

The Patriots' Truth

Flint Hills TEA Party News

See us at McALISTER'S DELI, EVERY WED after 5:30pm — *Join the Working Group. Monthly meetings are usually the 2nd or 3rd Saturday of each month. This month we are taking a break. **Next meeting: Feb 18 — 9:30AM, Manhattan City Library Auditorium.** Bring your important issues to be discussed. We **MUST** keep God in our Hearts!! Much is still to be accomplished in D.C., at the State Capital, county, Community & School Districts — may God guide them and all of us. **Join us March 2, 2014** for this year's "YES for Liberty" Scholarship Bee. It will be held at the Alumni Center at 17th & Anderson at 2pm. Come cheer Kansas High School students on in their study of the U.S. Constitution. Their Constitutional knowledge will help them continue their education after High School in the school of their choice. **We must work together for the good of all in the USA and the world. GOD BLESS us all!!***

The following was taken from Senator Pat Roberts Newsletter of Fri., Jan. 31, 2014

Introducing a Bill to Block Federal Intrusion on State Education Decisions

I introduced a bill to preserve state education autonomy by prohibiting the federal government from coercing states to adopt education standards like Common Core. Setting high standards for our schools, our teachers and our children is the right thing to do, but those standards should be decided in Kansas, without bribes or mandates from Washington. We need to get the federal government out of the classroom, and return community decisions back to where they belong - in the community.

Designed by the National Governors Association and the Council of Chief State School Officers in 2007, Common Core was an effort to raise math and reading standards for students across the country. States could adopt Common Core voluntarily.

In defiance of federal law, the Obama Administration began coercing states to implement Common Core. They required states to adopt Common Core standards to receive federal funding under the Obama administration's multibillion-dollar Race to the Top (RTT) program and used federal funds to develop Common Core-aligned tests.

My legislation, the Learning Opportunities Created At the Local (LOCAL) Level Act would strictly forbid the federal government from intervening in a state's education standards, curricula, and assessments through the use of incentives, mandates, grants, waivers or any other form of manipulation.

Unfortunately, it is evident that certain waivers from onerous education requirements have been granted only to those states that agree to implement the White House's preferred education policies. In fact, The New York Times has referred to the waiver process as "the most sweeping use of executive authority to rewrite federal education law since Washington expanded its involvement in education in the 1960s." My bill ensures States retain their authority to determine the curriculum and standards that are best for their students.

I strongly feel that it is time for Senator Roberts to retire. However, he hit this nail on the head!!

How I learned the meaning of the word "Service".

I became confused when I heard the word "Service" used with these agencies:

Internal Revenue 'Service', U.S. Postal 'Service', Telephone 'Service', Civil 'Service', State, City, County & Public 'Service', Customer 'Service'

This is NOT what I thought "Service" meant.

But today, I overheard two farmers talking, and one of them said he had hired a bull to 'Service' a few cows. BAM!! It all came into focus. Now I understand what all these agencies are doing to us.

You are now as enlightened as I am.

Those of you that elected our President – Are you happy with the "service" you're getting? Isn't it great that the USA has a President that is "servicing" the whole country??

The following was taken from State Rep. Sydney Carlin's weekly Newsletter

Lesser Prairie Chickens

Last week Secretary of State Kris Kobach testified in Senate Committee urging passage of SB 276 which would prevent efforts by the federal government to declare the lesser prairie chicken a protected species. The bill would also assert state sovereignty over non-migratory wildlife and would avoid any federal law in Kansas on the Lesser Prairie Chicken. Under the bill, state officials also would be allowed to charge federal officials with felony for any interference dealing with the lesser prairie chicken.

Son Saves Dad's Life By Shooting Burglar

Posted By [Philip Hodges](#) on Jan 25, 2014

From the Dallas News:

The homeowner woke up to see a man burglarizing his pickup truck that was parked in his front yard. He approached the man with a rifle, intending to hold him until law enforcement could arrive, but the man fled the scene, according to the Van Zandt County Sheriff's Office.

The homeowner fired at the man and then noticed a truck parked in the dark near the roadway, which he believed belonged to the man so he got in the truck and took the keys out of the ignition to prevent him from leaving the scene. The man confronted the homeowner and disarmed him, assaulting him with the rifle, authorities said.

The homeowner's son saw the man raising the rifle and, fearing the man was about to shoot his father, shot the suspect, killing him instantly.

"We are a nation of laws," said county sheriff Michael Lindsey Ray. "It's unfortunate that a young man had to die this morning... because of a bad decision he made to violate the rights of a law-abiding citizen."

Ray said the sheriff's office will always support citizens of the community who are protecting their "lives, liberty and property, especially during a lawful use of force situation."

Judging from the comment section of this news article, there were several people who claimed to have known the burglar either through friendship or family. One of the commenters claimed to be the burglar's father. He claimed the homeowner's son murdered his boy in cold blood. Those on the burglar's side claimed that although this boy had "uncontrollable" problems, he wouldn't have gone so far as to shoot or kill anyone. Therefore, deadly use of force was uncalled for.

I don't know either family involved, but I'm assuming the homeowner's family didn't know the burglar. There's no way the homeowner or his son would've known that the burglar *wouldn't* have killed anyone. If the homeowner's son had not intervened, the homeowner could've very well been killed.

