

*The Obama Timeline – Part II*

*The Doomed Presidency*

*January 2013*

Effective January 1, 75-watt incandescent light bulbs can no longer be manufactured in the United States or imported. (Existing supplies on store shelves can be purchased, however. Unless Congress reverses the “green” legislation and Obama does not issue a veto, 60-watt and 40-watt bulbs will be outlawed on January 1, 2014.) [41164]

The U.S. Senate votes 89–8 to extend the Bush income tax rates for individuals earning less than \$400,000 and families earning less than \$450,000, while limiting income tax deductions for individuals and families earning at least \$200,000 and \$250,000, respectively. Under ObamaCare, those Americans will also face a 0.9 percent increase in Medicare taxes. (Top income earners will therefore see a tax increase of 5.5 percent, with the 35 percent income tax rate going up to 39.6 percent plus the 0.9 percent Medicare tax hike.) Capital gains taxes will increase from 15 to 23.8 percent (including a 3.8 percent ObamaCare increase). The corporate tax rate on dividends goes up to 39.6 percent, and that same rate will also be paid by the wealthiest Americans who receive those dividends—along with a 3.8 percent ObamaCare tax tacked on. (Dividends will therefore be taxed at a whopping 83 percent—which certainly explains why many businesses paid their planned dividends for 2013 in 2012 instead.) The legislation also extends unemployment compensation benefits and continues tax credits for college tuition and “green energy” programs. The “doc fix” is extended, delaying a scheduled cut in Medicare payments to physicians. The “death tax” increases to 40 percent. (It was zero in 2010.) The Alternative Minimum Tax is addressed to keep it from applying to millions of taxpayers. The bill ends the temporary two percent reduction in Social Security taxes, so all American workers will see smaller paychecks in 2013. [41125, 41128, 41129, 41131, 41133, 41134, 41137, 41140, 41141, 41160, 41168, 41176, 41190, 41196, 41197]

There are no spending cuts in the bipartisan deal. Senator Mike Lee (R-UT), who voted against the bill, remarks, “[W]e will be leaving intact 99 percent of a dysfunctional system—99 percent of a tax code that’s unstable—that produces an inconsistent revenue stream and that’s gotten us \$16 trillion in debt and has been producing trillion dollar annual deficits.” (Other dissenters are Republican Senators Rand Paul of Kentucky, Richard Shelby of Alabama, Charles Grassley of Iowa, and Marco Rubio of Florida, and Democrats Tom Harkin of Iowa, Tom Carper of Delaware, and Michael Bennet of Colorado. The GOP senators oppose the legislation because it raises taxes and includes virtually no spending cuts. Democrat Harkin voted against the bill because he wanted the tax threshold set at \$250,000, rather than \$450,000. Carper and Bennet voted against the bill because it adds to the deficit and does not address entitlement reform.) [41125, 41128, 41129, 41131, 41133, 41134, 41137, 41140, 41141, 41160, 41168, 41176, 41190, 41196, 41197]

According to FoxNews.com, the tax increases in the Senate-passed deal amount to \$620 billion over 10 years, or \$62 billion per year—hardly a dent in an annual deficit of at least \$1.2 trillion. Spending cuts allegedly total a mere \$15 billion. Whether the legislation can pass the House of Representatives remains to be seen. (More than a few Republican Congressman were incensed by Obama’s December 31 comments.) [41132, 41133]

According to the Heritage Foundation, the 2013 tax hikes in the fiscal cliff deal and ObamaCare consist of: Resetting the employee portion of the Social Security tax back to 6.2 percent from its temporary 4.2 percent level, for about \$160 billion in additional annual tax revenue; increasing the top income tax rate from 35 percent to 39.6 percent for taxable incomes over \$450,000 (\$400,000 for single filers), for about \$39.5 billion in additional revenue; phasing out personal exemptions for adjusted gross income (AGI) over \$300,000 (\$250,000 for single filers), for about \$15 billion in revenue; phasing down itemized deductions for AGI over \$300,000 (\$250,000 for single filers); increasing the rate on dividends and capital gains from 15 percent to 20 percent for taxable incomes over \$450,000 (\$400,000 for single filers), for about \$5.5 billion; increasing the death tax rate (on estates larger than \$5 million) from 35 percent to 40 percent, for about \$2 billion; eliminating the full expensing of capital purchases by businesses; imposing a 3.8 percent ObamaCare surtax on investment income for taxpayers with taxable income exceeding \$250,000 (\$200,000 for singles), for about \$11 billion; adding a 0.9 percent ObamaCare increase in Medicare taxes for incomes over \$250,000 (\$200,000 for single filers), for about \$21 billion; imposing a 2.3 percent ObamaCare excise tax paid by medical device manufacturers and importers, for about \$2 billion; reducing the income tax deduction for individuals’ medical expenses (regardless of income level), for about \$2 billion; eliminating the corporate income tax deduction for expenses related to the Medicare Part D subsidy, for about \$4.5 billion; and limiting the corporate income tax deduction for compensation that health insurance companies pay to their executives. (It is worth repeating that the 2.3 percent ObamaCare medical device tax is applied to gross income, not profits. Massachusetts-based Abiomed grossed \$126 million in sales in 2012 but made a profit of only about \$1.5 million. The 2.3 percent tax would not be on that \$1.5 million in profit, as one might expect, but on the \$126 million in sales. Abiomed would therefore owe a tax of \$2.898 million—almost double its actual profit. In other words, it would be put out of business by ObamaCare.) [41281, 41287, 42401]

The legislation not only fails to cut spending, it adds to the deficit. According to the Congressional Budget Office, the bill adds about \$330 billion in spending over 10 years. The legislation represents the largest tax increase in 20 years. Because the tax increases largely impact job creators, it will not be surprising if another recession is the result. [41152, 41153]

Obama states, “Tonight’s agreement ensures that, going forward, we will continue to reduce the deficit through a combination of new spending cuts and new revenues from the wealthiest Americans.” (In other words, Obama wants still higher taxes in future deals—perhaps to continue funding grants like the \$300,000 award his Department of Agriculture gave an Idaho fish processor to promote caviar sales. If he wants additional tax revenue, he might want to consider taxing professional sports leagues like the NFL,

NHL, and the PGA—which are classified as non-profit organizations by the IRS.)  
[42060, 42061]

According to WashingtonTimes.com, the “fiscal cliff” legislation repeals ObamaCare’s “Community Living Assistance Services and Supports” program, a scheme to raise taxes in the short term while shamelessly promising (largely unfunded) federally-subsidized nursing home care in the future. “...Obama halted the program, saying he couldn’t find a way to make it cost-effective. But he had objected when Republicans tried to repeal it outright, saying he wanted to keep it on the books and try to amend it rather than kill it. But he did an about-face this week, accepting repeal in exchange for raising tax rates on the wealthiest.” [41138, 41139, 41253]

Senator Marco Rubio (R-FL) states, “Thousands of small businesses, not just the wealthy, will now be forced to decide how they’ll pay this new tax and, chances are, they’ll do it by firing employees, cutting back their hours and benefits, or postponing the new hire they were looking to make. And to make matters worse, it does nothing to bring our dangerous debt under control. ...I appreciate all the hard work that went into avoiding the so-called ‘fiscal cliff.’ I especially commend Senator [Mitch] McConnell’s efforts to make the best out of a bad situation. Nevertheless, I cannot support the arrangement they have arrived at. Rapid economic growth and spending reforms are the only way out of the real fiscal cliff our nation is facing. But rapid economic growth and job creation will be made more difficult under the deal reached here in Washington. Of course, many Americans will be relieved in the short term that their taxes won’t go up. However in the long run, they will be hurt when employers pass on to them one of the largest tax hikes in decades. Furthermore, this deal just postpones the inevitable, the need to solve our growing debt crisis and help the 23 million Americans who can’t find the work they need.” [41149]

