

Monday, November 23, 2015

Good Morning, Patriots!

Page 1 of 2

Happy Thanksgiving

From the house of *Hoosier Patriots* to yours...

Have a Happy Thanksgiving, count your blessings and be thankful you live in a nation under God, conceived in Liberty.

May we always stand, as Patriots, to insure her survival for the generations to come.

God Bless America!

Going down?

Despite the mishandling of any chance for an Obamacare repeal by Republicans before the elections in 2016, the ill-conceived, unconstitutional behemoth stumbles on its own.

More than \$1 billion in federal loan subsidies (taxpayer dollars) will disappear, as 12 of 23 Obamacare state co-ops (exchanges) head for failure. The states simply cannot pay the exorbitant costs built-in by the designers of the illegal mess.

As a result of the financial difficulties, more than 870,000 subscribers will have to seek new coverage plans.

Obamacare co-ops are failing due to several reasons. Among these are artificially low premiums, overly-strict regulations, and too many pay-outs.

Odds are that the remainder of state-run Obamacare exchanges will be *finished* for good by the end of next year, just in time for its "namesake's" exit!

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



'Not reflecting our American values'

Refugees or Recruits?

Dripping sarcasm, President Obama unloaded some nonsense last week while in Manila, saying the Republicans wouldn't "allow widows and orphans" and, more specifically, "three-year-old orphans," as refugees into the United States.

Except, Mr. President, as we have seen in the European refugee disaster, there aren't many widows and orphans pouring into the nations of Europe. The vast majority of refugees are Islamic, 80% male, between 18 and 24, likely single, and they're not carrying much with them; wives, children *or* baggage. Please explain this.

But this president won't; and he isn't about to put up with the GOP Congress' barricades to Islamic refugees. He is "not interested in posing... 'winning'... or whatever slogan they come up with." He implies Republicans in Congress, seeking to arrest the flow of Syrian refugees and stop the president's plans to "flood the zone" with unvetted foreign nationals, are afraid of "women, children... widows and orphans..."

When asked last Friday about the effort by Republicans to stem the flow of unknown Syrians, our imperial president said he wouldn't agree to the "spasm of rhetoric" – as he described the House bill that passed last Friday, pausing the admission of Syrian refugees into the United States.

Congressman Trey Gowdy (R-SC) responded that American people were "more afraid of a policy that *creates* more widows and orphans." Rep. Gowdy is very intuitive; he sees the carnage abroad, created by Islamists in their genocide against the Yazidis and Christians, the death toll mounting. He knows that the Islamic State is busy *creating* thousands of widows and orphans.

The president, however, is only interested in Islamic refugees; he could care less about others who don't follow Allah, and his actions over time speak volumes.

Of refugees admitted to the U.S. Over the last 18 months, 90% have been Islamic;

only 2.3% are Christian. The president singles Christians out, however, in his "inversion style," to make unfounded points, calling Americans "unchristian" for not allowing his demands to open the gates.

His accusation, as we hear repeatedly from those in his administration, is that if we object, we are "not reflecting our American values." But our imperial president does not embrace our "American values" – nor does he understand them.

"You're not being very *Christian* if you don't allow Syrian Muslims inside our country," he says. But the president doesn't even know there is a religious test in the U.S. statute for allowing asylum. It's the largest reason we have a "refugee" law. He can even have Valerie Jarrett look it up for him. Religion is a *BIG* reason.

The burden of proof in screenings for asylum as a refugee is on the *applicant*, not the country they want to enter. Their ethnicity, religion, and nationality all decide whether or not their application will be accepted. Affiliations are also important, as is a personal medical history.

We know *our* American values, Mr. President, and allowing stealth jihadists into our country to endanger our population is not one of them. "Refugees, unvetted" is not on our "American Values List." A recent poll showed that 67% of Americans are against the White House plan, allowing Syrian refugees into the U.S., and that number is probably an underestimate.

Americans, Mr. President, get to decide whether we take *refugees* or a chance on possible Islamist "recruits." There's a law, you know, with criteria. And, since you don't have a grip on "American values," or any *data*, you shouldn't get to decide.

We Be People



As *Breitbart* reported, the Left and the state-run media were apoplectic when six Syrian males were stopped in Honduras, with forged Greek passports, heading for the United States. (That wasn't good for the president's *refugee* scam; he said it was "safe.") Then they literally threw tantrums when eight Syrian refugees were detained at a border checkpoint in Laredo, Texas and six men from Pakistan and Afghanistan were caught illegally entering Arizona from Mexico! (Others were also apprehended in Costa Rica, St. Maarten, and Paraguay...)

It was becoming more apparent, and harder for the Left to hide, that there was a better than average chance a jihadist could slip in among the harmless refugees.

