

The Patriots' Truth

Flint Hills TEA Party News

Flint Hills TEA Party News

See us at McALISTER'S DELI, EVERY WED after 5:30pm ---- *Everyone is welcome, we ARE the Working Group. Come check us out!! WELCOME!*

Different Types of Government Explained In a Bovine Paradigm... Holy Cow!

Dear Patriots,

Here's the best list I've been able to find in my search for understanding the differences between the types of systems of government philosophy. I don't know who compiled it. But, it is insightful. *[In the interest of full disclosure, I did edit it a bit to make it more timely.]*

FEUDALISM: You have two cows. Your lord of the manor takes some of the milk in return for protecting you from roaming brigands. *(This is where the Mafia got the "protection racket" idea.)*

PURE SOCIALISM: You have two cows. The government takes them and puts them in a barn with everyone else's cows. You have to take care of all the cows. The government gives you as much milk as it thinks you should need.

BUREAUCRATIC SOCIALISM: You have two cows. The government takes them and puts them in a barn with everyone else's cows. They are cared for by ex-chicken farmers. You dairymen have to take care of the chickens the government took from the chicken farmers. The government gives you as much milk and as many eggs as the regulations say you should need.

FASCISM: You have two cows. The government takes both, hires you to take care of them, and sells you the milk. (See Chrysler and GM)

PURE COMMUNISM: You have two cows. Your neighbors help you take care of them, and you all share the milk equally. Life is good until one of the neighbors has triplets that require more milk than the allotted equal share. A committee is formed to decide what to do. In order to maintain the equal shares of milk, the triplets are killed.

RUSSIAN COMMUNISM: You have two cows. In order to avoid a one-way trip to the gulag, you have to take care of them, but the government takes all the milk.

TOTALITARIANISM (DICTATORSHIP): You have two cows. The government takes both cows and shoots you and your family.

SINGAPOREAN DEMOCRACY: You have two cows. The government fines you for keeping two unlicensed farm animals in a one-room apartment.

MILITARIANISM: You have two cows. The government takes both and drafts you.

PURE DEMOCRACY: You have two cows. You and your neighbors vote to see who gets the milk.

REPRESENTATIVE DEMOCRACY: You have two cows. You and your neighbors pick someone to tell you who gets the milk. Of course, the duly elected representative gets to siphon off first dibs on the milk.

AMERICAN DEMOCRACY: The government promises to give you two cows if you vote for it. After the election, the President is impeached for speculating in cow futures. The press dubs the affair "Cowgate". If the President is a Democrat, MoveOn.org urges us to move on and not cry over spilled milk. If he is a Republican, a truth commission headed by Nancy Pelosi will be convened.

BRITISH DEMOCRACY: You have two cows. You feed them sheep's brains and they go mad. The government doesn't do anything. The Queen eventually dissolves Parliament and the mad cow crisis is blamed on the IRA.

BUREAUCRACY: You have two cows. At first the government regulates what you can feed them and when you can milk them. Then it pays you not to milk them. After that it takes both cows, shoots one, milks the other and makes you pour the milk down the drain. Then it requires you to fill out forms in triplicate accounting for the missing cow and fines you for improper disposal of milk.

ANARCHISM: You have two cows. Either you sell the milk at what your neighbors think is a fair price or your neighbors try to kill you and take your cows.

ENTREPRENEURIAL CAPITALISM: You have two cows. You have an idea to create a dairy farm and dairy product company. You take personal initiative and risk to bring it to reality. You sell one cow and buy a bull. You breed them and work your butt off to create a small dairy and a herd that grows in size. You and your family get up at 3:00 am everyday to make the dairy productive and prosperous. Eventually you expand production by reinvesting your profits to grow the business and you hire workers to work in the growing dairy and take care of the herd. You produce much more milk much more efficiently and at a lower cost per gallon. You sell the milk, butter, cheese and ice cream far and wide and profit from your efforts. The government comes along and regulates the dairy to assure public health and safety. You have to hire a department to keep up with the regulatory paperwork. Profit margins shrink. Production costs rise. The Milker's union organizes your employees without a secret ballot using "Card Check" and then makes demands for higher wages and more and more benefits that cause the dairy to become non-competitive with cheaper imported milk, cheese, ice cream and butter. With profits tanking and regulatory and union headaches soaring. You finally say, "*Enough is enough!*" You liquidate the dairy, sell the cows, equipment and land to a shopping mall developer and retire to Florida. The unionized workers now go to the unemployment line and grumble about how unfair you are. The government will tax your estate when you die as a last act of indignity.

HONG KONG CAPITALISM: You have two cows. You sell three of them to your publicly-traded company, using letters of credit opened by your brother-in-laws at the banks, then execute a debt/equity swap with associated general offer so that you get all four cows back, with a tax deduction for keeping five cows. The milk rights of six cows are transferred via a Panamanian intermediary to a Cayman Islands company secretly owned by the majority shareholder, who sells the rights to all seven cows' milk back to the listed company. The annual report says that the company owns eight cows, with an option on one more. Meanwhile, you kill the two cows because the *feng shue* is bad.

