, revise, claim not to remember specifics, stall for time. When it passes, call the story "old news" full of questions that have already been answered. "As I've repeatedly said ..."

More scandals would follow. They all showed poor judgment on the part of the president, and usually Mrs. Clinton. They all included a startling willingness — and ability — to dissemble.

The point is it didn't start the past few years, it started almost a quarter-century ago. You have to wonder, what are the chances it will change?

Flint Hills TEA Party and all of us have a dear friend who reads many books that effects us all. She has kindly given us some book reviews that I am passing on to you.

TITLE: Crisis of Character

Author: Gary J. Byrne

A White House Secret Service Officer discloses his first hand experience with Hillary, Bill, and how they operate. Posted directly outside their residence: Clinton’s Oval Office, former secret service uniformed officer, Gary Byrne reveals what he observed of the character and culture inside the Clinton White House while protecting the First Family. Now that a second Clinton administration is a possibility, Mr. Byrne exposes what he saw of the “real” Hillary Clinton.

TITLE: The War on Cops

Author: Heather MacDonald

How the attack on law and order makes everyone less safe. This is a book that can save lives. The Honorable Rudolph Giuliani, former mayor of New York City, endorses her book with these words: “Heather MacDonald is an unsung hero in the transformation of New York into the safest large city in the United States. Her essays helped to lay out the rationale that gave me and my police commissioners guidance during the largest continuous reduction in crime ever accomplished in our city and nation. This book is a necessary read for anyone wondering what is happening in “the capital of the world”.”

TITLE; Se Something, Say Nothing

Author: Philip Haney

A Homeland Security Officer exposes the government’s submission to jihad. “Phil Haney is a modern=day hero who did all within his power to protect America from jihad. This book is a chronicle of Phil’s experiences that Americans need to read.” US Rep. Louie Gohmert, R-Tx. In this book, authors Philip Haney and Art Moore expose just how deep the deception goes. With information from internal documents, the authors reveal not only the subversive influences on the White House., but just how radical the administration itself has become in trying to defend Muslim supremacists using primary sources, the authors disclose new information about:

- *how much the Obama administration knew in advance of the Boston Marathon bombing;
- *the Obama administration’s stealth policy to protect Islamic leaders with ties to terrorism;
- *the scope of access to the White House and classified information the Obama administration has given to members of Muslim Brotherhood front groups; and much more...

The drama continues on Capitof Hill as Haney recounts his attempts to expose the deception to members of Congress. And now for the first time, he can tell his insider story of the Department of Homeland Security’s astonishing betrayal, and the agency’s response to his efforts to protect the nation by targeting him with internal investigations, culminating in a Department of Justice criminal probe.

I haven’t had the opportunity to read these books yet, but hope to. I think the Manhattan Public Library has or can borrow them – check them out if your near, if not check your local library. Good reading!!

THE PATRIOT POST/VOICE OF ESSENTIAL LIBERTY

SEPTEMBER 29, 2016

Mid-Day Digest

The Foundation

“There is but one straight course, and that is to seek truth and pursue it steadily”

--George Washington in (1795)

Comey’s Bad Day in Congress

"We have no evidence that's sufficient to justify conclusion that [Hillary Clinton] violated any of the statutes with respect to classified information," FBI Director James Comey said this week. And, he told

Congress Wednesday, "I haven't seen anything that would come near" to re-opening the investigation. "I know there's lots of questions, lots of controversy. I'm very proud of the way this was done." Regardless of Comey's pride, he and the FBI aided and abetted Clinton in walking free after she clearly violated the law and jeopardized national security with her careless handling of classified information over her private email system. In his July [announcement](#), Comey scolded Clinton for being "extremely careless," but he also effectively rewrote 18 U.S.C. 793(f) so as to include "intent" as being needed for conviction. He argued the FBI couldn't prove Hillary's intent, which is laughable given the lengths to which she went to cover-up her crimes. On Wednesday, he argued that it's not his job to determine Clinton's truthfulness in public statements. It's also not his job to rewrite statutes or to make prosecutorial decisions.

Comey also wouldn't answer when or if the FBI would investigate whether Clinton perjured herself before Congress. The record is [abundantly clear](#): She lied. A lot. But the answer is also obvious: The FBI isn't going to touch that with a 10-foot pole. Comey should say so.

Of course, one [reason Clinton was never indicted](#) was because of Barack Obama's direct involvement in her email scandal. In that sense, Comey's hands were tied. He was *not* going to be the guy to take on both Obama and Clinton — even less so after Attorney General Loretta Lynch's [clandestine meeting](#) with Bill Clinton.

On a final note, Rep. Trey Gowdy had one of the better exchanges of the day, explaining to Comey just how to determine someone's intent. Everything Hillary did, he said, from setting up the server in the first place to lying about it and deleting emails with sophisticated software — heck, she even smashed mobile devices with hammers — proves her intent. If only Comey were honest enough to admit as much.