Hillary Clinton jumped in, doing her best to keep the fraud alive, describing Muslims as "peaceful and tolerant" and having "nothing whatsoever to do with terrorism."

But there's that case in Kentucky, Mrs. Clinton, of the captured Iraqi "refugees." Surely you are aware of it?

In Bowling Green, Kentucky, two Iraqi refugees had planned to ship Stinger missiles and sniper rifles, along with substantial sums of cash, to al Qaeda operatives waging an insurgency war against U.S. forces in Iraq. Their plans were stopped, fortunately, and both are now in prison.

Memory of this incident highlights the potential danger of allowing Islamic refugees from Syria entrance into the United States.

Of course, the president did say on November 19 that Syrian refugees are no bigger threats than tourists ("The idea that they pose a more serious threat... than tourists"). Could those two Iraqi Islamists have just been tourists?

Why do we have Syrian refugees? Why do we have *any* Islamic "refugees" from the Middle East?

The obvious answer could be this: Due to the broad failure of Barack Obama's foreign policy over seven years and the acute power vacuum he has created in the Middle East, the Islamic State erupted in Syria and Iraq, from dismembered al Qaeda offshoots and remnants. Then, with the help of the Obama Regime, they concocted a way to get [here](#).



According to President Obama, Paris was 'a terrible and sickening setback'

Choosing sides

On November 21, 2015 former Governor of Arkansas, Mike Huckabee, made this comment, contrasting France's reaction to the radical Islamist attacks in Paris recently and President Obama's cool concern over this latest assault on Western Civilization: "*President Hollande of France closes his borders and declares war against radical Islam. President Obama opens our borders and declares war against Republicans.*"

If only Gov. Huckabee knew how prescient his comment was. President Obama's number one foe is Republicans, but his desire for open borders and non-enforcement of our nation's immigration laws is a work in progress that even the GOP denies.

Now, under a push to accept thousands of Islamic refugees from Syria, when we have already admitted hundreds of thousands since the U.S. was attacked on 9-11, we may discover Mr. Obama's intent.

As reported in the *New York Times* on November 18, the former head of the Defense Intelligence Agency (DIA), Lt. Gen. Michael Flynn, recalled an August, 2012 DIA intelligence report, presented to the Obama administration's national security team: "This particular report, this was one of those nobody wanted to see. It was disregarded by the White House... Frankly, at the White House, it didn't meet the narrative."

In other words, it simply did not fit President Obama's agenda.

What is becoming obvious is that the president plans no substantial exercise of military power (or even diplomatic) over the Islamic State (IS). He believes Iran, Syria, and their ally Russia can keep IS in check (moderately). As a result, he has allied the United States with them because he doesn't consider them enemies. His intelligence moles in the Department of Defense (DOD) and the Pentagon downplay setbacks against IS and deny their gains, going so far, some analysts say, as to fudge intelligence documents to show progress that isn't there: "ISIL has been contained."

Nothing could be further from the truth, but that won't stop the state-run media, the Socialist-Democrats or many in

leadership positions of the Republican Party to feign success. Dots are left unconnected but the "Iran Nuclear Deal" is safe. Iran capitalizes on the chaos and Assad stays in power. The U.S. is finally gone from the Middle East, it's all Islamic, the Russians have more influence, and Obama doesn't have to ever use the word "victory."

New "rules of engagement" negatively affect the U.S. ability to wound IS with air strikes. These are rare and must be cleared by the White House; many aircraft return from sorties with ordnance undelivered. Oil trucks carrying life-blood crude to IS were not hit because the drivers could not be identified as members of IS. They could not be attacked; the White House forbids "collateral damage" (loss of seemingly innocent life). So IS fights another day, killing and raping more infidels and selling more women and girls into sexual slavery, because our hands are tied. But Barack Obama's conscience is clear—no innocent Muslims were harmed (as far as he knows).

There is a reason, in the president's twisted ideology, why Republicans are the major threat—and IS gets a ho-hum.

Republicans *can* curb or defeat his policy agendas, his plan for the transformation and *transfiguration* of America, but they don't have the courage. The Islamic State has little influence on Obama's domestic priorities—wrecking our economy and distressing American citizens (reducing access to "the American Dream"). IS cannot reduce his power domestically; they cannot endanger Obamacare, they cannot undo the damage caused to our financial system by Dodd-Frank, or affect the president's power-squeeze over U.S. trade policy (TPP).

In Barack Obama's mind, the world is in turmoil because an imperialist America oppressed its neighbors, who are fighting back. And IS isn't the *real* problem, which is man-made climate change, of course.

Enough!
READ THE CONSTITUTION