

Monday, August 24, 2015

Good Morning, Patriots!

Page 1 of 2

Incubators of crime

Increases in criminal activity are guaranteed if you elect a progressive as your city's mayor.

These cities illustrate what happens in Socialist-Democrat incubators of crime.

New York City, after a few years of forward-thinking mayor (avowed Marxist) Bill de Blasio, saw murders go up 9.2% and rapes increase 6.8%, according to the NYPD. (Bill has just begun to dismantle the crime control policies of Rudy Giuliani.)

Chicago, maintaining its cultivation of crime under leftist mayor Rahm Emanuel, has seen murders surge by 21.5%, shootings explode by 18.3%, and criminal sexual assaults go up 6.3%, as noted by the Chicago PD. Black-on-black crime is headed for record highs.

Then there's Los Angeles, where former mayor Antonio Villaraigosa has driven aggravated assaults up 26.4% and total violent crimes up 20.2%, as reported by the LAPD. It's anyone's guess whether the new mayor, Eric Garcetti, can slow the trend.

And Baltimore is close behind those three.

If the Left retains control of these cities and others, body counts will rise, and what was once accepted as civil society will have disappeared.

Showcases of liberal failure are there to see, if we only look under the blanket of the media.

Monday Morning Newswire

Non-partisan conservative commentary published by Hoosier Patriots, 8329 Carolwood Court, Evansville, IN 47715, each Monday morning and sent by e-mail to those who subscribe. © 2015. All Rights Reserved.

HOOSIER PATRIOTS

Jim Bratten

Subscribe through e-mail at:
hpnw.jimb@gmail.com



Placing courts over the Constitution

14th Amendment distortion

The Fourteenth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution has been abused more than any other – by our own court system. It has been misused by our courts for “equal protection under the law” and other reasons. No mention of the concept of “birthright citizenship” is found in this amendment, but many legal scholars continue to misinterpret it, using supreme court rulings to redefine the amendment to fit their desires.

Yet the idea has been imbedded in the public discourse, forced into the lexicon of immigration activists for decades, so much so that one would think it was based in the authors' intent for the amendment.

The Emancipation Proclamation of 1863 freed slaves but did not assure them the same “equal” rights as those who had freed them, even though they were in the U.S. legally and “subject to the jurisdiction thereof.” The Civil Rights Act of 1866 was written to rectify the oversight. At the time of its passage, the 1866 act defined the phrase, “persons within the jurisdiction of the United States,” as those present in the United States at the time of the act's passage, born here, which included all slaves and their children, *subject to U.S. law*.

The 14th Amendment was designed to protect the provisions of the 1866 act from future legislatures and activist courts. If the amendment means what it says, as its authors intended and as was ratified by the states, instead of the misconstrued meaning given it today, then we need to discern the intent of its authors.

Republican Senator Jacob Howard of Michigan was one author of Section 1 of the 14th Amendment (the Citizenship Clause). In his notes of May 30, 1866 he clearly stated his intent for the amendment he helped compose:

“Every person born within the limits of the United States, and *subject to their jurisdiction*, is by virtue of natural law and national law a citizen of the United States.

This will not, of course, include persons born in the United States who are foreigners, aliens, who belong to the families of ambassadors or foreign ministers accredited to the government of the United States...”

The second author of the Citizenship Clause in the 14th Amendment, Illinois Senator Lyman Trumbull, reinforced the intent of Howard by stating that “subject to the jurisdiction of the United States” meant “not owing allegiance to anyone else” as in other nations.

Since those here *illegally* are still subject to the jurisdictions of their home countries, as *foreigners* or *aliens*, they cannot be subject to the jurisdiction of the U.S. Hence their children, born here *illegally*, are subject to the jurisdiction of their *parents'* home country, not citizens of the U.S. by “birthright.” Those children who are born to parents here *legally*, having no allegiance to a foreign power, are born citizens of the U.S.

The framers of the Civil Rights Act of 1866 and the 14th Amendment, passed July 9, 1868, used very plain language. Their position, as of those who defend their intent today, is not an “extreme position.” The intent of the 14th Amendment must be restored. The “birthright citizenship” crowd fails to comprehend that immigration is for the benefit of the *country*, as a unified nation with legal immigrants assimilated as Americans. It's not for the *illegal alien*, a citizen of another nation, a foreign nation.

Our nation cannot continue as a balkanized, open-borders welfare state. As Milton Friedman reminded us, “If you have a welfare state and want open immigration as practiced prior to 1914, that's impossible. A welfare state and an open border cannot coexist. If this occurs, the nation fails.”

We Be People



Arrogant dishonesty exposes the real Hillary

Clinton crash

In Keene, New Hampshire last week, a #Black Lives Matter contingent accosted Hillary Rodham Clinton after her speech to a small, but enraptured, audience. They accused her of being one cause of the “black violence problem.”