DANCING AROUND THE ISSUE

THE PATRIOT POST

Yesterday at a CNN sponsored town hall event with a heavy military presence, Barack Obama was asked by a gold star parent why he refuses to call radical Islamic terror "Islamic." Obama responded, "These are people who've killed children, killed Muslims, take sex slaves — there's no religious rationale that would justify in any way any of the things that they do." He then attempted to equate Christianity with Islam by saying, "If you had an organization that was going around killing and blowing people up and said, 'We're on the vanguard of Christianity.' As a Christian, I'm not going to let them claim my religion and say, 'You're killing for Christ.' I would say, that's ridiculous. That's not what my religion stands for. Call these folks what they are, which is killers and terrorists." In spite of voluminous and obvious evidence to the contrary, [Obama's blinding Islamophilia](#) has prevented him from seriously engaging the religious ideology which motivates these radical Islamic terrorists. And that there *aren't* Christians doing these things is somehow lost on him.

Similar to Obama's blindness on Islamic terrorists' ideological motivations are his rosy descriptions of the weakened condition of the Islamic State and terrorism. He declared that we're "significantly safer today than we were when 9/11 happened." Obama's comments run contrary to those of his own administration. Also yesterday, Department of Homeland Security Secretary Jeh Johnson in a panel discussion warned that the likelihood of a terror "attack is still there." He said that there was no good way to calculate how many attacks may be coming and said, "People ask me, 'What keeps you up at night?' That is thing number one, the prospect of another home-born violent extremist acquiring a weapon or tool of mass violence and carrying out an attack somewhere here in the homeland."



September 30, 2016

Dear Friend,

Ex-Speaker John Boehner was back in the news as we reached the one year anniversary of his forced resignation announcement.

First, he was named to the Board of tobacco giant Reynolds American -- a position that can pay up to \$400,000 per year. Then one of the largest special interest lobbying groups in Washington announced it had hired Boehner to a position that will pay upwards of \$1 million to cash in on his connections on Capitol Hill.

According to the announcement, Boehner's job will be to provide "strategic advice." As we know, Boehner's strategy as Speaker was to negotiate deals with Democrats that were good for Obama and other Washington insiders but bad for the American people.

To prove just how much the Republican Establishment doesn't get it, they asked Boehner to send a fundraising email to grassroots conservatives across American asking them for some of their hard-earned money to prop up the current GOP leadership.

"What our country needs is leadership. No matter what happens in November, we need principled conservatives leading the House," Boehner wrote.

Once again, Republican leaders are campaigning as CONSERVATIVES. Boehner and his Establishment allies are hoping you forgot that for the last six years, they have campaigned on our conservative principles to get your votes then **refused to stand up for conservative values** --caving to Obama, Reid and Pelosi at virtually every critical decision point.

Just this week, Republicans cut a backroom deal with Harry Reid on a spending bill that funded Obama's Iran Deal and Syrian refugee program, the radical transgender mandate, the failed Obamacare system, the giveaway of the Internet to the UN, and a RAISE for Planned Parenthood while doing nothing to reduce our \$20 trillion debt.

And while they were cutting another bad deal for the American people, they had the audacity to send John Boehner out to beg hard-working Americans for more of their money.

Instead of using \$2 million in Super PAC money from their wealthy donors and special interests friends to defeat a proven conservative like me in a primary, the GOP Establishment and their allies could have backed conservatives running against liberal Democrats around the country.

But these liberal Republicans simply don't like conservatives, what we stand for, or the fact that we are not afraid to point out their hypocrisy in Washington.

Just how bad is it?

These Insiders were the first ones to stand up for the IRS Commissioner when he **should be impeached**. They are already laying plans for a **lame duck session** to tax the Internet and bust the budget by as much as \$50 billion. And it would be **much worse** if conservatives were not fighting to hold Washington accountable.

That is why we must remain vigilant in the fight for liberty. Our future depends on it.

Yours in Liberty,

Tim Huelskamp

We must listen to Rep. Huelskamp. He is keeping us informed, as always. Soon we will NOT have his good information available. To have his info and advise has been great. Let him know how much we appreciate him. Rep. Huelskamp has been exactly what the Republican Party needs. We will miss him drastically!!

YOUR MEMBER OF CONGRESS IS LYING TO YOU From CONSERVATIVE REVIEW BY: GASTON MOONEY on Sept 29, 2016

As if utter spinelessness on behalf of the voters isn't mournful enough on its own, Senate leaders have hastened to remind us they also lack rudimentary political judgment. - See more at:

https://www.conservativereview.com/commentary/2016/09/your-member-of-congress-is-lying-to-you?utm_source=newsletter&utm_medium=email&utm_content=093016crcontentemail&utm_campaign=newslettertraffic#sthash.reeKv2Id.dpuf

The party's gratitude to voters for its two-house majority has come in the form of lies, incompetence, cowardice, and tragic political judgment. With just weeks to go until the next referendum on their performance, Republicans are, unfortunately, eager to stay consistent in this regard.