Politico reports, “House Republicans are overwhelmingly opposed to the Senate’s bill to avert the fiscal cliff, making it nearly certain that Speaker John Boehner’s chamber will amend the legislation and send it back to the Senate—a potentially serious blow to a package that appeared well on its way to becoming law. House Majority Leader Eric Cantor (R-VA), the [number two] House Republican, told GOP lawmakers that he was opposed to the legislation in its current form. Republicans are chiefly concerned with the lack of spending cuts in the tax bill.” (Throughout 2012 Obama has called for “balanced” legislation, with tax increases and spending cuts, yet Senate Democrats came up with \$620 billion in tax increases and a reported \$15 billion in spending cuts—a ratio of 41-to-1.) FoxNews.com reports, “House Republican leaders voiced serious concern Tuesday afternoon about the Senate’s just-passed fiscal crisis bill during a closed door meeting with rank-and-file lawmakers, sources told Fox News. The response raised questions about how the House would handle the deal, which was highly touted by bipartisan officials in the Senate just hours earlier. Doubts that the GOP-controlled House would pass the plan intensified Tuesday afternoon. Lawmakers have just two days to go before a new Congress convenes which limits the House’s options. The House can reject the plan, pass it as written by the Senate—which is unlikely given strong GOP opposition—or

amend it. If the House amends it, the legislation goes back to the Senate where time constraints would likely kill it for the current Congressional session.” [41139, 41143]

According to Bloomberg.com, “The heaviest new [tax] burdens in 2013, compared with 2012, would fall on top earners, who would face higher rates on income, capital gains, dividends and estates. The top 1 percent of taxpayers, or those with incomes over \$506,210, would pay an average of \$73,633 more in taxes. ... The top 0.1 percent of taxpayers, those with incomes over about \$2.7 million, would pay an average of \$443,910 more, reducing their after-tax incomes by 8.4 percent. They would pay 26 percent of the additional taxes imposed by the legislation.” (No reasonable person can believe that such tax increases will not result in job losses. Every additional dollar confiscated by the government is a dollar not being spent in the private sector.) [41141]

Obama pays back his Hollywood friends with the fiscal cliff deal. According to Breitbart.com, “Section 317 of the freshly approved legislation includes an extension for ‘special expensing rules for certain film and television productions.’ Congress first enacted production tax incentives favorable to the domestic entertainment industry in 2004, and extended them in 2008, but the deal was meant to expire in 2011. The fiscal cliff deal extends the tax incentives through 2013—even as payroll taxes rise on ordinary Americans.” [41144]

Addressing the debt limit issue, Obama states, “I will not have another debate with this Congress over whether or not they should pay the bills that they’ve already racked up through the laws that they passed. Let me repeat. You can’t not pay bills that we have already incurred. In Congress refuses to the United States government the ability to pay these bills on-time, the consequences for the entire global economy would be catastrophic—far worse than the impact of a fiscal cliff. People will remember back in 2011, the last time this course of action was threatened, our entire recovery was put at risk. We can’t go down that path again.” (Obama wants the debt limit raised without any spending cuts. With the election over, his “balanced approach” is nowhere to be found.) [41155, 41166]

The House of Representatives votes 287–129 to freeze the salaries of federal workers and legislators. [41146]

Congressman Louis Gohmert (R-TX) states, “I just wanted to thank so many on the other side after all these years, for finally acknowledging publicly that ninety-eight percent of the Bush tax cuts helped the middle class.” (When the tax cuts were passed in May 2003, the Democrats refused to make them permanent and demanded they expire. Senate Democrats voted 46–2 against the tax cuts in 2003; House Democrats voted 198–7 against them. But in 2012 they decided it was better to make them permanent—at least until they regain control of the House of Representatives.) [41338]

On Fox News, Charles Krauthammer comments on the fiscal cliff deal: “...Look how much [Obama] gained tonight. They [the Democrats] gave away so little; they gave away nothing. For example, he rejected the very idea of having just a technical change in how

the cost of living is calculated. Why did he do that? So that he now can give a bone to the Republicans in the future in other negotiations, again, in return for spending cuts. Look, tonight is one of the low points that Republicans have ever had in the last few years. It was on substance and also on politics. On the substance, this is a really bad deal. And Obama's cleverness in insisting on raising [income tax] rates is that he's gonna follow this now by trying to raise taxes through [further limiting] deductions. And remember, the Republican Speaker has already offered \$800 billion in higher revenues as a result of eliminating loopholes. So he [Obama] still has that he can pocket. So he gets a double rise in taxes, on rates, and then on eliminating the deductions. And that's on substance. But on the politics, I think it was really fascinating what we saw tonight, which was Obama understood that if he got the Republicans insistent on rates being increased, he made it an ultimatum. He said either you agree on raising the rates on the rich or you get nothing and you go over the cliff. He broke the unity of the Republicans." [41171]

"In the last two years, he [Obama] wasn't able to achieve anything of substance in the House because there was a united Republican House that stopped him. All the achievements he got, ObamaCare, stimulus, he all got in the first two years when he had control of the Congress. But now, look what's happened tonight. The Republicans are split and this will only be able to pass because Democrats are supporting it. So on the politics of this, he has very much now weakened the Republicans; he's split the Republicans in the House. And the one obstacle to his being able to control the agenda in Washington is now very much diminished. And that I think was his political objective in all of this, so he achieved a lot on substance, higher taxes, or try to undo the Reagan idea of lower taxes, and second, on the politics, by splitting the Republicans and taking essentially control of Washington. That doesn't mean he'll succeed through the two years [until the 2014 mid-term elections] and have it all his way but he sure has succeeded tonight and that's why... Republicans are so bitter and heartbroken." [41171]

The House votes 257–167 to approve the “fiscal cliff” tax increases passed by the Senate the Senate on January 1. Democrats provide the victory, voting 172–16. The Republican vote is 85–151. Obama states, “Thanks to the votes of Democrats and Republicans in Congress I will sign a law that raises taxes on the wealthiest two percent of Americans while preventing a middle-class tax hike that could have sent the economy back into recession and obviously had a severe impact on families all across America.” *The Wall Street Journal* notes, “The compromise dodges one cliff, but it sends Congress barreling toward another. In two months, the delayed \$110 billion in spending cuts will again kick in. At the same time, the U.S. will face the need to increase its borrowing limit, a change that can only be made by Congress. That sets up another rancorous fight, one with potentially more damaging consequences. Republicans want to use the debt ceiling to extract spending cuts. ...Obama has said he won't negotiate. The failure to grapple with the biggest budget questions disappointed business leaders who had hoped for a comprehensive budget agreement that could tackle the deficit and diminish what for some has been a debilitating policy uncertainty.” House Speaker John Boehner (R-OH) states, “The American people re-elected a Republican majority in the House, and we will use it in 2013 to hold [Obama] accountable for the ‘balanced’ approach he promised, meaning significant spending cuts and reforms to the entitlement programs that are driving our

country deeper and deeper into debt.” (Some consider the vote a victory for Obama because he was able to raise taxes on the top one percent of Americans. Others might consider it a victory for the Republicans because they were able to get the Bush tax rates extended for the other 99 percent *without* an expiration date—something they could not get when the rate reductions were passed in 2003. The GOP also obtained a permanent “fix” for the Alternative Minimum Tax rule that harms millions of Americans.) [41147, 41148, 41150, 41151, 41154, 41157, 41158, 41159]

Obama tells reporters, “We can’t simply cut our way to prosperity. Cutting spending has to go hand-in-hand with further reforms to our tax code so that the wealthiest corporations and individuals can’t take advantage of loopholes and deductions that aren’t available to most Americans. And we can’t keep cutting things like basic research and new technology and still expect to succeed in a 21st century economy. So we’re going to have to continue to move forward in deficit reduction, but we have to do it in a balanced way, making sure that we are growing even as we get a handle on our spending. ... Today’s agreement enshrines, I think, a principle into law that will remain in place as long as I am [in the White House]: The deficit needs to be reduced in a way that’s balanced. Everyone pays their fair share. Everyone does their part. That’s how our economy works best. That’s how we grow.” (That is, Obama is not done demanding tax hikes, and has no desire to cut spending. Further, the principle Obama and Congress have “enshrined” is Marxism—via a more progressive income tax rather than equal tax treatment of everyone under the law.) [41167, 41185, 41186]

Almost immediately after the House passes the legislation, Obama heads back to Hawaii—without signing the bill. (It is later “signed” by Obama via “autopen.”) Obama wins a victory with the tax hikes on the upper-income earners, but loses because the Bush tax rates were made permanent for everyone else—they were not temporarily extended. That makes it even more difficult for Obama to get additional revenue to spend (unless Democrats recapture the House of Representatives in the November 2014 elections, in which case middle class income tax rates will probably be increased). [41156, 41163, 41170, 41174]