Sometimes, we think that *our* family members aren't *capable* of such things as murder. I think that's what some of the burglars' family and friends were saying. The truth is, we're *all capable* of murder, given the right opportunity and motivation.

In no way am I downplaying the loss of this boy. It was obviously unfortunate. These sorts of situations, no matter the circumstances, are always heartbreaking for the families involved. I can't imagine what it would be like to lose my own son in this way.

But if I did lose my own son this way, I think I'd be angry at my *son* for being so reckless. That doesn't mean that I wouldn't miss him or grieve over his death.

I'm sorry to say, but anytime someone decides he's going to commit a crime, especially on someone's private residential property, he's setting a trap for himself. If the boy had stopped when he got caught the first time, he'd probably still be alive today, sitting safe and sound in a jail cell. But he had to run and then fight with the homeowner and hit him with the rifle. You do something like that, you're just begging for trouble. The homeowner's son saw what was going on and, fearing for his dad's life, shot the guy.

And they want to take our guns – I don't think so!! Get ammo before they take all of it off the market. Gotta keep an eye out to stay ahead!! We should all have our guns & know how to use them.

Frankly Speaking | by Frank F. Clark

The other day, I listened to a broadcast by Ravi Zacharias concerning the effect of globalization on our lives. He started out by quoting a secular sociologist by the name of Daniel Bell. Daniel wrote, "Culture is an effort to provide a coherent set of answers to the existential situations that confront all human beings in the passage of their lives... In the west we are witnessing a genuine cultural revolution. A genuine cultural revolution is one that makes a decisive break from the shared meanings of the past, particularly those related to the deepest questions of the purpose meaning of life." Existential questions are those that seek the meaning of life and deep questions of the longings of life.

What we are witnessing is the breaking apart of those foundations which brought our culture together. This is especially true of those questions dealing with what life actually means and what our destiny is. We are also

witnessing the redefining of the words we use. An obvious example is the word “gay.” It used to mean one who was jovial and happy. Today it means one who engages in homosexual activity.

We have witnessed a change in the moral standards of society. Many of us have seen the comparison between the discipline problems in schools in the 1950's with today. The most notable example of this is the increase in mass shootings at schools by students. Even as late as the 1970's this was virtually unheard of.

The first two mass shootings that I personally remember are Pearl High School in Pearl, Mississippi and Heath High School in Paducah, Kentucky. In the Pearl High shooting, the shooters had ties with Satanism. Paducah is notable, because all of the victims were Christian students at a prayer meeting before school when they were shot. The Christian high school students where I was principal at the time wanted to do something to help one of the wounded Paducah victims who became a paraplegic as a result of the shooting. We invited that girl and her father to visit our school. Our students blessed her with some needed ambulatory equipment. It was a very moving experience for everyone.

Since then the shootings have occurred on an ever-increasing basis. It's not the guns, folks. It is the moral rift that has developed in our society, because we have left our Judeo-Christian founding principles behind. As Ravi stated in his comments, that rift has become so wide that someone today can walk into a church for the first time and say, “My goodness, what was that all about?”

The younger generation has been separated in language, morals and history from our nations' roots. Our public education system is helping this process further along with the introduction of Common Core. The result is that our culture is coming unglued with increasing speed. This is catastrophic! As 1 Corinthians 3:19 says, “For the wisdom of this world is foolishness in God’s sight. As it is written: “He catches the wise in their craftiness...”

Can we reverse this? Absolutely! However, we did not get this way over night. It will take time to get out of it, as well. 1 Peter 4:1-2 says: “Therefore, since Christ suffered in his body, arm yourselves also with the same attitude, because whoever suffers in the body is done with sin. As a result, they do not live the rest of their earthly lives for evil human desires, but rather for the will of God.” Are we willing to do this for the long haul? Our nation's survival depends on it.

The Case for Voter ID | By KRIS W. KOBACH

Updated May 23, 2011 12:01am EDT

On Thursday, the Wisconsin legislature sent a bill requiring photographic identification for voting to Gov. Scott Walker's desk. This follows the enactment of an even stricter law in Kansas a few weeks ago.

Drafted by my office, Kansas' Secure and Fair Elections Act combined three elements: (1) a requirement that voters present photo IDs when they vote in person; (2) a requirement that absentee voters present a full driver's license number and have their signatures verified; and (3) a proof of citizenship requirement for all newly registered voters. Although a few states, including Georgia, Indiana and Arizona, have enacted one or two of these reforms, Kansas is the only state to enact all three.

Other states are moving in the same direction. The Texas legislature sent a photo-ID bill to Gov. Rick Perry's desk last Monday. And next year Missouri voters will get a chance to vote on a photo-ID requirement.

Immediately after the Kansas law was signed in April, critics cried foul. They argued that voter fraud isn't significant enough to warrant such steps, that large numbers of Americans don't possess photo IDs, and that such laws will depress turnout among the poor and among minorities. They are wrong on all three counts.

Voter fraud is a well-documented reality in American elections. To offer a few examples, a 2010 state representative race in Kansas City, MO was stolen when one candidate, J.J. Rizzo, allegedly received more than 50 votes illegally cast by citizens of Somalia. The Somalis, who didn't speak English, were coached to vote for Mr. Rizzo by an interpreter at the polling place. The margin of victory? One vote.

