

The will to fight

“War is an ugly thing, but not the ugliest of things. The decayed and degraded state of moral and patriotic feeling which thinks that nothing is worth war is much worse. The person who has nothing for which he is willing to fight, nothing which is more important than his own personal safety, is a miserable creature and has no chance of being free unless made so and kept so by the exertions of better men than himself.” ~ John Stuart Mill

National downsizing

The White House had another of its “unicorn” moments, praising the continuation of its trumpeted unemployment rate for September, 2015 of 5.1%.

Fantasies being what they are, it’s hard to find joy in that number when the *tangible* effects of 6½ years of Barack Obama’s progressive transformation of a once-vibrant economy into a leftist sinkhole of debt, taxes, and regulation is so evident.

Our actual job participation rate, as a percentage of those available to work, is now at a 38-year low of 62.4%, the lowest since 1977, under Jimmy Carter.

A paltry 142,000 jobs were added in September (most in the health care and service sectors) and the manufacturing area lost 9,000 jobs. The president’s *downsizing* plan continues...

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



Let’s make a deal - with anyone

‘Deconflicting’

The NEW term for the Obama administration’s so-called foreign policy is now “Deconflicting” (or, “doing away with conflict” – another term for abandonment).

Put a different way, the new White House buzz-word can mean, “Withdrawing all U.S. presence, power, and ability to influence events in the Middle East, creating a vacuum, thereby handing control of the geographic area to Russia and Iran.”

As the president said in 2012 to Dmitry Medvedev, “...after my election I have more flexibility.” Open mics can be dangerous, posing questions as to the speaker’s intent. To what did President Obama’s *flexibility* comment refer, whispered to the President of the Russian Federation?

Perhaps we are finding out.

Upon President Obama’s invitation to Vladimir Putin to join the “team” to defeat the Islamic State, the United States effectively retired to the sidelines. The president is apparently happy to watch conflicts develop in the Middle East on the evening news, from the comfort of an easy chair in the White House family quarters, as he has inferred to the press. At least that’s the impression he gives with his flippant treatment of all things strategic. “I saw it on the news... same time you all did.”

So Putin took control of the “team” and did as he intended to do all along: partner with his old ally Iran to move Russian forces into Syria, another long-time ally, and insure Bashir Assad retains power. Russia cares little about the Islamic State; they’re interested in beating back the opponents of Assad; the anti-Assad “rebel forces” the U.S. had covertly armed with weapons smuggled through Libya (pre-Benghazi).

Accepting President Obama’s signal of acquiescence, Iran moved troops from its Quds Force into Syria, under Russian air support. The fact that Iran had just received \$21 billion from Russia for advanced satellite technology and jet aircraft helped a bit,

as did the Russian attack aircraft flown in (smuggled) *under* the “cargo” transports that delivered tanks and personnel carriers. The lifting of \$150 billion in sanctions by the U.S. will also be an *extra* gift for Iran.

Isn’t it wonderful when a plan comes together? Except it’s not OUR plan; it’s the plan of Russia, Iran, and Iran’s puppet terrorist group, Hezbollah, to assist Assad.

The Russians must have been choking on their vodka and caviar, toasting their success at duping the U.S. president, laughing at his supposition that the Russians were actually there to attack the Islamic State!

An imperial president, Barack Obama crushes U.S. supremacy, stiff-arms Israel, aligns our nation with the largest Islamist state sponsor of terrorism in the world, with hundreds of American soldiers’ blood on its hands, cuts a “deal” with them to guarantee their acquisition of nuclear arms, then invites the Russians in for a “team effort.”

Our president is unwavering concerning moral equivalence and cultural relativism, as all leftists. He grew up with these Marxist concepts, much to the detriment of Americans and the survival of our nation.

As a radical leftist, he suffers from a twisted identification of good and evil; Americans are the imperialist “bad guys” (so Russia and Iran must be the good). We have nuclear weapons, so why can’t China, North Korea, and... Iran? If we have nuclear arms why shouldn’t other countries?

That answer is known. But an answer to this question is not: “Why does *he* not worry about nuclear-armed despots?”

This president will not fight, no matter what the purpose, no matter what the cause. Nothing is more important than his agenda.

But what is that agenda?

We Be People



GOP 'compromise crew' stumbles along while the...

Outsiders build a case

Since the GOP regained control of the House of Representatives in 2011, to the reinstatement of a Republican majority in the Senate in 2015, I have watched a party of mediocrity. Decision making has been tepid at best, always based on how the Democrats would react, whether the administration would accept, or what the state-run media would allow. The "good of the country" was seldom, if ever, considered.