GovtSlaves.info posts an SGTReport.com interview with an unnamed, SWAT-trained Connecticut police lieutenant who raises questions about the discrepancies in the official reports of the Sandy Hook school shooting, the event which is being used as a catalyst for gun control legislation. The police officer notes that there were reports of a second shooter who was arrested; there was video from a helicopter that showed police chasing and apprehending an individual in the woods behind the school; there were eyewitness accounts of a man with a dark shirt and camouflage pants who was handcuffed and in police custody outside the school and then sitting in a police vehicle; police dispatch audio makes it clear that there were two individuals “proned out [sic]” on the ground by officers at the school; according to initial reports, four handguns were the murder weapons and were found inside the school and an AR-15 was found in the trunk of the alleged shooter’s car; video shows police removing a shotgun from the trunk of the vehicle; there were reports by the police that hundreds of shots were fired but no reports of dozens of expelled magazines; although teachers reported that they heard shots fired,

none reported that they heard “hundreds” being fired; there is virtually no record of the existence of alleged killer Adam Lanza in the three years prior to the shooting and his brother had not even seen him; no school security video has been released showing Lanza at all—let alone dressed in black, with a mask, and carrying 40 or more pounds of weapons and ammunition on his skinny frame; no crime scene photographs have been released, not even of the window Lanza allegedly broke to gain entry into the school; a “rest in peace” Facebook page for teacher victim Victoria Soto was posted four days prior to the shooting. (If there are explanations for any of these discrepancies and other inconsistencies in the reporting, they have never been released by the media or the police.) [42006, 42053, 42162]

Among the other Sandy Hook “anomalies,” a neighborhood resident named Eugene Rose, who brought Sandy Hook students into his home after the shootings, looks remarkably like FEMA representative Eugene Rosen who, in August 2008, was seen passing out literature to children at an event in Harbinger, Texas. Photographs of the scene posted on Twitter by CNN reporter Audrey Washington have date/time stamps that precede the shooting. [42242, 42269]

On January 2 The Ulsterman Report hears from the unnamed Republican insider, who relates, “[There is] Some pushing and shoving [within House GOP ranks] at this point. The knives haven’t come out just yet and [House Speaker John] Boehner and his supporters are trying to calm us down and making promises that the debt ceiling will be the real battle and that we can count on him then. Yeah, right. He lost a lot of votes and a lot of support on this fiscal cliff nonsense. There were a few Democrats saying that Obama played no part in the actual negotiations. He didn’t return calls. Didn’t offer up suggestions. Nothing. Everything went through White House operatives. Then we had the Joe Biden show which I figured right off the bat was some kind of reward to him for time served to help set up the 2016 run. Biden, who is already about 70 years old, really does believe he will be the next president and he has enough Obama operatives willing to consider that scenario that they set up his dog and pony thing with [Senate Minority Leader Mitch] McConnell to get the Senate vote. Biden is so confident I heard he shook McConnell’s hand and said, ‘Look forward to working with you in four years Mitch—from the Oval Office.’ My guess, and that’s all it is at this point, is that the same people who put Barack Obama in power have been given assurances by Joe Biden that he will be more than happy to continue the agenda. Meaning they can completely control Biden just like they do Obama. But a 74-year-old first-term President of the United States? That seems highly unlikely. I say that and then have to remind myself how unlikely it was for an unknown absentee Senator from Illinois to become president. If the powers that be want it to happen, it can happen. Especially if enough people continue to not pay attention or allow themselves to be split up and fighting one another. We all need to remind ourselves of that.” [41162]

“More to come after the smoke clears on this latest battle. People need to be realize that a majority of Republicans in the House voted NO on the fiscal cliff deal. We also had 16 Democrats join us in that no vote. The Obama machine is now turning its sights on 2014. They are targeting very specific GOP races they think they can win. They want the House

back. Obama's third year agenda is the one that really worries me now. If we keep the House and take the Senate in 2014, we can start to rebuild from the Obama damage that he has already done, and make him a complete Lame Duck. If we lose the House and the Dems keep the Senate, as bad as things are now, I know they will get much worse. I'm starting to sense that getting Obama re-elected was to set up that 3rd year agenda. The real globalization push. Taxes, immigration, guns, environment, currency, healthcare mandates, the domestic drone program, all of it and more will come together in that third year if they control the White House and Congress. All of it will be finalized. Everything the globalists have worked for all this time will come together during that third year of Barack Obama's second term. What's the old saying? Death comes in threes? Word is Boehner thinks that legislative doomsday scenario is silly while Cantor is taking it much more seriously." [41162]

At WashingtonExaminer.com Tim Carney writes, "The 'fiscal cliff' legislation passed this week included \$76 billion in special-interest tax credits for the likes of General Electric, Hollywood and even Captain Morgan [rum]. But these subsidies weren't the fruit of eleventh-hour lobbying conducted on the cliff's edge—they were crafted back in August in a Senate committee, and they sat dormant until the White House reportedly insisted on them this week. The Family and Business Tax Cut Certainty Act of 2012, which passed through the Senate Finance Committee in August, was copied and pasted into the fiscal cliff legislation, yielding a victory for biotech companies, wind-turbine-makers, biodiesel producers, film studios—and their lobbyists. So, if you're wondering how algae subsidies became part of a must-pass package to avert the dreaded fiscal cliff, credit the Biotechnology Industry Organization's lobbying last summer. ...A Republican Senate aide familiar with the cliff negotiations tells me the White House wanted permanent extensions of a whole slew of corporate tax credits. When Senate Republicans said no, 'the White House insisted that the exact language' of the [Senator Max] Baucus bill [from August] be included in the fiscal cliff deal. 'They were absolutely insistent,' another aide tells me. (The White House did not return requests for comment.) Sure enough, Title II of the fiscal cliff legislation is nearly a word-for-word replication of the Family and Business Tax Cut Certainty Act of 2012." [41184, 41220]

LATimes.com reports, "The Obama administration eased the way Wednesday for illegal immigrants who are immediate relatives of American citizens to apply for permanent residency, a change that could affect as many as 1 million of the estimated 11 million immigrants unlawfully in the U.S. A new rule issued by the Department of Homeland Security aims to reduce the time illegal immigrants are separated from their American families while seeking legal status, immigration officials said. Beginning March 4, when the changes go into effect, illegal immigrants who can demonstrate that time apart from an American spouse, child or parent would create 'extreme hardship,' can start the application process for a legal visa without leaving the U.S." [41165]

Secretary of State Hillary Clinton is discharged from New York Presbyterian Hospital Columbia University Medical Center.



According to HuffingtonPost.com, Obama “plans to push for immigration reform this January. [An administration] official, who spoke about legislative plans only on condition of anonymity, said that coming standoffs over deficit reduction are unlikely to drain momentum from other priorities. The White House plans to push forward quickly, not just on immigration reform but gun control laws as well. The timeframe is likely to be cheered by Democrats and immigration reform advocates alike, who have privately expressed fears that Obama’s second term will be drowned out in seemingly unending showdowns between parties.” (At a Lebanon, Virginia campaign appearance in 2008 Obama said, “When you all go home and you’re talking to your buddies and you say, ah ‘He wants to take my gun away.’ You’ve heard it here, I’m on television so everybody knows it. I believe in the Second Amendment. I believe in people’s lawful right to bear arms. I will not take your shotgun away. I will not take your rifle away. I won’t take your handgun away.” Obama was lying.) [41177, 41178, 41179, 41236]

In *The Wall Street Journal*, Fred Barnes writes that Obama “has mainly himself to blame” for failing to strike a “grand bargain” on the fiscal cliff. “He faults congressional Republicans for his inability to achieve the impressive compromises that [others have] attained. But the biggest hindrance to a bipartisan breakthrough has been [Obama’s] own style in dealing with the GOP opposition. ...Obama doesn’t believe he is obligated personally to bring about a compromise. Over the past 18 months, he hosted meetings with Republican leaders and had numerous one-on-one conversations with House Speaker John Boehner—all for naught. Much of the serious negotiating is left to subordinates. He skipped the final talks on the fiscal-cliff deal, only to appear on television to inform ‘members of both parties’ in Congress that he and the American people were anxiously awaiting a last-minute accord—as if he were as uninvolved in the budget wrangling as the public. ...An even bigger impediment is [Obama’s] predilection for stepping up his demands just as a compromise appears possible. After Mr. Boehner agreed to \$800 billion in new tax revenues in 2011, ...Obama suddenly called for \$400 billion more. This instantly killed a potential grand bargain and deepened Republican distrust of [Obama]. ...He is strikingly un-conciliatory. ...[Obama] barred significant spending cuts in the stopgap bill, further alienating Republicans and worsening the poisonous political climate in Washington as he begins his second term. This is a bigger problem than ...Obama may imagine. The most important issues—the debt ceiling, entitlement reform, tax reform, government spending, the \$110 billion sequester—now must be dealt with in an atmosphere that is hardly conducive to bipartisanship and compromise. The essence of bipartisan deals is win-win: Both sides are satisfied, even if not elated. ...Obama’s approach is that he alone gets to win. The approach worked, more or less, on the fiscal-cliff deal, but it won’t produce the larger bipartisan agreements that ...Obama now needs. And he’ll miss the opportunities that [others have] seized, to their own benefit and the country’s.” [41188]

Meanwhile, Senator Ron Johnson (R-WI) tells Newsmax.tv that “...Obama has no idea how to work with people in a bipartisan fashion and in good faith. ...Obama is basically taunting Republicans, ...he’s spiking the football. This is not the way to set up good relationships with Republicans here in Congress so that we can deal together in a cooperative, good-faith effort to start solving the very serious problems facing this nation.