In Kansas, 221 incidents of voter fraud were reported between 1997 and 2010. The crimes included absentee-ballot fraud, impersonation of another voter, and a host of other violations. Because voter fraud is extremely difficult to detect and is usually not reported, the cases that we know about likely represent a small fraction of the total.

My office already has found 67 aliens illegally registered to vote in Kansas, but when the total number is calculated, it will likely be in the hundreds. In Colorado, the Secretary of State's office recently identified 11,805 aliens illegally registered to vote in the state, of whom 4,947 cast a ballot in the 2010 elections.

Evidence of voter fraud is present in all 50 states, and public confidence in the integrity of elections is at an all-time low. In the Cooperative Congressional Election Study of 2008, 62% of American voters thought that voter fraud was very common or somewhat common.

Fear that elections are being stolen erodes the legitimacy of our government. That's why the vast majority of

Americans support laws like Kansas's Secure and Fair Elections Act. A 2010 Rasmussen poll showed that 82% of Americans support photo ID laws. Similarly, a 2011 Survey USA poll of Kansas voters showed that 83% support proof-of-citizenship requirements for voter registration.

Critics of these laws nevertheless make outrageous arguments against them. New York University's Brennan Center, which stridently opposes all photo ID laws, claims that a whopping 11% of the American voting-age public — that means tens of millions of people — don't possess a photo ID. It bases this number on a survey it conducted in 2006.

However, we don't have to rely on implausible estimates when the actual numbers are readily available. In Kansas, my office obtained the statistics, and they tell a very different story. According to the 2010 census, there are 2,126,179 Kansans of voting age. According to the Kansas Department of Motor Vehicles, 2,156,446 Kansans already have a driver's license or a non-driver ID. In other words, there are more photo IDs in circulation than there are eligible voters. The notion that there are hundreds of thousands of voters in Kansas (or any other state) without photo IDs is a myth.

Carrying a photo ID has become a part of American life. You can't cash a check, board a plane, or even buy full-strength Sudafed over the counter without one. That's why it's not unreasonable to require one in order to protect our most important privilege of citizenship. But just in case any person lacks a photo ID, Kansas's law provides a free state ID to anyone who needs one. Other states have included similar provisions in their photo-ID laws.

Some opponents of election security laws also declare that they are part of a sinister plot to depress voter registration and turnout, especially among minority voters who are more likely to vote Democrat. Here too the facts do not support the claim. Georgia's photo ID requirement was in place for both the 2008 and 2010 elections, when turnout among minority voters was higher than average. Likewise, Arizona's proof-of-citizenship requirement for registration has not impeded minority voters from registering.

If election security laws really were part of a Republican scheme to suppress Democratic votes, one would expect Democrats to fight such laws, tooth and nail. That didn't happen in Kansas, where two-thirds of the Democrats in the House and three-fourths of the Democrats in the Senate voted in favor of the Secure and Fair Elections Act. They did so because they realize that fair elections protect every voter and every party equally.

No candidate, Republican or Democrat, wants to emerge from an election with voters suspecting that he didn't really win. Election security measures like the one in my state give confidence to voters and candidates alike that the system is fair.

Mr. Kobach is the Kansas Secretary of State. He is also the co-author of Arizona's SB 1070 illegal immigration law and former Counsel to U.S. Attorney General John Ashcroft.

From the Jay Leno show:

"I was going to start off tonight with an Obama joke, but I don't want to get audited by the IRS."

Now that he's a short timer, Jay does not feel constrained to stay within the network guidelines of "no Obama criticism and staying politically correct" — What a breath of fresh air!

Kansas pretty well took care of the gun rights and voter fraud problem thru Legislature. We passed a law giving us the right to "bear arms". The 2nd Amendment was NOT written for us to protect ourselves from foreign attack — **it was meant to protect us from a controlling Federal Government.** Our Founding Fathers had just freed/protected themselves from a controlling Government — the British!!! We must be ready to do the same now. Most everyone we know and associate with are hunters — there are many 1000s all over our country — our kind of "army" is the most important. A hunter that can sneak up on wildlife and successfully feed their family can be a successful army member. This "army" is the one that the Japanese were not willing to and would not challenge during WWII. Yes, this is probably the largest and the most dedicated army in the world. Pay attention, world. **We don't want to activate, but never, ever forget we are here!!!**

This is worth reading...

Snowstorm in the South is about as rare as a glass of unsweetened tea at a church supper. Folks around Birmingham, Ala. weren't all that worried though. The storm was only supposed to dust the city – not even enough powder for a Southern snowman.

So when the first snowflakes began to fall, no one paid all that much attention. But then, the flakes kept falling. Before too long folks in places like Hoover and Inverness realized it was much more than a dusting. By that point, it was too late for anyone to do anything.

Icy interstates and highways soon became clogged with cars and trucks. Thousands of motorists soon found themselves stranded with nowhere to go – including many stuck on Highway 280.

Chick-fil-A had a captive crowd of hungry customers. So why did they give away their food?

But a good number of those stranded motorists were able to find shelter in the storm thanks to the kindness and generosity of Chick-fil-A restaurant employees and the restaurant's owner, Mark Meadows.

Once the snow started accumulating, Meadows closed the restaurant and sent his staff home. But a few hours later, many of them returned – unable to get to their homes.

“Our store is about a mile and a half from the interstate and it took me two hours to get there,” manager Audrey Pitt told me. “It was a parking lot as far as I could see.”