ENVIRONMENTALISM: You have two cows. Thanks to ACLU lawsuits for animal abuse and torture, the government bans you from milking or killing them. OSHA and the EPA mandate that all manure and methane emissions must be properly captured by workers in haz-mat suits and treated before disposal at the Government Recycling Center 246 miles away. It is open every other Wednesday between 9:00 and 4:30. Permits for transportation and disposal must be obtained every other Friday between 9:00 and Noon at the recycling center.

FEMINISM: You have two cows. They get married in New Hampshire and adopt a veal calf. They buy fat free homogenized milk at the store and live out a peaceful life as dry cows.

TOTALITARIANISM: You have two cows. The government takes them and denies they ever existed. Milk is banned because of "it's consumption can lead to obesity, heart disease, mad cow disease and lactose intolerance."

COUNTER CULTURISM: Wow, dude, there's like... these two cows, man. You got to have some of this milk.

SURREALISM: You have two male giraffes. The government requires you to take harmonica lessons.

LIBERTARIANISM: You have two cows. One has actually read the Constitution, believes in its principles and has some really good ideas about government. The cow runs for office, and while most people agree that the cow is the best candidate, nobody except the other cow votes for her because all the other cows think it would be "throwing their vote away."

DISCONTENTED CARNATIONISM: Discontented Carnation cows vote for "Change," Obama is elected and ACORN is put in charge of counting your cows and all of the rest of the cows - and, because of the *hay bale out* - all cows are now owned 75% by the Milker's Union and 22.5% by the Federal Government and 2.5% by you. The Bondholders have to settle for 10-cents on the dollar. Take it or leave it.

Written by: Birk

Commonsensetarian Citizen of the Republic

PS: None of the cows mentioned were harmed or consumed during the writing process, nor was any milk spilled or cried over, nor does the homogenized milk mentioned have anything whatsoever to do with the movie *MILK*.

"It is necessary for every American, with becoming energy to endeavor to stop the dissemination of principles evidently destructive of the cause for which they have bled. It must be the combined virtue of the rulers and of the people to do this, and to rescue and save their civil and religious rights from the outstretched arm of tyranny, which may appear under any mode or form of government."

~ Mercy Warren, History of the Rise, Progress, and Termination of the American Revolution, 1805

The following was taken from the weekly Newsletter of **Congressman Kevin Yoder**.

Speaking On CNBC About The Fiscal Cliff

I spoke on CNBC last week about the great need for Congress to arrive at a long-term solution to our country's rapidly approaching fiscal cliff deadline. I hear from business owners throughout the 3rd District over and over again that they want certainty and as much economic predictability as possible. That means no more short-term, band-aid legislation. We need to take this opportunity to make significant changes about how we spend money as a country, and ensure we leave the country in better shape for future generations.

To read all of Congressman Yoder's Newsletter go to: kevin.yoder@congressnewsletter.net

A College Kid From the Eighties Remembers Robert Bork

by John Hayward on 12/20/2012 at 12:02pm

I'm a conservative because of Robert Bork, who passed away this week at the age of 85.

I wasn't set on the road to conservatism because of his fine scholarly work – I read his writing much later. I'm conservative today because in the Eighties, I was a conventionally apathetic college kid who generally drifted upon the tides of popular culture... until the day I started asking why this Bork fellow was the Devil, and no one on the Left could give me a straight answer.

Sometimes I wonder how many people can trace the precise moment of their political awakening: the moment when they joined the national conversation, rather than merely nodding along at what all the fashionable people were saying. Mine came during an evening of pizza delivery. I happened across a local talk radio show while I was tooling along with a payload of pepperoni and sausage. The various callers were railing against Bork and complaining about the dire straits America had reached, if such a horrible man could be nominated to the Supreme Court. I'm not sure what caught my attention and prompted me to spend the rest of my working evening listening to the show. What I clearly remember is noticing that nobody ever got around to explaining what, precisely, was so horrible about Bork. It was a succession of people who *hated* him, rather than disagreeing with him... because they had been *told* to hate him.

I asked around, and soon discovered that not even Left-leaning staff at my college could explain what was so hideous about Bork. A few of his more informed critics could mention a disagreement or two, but nothing that seemed to rate the full-on destruction of the man's character, with Ted Kennedy famously challenging his very humanity. Criticism was one thing, but no one could tell me why this particular Supreme Court nominee was *unthinkable*.

It really stuck in my craw... and over time, it led me to challenge the popular impression of other conventionally hated figures as well, notably President Ronald Reagan – who was routinely subjected to pop-culture insults that would be classified as hate crimes, or paranoid delusions, if directed at the current occupant of the White House. If you're too young to recall the Eighties, it was not uncommon to hear the Reagan presidency described as a threat to the continued survival of the human race.

Conservatives *are* the counter-culture, and we have been for a very long time. I wonder if the best yardstick for measuring our influence upon political culture would be to ask if today's alternative media could have saved the Bork nomination, by highlighting its vacuity and puncturing the assumed moral authority of his persecutors, particularly Ted Kennedy. It seems to me that the Left retains too much power to define people as villains for low-information voters and the water-cooler chat network. That's a big part of how Barack Obama got re-elected, and it's clear that not many people associated with the Romney campaign realized how well it was working.