...He won the election. Republicans had no power in these [fiscal cliff] negotiations. We had no leverage—so he was going to get what he wanted. Our role was limiting the damage. What I was faced with was a very simple choice. After a fairly disgusting process coming out of a totally dysfunctional United States Senate and totally dysfunctional Washington, we literally had less than a half hour to consider whether we wanted to vote for this bill. In the end, it was probably best if I could shield 98 to 99 percent of Americans from having their taxes increased and basically keep \$3.5 trillion out of the federal government's coffers over the next 10 years. The economic damage, the harm to people's livelihoods, would be so severe that that was the number one consideration—and that's why I decided to vote 'yes.' But, trust me, I fully understand why people voted 'no.' This was a disgusting process. It's business as usual in Washington. It's a bill, a must-pass piece of legislation. I didn't like voting for it, but I certainly just couldn't stand by and watch 98 to 99 percent of Americans have their income taxes increased. ...All of these tax changes are permanent. We haven't created another one of these fiscal tax cliffs. What we've done—for 98, 99 percent of Americans—is that they're tax situation is pretty certain going well into the future and even more so, as long as you keep electing Republicans.” [41189]

The dysfunctional process, says Johnson, is “a price to be paid by the American public, because they elected a man who doesn't know how to really work with people, doesn't negotiate in good faith, doesn't have a clue how to create jobs, and doesn't have a clue how harmful his ideology and his policies are in terms of economic growth. That's a real problem. And, of course, [Obama's] rubbing Republicans' noses in it is just the worst possible way of trying to develop a good, trusting working relationship with people you're going to have to work with to solve the problems. He won the election, but so did members of the House. They have every bit of a mandate from the people who elected them as ...Obama has from the people who elected him. The solutions are going to have to be bipartisan. Neither side is going away, so you [had] better learn how to work with each other—and I can't imagine [Obama] setting a poorer example and establishing a worse tone than what he did over this fiscal cliff.” [41189]

According to AllAfrica.com, “Although Ahmed Boukhtala is the main suspect in the September 11th terrorist attack on US consulate in Benghazi as well as a suspect in assassination of Libyan rebel commander Major General Abdelfattah Younis, he continues to live freely in Benghazi.” [41195]

On January 3 Congressman John Boehner (R-OH) is reelected Speaker of the House by the incoming House of Representatives. (Twelve Republicans do not vote for Boehner, and Nancy Pelosi gets 192 votes from Democrats.) [41180, 41183]

Reverend James David Manning, pastor of ATLAH World Missionary Church in Harlem, New York City, speculates on the cause of the bruise on Obama's right cheek that was evident during his remarks to the press after the House approved tax increases. (Manning believes it is a symptom of herpes.) [41181]

Treasury Secretary Timothy Geithner announces he will leave his position at the end of January. [41182, 41210, 41213]

In California, U.S. District Judge Morrison C. England Jr. denies an appeal from attorney Orly Taitz to block the counting of electoral votes from the presidential election because Obama is not a natural born citizen. England argues that Taitz's claims are unsupported—but conveniently refuses to allow her to present evidence to support those claims. England argues that Obama must be legitimate because he already resides in the White House. (Taitz later writes, “[The] Chief judge of the Eastern District of California is de facto saying: it is ok to be a thief and a forger, as long as you can forge and steal and not be caught because there isn't one honest AG [attorney general] or DA [district attorney] or US attorney or a judge to compel production of the original documents and prosecute you for fraud, forgery and theft, then you can continue keeping the stolen property forever...”) Taitz tells reporters, “What we're doing here is the right thing. It's stopping treason. We are looking for one honest judge who will look at the case on its merits.” (So far no honest judge has allowed an Obama eligibility case to proceed on its merits. All have found excuses to dismiss the cases, or simply refused to hear evidence.) [41194, 41201, 41202, 41215, 41225]

An Egyptian magazine, *Rose El-Youssef*, confirms that members of the radical Muslim Brotherhood have infiltrated the Obama administration: Arif Alikhan, assistant secretary of Homeland Security for policy development; Mohammed Elibiary, a member of the Homeland Security Advisory Council; Rashad Hussain, the U.S. special envoy to the Organization of the Islamic Conference; Salam al-Marayati, co-founder of the Muslim Public Affairs Council (MPAC); Imam Mohamed Magid, president of the Islamic Society of North America (ISNA); and Eboo Patel, a member of ...Obama's Advisory Council on Faith-Based Neighborhood Partnerships. [41199, 41200]

According to Yahoo News, an analysis of the 2009 “cash for clunkers” program ended up producing “tons of unnecessary waste while doing little to curb greenhouse gas emissions.” The Obama program required that the engines of older, traded-in cars be destroyed in order to keep them off the roads, but “Shredding vehicles results in its own environmental nightmare. For each ton of metal produced by a shredding facility, roughly 500 pounds of ‘shredding residue’ is also produced, which includes polyurethane foams, metal oxides, glass and dirt. All totaled, about 4.5 million tons of that residue is already produced on average every year. Where does it go? Right into a landfill. ...*E Magazine* states recycling just the plastic and metal alone from the ...scraps would have saved 24 million barrels of oil. While some of the ‘Clunkers’ were truly old, many of the almost 700,000 cars were still in perfectly good condition. In fact, many that qualified for the program were relatively ‘young,’ with fuel efficiencies that rivaled newer cars.” The program also drove up the price of used cars, because there were suddenly 700,000 fewer available. [41229]

GovtSlaves.info reports on the strange claim that the *Daily Mail* posted a photograph of a Sandy Hook “victim” that was, in fact, an image of a young girl copied from a page on the Flickr web site. Distraught mother Cathy Gaubert writes on Facebook, “This photo,

MY PHOTO. of MY CHILD (this sweet, beautiful, alive and well child), was taken from my Flickr page without my knowledge or consent and is fraudulently being used...” (The media eventually started using a different, and allegedly correct, photo for the victim.) [42001, 42002, 42003]

On January 4 France24.com reports, “Saudi Arabia has provided fighter jets to assist the United States with its drone strikes against Al-Qaeda targets in Yemen, the London Times reported on Friday. US drones are backing Yemeni forces combating militants of Al-Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula (AQAP). The group’s Yemen branch is considered by Washington to be the most active and deadliest franchise of the global jihadist network.” [41198]

DailyCaller.com posts video of a September 23, 2010 interview with Mohammed Morsi, the new president of Egypt, in which he states, “No reasonable person can expect any progress on this track. Either [you accept] the Zionists and everything they want, or else it is war. This is what these occupiers of the land of Palestine know—these [Jewish] blood-suckers, who attack the Palestinians, these warmongers, the descendants of apes and pigs... there is no place for them on the land of Palestine. We should employ all forms of resistance against them. There should be military resistance within the land of Palestine [Israel] against those criminal Zionists, who attack Palestine and the Palestinians. There should also be political resistance and economic resistance through a boycott, as well as by supporting the resistance fighters. This should be the practice of the Muslims and the Arabs outside Palestine. They should support the resistance fighters and besiege the Zionist wherever they are. None of the Arab or Muslim peoples and regimes should have dealings with them. Pressure should be exerted upon them. They must not be given any opportunity, and must not stand on any Arab or Islamic land. They must be driven out of our countries... We want a country for the Palestinians on the entire land of Palestine, on the basis of [Palestinian] citizenship. All the talk about a two-state solution and about peace is nothing but an illusion, which the Arabs have been chasing for a long time now. They will not get from the Zionists anything but this illusion.” In January 2010, the Obama-endorsed Morsi said, “Dear brothers, we must not forget to nurse our children and grandchildren on hatred towards those Zionists and Jews, and all those who support them. They must be nursed on hatred. The hatred must continue.” (Morsi, a member of the radical Muslim Brotherhood, is considered a “moderate” by the Obama administration.) [41203, 41209, 41511, 41554, 41633]