After asking the black activists to come up with “some demands” and being rejected by their spokesman, she half-heartedly pushed back, making a sarcastic comment that she would “only talk with white people” if the black activists would not help her out.

Then the *real* Hillary Rodham emerged, devoted Alinskyite, and exposed the radical leftist she really is: “I don’t believe you change hearts... you change laws, allocation of resources... systems,” etc.

True to her radical roots, Hillary doesn’t believe in convincing people who don’t share her perspective, through discussion and debate, to agree with her positions. No; she must *force* them to comply with what she ordains; what she *directs* them to do. Control the people and subjugate them... Who cares if they object? After all, she knows better than they what’s best for them!

This level of progressive elitism, however, is not only populated by Socialist-Democrats. The Republican establishment shares the realm of the arrogant, as seen on “The Five,” a weekday production of the *Fox News Channel*, when panel member Dana Perino, former G. W. Bush White House press secretary, was exposed as a member in good standing of this exclusive, elite club.

During a discussion of wealthy celebrities’ product endorsements, Kim Kardashian’s promotion of a morning sickness drug (without warning of the side effects) was pounded by Perino. She was incensed, calling Kardashian “irresponsible.” Then she said, “Celebrity is powerful... at what point do you have enough money?”

Irresponsible? Maybe. But what business does Perino have in determining the limits of Kim Kardashian’s wealth?

Welcome to Hillary’s World, Ms. Perino.

I suggest you read some Barack Obama campaign notes to get the “feel” for income limitation and redistribution of wealth. It sounds as if you’re a natural.

“A lie gets halfway around the world before the truth has a chance to put its pants on.” ~ *Winston Churchill*

But what about *many* lies? We now understand why Mrs. Clinton accumulated so many miles of travel when she was secretary of state. A pathological penchant for lying (under oath or otherwise) demanded multiple circumnavigations of the globe. (In Hillary’s case, Sir Winston, it’s *pantsuit*.)

Despite Hillary’s previous misadventures with the truth this latest round of dishonesty and deception may be her last rodeo.

From her \$100+ million in donations to the Clinton Foundation from foreign states (money laundering) to the nearly 60,000 *misplaced* e-mails during her state department mismanagement, the corruption and malfeasance of Hillary Clinton will be difficult to dismiss; it’s that egregious.

Federal law (44 U.S. Code, §3101) states: “The head of each federal agency shall make and preserve records containing adequate and proper documentation of the organization, functions, policies, decisions, procedures, and essential transactions of the agency and designed to furnish the information necessary to protect the legal and financial rights of the governments and of persons directly affected by the agency’s activities.”

Mrs. Clinton’s communications, while serving as secretary, were kept *outside* of the agency, on an unknown, *unsecured* e-mail server, rendering her department opaque and organizationally dysfunctional. Policies were ignored and sidestepped.

Federal law (18 U.S. Code, §1924) states: “[Whoever] becomes possessed of documents or materials containing classified information of the United States, knowingly removes such documents or materials without authority and with the intent to retain such documents or materials at an unauthorized location shall be fined under this title or imprisoned for not more than one year, or both.” At last examination, inspectors general have found roughly 300 of Hillary’s e-mails identified as “possibly classified” (and a potential of 1,500 more).

And there’s no more “unauthorized location” than an undisclosed, secret, off-site, *private* e-mail server.

Mrs. Clinton’s long-time family attorney, David Kendall, had a thumb-drive with thousands of her e-mails on it, classified and otherwise, although he was not authorized and had no security clearance. Hillary’s closest assistants, Mrs. Anthony Weiner (Huma Abedin, of Muslim Brotherhood fame) and Cheryl Mills, also had access to the home-based, illegal server, which included their own e-mail addresses.

Then there’s Hillary’s remote back-up server, squirreled away in an old, residential multi-occupant building in Denver, at Platte River Networks, a little-known website support firm having no security clearance to handle classified U.S. government data, no matter what level, no matter what agency.

Finally, federal law (18 U.S. Code, §2071) also says that: “Whoever, having the custody of any such record, proceeding, map, book, document, paper, or other thing, willfully and unlawfully conceals, removes, mutilates, obliterates, falsifies, or destroys the same, shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than three years, or both; and shall forfeit his office and be disqualified from holding any office under the United States.”

This last statute may finish her career ambitions, for *any* public office, since one judge counts the felony score at *seven*.

Republican presidential candidate and former Arkansas governor Mike Huckabee described her actions as, “...life-threatening to members of our military and every American citizen. The same action, for anyone serving in the military, would mean a court-martial and prison sentence.”

Will we finally witness Mrs. Clinton’s undoing, after nearly 30 years of corruption and deceit? Will she be held accountable?

Anything is possible, even justice.

Enough!
READ THE CONSTITUTION