But I'm confident that the best on-ramp for young people to join the conservative movement is the same one I took, many years ago: *ask the questions you're not supposed to ask*. Note the lack of substance in the answers you receive. Refuse the demands to place some political figures above criticism, while burying others beneath contempt. Don't listen to what other people say about someone you're supposed to hate – it's easier than ever before to go right to the source, and judge their words and ideas for yourself. I can point to all sorts of compulsive legislation advanced by leftists, but they often have trouble explaining exactly what their right-wing demon figures and hate fetishes want to make the rest of us *do*. I kept asking that question during the fitful spasms of anti-Mormonism over the past year, and never could find out exactly what our prospective Mormon overlords were planning to shove down our throats, or pull out of our wallets.

It was relatively difficult for a college kid of the Eighties to track down what Robert Bork actually said and wrote. Today it would only take a few mouse clicks. It is *always* worth the effort.

Commenter **DeepWheat** adds:

Here's a question that'll tie 'em in knots: "If we're to accept that the perpetrators of mass shootings like at Sandy Hook elementary school are totally crazy (with or without the help of drugs, legal or not), why don't they ever attack the local police station?"

Clue: Crazy, but not **that** crazy... ergo, more rational than commonly thought, hmm? ~ DeepWheat

"In such a performance you may lay the foundation of national happiness only in religion, not by leaving it doubtful "whether morals can exist without it," but by asserting that without religion morals are the effects of causes as purely physical as pleasant breezes and fruitful seasons."

~ Benjamin Rush, letter to John Adams, 1811

Gun Control and the Liberal Id by John Hayward on 12/20/2012 at 2:08 pm

No other issue connects with the Left on such an emotional level, or provokes the most wildly out-of-control behavior, as gun control. It's been off the national radar screen for a long time, not least because liberals know it's a killer during presidential elections, so we're seeing a great deal of pent-up frustration erupting now.

Exhibit A is Piers Morgan of CNN, who appears to have gone utterly mad since the Newtown shooting. He claimed it was possible to buy AR-15 assault rifles in *supermarkets*, ignoring **repeated requests from more rational commentators** to name the remarkable supermarket he's been shopping at. On Tuesday, he went berserk on the air and got into a shouting match with guest Larry Pratt of Gun Owners of America: Some of this can be dismissed as grandstanding for ratings, but it's not just Morgan. Author Joyce Carol Oates **wished NRA members would get shot**, so they might finally give up their damnable Second Amendment rights... and insisted she wasn't speaking "ironically." She also mused that a lot of "gun accidents" might not be so accidental after all, broadly accusing thousands of Americans who disagree with her of being murderers.

University of Rhode Island history teacher Erik Loomis **launched into a profane tirade** that accused the National Rifle Association of being a "terrorist organization" and called for the CEO's "head on a stick," although he *did* later try to claim he was speaking ironically, after being rebuked by his university.

It's one thing to be passionately committed to a political position, but these people have gone *feral*. Partly this is due to the small window of opportunity afforded by tragedy. Gun-control zealots know they've only got a few days of grief to exploit, before most Americans begin once more thinking rationally about the Constitution and self-defense. Many of the legislative nostrums prescribed by the gun-control crowd have only tenuous connections to the event itself; it's not long before voters start wondering why there's a big push to ban "assault weapons" because they *look* scary, and note that possession of such a weapon is not essential to the awful business of carrying out a shooting spree.

But much of what we see pouring from the Left in the gun-control debate is a pure expression of their id. This is a hot-button issue for them. Actually, it's wired into *all* of their hot buttons.

There's arrogant contempt for rural "gun culture" – a phrase that most certainly does *not* refer to the gun culture of urban street gangs when a liberal uses it.

There is a dash of leftist power politics involved, since they regard groups like the NRA as vital organs of the Right, a source of both money and political muscle for conservatives. That's one reason so many liberals reflexively wish violence and death upon members and officers of the NRA. Those people are the *enemy*, 365 days a year; the aftermath of a high-profile shooting affords an opportunity to attack them with particular vigor.

Philosophically, the Second Amendment is a hated repudiation of everything collectivists believe about the proper relationship between citizens and the all-powerful State. The concept of private firearms as a bulwark against tyranny *insults* them, because they believe nobody should think about maternal, coercive leftist government that way, not even in the abstract.

The more immediate and practical use of legal firearms for self-defense is also an insult to the State – an accusation that benevolent government cannot adequately protect its citizens. You're supposed to let the agents of the State defend you from criminals, not take matters into your own hands. Frankly, you little people are just too damned stupid to be entrusted with deadly force. You can't *live* any aspect of your lives without maternal government assistance, so how can you be trusted to *defend* your own life?

Personal responsibility is the antithesis of the nanny state, and gun ownership is among the most powerful expressions of such responsibility. Gun owners often see it that way themselves – it has hardly escaped the notice of liberals that Gadsden flags tend to erupt from large gatherings of gun enthusiasts. Right

now, the news is filled with reports of **gun sales skyrocketing**, due to apprehension over the possibility of new gun control legislation. Liberals read headlines like that and *seethe*. It reeks of anarchy to them.