John Noveske, of NoveskeRifleworks.com, is killed in a mysterious car crash—just days after a lengthy Facebook in which he notes the drugs taken by the killers involved in various school shootings and other incidents. Noveske asked, “What drugs was Adam Peter Lanza on?” Noveske’s death follows that of Keith Ratliff, owner of weapons manufacturer FPS Industries and creator of a YouTube channel featuring videos of unusual weapons. According to the *Daily Mail*, Ratliff’s body was “discovered on a rural road in Carnesville, Georgia. Ratliff had a single gunshot wound the head and police are treating his death as a homicide.” (Whether the Noveske and Ratliff deaths are coincidental or an effort to eliminate prominent supporters of the Second Amendment right to bear arms is not known. At NaturalNews.com Mike Adams writes, “Steve

Quayle, creator of SteveQuayle.com, says ‘the red list is on!’ This refers to the so-called ‘red list’—a secret kill list of Americans authorized by Obama and designed to be invoked immediately before an attempted radical leftist takeover of the nation. In support of this theory, Obama himself actually signed into law the NDAA which authorizes secret assassinations of U.S. citizens on U.S. soil. Instead of the red list being ‘conspiracy theory,’ it appears to be a key component of Obama’s domestic policy.” Although *The Obama Timeline* has no way of confirming Quayle’s suspicions, nothing should be considered outside the realm of possibility when it comes to a government seeking to extend its powers—especially when its fiscal policies are leading to a monumental collapse. If a government can routinely ignore the U.S. Constitution, cover up the John F. Kennedy assassination conspiracy, and allow an ineligible person to inhabit the White House, nothing should be considered too far-fetched.) [41356, 41365, 41371, 41394, 41405]

According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, a mere 155,000 jobs were added in December and the unemployment rate stands at 7.8 percent. The number of unemployed rose by 164,000. The unemployment rate for women increases from 7 to 7.3 percent; the rate for blacks jumps from 13.2 to 14 percent. *The New York Times* notes, “For jobs, the past four years have been a wash. The December jobs figures out today indicate that there were 725,000 more jobs in the private sector than at the end of 2008—and 697,000 fewer government jobs. That works into a private-sector gain of 0.6 percent, and a government sector decline of 3.1 percent. In total, the number of people with jobs is up by 28,000, or 0.02 percent.” [41206, 41212, 41222, 41226]

More than a few Obama supporters receive their first paycheck of 2013 and are stunned to learn that their Social Security tax rate returned to the normal level. At DemocratUnderground.com, comments include: “What happened that my Social Security withholding’s in my paycheck just went up?” “My paycheck just went down by an amount that I don’t feel comfortable with. I guarantee this decrease is gonna’ hurt me more than the increase in income taxes will hurt those making over 400 grand. What happened?” “My boyfriend has had a lot of expenses and is feeling squeezed right now, and having his paycheck shrink really didn’t help.” “Many of my friends didn’t realize it, either. Our payroll department didn’t do a good job of explaining the coming changes.” “\$86 a month is a lot. That would pay for... Groceries for a week, as someone said. More than what I pay for parking every month, after my employer’s contribution to that. A new computer after a year. A new quality pair of shoes... every month. Months of my copay [sic] for my hormones. A new thick coat (on sale or at discount place). It would pay for what I spend on my dogs every month... food, vitamins, treats.” On Twitter, Obama fans suddenly stunned by the reality that they have to pay taxes to fund their own future Social Security benefits, write, “Really, how am I ever supposed to pay off my student loans if my already small paycheck keeps getting smaller? Help a sister out, Obama.” “F\*\*\*ing Obama! F\*\*\* you! This taking out more taxes s\*\*\* better f\*\*\*ing help me out!! Very upset to see my paycheck less today!” “Obama I did not vote for you so you can take away alot [sic] of money from my checks.” “I’m starting to regret voting for Obama.” “Obama is the biggest f\*\*\*ing liar in the world. Why the f\*\*\* did I vote for him?” [41358]

The House passes legislation providing \$9.7 billion in aid for victims of Hurricane Sandy victims. (Speaker John Boehner had been widely criticized for not immediately approving the Senate version—which totaled about \$60 billion after a mountain of “pork” was added. The \$60 billion the Senate wanted is essentially equal to the amount of tax revenue the government would get in one year as a result of the “fiscal cliff” deal. That is, the Senate was eager to spend in one day an entire year’s worth of increased tax revenue.) [41207, 41208, 41221, 41230]

Meanwhile, hurricane victim Donna Vanzant, who was given a hug by Obama during his photo-op visit to the storm-damaged area, tells Phillymag.com, “After [Obama’s] visit, I sent an email to ...Obama. Many days later, I got a response back. It was disturbing. ...It had nothing to do with what I was asking him. It was a form letter. It thanked me for supporting the troops. He made a promise to rebuild on national television, and I can’t even get this money. It’s heartbreaking, really. I did reach out to [State] Senator Whelan, and I got a response that they were forwarding my email to the person that Governor Christie put in charge of Sandy relief. But from ...Obama, I got a form letter. ...When you get a hug from [Obama], you feel like there’s something there. A promise was made. I have two grown kids. One is a U.S. Navy diver. The other one lives at the marina with his wife and new baby, and they lost everything. But I raised my kids to know that your word is your word. You promise something, you keep it, and that was a broken promise. I’ve never been a person to expect free handouts, but [Obama] gave me hope. But now, I just don’t know.” [41216]

WhiteHouseDossier.com reports, “The total cost to taxpayers of Obama’s vacations to Hawaii since [January 2009] is likely in excess of \$20 million, and possibly much, much more. During a time of budget deficits that threaten the nation’s security and its future, the Obamas have chosen to maintain a ‘family tradition’ and vacation halfway around the world instead of finding far cheaper alternatives closer to home. The \$20 million figure is based on estimates of the cost of the four Hawaii vacations the Obamas have taken during Christmastime 2009–2012. According to a detailed breakdown by the Hawaii Reporter, the annual excursions in 2009, 2010, and 2011 cost about \$4 million, much of it attributable to the expense of taking Air Force One, at an hour rate of about \$180,000, on an eighteen-hour roundtrip journey to Honolulu and back. But \$4 million almost certainly underestimates the true tally, as it does not include many miscellaneous items like the cost of flying advance teams out to Hawaii and separate flights Michelle Obama took in 2010 and 2011, when she left ahead of her husband, who was forced to stay in Washington to finish up work with Congress.” [41211]

MiamiHerald.com reports, “Lincolnton Furniture Company closed abruptly Thursday just one year after it was hailed by ...Obama as an example of the recovering U.S. economy.” [41214]

Activists proclaim January 5 “Shop Hobby Lobby Day,” and encourage Americans to patronize the 500+ Hobby Lobby stores in 41 states to show support for its stand against the ObamaCare forced birth control/abortifacient/sterilization mandate that the

company's owners have are defying for religious reasons. (The company, which is always closed on Sundays "to allow employees time for families and worship," faces fines of \$1.3 million per day.) [41218, 41231]

FoxNews.com reports that the Obama administration plans to leave not more than 10,000 U.S. troops in Afghanistan beyond 2014, but "The official emphasized that none of these plans are set in stone and that until [Obama] announces his decision the plans could be subject to change." [41219]