The debate over the latest government funding bill has indeed played out true to form. As usual, House and Senate leadership began this process with a lot of rousing promises and formidable rhetoric. Before long, the House was content to take a backseat in the process, insisting Senate negotiations were already in motion and would inculcate its

perspective. Then the early details of the deal began to leak out.

One major goal of conservatives was to pass a funding bill that at least kept operations going into 2017 when a new Congress and administration would return under the watchful eye of an expectant public. This was the first thing Senate leadership gave away.

The bill the Senate passed, however, will expire in early December, setting the stage for a lame duck session. This gives members who have been voted out of office, and have no consequences left to suffer, a chance to return to the chamber and wreak havoc on the country with legislation that was too unpopular to pass right before election day. A lame-duck session under a nothing-to-lose President Obama poses even graver threats as he has one final chance to cement his legacy with forced court appointments and last-ditch progressive measures. Your Republican Congress is fully aware of the long, perilous history of this dynamic and opted to cede the ground from the get-go.

Right alongside this concession was Senate Majority Leader **Mitch McConnell's, R-Ky. (F, 42%)** eagerness to cave on additional Planned Parenthood funding. Despite stentorian objections from the GOP base about the nature of Zika funding language — whether prohibitions would be kept in place to ensure that money would not find its way to abortion providers —McConnell did away with these protections in early negotiations. With such an obvious aversion to his own base and a fear of fighting on any issue important to conservatives, McConnell gave Democrats the opening to demand even more. And of course, they did.

The next Democratic ask was for more emergency spending to address the drinking water crisis in Flint, Michigan. For reasons passing understanding, McConnell chose *this* as his (brief) moment of defiance. As if utter spinelessness on behalf of the voters isn't mournful enough on its own, Senate leaders have hastened to remind us they also lack rudimentary political judgment. A town desperate for clean drinking water strikes the GOP as more fertile ground for taking a stand than the president's abuse of authority or the cause of protecting the unborn.

Lest he gamble with corporate crony allies of *both parties*, however, McConnell was willing to go to the mat for **corporations seeking anonymity** in their political donations. Funny how he is only willing to standing up for those who helped keep his party in office, even if it isn't the U.S. voter.

Americans gave Republicans ground on which to fight and the reserves to win. The only thank you they ever wanted was a legislative body willing to do battle on their behalf.

So when your elected officials tell you that a bipartisan success has been achieved, despite those pesky conservatives trying to interfere, know that while Republicans showed up to get along, Democrats played to win. And in that sense it's quite true: Each got what they wanted.

- See more at: https://www.conservativereview.com/commentary/2016/09/your-member-of-congress-is-lying-to-you?utm_source=newsletter&utm_medium=email&utm_content=093016crcontentemail&utm_campaign=newslettertraffics#sthash.reeKv2Id.dpuf

START: MODULES/TWITTER-RTE-BLOCK

Think about this as you go to the voting booth in November. There is NO DOUBT Dr. Marshall is bought and paid for – Is LaPolice also? I don't really know, but I'll try to find out.

The BRAVEST People in America ARE BLACK CONSERVATIVES!!!
Hello Everyone!! This is exactly what I've been thinking for a very LONG time!!
If socialist College Professors believed their own Propaganda
WOULDN'T THEY TEACH FOR FREE???

MY PARENTS LIVE BETTER WITH A HIGH SCHOOL DIPLOMA
THAN I DO WITH A 4 YEAR DEGREE!!

"WE ARE LENDING MONEY WE DON'T HAVE TO KIDS WHO CAN'T PAY IT BACK TO TRAIN
THEM FOR JOBS THAT NO LONGER EXIST. THAT'S NUTS
--MIKE ROWE

WHEN ONE MILLION BIKERS PROTESTED IN WASHINGTON DC

***NOT ONE STORE WAS LOOTED, ONE FIRE SET, OR ONE OFFICER WOUNDED!!
AND THEY ARE SUPPOSED TO BE THE "BAD" GUYS OF AMERICA!!!***

If you would like to forward this Newsletter as is on to others – be my guest.
If you would like to send/submit comments/editorials to the editor – be my guest.
Send to Sylde's email: sylde@gemsandwood.com

Flint Hills TEA Party contact information: www.flinthillsteaparty.com; fhttp@flinthillsteaparty.com
or facebook – Flint Hills TEA Party; Manhattan contact – Chris or Larry Tawney or Sylde
Nichols, editor, email: sylde@gemsandwood.com. Sylde 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 or to Flint Hills TEA Party which is not tax deductible.

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