So Audrey left her car on the side of the interstate to join a flock of bundled up drivers trudging through the snow.

“At one point there were more people walking than driving,” she said.

Some of the drivers had been stuck in their cars for nearly seven hours without any food or water. So the staff of the Chick-fil-A decided to lend a helping hand.

“We cooked several hundred sandwiches and stood out on both sides of 280 and handed out the sandwiches to anyone we could get to – as long as we had food to give out.”

The staffers braved the falling snow and ice, slipping and sliding, as they offered hot juicy chicken breasts tucked between two buttered buns. And Chick-fil-A refused to take a single penny for their sandwiches.

The meal was a gift – no strings attached.

For the frozen drivers, it was manna from heaven.

“They were very excited and extremely thankful,” she said. “People were thankful to get something to put in their stomachs.”

Audrey said they were especially surprised that the sandwiches were free. Why not make some extra money during the storm? It's not like anyone could go to another restaurant. Chick-fil-A had a captive crowd of hungry customers. So why did they give away their food?

“This company is based on taking care of people and loving people before you're worried about money or profit,” Audrey told me. “We were just trying to follow the model that we've all worked under for so long and the model that we've come to love. There was really nothing else we could have done but try to help people any way we could.”

Lauren Dango was one of those stranded motorists. She's known Meadows for years and she was stunned when she saw him walking from car to car with Chick-fil-A sandwiches.

“I looked up and I'm like, what is he doing?” Dango told me. “He had a catering order and it got canceled, so he pulled over and started giving away food.”

And if that wasn't enough, Meadows helped a driver maneuver along the icy road by pushing a car up an incline.

Dango was so touched by Meadows' kindness, she sent a letter to Chick-fil-A's corporate headquarters.

“Kudos to Mark Meadows for not only preaching the ‘second mile’ concept, but actually living by it,” she wrote.

It's no secret that Chick-fil-A was founded by a Christian family. And it's no secret that they run their business on biblical values. What happened in Birmingham is an example of how those biblical values are played out.

“We just wanted to be able to help,” Audrey said. “Yesterday was such a hopeless situation. We wanted to do something to make people feel a little bit better. We were here. We had food and there were people outside who needed food. So it just made sense to do something for them.”

But Chick-fil-A's generosity didn't stop there.

“We opened up our dining room to anyone who wanted to sleep on a bench or a booth,” Audrey told me.

And this morning, the weary staff members fired up their ovens and began preparing chicken biscuits. The only thing that is closed – is Chick-fil-A's cash register.

“We're not open for business,” she said. “We're just feeding people who are hungry.”

I'd say the Chick-fil-A team blessed a lot of people in Birmingham – but that's not how Audrey sees it.

“It's a blessing to us to be able to help people,” she said. “It really is.”

“For I was hungry and you gave me something to eat,” Jesus said in the Gospel of Matthew. “I was thirsty and you gave me something to drink. I was a stranger and you invited me in.”

It was a Sunday school lesson illustrated on a snowy winter day along Highway 280 in Alabama with a chicken sandwich and a side of waffle fries.

May we all take a lesson from this — A wonderful happening. God be with them!!

Stanford Law Professor: The 2nd Amendment Is All About Restrictions On Citizens

Posted By Mark Horne on Jan 31, 2014 | LAST RESISTANCE, LIBERALISM'S WORST NIGHTMARE

The 2nd Amendment is arguably the most restricted, regulated and misinterpreted amendment of the Constitution. Liberals argue for abortion “rights” because of some court opinion *decades* ago that supposedly settled the issue. The passage of time

officially codified abortion as a woman's "right."

But something like the Bill of Rights, which was "settled" centuries ago doesn't apply anymore. It's subject to restrictions, regulations, government monitoring and tracking, licenses, etc. Try doing that with abortion, and you'll be met with vitriol.

John Donahue, a Stanford Law Professor, believes that the 2nd Amendment is all about restrictions, not acknowledgements of freedom. He made his remarks in a debate with Donald Kilmer. [The Stanford Review](#) reported:

Donohue was the first to respond. "I support the right to self-defense," he said, "but that doesn't mean that you have a right to high-capacity magazines." He argued that the Second Amendment must be interpreted through a historical lens, noting that the firepower available when the Bill of Rights was written is not comparable to today's firepower. "Restriction has to be at the core of this right," he said... "It's fanciful to think that guns in the hands of citizens acts as a realistic check. They're not really trained to do so. And it's fanciful to think that the military would ever turn on U.S. citizens."

I'd argue that the Bill of Rights has nothing to do with restricting citizens, and everything to do with restricting the **government**. "Congress shall make no law...""... shall not be infringed..." "..." shall not be violated..." etc. These things are restrictions on the government. The Constitution was meant to be the government's ball and chain.

As faulty as the founders were, they understood total depravity. They may have not called it that, but they understood that men (and women) in positions of power would be tempted to garner and achieve as much power as they possibly could.

Despite the checks and balances in government, those in power over the past couple hundred years, and particularly the past 100 years, have given in to these temptations and have reinterpreted the Constitution to accommodate their lust for more power.

Over time, power has slowly been consolidating in the federal government; and inside the federal government, power has been slowly concentrating in the executive branch, and particularly in the president himself.