HuffingtonPost.com reports, "Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid (D-NV) has privately told other Democrats, including ...Obama, that if the administration used its constitutional and executive authority to continue paying its debts in the face of House Republican opposition, he would support the approach, according to a source familiar with Reid's message to [Obama]. The simplest escape route out of the debt ceiling impasse is for [Obama] to direct the Treasury to find a legal way to pay its debts. The Treasury then has a variety of options. One gaining particular attention relies on a law that allows the Treasury to mint a coin of unspecified value and deposit it with the Federal Reserve. Those funds could then be used legally to pay debts. 'Reid has not dismissed any option,' said the source close to Reid." (The absurd proposal is to simply mint a platinum coin and deem it "worth" \$1 trillion and use it to pay bills, therefore bypassing the debt ceiling altogether and demands by Republicans to cut spending. If Obama takes that action, he would essentially be declaring the U.S. dollar worthless, sparking hyperinflation at levels the nation has never seen.) Meanwhile, increasing numbers of Republican legislators are showing a willingness to accept a partial government shutdown if that is what it takes to force Obama and his fellow Democrats to accept spending cuts. (According to the National Inflation Association, "Throughout world history, only about 16 tons of platinum have been mined, which based on the current platinum price of \$1,595 per oz would value all of the platinum produced in history at \$816.6 million. In order to produce a real (non-fiat) \$1 trillion dollar platinum coin based on the current platinum price, it would require 627 million ounces or approximately 20,000 tons of platinum. This equals 1,250 times more platinum than what has been mined in world history. Even if the U.S. was able to obtain all of the world's platinum ever mined, the U.S. dollar would need to be devalued so that a \$100 bill only has the purchasing power of what 8 cents does today.") [41227, 41228, 41272, 41285, 41297, 41459]

In an effort to make Obama dictator-for-life, Congressman Jose Serrano (D-NY) proposes the repeal of the Twenty-Second Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, which limits presidents to two terms. (Serrano introduced a similar House Joint Resolution on January 6, 2009.) [818, 823, 41233, 41234]

Obama makes Judicial Watch's "Ten Most Wanted Corrupt Politicians for 2012" list, based in part on illegal recess appointments, illegal immigration orders, unprecedented secrecy, unconstitutional czars, use of executive privilege to shield Attorney General Eric Holder from Operation Fast and Furious investigations, Benghazi cover-ups and lies, personal involvement in the Solyndra scandal, etc. [41244]

Military.com reports, “Some 250 prisoners formerly held by the U.S. have been released by Afghan authorities in hopes that this will lead to reconciliation in the 11-year conflict, a Defense Ministry spokesman said Friday. Police Maj. Jalal Uddin said that 80 were freed from prisons across the country that day, the latest batch of a total of 400 to be released this week. The released prisoners had been captured in operations against the Taliban and other groups. ‘We are certain they can help to bring peace in Afghanistan and will support the government,’ he said.” (The U.S. military captures enemy combatants, retains them at Bagram, eventually turns them over to the Afghans—who then turn them loose to kill more American troops.) [41246, 41247]

EgyptIndependent.com reports, “The North Sinai Security Director seized a shipment of advanced anti-tank and anti-aircraft missiles at dawn on Friday. The directorate received a tip that the missiles were being secretly stored in a repository in Be’r al-Hefn—just south of Arish, the capital of North Sinai—and would be smuggled through tunnels to the Gaza Strip, said a security source. After informing the Interior Ministry in Cairo, two assistants to the interior minister led a large formation of police in a raid on the area. Be’r al-Hefn has often been used as an illegal storage area for explosives and weapons. ‘With the help of secret informants, the police found the storage site, where they found six US-made advanced missiles inside large holes in the ground [that were waiting to be] smuggled to the Gaza Strip through tunnels,’ the source said. He said the shipment likely originated in Libya...” (The missiles were probably originally provided by the Obama administration to the Libyan rebels.) [41286]

On January 5 WeeklyStandard.com reports, “A pro-lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender group issued a statement today urging ...Obama not to nominate [former Nebraska Senator] Chuck Hagel as secretary of defense. ‘GetEQUAL strongly opposes the potential nomination of Chuck Hagel to become the next Secretary of Defense. Hagel has, time and time again, taken every opportunity to lambast [sic] and denigrate lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) Americans, and the Cabinet is no place for this kind of disrespect,’ writes the chair GetEQUAL’s board Tanya Domi.” (Hagel is also notoriously anti-Israel and anti-Jew. Columnist Caroline Glick has written that Obama “is right to think he can win the Hagel fight. The Republican Senators aren’t going to get into a fight with Obama about his DOD [Department of Defense] appointee, especially given that it’s one of their [former] fellow [Republican] senators, even though many of them hate him. The Democrats are certainly not going to oppose him. Obama wants to hurt Israel. He does not like Israel. He is appointing anti-Israel advisors and cabinet members not despite their anti-Israel positions, but because of them. ...Obama won with 70 percent of the Jewish vote despite the fact that his record in his first term was more hostile to Israel than... Jimmy Carter. No one can expect him now, after his victory, to feel even slightly constrained in his desire to weaken the US relationship with Israel. ...Let there be no doubt, Obama will get Hagel in at Defense. And Hagel will place Israel in his crosshairs.” Obama wants the soft-on-defense Hagel at the Defense Department for two reasons: to work against Israel and slash defense spending to free up the money for welfare programs.) [40888, 41223, 41224, 41252, 41257, 41367, 41500]



NYTimes.com reports, “Health insurance companies across the country are seeking and winning double-digit increases in premiums for some customers, even though one of the biggest objectives of the Obama administration’s health care law was to stem the rapid rise in insurance costs for consumers. Particularly vulnerable to the high rates are small businesses and people who do not have employer-provided insurance and must buy it on their own. In California, Aetna is proposing rate increases of as much as 22 percent, Anthem Blue Cross 26 percent and Blue Shield of California 20 percent for some of those policy holders, according to the insurers’ filings with the state for 2013.” (Obama promised that ObamaCare would lower the average health care premium by \$2,500 per year.) Among those hardest hit by premium increases will likely be younger customers, because ObamaCare prohibits health insurers from charging older customers more than three times the rate paid by younger customers. Even if older customers cost five times as much to insure, the insurance companies are prohibited from charging them more than three times as much. As a result, younger customers will be overpaying so that older customers can underpay. (The rule is absurd. It is young, healthy customers that are needed to offset the cost of covering older, less healthy customers. Charging young customers more than is necessary will encourage them not to have insurance at all—which is precisely the opposite of what is needed. The three-to-one limit is tantamount to prohibiting car insurers from charging owners of Ferraris and Lamborghinis appropriate rates, and overcharging Taurus and Camry owners to make up the shortage.) [41238, 41258, 41293]

At PJMedia.com, former Department of Justice (DOJ) official J. Christian Adams reports, “A federal court has ruled that South Carolina was the prevailing party in the unnecessary Voter ID litigation, and therefore the [DOJ] is liable for paying the state’s costs. South Carolina spent \$3,500,000 to obtain federal court approval of the state’s Voter ID law as non-discriminatory under the Voting Rights Act. The lawsuit was made necessary only because of the political and ideological radicalism of Assistant Attorney General Tom Perez and his deputy Matthew Colangelo. ...[C]areer Voting Section employees, including Voting Section Chief Chris Herren, recommended that the Voter ID law be approved in the first place by DOJ after a careful written analysis inside the Voting Section. Documents prepared by the career staff urged Perez and Colangelo to grant administrative approval to the South Carolina Voter ID law—but they refused. Their refusal was, in part, designed to energize a moribund political base heading into the 2012 election. The cost to the American taxpayers for their stunt will be significant.” (In other words, Obama officials intentionally fought back against South Carolina’s photo ID law for the sole purpose of ginning up minority votes for Obama. Frivolous motions filed by the Obama administration included “...challenging the 12-point font size on a document the state filed.”) Senator Lindsey Graham (R-SC) had previously requested documents from the DOJ related to its actions. So far Obama’s officials have refused to comply. (Attorney General Eric Holder responds to the Court’s ruling by sending a team of high-priced Department of Labor attorneys to harass South Carolina officials during a special town council election in tiny Branchville—where 186 people vote. Holder’s goal: to find voting irregularities to use against the state in future legal actions.) [41239, 41357]

On January 6 FoxNews.com reports, "...Obama's 2008 campaign has been fined \$375,000 by the Federal Election Commission for reporting violations related to a set of donations received during the final days of the campaign. The fines are among the largest ever levied on a presidential campaign by the FEC and stem from a series of missing filings for nearly 1,200 contributions totaling nearly \$1.9 million. Campaigns are required to file the reports during the final weeks of the campaign." (The FEC has never penalized the Obama campaign for accepting illegal foreign contributions.) [41237, 41245]