The Left views government as the primary agency of moral action. It “solves” problems by passing laws. Agitating for problem-solving laws is an easy way to express moral supremacy, and in this case, for liberals who don’t personally own guns – or who, like most of the high-level politicians and opinion makers, enjoy armed security protection – it’s completely cost-free. It’s a nice, simple equation: call for banning some types of gun, or *all* of them, and you’re “good.” Everyone else is callous and evil. People who try to introduce actual *facts* into the discussion are vilified with gusto, because they dare to introduce icy logic into an emotional, moral crusade... they want to *talk*, when it’s clearly time for action! It’s an attitude that curdles quickly into the kind of blind hatred that liberals normally congratulate themselves for opposing, because it’s so shallow.

And let’s face it: a blanket pass to scream insults at people you don’t like – justified with a plea that You Care So Very Much and It’s All For the Children – is great fun, and very cathartic. It’s no surprise that a wide range of other issues swiftly creep into these tirades, and soon the gun zealot is, like filmmaker Michael Moore, **describing opposition to socialized medicine** as the moral equivalent of murder. The Left has a great deal of anger to vent. There’s a lot of pressure built up behind that gun-control valve.

Commenter **DeepWheat** adds: *"You can lead a lib to logic, but you can't make it think."* ~ *DeepWheat*

Commenter **Poor Wilber** adds: I suppose the Obama administration has no issue walking guns over to Mexican cartels, while taking issue with law abiding citizens purchasing those same weapons. Why do we have a second amendment to the US Constitution, and why should we fight to preserve it?

Shouldn't Obama realize... it's for the same reason his administration wants to send arms to Syria and Libya? It's for the same reason the people of Iran are oppressed by the Islamic radical theocracy. Gun control means those with guns control those who don't.

”Laws that forbid the carrying of arms ... disarm only those who are neither inclined nor determined to commit crimes... Such laws make things worse for the assaulted and better for the assailants; they serve rather to encourage than to prevent homicides, for an unarmed man may be attacked with greater confidence than an armed man.”

~ Cesare Beccaria, *On Crimes and Punishment*, quoted by Thomas Jefferson in *Commonplace Book*

COULTER: WE KNOW HOW TO STOP SCHOOL SHOOTINGS

By: **Ann Coulter** on 12/19/2012 at 07:05 PM

In the wake of a monstrous crime like a madman’s mass murder of defenseless women and children at the Newtown, Conn., elementary school, the nation’s attention is riveted on what could have been done to prevent such a massacre.

Luckily, some years ago, two famed economists, William Landes at the University of Chicago and John Lott at Yale, conducted a massive study of multiple victim public shootings in the United States between 1977 and 1995 to see how various legal changes affected their frequency and death toll.

Landes and Lott examined many of the very policies being proposed right now in response to the Connecticut massacre: waiting periods and background checks for guns, the death penalty and increased penalties for committing a crime with a gun.

None of these policies had any effect on the frequency of, or carnage from, multiple-victim shootings. (I note that they did not look at reforming our lax mental health laws, presumably because the ACLU is working to keep dangerous nuts on the street in all 50 states.)

Only one public policy has ever been shown to reduce the death rate from such crimes: concealed-carry laws.

The effect of concealed-carry laws in deterring mass public shootings was even greater than the impact of such laws on the murder rate generally.

Someone planning to commit a single murder in a concealed-carry state only has to weigh the odds of one person being armed. But a criminal planning to commit murder in a public place has to worry that anyone in the entire area might have a gun.

You will notice that most multiple-victim shootings occur in “gun-free zones” – even within states that have concealed-carry laws: public schools, churches, Sikh temples, post offices, the movie theater where James Holmes committed mass murder, and the Portland, Ore., mall where a nut starting gunning down shoppers a few weeks ago.

Guns were banned in all these places. Mass killers may be crazy, but they’re not stupid.

If the deterrent effect of concealed-carry laws seems surprising to you, that's because the media hide stories of armed citizens stopping mass shooters. At the Portland shooting, for example, no explanation was given for the amazing fact that the assailant managed to kill only two people in the mall during the busy Christmas season.

It turns out, concealed-carry-holder Nick Meli hadn't noticed that the mall was a gun-free zone. He pointed his (otherwise legal) gun at the shooter as he paused to reload, and the next shot was the attempted mass murderer killing himself. (Meli aimed, but didn't shoot, because there were bystanders behind the shooter.)

In a nonsense "study" going around the Internet right now, Mother Jones magazine claims to have produced its own study of all public shootings in the last 30 years and concludes: "In not a single case was the killing stopped by a civilian using a gun."

This will come as a shock to people who know something about the subject.

The magazine reaches its conclusion by simply excluding all cases where an armed civilian stopped the shooter: They looked only at public shootings where four or more people were killed, i.e., the ones where the shooter wasn't stopped.

If we care about reducing the number of people killed in mass shootings, shouldn't we pay particular attention to the cases where the aspiring mass murderer was prevented from getting off more than a couple rounds?

It would be like testing the effectiveness of weed killers, but refusing to consider any cases where the weeds died.

In addition to the Portland mall case, here are a few more examples excluded by the Mother Jones methodology:

- Mayan Palace Theater, San Antonio, Texas, this week: Jesus Manuel Garcia shoots at a movie theater, a police car and bystanders from the nearby China Garden restaurant; as he enters the movie theater, guns blazing, an armed off-duty cop shoots Garcia four times, stopping the attack. Total dead: Zero.