The Constitution was meant to restrain *the government* from devolving into a totalitarian dictatorship. It doesn't seem to be working, because the Constitution will only work in a *moral* society. And we have anything *but* a moral society.

Read more at <http://lastresistance.com/4580/stanford-law-professor-2nd-amendment-restrictions-citizens/#WUViIc7TGa6DLcC3.99>

**THESE ARE THE MEMBERS OF THE KANSAS LEGISLATIVE EDUCATION COMMITTEE
LET EACH AND EVERY ONE OF THEM KNOW THAT WE ARE AGAINST "COMMON CORE"... WE DO NOT WANT
IT TAUGHT IN KANSAS SCHOOLS!!!**

Name	District	Capitol Phone	Email
Senator Kerschen	32	785-296-7353	Dan.Kerschen@senate.ks.gov
Senator Ostmeyer	40	785-296-7399	Ralph.Ostmeyer@senate.ks.gov
Senator Pettey	6	785-296-7375	Pat.Pettey@senate.ks.gov
Senator Pyle	1	785-296-7379	Dennis.Pyle@senate.ks.gov
Senator V. Schmidt	20	785-296-7374	Vicki.Schmidt@senate.ks.gov
Senator Tyson	12	785-296-6838	Caryn.Tyson@senate.ks.gov
Senator Wolf	7	785-296-7390	Kay.Wolf@senate.ks.gov
Rep. Boldra	111	785-296-4683	sue.boldra@house.ks.gov
Rep. Bradford	40	785-296-7653	john.bradford@house.ks.gov
Rep. Bridges	83	785-296-7646	carolyn.bridges@house.ks.gov
Rep. Dierks	71	785-296-7642	diana.dierks@house.ks.gov
Rep. Dove	38	785-296-7670	willie.dove@house.ks.gov
Rep. Ewy	117	785-296-7105	john.ewy@house.ks.gov
Rep. Gandhi	52	785-296-7672	shanti.gandhi@house.ks.gov
Rep. Grosserode	16	785-296-7659	amanda.grosserode@house.ks.gov
Rep. Hedke	99	785-296-7699	dennis.hedke@house.ks.gov
Rep. Highland	51	785-296-7310	ron.highland@house.ks.gov
Rep. Houston	89	785-296-7652	roderick.houston@house.ks.gov
Rep. Lunn	28	785-296-7675	jerry.lunn@house.ks.gov
Rep. Lusk	22	785-296-7698	nancy.lusk@house.ks.gov
Rep. Rooker	25	785-296-7686	melissa.rooker@house.ks.gov
Rep. Winn	34	785-296-7657	valdenia.winn@house.ks.gov

The following was sent by a Legislative Representative in her weekly newsletter:

A new Legislative Hotline: 1-800-432-3924!! The calls are answered by experienced reference/research librarians at the State Library of KS and kept confidential open weekdays 8-5. You can leave messages for Legislators; request copies of bills calendars/journals/committee agendas/voting records and other legislative

documents. Text questions can be texted 785-256-0733 w/charges being standard instant message www.kslib.info/askalibrarian. Visit the State Library (I have, and it is stunning) in the North wing on 3rd floor of the KS Capitol Building. A tour of the whole building is fantastic!! We did this and enjoyed it greatly!!

Worth remembering | by Joseph Curl

Every year, in the week between Christmas and New Year's, I think about George W. Bush.

It was in that week each year for the eight that I covered him as a reporter that he gave me a spectacular gift — and he knew it.

I started covering the newly elected president in 2000, when I was in my late 30s. Back then, as a reporter for The Washington Times, we went everywhere the president went. If he went to Charlotte, N.C., to give a 30-minute speech on an airport tarmac, we went. Up at 4 a.m., an hour long commute to Andrews Air Force Base, in place on the ground hours before POTUS landed, and there for hours and hours after he left — sometimes right through the evening news so network reporters could file live from the site.

We also went with the president to Texas every summer — often for a month — and every winter, too, over the holidays.

But here's the thing: In December, we never left Washington, D.C., until the day after Christmas. Never. Mr. Bush and his wife Laura would always depart the White House a few days before the holiday and hunker down at the presidential retreat in Maryland, Camp David. After a few years, I asked a low-level White House staffer why.

I still remember what she said: "So all of us can be with our families on Christmas."

Who was "us"? Hundreds and hundreds of people, that's who. Sure, the reporters who covered the president, but also dozens and dozens on his staff, a hundred Secret Service agents, maybe more, and all of those cops required whenever the president's on the move in D.C.

For me, that one-day delay was huge. My kids were 6 and 8 when Bush took office. When he went home to Prairie Chapel that last time in 2009, my girl was driving, the boy was 6 foot 1. But in the meantime, I was home for eight Christmas mornings, playing Santa, stoking the fire, mixing up hot chocolate.

That was President Bush. And every year for the last five, I've thought about what that meant to me. (By the way, some years, I got holiday duty, which meant I was off to Waco, Texas, the day after Christmas. But once again, the Bush White House had us covered: A press plane flew out with the president, and back then, reporters could pay \$100 per family member for the plane ride. So sometimes, the family went along. For the kids, it was an adventure; for me, well, we were all together).

All that has changed with President Obama. No more press plane, for one. Reporters are on their own — so taking family is, say, \$1,000 a pop. Not likely. And this president would never delay his trip to his island getaway. He's off every year well before Christmas. Hundreds and hundreds head off with him, leaving family behind.