AmericaC2C.com reports that Obama has nominated French economist Esther Duflo, a socialist, to join the Global Development Council. The council "was founded by Obama in 2010 to help shape US development efforts abroad." Duflo supports the forced redistribution of wealth by government. [41254, 41843]

House Speaker John Boehner (R-OH) tells *The Wall Street Journal's* Stephen Moore, "At one point several weeks ago, [Obama] said to me, 'We don't have a spending problem.'" Moore writes, "Mr. Boehner confirms that at one critical juncture he asked ...Obama, after conceding on \$800 billion in new taxes, 'What am I getting?' and [Obama] replied: 'You don't get anything for it. I'm taking that anyway.'" Boehner notes, "I'm the guy who put revenues on the table the day after the election, and I'm the guy who put the [income] threshold at a million dollars. Then we agreed to let the rates go up, on dividends, capital gains as a way of trying to move them into a deal. ...But we could never get him to step up. ...[I]t became painfully obvious that [Obama] won't cut spending." [41393]

Another gay-themed poem written by Obama surfaces. In the poem, published in Obama's 1978 Punahou School literary magazine, he writes: "Seeking a hiding place, the night seals us together. A transient spark lights his face, and in my honor, He pulls out forgotten dignity from under his flaking coat." (Whether the poem was written by Obama or his communist mentor, Frank Marshall Davis, is not known. It is suspected that Davis wrote several of Obama's school assignments. Even before his relationship with the pornographer Davis, Obama had encounters with sexually perverted individuals. While living in Indonesia, Obama was often under the care of a so-called male nanny named Turdi, who often dressed as a woman and went by the name of Evie.) [41242]

On ABC's *This Week*, newly-elected Senator Heidi Heitkamp (D-ND) says of Obama's gun control agenda, "I think you need to put everything on the table, but what I hear from the administration—and if the Washington Post is to be believed—that's way, way in extreme of what I think is necessary or even should be talked about. And it's not going to pass." According to *The Washington Post*, "The White House is weighing a far broader and more comprehensive approach to curbing the nation's gun violence than simply reinstating an expired ban on assault weapons and high-capacity ammunition, according to multiple people involved in the administration's discussions. A working group led by Vice President [Joe] Biden is seriously considering measures backed by key law enforcement leaders that would require universal background checks for firearm buyers, track the movement and sale of weapons through a national database, strengthen mental health checks, and stiffen penalties for carrying guns near schools or giving them to

minors, the sources said.” (One of the members of Biden’s gun control team is Thomas J. Nee, an anti-gun activist whose son, Joseph T. Nee, was convicted in 2008 of conspiracy to commit murder in the plotting of an attack on Marshfield High School in Massachusetts.) [41248, 41251, 41262, 41273, 41274, 41275]

Also on *This Week*, Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell (R-KY) declares, “The tax issue is finished, over, completed. That’s behind us. Now the question is what are we going to do about the biggest problem confronting our country and our future, and that’s our spending addiction.” (McConnell may believe additional tax increases are off the table, but Obama and his fellow Democrats certainly do not.) [41265]

On *Face the Nation*, House Minority Leader Nancy Pelosi suggests Obama simply ignore the debt ceiling and claim that the Fourteenth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution gives him the power to do so. (Pelosi’s argument is absurd. The Amendment says, in part, “The validity of the public debt of the United States, authorized by law, including debts incurred for payment of pensions and bounties for services in suppressing insurrection or rebellion, shall not be questioned.” But that does not give Obama free rein to spend money any way he chooses. Additionally, any public debt must be “authorized by law”—which certainly would not be the case if Obama ignored the law. Article I, Section 8, Clause 2 of the U.S. Constitution specifically gives only *Congress* the power “To borrow Money on the credit of the United States[.]” Pelosi also forgets Article I, Section 9, Clause 7, which states, “No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law; and a regular Statement and Account of the Receipts and Expenditures of all public Money shall be published from time to time.” If the House of Representatives does not pass an appropriation, Obama cannot spend a dime. Period.) Pelosi also tells host Bob Schieffer that additional tax increases “are not off the table,” and that the fiscal cliff deal did not have “enough on the revenue side”—even though the ratio of tax increases to spending cuts was 41-to-1. [41249, 41260, 41261, 41269, 41284, 41372]

Thousands of misguided Americans, including leftist actor Danny Glover, urge Obama to appoint *New York Times* economics columnist Paul Krugman to replace outgoing Treasury Secretary Timothy Geithner. (Krugman is a “Keynesian,” who believes that government should spend money it does not have in order to boost the economy. Krugman, an economic idiot who supports the minting of a \$1 trillion coin to get around the debt limit, has never seen a tax increase he didn’t like or a spending cut he liked. He is also delusional enough to believe that disasters like earthquakes and hurricanes are good because they create jobs in the construction industry.) [41250, 41292, 41297]

ObamaBallotChallenge.com announces that investigator Mike Zullo, of Sheriff Joe Arpaio’s “cold case posse,” will speak at a meeting of the Surprise, Arizona Tea Party on January 15. (The Maricopa County investigative unit has already declared Obama’s long form birth certificate to be a forgery, as well as his Selective Service registration form, and cast suspicions on his use of multiple Social Security numbers. [41266, 41267]

On January 7 Secretary of State Hillary Clinton returns to work after being hospitalized for an alleged blood clot in her head. [41243]

Obama names John O. Brennan, White House homeland-security and counterterrorism adviser, director of the Central Intelligence Agency. The choice of Brennan—which clearly represents political payback—is astounding and should be met with considerable criticism. During the Clinton presidency, Brennan was instrumental in preventing an operation that would have killed or captured Osama bin Laden. Brennan, Obama’s terrorism and intelligence advisor, once headed a firm that was involved in the March 2008 breach of Obama’s passport file at the State Department. A Brennan employee reportedly accessed Obama’s file to cleanse it of incriminating or damaging information. As Obama’s “terrorism czar,” Brennan outlined a “new way of seeing” the fight against terrorism. The “new way” included discontinuance of the terms “war on terrorism,” “global war,” and fighting “jihadists.” Instead, the United States should only be “at war with al-Qaeda,” and “We are at war with its violent extremist allies who seek to carry on al Qaeda’s murderous agenda.” [807, 4199, 4200, 7631, 7633, 7634, 7636, 7759, 7760, 7664, 7666, 7820, 7830, 7831, 7837, 8933, 8934, 8953, 9043, 11344, 11390, 11425, 11583, 20268, 20287, 20288, 34608, 38496, 38497, 38500, 38502, 38503, 41255, 41256, 41298, 41328, 41842, 42098, 42100, 42298]

Brennan ludicrously argued that although al-Qaeda and other terrorist groups represent “a dynamic and evolving threat,” using the term “global war” somehow enhances their image. Brennan, eager not to hurt the feelings of murdering thugs intent on either converting or killing all non-Muslims, prefers Obama’s views—which are “nuanced, not simplistic; practical, not ideological.” DailyCaller.com reports, “In his 1980 graduate thesis [“Human Rights: A Case Study of Egypt”] at the University of Texas at Austin, John Brennan denied the existence of ‘absolute human rights’ and argued in favor of censorship on the part of the Egyptian dictatorship. ‘Since the press can play such an influential role in determining the perceptions of the masses, I am in favor of some degree of government censorship,’ Brennan wrote. ‘Inflammatory [sic] articles can provoke mass opposition and possible violence, especially in developing political systems.’” Brennan claimed that Americans sometimes expect “too much freedom.” In 2006 Brennan said it “...would be nice to be able to put [the terrorist group] Hezbollah in a category of being totally evil, but Hezbollah as an organization is a very complex one that has [a] terrorist arm to it. It has a social and political nature to it as well. You can’t divide the world into good and evil. There is a lot of good out there that tends to be camouflaged along with the evil. What we need to do as a government and a people is to really have a better appreciation of the needs and the challenges that people throughout the world face.” (Brennan is the type of person who is sympathetic to murderous mobsters like John Gotti because they give money to charity.) [807, 4199, 4200, 7631, 7633, 7634, 7636, 7759, 7760, 7664, 7666, 7820, 7830, 7831, 7837, 8933, 8934, 8953, 9043, 11344, 11390, 11425, 11583, 20268, 20287, 20288, 34608, 38496, 38497, 38500, 38502, 38503, 41255, 41256, 41298, 41328, 41842, 42098, 42100, 42298]