- Winnemucca, Nev., 2008: Ernesto Villagomez opens fire in a crowded restaurant; concealed carry permit-holder shoots him dead. Total dead: Two. (I'm excluding the shooters' deaths in these examples.)

- Appalachian School of Law, 2002: Crazy immigrant shoots the dean and a professor, then begins shooting students; as he goes for more ammunition, two armed students point their guns at him, allowing a third to tackle him. Total dead: Three.

- Santee, Calif., 2001: Student begins shooting his classmates — as well as the "trained campus supervisor"; an off-duty cop who happened to be bringing his daughter to school that day points his gun at the shooter, holding him until more police arrive. Total dead: Two.

- Pearl High School, Mississippi, 1997: After shooting several people at his high school, student heads for the junior high school; assistant principal Joel Myrick retrieves a .45 pistol from his car and points it at the gunman's head, ending the murder spree. Total dead: Two.

- Edinboro, Pa., 1998: A student shoots up a junior high school dance being held at a restaurant; restaurant owner pulls out his shotgun and stops the gunman. Total dead: One.

By contrast, the shootings in gun-free zones invariably result in far higher casualty figures — Sikh temple, Oak Creek, Wis. (six dead); Virginia Tech, Blacksburg, Va. (32 dead); Columbine High School, Columbine, Colo. (12 dead); Amish school, Lancaster County, Pa. (five little girls killed); public school, Craighead County, Ark. (five killed, including four little girls).

All these took place in gun-free zones, resulting in lots of people getting killed — and thereby warranting inclusion in the Mother Jones study.

If what we care about is saving the lives of innocent human beings by reducing the number of mass public shootings and the deaths they cause, only one policy has ever been shown to work: concealed-carry laws. On the other hand, if what we care about is self-indulgent grandstanding, and to hell with dozens of innocent children being murdered in cold blood, try the other policies.

Commenter **DeepWheat** adds: *"You can lead a lib to logic, but you cannot make it think."*

"Before a standing army can rule, the people must be disarmed; as they are in almost every kingdom of Europe. The supreme power in America cannot enforce unjust laws by the sword; because the whole body of the people are armed, and constitute a force superior to any band of regular troops that can be, on any pretence, raised in the United States."

~ Noah Webster, *An Examination of the Leading Principles of the Federal Constitution*, 1787

"Law and liberty cannot rationally become the objects of our love, unless they first become the objects of our knowledge." ~ James Wilson, *Of the Study of the Law in the United States*, 1790

CHINESE STATE MEDIA DEMANDS UNITED STATES CITIZENS BE DISARMED

by BRANDON DARBY on Dec. 18, 2012

The official Chinese government news agency, Xinhua, has demanded the US immediately adopt stricter gun control measures to reduce the number of firearms the US populace is permitted to possess.

The Chinese state-controlled media's statement, titled "[Innocent Blood Demands No Delay for US Gun Control](#)," is primarily focused on the Newtown tragedy in which 26 Americans were killed by a mad gunman. Twenty of the victims were young children.

The Chinese government stated, "Their blood and tears demand no delay for the U.S. gun control."

In an apparent effort to restrict information to their populace, the Chinese government wrote of a number of US mass shootings but failed to mention they were either stopped by a citizen legally carrying a firearm or otherwise only occurred in the controversial gun-free zones that critics say make prime targets for madmen.

The Chinese government states: The past six months have seen enough shooting rampages in the United States. Just three days ago, three people were shot dead at a shopping mall in Oregon. Two weeks ago, a football player shot his girlfriend dead and then committed suicide. Five months ago, 12 people were killed and 58 wounded in a shooting spree at a midnight screening of a Batman film in Colorado.

The government went on to express a strong dislike of the National Rifle Association while also attacking the Republican Party as somehow complicit in the violence. Conversely, the article heaps praise on the Democratic Party:

The Clinton government launched a series of gun control policies at the end of last century. And the Democrats lost the Congressional election in 1994 and the presidential election in 2000, with the shadow of the NRA present in both defeats.

The current Chinese government, the communist People's Republic of China, was established in a revolution led by Mao Zedong, who killed an estimated 40-70 million people with starvation, executions, and re-education camps.

Right off the bat: Who are the Chinese to demand anything of the USA? AND IF that is what the Chinese Government wants of the USA, Then it is the last thing the USA should do. Concerning what the Chinese Government has done (read the last sentence of this article) who are THEY to even open their mouths? We need to prevent random persons entering schools, office buildings and do away with "GUN FREE" areas. Those 3 changes would have stopped several of the mass shooting events in the USA.

Obama Could Be Facing Impeachment

by Giacomo on December 22, 2012

There are rising concerns on Capitol Hill that President Obama is considering sending US troops into Syria. The military has already taken steps to increase its presence in the area and has been supplying Patriot missiles to Turkey.

At a recent press conference, [Rep Walter Jones \(R-NC\)](#) explained his resolution before the House (H.Con. Res. 107), saying:

"The sense of Congress that the use of offensive military force by a president without prior and clear authorization of an Act of Congress constitutes an impeachable high crime and misdemeanor under article II, section 4 of the Constitution."

The US Constitution states that only Congress has the power to maintain an army, navy and to declare war. None of these fall under the constitutional duties of the president. Article I, Section 8 of says:

"The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;..."