No Christmas at home. Instead, the Hawaiian Village Waikiki Beach Resort. Nice, but not exactly home.

Anyway, that's why I think of George W. Bush every year in the week between Christmas and New Year's. Probably will 'til I die. Thanks, GWB.

• Joseph Curl covered the White House and politics for a decade for The Washington Times and is now editor of the Drudge Report. He can be reached at josephcurl@gmail.com and on Twitter @josephcurl.

You might want to read this again --- as long as we have the existing narcissistic man & woman in office, this won't happen again! This is only a small example of the conceited, selfish attitude of President Obama and his wife. The personal, individual selfish things they have done for themselves, the huge amounts of money that all these things cost along with the other millions of \$'s spent for their enjoyment and personal gratification makes it so obvious that this man and wife have absolutely no care/concern for others. Hmm, could that be why our country is in the position/condition it is? I pray for the day we will again have a President that is more concerned for those around him and the country itself than he is concerned for his and his family's enjoyment. **Pray with me!!**

From Patriot ACTION Network Posted by MOTUS on 2/4/14 at 10:58am

Obama's Phony scandals and O'Reilly thrash it out in the Fox's No-Spin Zone

Liberals claim to want to give a hearing to other views, but then are shocked and offended to discover that there are other views. – William F. Buckley Jr.

In O'Reilly's *extended Super Bowl interview*, Big Guy made it perfectly clear that he felt Bill had been "absolutely" unfair to him throughout his presidency.

And since BO practices so much "unfairness" he should be able to identify 'unfairness'.

I knew Richard Nixon. Richard Nixon was our President. You, sir, are no Richard Nixon! Lacking adequate press support, Richard Nixon was unable to overcome his phony scandal.

"And I disagree with that because I think that what used to be considered sensible we now somehow label as — as liberal."

Yeah, I can see that; in the same way that what used to be considered today-ism we now somehow label as journalism. And what used to be known as investigative journalism is now known as "absolutely unfair."

Investigating a break in at the DNC Watergate headquarters: investigative journalism.

Asking the President about the terrorist attack on Benghazi: "absolutely" unfair.

Oh, so true – "absolutely" unfair to the 4 American men who died in Benghazi!! Died because their Country failed them, would NOT protect them. Who was the "Commander-in-chief" at the time? Who was Secretary of State at the time? Who was responsible for the safety of USA Ambassadors at the time? GOD Bless those MEN and their families!!

Maybe BO is NOT the most transparent President either.

Well, maybe he is more transparent than, at first, thought – It is obvious he intends to **rule** the USA. He obviously doesn't **really** care about the American citizens. If he did he would not favor some citizens over others. In 2009 BO took an oath to defend the USA Constitution when first sworn into office, now in the "State of the Union" speech of 2014 he openly announces that when he doesn't get his way he will just issue "Executive Orders" to get what he wants – Congress just doesn't count. The message that gives me is that if Conservatives fail to gain control of Congress in 2014 we will probably NOT HAVE ANY MORE ELECTIONS or THAT BO WILL BE THE ONLY ONE ALLOWED TO RUN FOR PRESIDENT!!

Oh, yeah, and "We have not massively expanded the welfare state." We've just spread the 1%'s wealth around.

Back in the thirties we were told we must collectivize the nation because the people were so poor. Now we are told we must collectivize the nation because the people are so rich. – William F. Buckley Jr.

When there are more citizens on welfare, or whatever they are calling it these days, than there are working to support the Country (pay taxes) that the end is near.

A Country Founded by Geniuses but Run by Idiots **by Jeff Foxworthy**

If you can get arrested for hunting or fishing without a license, but not for entering and remaining in the country illegally —
you might live in a nation that was founded by geniuses but is run by idiots.

If you have to get your parents' permission to go on a field trip or to take an aspirin in school, but not to get an abortion —
you might live in a nation that was founded by geniuses but is run by idiots.

If you **MUST** show your identification to board an airplane, cash a check, buy liquor, or check out a library book and rent a video, but not to vote for who runs the government — **you might live in a nation that was founded by geniuses but is run by idiots.**

If the government wants to prevent stable, law-abiding citizens from owning gun magazines that hold more than ten rounds, but gives twenty F-16 fighter

jets to the crazy new leaders in Egypt —
you might live in a nation that was founded by geniuses but is
run by idiots.

If, in the nation's largest city, you can buy two 16-ounce sodas, but not one 24-ounce soda, because
24-ounces of a sugary
drink might make you fat —

you might live in a nation that was founded by geniuses but is
run by idiots.

If an 80-year-old woman or a three-year-old girl who is
confined to a wheelchair can be strip-searched by the TSA at the airport, but a woman in a burka or
a hijab is only subject to having her neck and head searched —

you might live in a nation that was founded by geniuses but is
run by idiots.

If your government believes that the best way to eradicate trillions of dollars of debt is to spend
trillions more —

you might live in a nation that was founded by geniuses but is
run by idiots.

If a seven-year-old boy can be thrown out of school for
saying his teacher is "cute," but hosting a sexual exploration or
diversity class in grade school is perfectly acceptable —

you might live in a nation that was founded by geniuses but is
run by idiots.