There have been no classic struggles over principles and ideas, fought by a party that embraces the Constitution and the rule of law. A party that champions liberty and does what is best for We the People has not been seen in Congress since 1994-1996.

Since then, citizens of the United States have been treated as aliens in the chambers of Congress. John Boehner, since his installation as Speaker of the House in 2011, has been a central player in the four-year effort to place privileges for illegal alien invaders, citizens of a *foreign* nation, ahead of considerations for American citizens.

The Republican camp has been one of appeasement, catering to the most dangerous president in American history. The establishment Republicans in Boehner's House weren't fighters willing to defend liberty in the face of accelerating statism.

Instead, the committee chambers have been the home of compromisers, waiters and watchers, devoid of courage or desire to thwart the assault on our country by the enemies within... enemies the Republican Party allowed to take power in the first place. And does anyone in Republican leadership even want to *identify* the enemies within?

How can they, when many don't have an understanding of what they're fighting for?

There is a reason 62% of the Republican Party's base dislikes the direction of its party and 80% of the conservatives (the majority of the base) have problems with party leadership: the reason IS the leadership!

Now that Boehner is leaving and Kevin McCarthy has injured himself for the bid as the next Speaker, some conservative leader may emerge. Jason Chaffetz (R-UT) may be the one conservative to prevail. Courageous leadership would be a welcome change.

The Party of Nelson Rockefeller cannot stomach the Tea Party movement or conservatives in general (you know, those *principled* people who talk about the Constitution all the time). But they *really* freak at the concept of Donald Trump, Ben Carson, Carly Fiorina and Ted Cruz amassing well over 60% of potential Republican primary votes. These four pose a real threat to the status quo career paths of establishment GOP leadership *and* their donors' desires.

"Outsiders" are drawing voters precisely due to the lack of leadership and ineptitude of the Republican Party establishment. Voters are fed up with the Washington, DC pabulum of promises not kept and the obvious disconnect between denizens inside the Beltway and those on the outside.

Short story: Donald Trump does stuff, gets things done; Ben Carson doesn't back down and remains true to his principles and faith, no matter what; Carly Fiorina isn't afraid of facing Democrats and staring them down, particularly Mrs. Clinton; and Ted Cruz is an unapologetic, rock-solid constitutional conservative who stands firm in the face of Republican Senate leadership and says, "No more compromise or consent to Barack Obama's transformation plans!"

Probably the worst case of Republican leadership's unwillingness to *lead*, to be bold, to fight and achieve victories, is the "government shutdown" syndrome.

Senate Majority Leader Mitch McConnell has this, again surrendering, now in a prison of his own making. Blustering about another accusation from the state-run media about a "government shutdown," Mitch placed himself in the cowardice corner, proclaiming, "No government shutdown for *any* reason!" (And no confrontation at all...)

So he tosses the Constitution into the waste bin when, in this case, it serves as a sword to fight a runaway government.

He is deathly afraid of the press *and* the president, offering virtually no resistance to the forces of tyranny. When he's threatened, he curls up. ("He *really would* like to put up a fight but there's this *one* thing... you know, the *one* thing we cannot do...

shut down the government. If it comes down to that, there's nothing we can do!") "Shut down" has been used roughly 20 times since the 1970s and Reagan *used* it three times during his presidency.

When it comes to loggerheads over policy or issues with the Obama administration, the Majority Leader is a no-show. McConnell simply will not engage. He will make deals and compromise on anything to placate his opponents, but he won't fight. Perhaps he can get a clue from the demise of Speaker Boehner... but chances are slim.

Then there's the *ineptitude* concern. This is only one example, but it gives a window into the cluelessness and disconnectedness of "career" Republicans.

National Affairs Quarterly found that, in 1963, 24% of federal spending went to social welfare programs. By 2013, fifty years later, federal spending used for social welfare programs was at 59%. The "boat" is capsizing, yet Republicans in national elected office don't seem to care. Under their watch the welfare state continues to explode, unchecked by broken promises and a fear to even engage in debate.

Shortly after the 114th Congress was sworn in, January 2015, when asked in an interview by *Fox News Channel* what he thought of the comparison from *National Affairs Quarterly*, Senator Orrin Hatch (R-UT) said he was surprised. Seriously; he was *surprised!* A man who has been there during the bulk of the ugly process of spending devastation, and he hasn't even noticed the economic wreckage around him? Or, does he simply not care?

The American people are tired of the dearth of neurons and lack of courage inside the Beltway. The "establishment" candidates will continue to creep along, if they show they don't care or cannot comprehend the disconnect. Voters will go for the alternative; they'll vote for the *outsiders*.

Enough!
READ THE CONSTITUTION