"To declare War, grant Letters of Marque and Reprisal, and make Rules concerning Captures on Land and Water;"

"To raise and support Armies, but no Appropriation of Money to that Use shall be for a longer Term than two Years;"

“To provide and maintain a Navy;”

In a surprise move, one noted Democratic congressman has sided with Jones. [Charles Rangel \(D-NY\)](#) explained that the proper constitutional procedure for sending troops to war is for the president to go to Congress with the request first. Having Congressional approval is viewed as meeting the will of the people, although that can be questioned in today’s politics.

Others that have expressed support of Jones’ actions are Michael Michaud (D-ME); Ron Paul (R-TX), Mo Brooks (R-AL) and Justin Amash (R-MI).

Jones and his supporters sent a [letter to President Obama](#) which read in part:

“Outside of an actual or imminent attack on America, the only precursor to war can be the authorization of Congress. We call on you to abide by our Constitution, and rely on our country’s representatives to decide when war is necessary.”

When asked what he would do if Obama does carry out his intentions of sending troops to Syria without congressional approval, Jones said he would have no choice but to bring impeachment charges against the president.

Read more: <http://godfatherpolitics.com/8661/obama-could-be-facing-impeachment/#ixzz2FoPUKLiH>

Here are a couple comments given on this article:

*Comment #1: Never will be impeached. Congress is too chicken-s**t to do anything because they'll be labeled as Racist. WHAT A JOKE!!*

Comment #2: Actually Congress might vote a bill of impeachment, but Harry Reid would never bring it before the Senate. That is the measure of how little those in power think of their country. It's party before Nation.

This was actually the reason a Kansas Representative gave us for the House NOT initiating impeachment proceedings during his first term. I'm sure they would stick to that decision.

Store Clerk Shoots Black in Self Defense – Now Black Community in Uproar

by Francis Marion on November 30, 2012

I hate talking about the race issue because there is only one race: the human race. Yes, there are different ethnic groups within the human race. Some have darker skin, others lighter skin. Some have almond shaped eyes, others have more rounded shaped eyes. Some ethnic groups are quite tall and others quite short. But the bottom line is that we are all part of the same human race and need to treat each other accordingly and stop trying to use race as a tool of hatred.

Case in point is what happened to [Alexander Calloway](#) of Houston, Texas. Calloway, 21 and two other young black men approached a Valero gas station at 3:30 am, only to find it closed and the doors locked. Instead of leaving, Calloway and his friends banged on the front door and yelled at the clerk who was working inside. An argument ensued through the locked glass door.

In an attempt to resolve the matter, the clerk unlocked the door and tried to end the argument when Calloway hit him in the face. Seeing that the other two men had guns, the clerk drew his own gun out and shot his attacker in the stomach. Calloway was rushed to a local fire station by his cousin. He was then sent to the hospital where he is listed in critical condition.

Police watched the surveillance tape of the incident and ruled that the clerk shot in self-defense and that his actions were justified. Of course, the clerk is not black, so even though he was the one who was first assaulted, Calloway’s father, along with a number in the local black community are all up in arms and want the clerk arrested and convicted.

I’ve seen this all too often across the country. Had the clerk been black and Calloway white, there would be no protests and no calls for justice. If anything, the white guy would be found guilty of a hate crime for punching a black guy in the face. But in real life, it was a non-black guy who defended himself against three armed blacks and now the blacks are blaming him and demanding justice. I noticed I didn’t hear his dad say anything about his son assaulting the clerk first or that his wonderful son bears any blame. And now, the clerk is out of a job because of the community pressure and protest against the store.

When will it all end or will it end? The saddest part in all of this is that it is the blacks that keep pouring fire on racial hatred. They are the ones that keep hollering the most when it is one way and not the other. Years ago I was worked the electric company as a meter reader and one of my routes took me into an all black area of town. I can’t tell you how many times I was yelled at, had someone in my face threatening me or how many times I was eyewitness to drug abuse and other crimes. But the incident that got to me the most was when a 3-4 year old boy walked up to me and called me a ‘m.f. whitey’ and told me to get my white ass out of his yard.

It became obvious to me that it isn’t society that causes blacks to become hateful and bitter, rather they

are taught to be that way by their families. They are taught to hate whites from the earliest of age, and that hatred continually gets fueled by family and friends as they grow up.

It's no different than the way Muslim youth are raised to hate Jews, Christians and Americans from when they are very young. By the time they enter their teens, they're already armed and ready to kill.

Proverbs 22:6 says:

“Train up a child in the way he should go; even when he is old he will not depart from it.”

Unfortunately, too many children today are not being trained in the ways of the Lord and many of the racial issues we see taking place testifies to this.

This is all so true, not only in the Black Community, but everywhere. Too many children are not only raised without the word of GOD, but are taught to hate. Why anyone raising a child would do that is beyond me, but it happens everywhere and is and has been happening here in our great country for, at least, the last 25 - 30 years. For a child or any person to have hate instead of love in their heart, toward everyone, is a truly a sad, unhappy person. Maybe this is the first thing we should work on to change. “Love one another.” I think that is the first thing we learned in Sunday School. So many things have be eliminated from our schools, has that been eliminated from our Churches? Not mine – how about yours?