If hard work and success are met with higher taxes and
more government regulation and intrusion, while not working is rewarded with Food Stamps, WIC
checks, Medicaid benefits, subsidized housing, and free cell phones —

you might live in a nation that was founded by geniuses but is
run by idiots.

If the government's plan for getting people back to work
is to provide incentives for not working, by granting 99 weeks of
unemployment checks, without any requirement to prove that gainful employment was diligently
sought, but couldn't be found —

you might live in a nation that was founded by geniuses but is
run by idiots.

If you pay your mortgage faithfully, denying yourself the
newest big-screen TV, while your neighbor buys iPhones, time shares, a wall-sized do-it-all plasma
screen TV and new cars, and the government forgives his debt when he defaults on his mortgage —

you might live in a nation that was founded by geniuses but is
run by idiots.

If being stripped of your Constitutional right to defend yourself makes you more "safe" according to
the government —

you might live in a nation that was founded by geniuses but is
run by idiots.

What has happened to **OUR** country! Only **YOU** can make a difference.

Subject: First American Tyranny!

By AJ Fox

Why President Obama hasn't been physically dragged out of office at this point is one of those questions that will likely remain a mystery.

In case you missed it, Obama this week declared to his Cabinet that if Congress doesn't do what he wants it to do, he will simply use executive orders to create and enforce any law he chooses. Based on the silence from my many liberal acquaintances, the response to Obama from the Left is, "So what?"

Obama repeated his declaration to the Democratic members of Congress, who then walked out of the meeting without talking to reporters. Again, silence. Did Obama talk too fast? Was he not speaking clearly?

For my hard-headed friends on the Left, let's review: The president of the United States just declared that Congress is null and void as far as he's concerned. Except for the fact that Congress will continue to burn through money like a hot knife through butter, and absent a formal declaration of dissolution, the Legislative Branch has effectively ceased to exist. It's still there in the sense that it occupies space, but that's it.

Obama is acting like Jack Nicholson in "Mars Attacks": "I want the people to know that they still have two out of three branches of the government working for them, and that ain't bad." Except the invader here isn't from another planet or even another country. We've just witnessed a homegrown coup. (And one that many of us saw coming even before Obama's first presidential victory.)

We are now living — officially — in a dictatorship. So where's the outrage? Is Twitter so fascinating that you just can't be bothered? Grumpy Cat got your tongue? Bill Maher didn't make fun of it, so it hasn't happened? Is it the fluoride in the water? Is it the legalized pot? Or is it that after years of dumbing down public education, we are simply too stupid to realize what just happened?

Another review for the Left: The government derives its authority from the people. The Constitution is the contract that limits and defines what the government can do. The president under the contract is supposed to work with Congress and enforce the laws that Congress passes. President Obama has just said he will not follow that contract he has with the people. He has broken the contract. **No Constitution, no presidency.**

So if Obama, despite breaking his contract, continues to accept and enjoy all the perks of the president's office while failing to honor his obligations, that makes him something else other than the president. Now, what are you going to do about it?

I used to wonder how millions of Germans could allow a dictator to come to power. We are now demonstrating exactly how it happens.

WND EXCLUSIVE

PUSH TO IMPEACH OBAMA MAKES MAJOR GAIN

Members of Congress more and more eyeing Washington solution | Published: 2/5/14

The possibility of impeaching Barack Obama based a wide range of alleged constitutional violations already has been discussed by a long list of members of Congress, from Sen. Ted Cruz, R-TX, to Rep. Duncan Hunter, R-CA.

Now Rep. Paul Broun, a Georgia Republican who is seeking to replace the retiring Sen. Saxby Chambliss, is joining the list.

He's accompanied by a couple of his opponents in the open race.

A video from a forum over the weekend featuring candidates for Chambliss' seat shows Broun and two others, Derrick Grayson, an engineer, and Eugene Yu, a businessman, raising their hands when asked whether they would support impeachment.

A forum moderator asked the candidates: "Obama has perjured himself on multiple occasions. Would you support impeachment if presented for a vote?"

Broun, Grayson and Yu raised their hands.

Several other candidates did not, and there were others vying for the office who were not in attendance.

[WND has been reporting](#) on members of Congress who have discussed impeachment. The list now includes: Rep. Steve King, R-Iowa; Rep. Blake Farenthold, R-Texas; Rep. Steve Stockman, R-Texas; Rep. Bill Flores, R-Texas; Rep. Duncan Hunter, R-Calif.; Sen. Tom Coburn, R-Okla.;

Rep. Kerry Bentivolio, R-Mich.; Sen. Ted Cruz, R-Texas; Sen. James Inhofe, R-Okla.; Rep. Jason Chaffetz, R-Utah; Sen. Tim Scott, R-S.C.; Rep. Michele Bachmann, R-Minn.; Rep. Louie Gohmert, R-Texas; Rep. Trey Radel, R-Fla.; and Rep. Ted Yoho, R-Fla.

Read the definitive case for removing Barack Obama from office in "Impeachable Offenses" by Aaron Klein and Brenda J. Elliott.

Several, including King and Farenthold, made comments in interviews with Sean Hannity.

King pointed to the president's actions on immigration, such as his orders for authorities not to enforce current immigration law, as grounds for impeachment.

He said there are multiple violations related to Obamacare and asserted the president's "recess" appointments of judges when the Senate was not actually in recess also is worthy.