Foster Parents Lose Kids Because of Right-Wing Political Views

Posted on [December 1, 2012](#) by [Dave Jolly](#)

Some of you reading this either are or have been foster parents and you know how much your foster kids mean to you. Now imagine that after seven years of being a foster parent that you suddenly had your three current foster children removed from your home because you identified with a particular political party.

Wouldn't you be outraged?

That is what happened to couple in Great Britain. Before you blow this off as being over there and not here in the US, let me tell you that in many such matters like this, the US almost always follows the patterns set in Great Britain and this could well happen here any day, if it hasn't already.

At the moment, the Labor Party is the ruling party in Rotherham, England politics. It is a left-wing party that supports membership to the European Union, a fairly open immigration policy and favored multiculturalism in many ways.

There is a right-winged political party in the UK known as United Kingdom Independence Party or UKIP. It is a libertarian party that is pushing for the UK to withdraw from the European Union before they are destroyed by it. UKIP also wants to see a five year freeze on immigration for seeking permanent residence in the country. They also want to regulate and reduce the access to welfare benefits to new immigrants. Because of these anti-immigration views, opponents claim that UKIP is anti-multiculturalism.

When social workers visited the UK couple and discovered that they were affiliated with UKIP, they called the couple racist and declared that they were unsuitable caregivers because of their political views. The three foster children, all under the age of 10, were immediately removed from the home. The issue, according to the child services people is that the three foster kids are European immigrants and UKIP's stance on immigration.

The [foster mother](#) reported that one of the social workers told her:

“[W]e would not have placed these children with you had we known you were members of Ukip because it wouldn't have been the right cultural match.”

[Joyce Thacker](#), Strategic Director of Children and Young People's Services in Rotherham, supported the actions of the social workers, stating:

“If the party mantra is, for example, ending the active promotion of multiculturalism I have to think about that ... I have to think of [the children's] longer-term needs.”

Not all of the British bureaucrats are supportive of the removal of the foster kids. Michael Grove, Secretary of State for Education believes the actions taken were arbitrary, ideological and indefensible. He stated:

“If we say you cannot foster children because you're a member of a mainstream political party or because you have views on multiculturalism then that's utterly wrong.”

Although the Rotherham borough council say they are keeping the matter under review, nothing has been done to return the foster kids to the couple. The way the entire matter was handled by child services prompted the foster mother to say:

“[She and her husband had] personally been slandered and we would like a public apology from Rotherham.”
“From a personal and selfish point of view, we would like the children back. But we are more concerned with

the children's welfare, and we do not want them traumatized any more than they already have been."

Like I said earlier, if you don't think it could happen here in the US, think again. I personally know of a case that happened a few years back. I couple I knew were foster parents and had two school age foster children living with them. The children had been with them since they were infants. When a new children services caseworker visited, she was outraged that the couple was taking the kids to church and Sunday school. She immediately ruled that the foster parents were causing undo mental and emotional harm by forcing their religious views on the children. The kids were immediately removed from the home and placed with a non-church attending family.

When the foster parents asked her to justify her actions, she said that the kids needed to wait until they were old enough to make their own decision on what religion, if any, they wanted to pursue. In other words, she wanted the kids raised with her religion of atheism rather than the couple's Christian religion. The original foster parents fought to get the foster kids, but when it appeared the social worker was about to lose, she made a number of other false accusations about how the kids were being treated and the conditions they were living in. Sadly, the whole thing was so emotionally damaging on the parents that they decided they would no longer serve as foster parents and pulled out of the program. Incidentally, the foster mother ended up having an emotional breakdown and needed long term counseling and medical care.

Any of you out there who are foster parents or thinking about being foster parents, I can't urge you strongly enough to do it because there are so many kids that need a good stable home environment. However, you also need to be aware that you may encounter social workers who have different religious and political views than your own and they may take action based on those differences.

On Conservatives' Wish List and Liberals' Kill List: Privacy

Witten by Chris Graham on Dec. 1, 2012 -- concerning Government Control, Liberalism and Politics

Rep. Hank Johnson, a Democrat of Georgia, came out the other day in support of a constitutional amendment to prevent corporations from donating to political campaigns. Of course, inasmuch as corporations are not sentient entities and therefore can neither donate money nor even think about doing so, corporations do *not* donate to political campaigns. The people who work for the corporations do, however, and in reality it is the rights of these people that Johnson wants to limit:

"[Y]ou are being taught to hate your government— don't want government, but 'keep your hands off of my Medicare,' by the way. I mean, we are all confused people and we're poking fingers at each other saying, 'Well, you're black, you're Hispanic, immigration, homosexuals.' You know, we're lost on the social issues, abortion, contraception... And these folks are setting up a scenario where they're privatizing every aspect of our lives as we know it. So, wake up! Wake up! Let's look at what's happening. We need a constitutional amendment to allow the legislature to control the so-called free speech rights of corporations."

So that's the context of what he said. More noteworthy, I believe, than his call for a constitutional amendment is his line, "And these folks are setting up a scenario where they're privatizing every aspect of our lives as we know it." In case it is not clear, he's saying privatization is a bad thing.

When a conservative speaks of the concept of "privacy" and all of that word's derivatives, he does so in a positive light, viewing it as a necessary trait of American society. Conservatives want privacy for themselves and for all. The smaller the government, the more freedoms are enjoyed by the citizens, including the freedom to privacy. Privatization is just the implementation of privacy.