The "uber-presidency," King said, has little or no respect for the Constitution.

Farenthold said Obama "is grabbing as much power as he can," but Congress also is doing little to draw in the reins.

The two said that politically, Obama is exercising great power and believes Congress cannot or will not stop him.

"The president knows it; he's exploiting it," King said.

[Stockman even handed out in Congress](#) copies of a book that has been described by its authors as the "articles of impeachment" for Barack Obama. Stockman suggested that special investigations and possibly prosecutions are needed in response to Fast and Furious, Benghazi and other Obama scandals.

Rep. Bill Flores, R-Texas, was speaking at a town hall meeting when he considered the idea. A video of his comments was posted at the Western Center for Journalism.

"I've looked at the president. I think he's violated the Constitution. I think he's violated the Bill of Rights," he said.

He said at some point a decision must be made.

"I think if the House had an impeachment vote, it would probably impeach the president."

But he noted there are only 46 members of the GOP in the U.S. Senate, where an impeached president would be put on trial.

To obtain a conviction, the prosecuting team must have 67 votes, and he wasn't sure even all of the GOP members would vote to convict.

"I think he's breaking the law if he strikes without congressional approval," Hunter told the Washington Times regarding Obama's plan to bomb Syria. "And if he proceeds without Congress providing that authority, it should be considered an impeachable offense."

WND previously reported Coburn's statement that Obama is "perilously close" to qualifying for impeachment.

Speaking at the Muskogee Civic Center in Oklahoma, the senator said, "What you have to do is you have to establish the criteria that would qualify for proceedings against the president, and that's called impeachment."

Coburn said it's "not something you take lightly, and you have to use a historical precedent of what that means."

Visit [WND's online Impeachment Store](#) to see all the products related to ousting Obama.

Earlier, Bentivolio said it would be a "dream come true" to impeach Obama.

Bentivolio told the Birmingham Bloomfield Republican Club Meeting, "You know, if I could write that bill and submit it, it would be a dream come true."

He told constituents: "I feel your pain and I know. I stood 12 feet away from that guy and

listened to him, and I couldn't stand being there. But because he is president I have to respect the office. That's my job as a congressman. I respect the office."

Bentivolio said his experience with the president caused him to consult with attorneys about what it would take to remove Obama from office.

Cruz responded to a question about impeachment after a speech.

"It's a good question," Cruz said. "And I'll tell you the simplest answer: To successfully impeach a president you need the votes in the U.S. Senate."

In May, Inhofe suggested Obama could be impeached over a White House cover-up after the attack in Benghazi, Libya, on Sept. 11, 2012.

He told listeners of "The Rusty Humphries Show": "Of all the great cover-ups in history – the Pentagon papers, Iran-Contra, Watergate, all the rest of them – this ... is going to go down as the most egregious cover-up in American history."

But even with that searing indictment, Inhofe, too, stopped short of calling for impeachment.

Rep. Jason Chaffetz, R-Utah, has offered tentative support for impeachment.

"I'm not willing to take it off the table, but that's certainly not what we're striving for," he told CNN.

One Republican actually has come out and called for the impeachment of Obama, and he did it more than two years ago, before he became a congressman.

Rep. Ted Yoho, R-Fla., posted on his website in June 2011 a list of reasons for impeachment.

Other figures who have discussed impeachment include Glenn Beck, Watergate investigative reporter Bob Woodward, WND columnist Nat Hentoff and a panel of top constitutional experts.

Stockman recently distributed copies of the book, "[Impeachable Offenses: The Case for Removing Barack Obama From Office](#)," to the other 434 members of the House of Representatives to bolster his case for a special investigation of the president.

The bestselling "Impeachable Offenses" presents an indictment that goes well beyond today's headlines.

The Daily Mail of London has called "Impeachable Offenses" "explosive," reporting that the book contains a "systematic connect-the-dots exercise that the president's defenders will find troublesome."

[Constituents also are reaching some surprising conclusions.](#)

Voters in Republican Rep. Jim Bridenstine's Oklahoma district may look meek and mild, maybe even sweet, but their opinions of President Obama reveal nothing but a battleground "take-no-prisoners" attitude.

One lady, for example, said there needs to be changes in the Senate so "we can impeach the S-O-B."

Said another: "He's not president as far as I'm concerned... Should be executed. He's an enemy combatant."

She complained that Congress is doing nothing, and that "allows this moron to make decisions."

"He has no authority. None."

The video was uploaded just this week, but it's unclear when the meeting was held, and the congressman's office was unable to provide details immediately.

At one point the congressman references "back in April 2013," and it appears to be winter, so likely it was recorded in the past few months.

The congressman had been documenting Obama's "lawlessness."

Read more at <http://www.wnd.com/2014/02/impeachment-caucus-makes-gain/#L5mhKHvRs2OcRv08.99>

In this New Year, 2014, both Groundhog Day and the State of the Union address will occur on the same day.

This is an ironic juxtaposition of events. One involves a meaningless ritual in which we look to an insignificant creature of little intelligence for prognostication.

The other involves a groundhog. (Sorry, folks, I saw this and couldn't resist!!)

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; fhttp@flinthillsteaparty.com or facebook – Flint Hills TEA Party; Manhattan contact – Chuck Henderson, 785-236-1286; Sylda Nichols, editor, email: sylda@gemsandwood.com. Sylda 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.