When a liberal speaks of the concept of privacy, as we can see by the words of this Johnson fellow, he does so disparagingly. This is because the more privacy the people have, the more freedoms they have, and the less control the government has over them. The only time liberals seem to worry about privacy is when it comes to sodomy in the bedroom. And that's fine; they can do whatever they want in the bedroom. But it is a farce that they want their bedrooms to be private. "Keep your nose out of our bedrooms," they say, while simultaneously bringing their bedrooms into the public square to demonstrate to all what they do on a nightly basis in their bedrooms. But I digress.

"And these folks are setting up a scenario where they're privatizing every aspect of our lives as we know it," says Johnson, as if there's nothing more dangerous and dire a circumstance than people wanting privacy.

"Hurry," he seems to say, "we must stop this corrosive concept, this, this 'privacy' they keep asking for! These conservatives are getting out of line!"

If only real issues, like the bankrupting of America, drove Democrats to such passionate cries to heed their warnings, we might still be a strong country.

The Foundation -- Brief · December 3, 2012

"The right of the citizens to keep and bear arms has justly been considered as the palladium of the liberties of a republic." ~ Joseph Story

Re: The Left by columnist Jason Whitlock of Fox Sports... blamed the Second Amendment to the United State Constitution for the murder/suicide of Jovan Belcher, linebacker for the Kansas City Chiefs. Calling for the NFL to have cancelled the Chiefs' Sunday game, Whitlock wrote: 'I would argue that your rationalizations speak to how numb we are in this society to gun violence and murder. We've come to accept our insanity. We'd prefer to avoid seriously reflecting upon the absurdity of the prevailing notion that the second amendment somehow enhances our liberty rather than threatens it. How many young people have to die senselessly? How many lives have to be ruined before we realize the right to bear arms doesn't protect us from a government equipped with stealth bombers, predator drones, tanks and nuclear weapons? Our current gun culture simply ensures that more and more domestic disputes will end in the ultimate tragedy, and that more convenience-store confrontations over loud music coming from a car will leave more teenage boys bloodied and dead.' Whitlock never lays responsibility for Jovan Belcher's murder of his 22-year-old girlfriend and his suicide at the feet of Jovan Belcher. In fact, he describes Belcher as a '25-year-old kid,' which is simply asinine -- at age 25, you are no longer a 'kid.' You are a man, with real responsibilities -- Belcher had a three-month-old child. ... If Belcher wanted to kill his girlfriend and then himself, he didn't need a gun to do it. And no matter how much Whitlock propounds that 'Handguns do not enhance our safety,' Kasandra Perkins would have had a much better shot at life if she'd been the one with the handgun." ~ Breitbart's [Ben Shapiro](#)

Editor's Note: Not only is Whitlock dead wrong, as was NBC's Bob Costas in quoting him during Sunday Night Football, but, as Mark Alexander argued Thursday, [all Patriots are obligated to be armed & ready](#).

For the Record by columnist Doug Hagmann

"On the day before Thanksgiving, Barack Hussein Obama issued a Presidential Memorandum, or an unofficial directive to the heads of departments and agencies under the executive branch. This Presidential Memorandum, the text of which is only 183 words, directs agency and department heads to establish a program 'to deter, detect, and mitigate actions by employees who may represent a threat to national security.' ... [T]here appears to be a deliberate lack of specificity concerning the exact elements that constitute such an 'insider threat.' ... The key to understanding this memorandum is to understand that we are witnessing the greatest consolidation of power and control under the Executive branch of the government in recent U.S. history. This consolidation of power makes it possible for a select number of highly political 'czars' and appointed officials to observe, control and report on the activities of people within their various departments to the Executive branch. ... It's no longer about the rule of law and one's allegiance to the United States. It's now about allegiance to the agenda of the Executive branch, assured by active surveillance of government employees by Obama's hand-picked appointees."

Political Futures by The Washington Examiner's Philip Klein

"To be clear, Republicans didn't lose the health care debate in 2009 or 2012. They lost it during the Bush era, when Republicans came to power and failed to advance free market solutions. Unlike issues like guns or taxes, there isn't a strong activist community on the right built around health care. Such activism has only traditionally been created on an ad hoc basis to respond to Democratic efforts to expand the role of government, as with Hillarycare in 1993 and 1994, and Obamacare. As long as Republicans failed to address problems with the health care system, it was inevitable that at some point Democrats would realize their dream of national health care. ... In the coming years, it will be important for conservatives and Republicans to avoid making the same mistake again. Though it's now inevitable that Americans will experience Obamacare, the battle over the future of the health care system is far from over. At some point in the future, liberals will be arguing that any ongoing problems with the health care system are a result of Democrats leaving the private sector with too much control. They'll be renewing their push for a 'public option,' with the ultimate goal of achieving single-payer health care. And if Republicans don't present compelling alternatives, that's exactly where America will end up."

If you would like to forward this Newsletter as is on to others – be my guest.
If you would like to send comments (just a sentence or two) 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; fhtp@flinthillsteaparty.com or facebook – Flint Hills TEA Party; Manhattan contact – Chuck Henderson, 785-236-1286; Sylva Nichols, editor, email: sylda@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.