After the Christmas Day attempt to blow up flight 253 by Umar Farouk Abdulmutallab, Brennan said on CNN’s *State of the Union*, “There is no smoking gun. There was no

single piece of intelligence that said, ‘this guy is going to get on a plane.’” Some might argue, however, that buying a three-continent airline ticket with cash, carrying no luggage, and arriving for an international flight without a passport were three “pieces of evidence” that should have been enough to prompt authorities to question. Michael Scheuer, former chief of the CIA’s Osama bin Laden unit, once told the Fox News Channel’s Judge Andrew Napolitano that Brennan “mostly made his career by kissing other people’s behinds” and will not tell Obama “something [he] doesn’t want to hear.” Brennan supports trying 9/11 terrorist planner Khalid Sheikh Mohammed in a civilian criminal court in the United States rather than a military tribunal at Guantanamo. Brennan, who has stated that Islam “helped to shape [his] own world view” and that his travels have taught him “the goodness and beauty of Islam,” has called the terrorist group Hezbollah “...a very interesting organization. ...There is [sic] certainly ...elements of Hezbollah that are truly a concern to us [as far as] what they’re doing. And what we need to do is to find ways to diminish their influence within the organization and to try to build up the more moderate elements”—as if terrorist groups have moderate elements. Brennan also often refers to the Israeli capital of Jerusalem by the Muslim reference “al Quds,” saying, “...in all my travels, the city I have come to love most is al Quds...” Brennan also argues that using the term jihad is “counterproductive” because it plays into a “false perception” that the West’s enemies are engaged in a “holy cause.” He says, “...describing our enemy in religious terms would lend credence to the lie propagated by Al Qaeda and its affiliates to justify terrorism—that the United States is somehow at war against Islam.” (Brennan and Obama may not want the United States to be at war with Islam, but Islam is at war with Israel, the United States, and western civilization.) [807, 4199, 4200, 7631, 7633, 7634, 7636, 7759, 7760, 7664, 7666, 7820, 7830, 7831, 7837, 8933, 8934, 8953, 9043, 11344, 11390, 11425, 11583, 20268, 20287, 20288, 34608, 38496, 38497, 38500, 38502, 38503, 41255, 41256, 41298, 41328]

After the operation to kill Osama bin Laden, Brennan was instrumental in providing false information to the media and portraying Obama as heroic. Brennan told reporters that May 1 was “probably one of the most anxiety-filled periods of times in the lives of the people assembled here. There was nothing that confirmed that bin Laden was at that compound. And, therefore, when ...Obama was faced with the opportunity to act upon this, [he] had to evaluate the strength of that information and then made what I believe was one of the most gutsiest calls of any president in recent memory.” (Obama had spent nine months dithering over the decision, unsure whether to bomb bin Laden’s compound or send special forces in to capture or kill the terrorist leader—and Brennan described Obama as “gutsy.” Most Americans would instead call the Navy SEALs involved in the operation gutsy.) Brennan stated that bin Laden “was engaged in a firefight with those that entered the area of the house he was in.” That was untrue. [807, 4199, 4200, 7631, 7633, 7634, 7636, 7759, 7760, 7664, 7666, 7820, 7830, 7831, 7837, 8933, 8934, 8953, 9043, 11344, 11390, 11425, 11583, 20268, 20287, 20288, 34608, 38496, 38497, 38500, 38502, 38503, 41255, 41256, 41298, 41328]

Tom Trento, director of Florida Security Council, comments, “Mr. Brennan is, at best, willfully blind to the threat posed to homeland and national security of the United States by those who adhere to Shariah law.” According to Examiner.com, Brennan allowed

Sheik Kifah Mustapha, a known Hamas operative, to participate “in a six-week-long, government-sponsored ‘Citizens Academy’ hosted by the FBI as part of its outreach to the Muslim community. During the six-week FBI program, Mustapha... was escorted into the top secret National Counterterrorism Center and other secure government facilities, including the FBI National Academy located on the Quantico, Virginia U.S. Marine Base.” Frank Gaffney, a former Assistant Secretary of Defense during the Reagan administration, said at the time, “Mr. Brennan is, at best, willfully blind to the threat posed to the homeland and national security of the United States by those who adhere to shariah. In the wake of this recent episode at the National Counterterrorism Center, in which the FBI gave a guided tour of one of our most sensitive counter-terrorism facilities to a known Hamas operative, it is clear that the cluelessness fostered by Mr. Brennan is causing an empowering of the wrong sorts of Muslims in America—and endangering the American people.” (Nevertheless, Obama wants Brennan to head the CIA.) [41268]

At AtlasShrugs.com Pamela Geller writes, “Could you imagine an even more dangerous pick than Hagel for Secretary of Defense? Under Obama, yes. Worse is always what’s next.” With his pick of Brennan to head the CIA, “Obama is doing the full monty. ...Atlas readers are long familiar with the pro-jihadi thug Brennan. If you recall, during the 2008 presidential election, I ran a number of stories on the breach of Obama’s passport at the Department of State. It bears noting that John O. Brennan, whom Obama first appointed to be Assistant to the President and Deputy National Security Adviser for Homeland Security and Counterterrorism, in which capacity he made his notorious and incredible pro-terror remarks, some in Arabic no less, about the beauty of jihad, was connected with the tampering with Obama’s passport. He led the investigation into the breach of Obama’s passport records—the mysterious passport Obama traveled to Pakistan on in 1981. Quid pro quo? ...You will also recall that the key witness in the presidential passport tampering case [Lieutenant Quarles Harris, who was not a police or military officer but had an odd name that was strangely spelled] was murdered. Shot in the head, in his car, in front of his church.” (That case remains unsolved, as are the 2007 murders of Obama’s gay church friends Donald Young and Larry Bland. On BeforeItsNews.com a list of mysterious deaths and unsolved murders related to persons associated with Obama or with Obama investigations includes Harris, Young, Bland, and many others. *The Obama Timeline* cannot vouch for the accuracy of every item on the list.) [41277, 41445]

Obama also officially nominates former Nebraska Senator Chuck Hagel for Secretary of Defense. (Many Republicans and more than a few Democrats oppose the anti-Israel, Iran-appeasing Hagel, and Senate confirmation is not a foregone conclusion.) Former Secretary of State Colin Powell and the Iran’s foreign ministry endorse Hagel—which is reason enough for many conservatives to oppose him. Reuven Rivlin, the speaker of the Israeli parliament and a member of Netanyahu’s Likud Party, tells the Associated Press, “Because of [Hagel’s] statements in the past, and his stance toward Israel, we are worried.” Hagel has stated, “I would say that a military strike against Iran, a military option, is not a viable, feasible, responsible option.” that is tantamount to telling Iran, “Go ahead and develop nuclear weapons to take out Israel, because we have no intention of standing in your way.” Even if military action is not on the table, it is unwise to signal

that to one's adversaries—but Hagel is willing to do so. Politico laughably claims the Hagel nomination “appeals to Obama’s bipartisan spirit”—as if Obama has ever demonstrated any bipartisan spirit. (Not surprisingly, Iran is more than pleased with the Hagel nomination. In 2006 Hagel refused to sign a letter recommending that the European Union classify the Iran-linked Hezbollah a terrorist organization.) Leftists would normally oppose Hagel because he is anti-abortion, but his eagerness to cut defense spending and be tough on Israel is enough to allow them to ignore that issue. [41257, 41259, 41263, 41263, 41270, 41271, 41283, 41289, 41317, 41320, 41321, 41325, 41333, 41341, 41407]

At Spectator.org Ben Stein writes, “I hope the people who are supporting Chuck Hagel know that by confirming him, they are cementing at 100 percent that odds that Iran will get a nuclear capability without U.S. interference. Whether Israel can survive an Islamic bomb is questionable at best. This means a vote to confirm Mr. Hagel is a vote that expresses no interest in whether Israel survives. As a student of anti-Semitism in Europe before, during, and after the Holocaust, no amount of hatred and loathing for Jews surprises me. Americans who do love Israel should be aware, though, that it is growing much more likely by the moment that there will be a second Holocaust. The only real friends that Israel has on this earth, evangelical Christians, will take note. Whether anyone else will is a big question. ...I suspect that ...Obama will get away with his contempt for Israel, and that the same Jews who have always put the party line ahead of Israel will still support him. If Iran kills two million Jews in an afternoon (God forbid!) they will find a way to blame George W. Bush.” [41359]

It is worth noting that Hagel is the former CEO of American Information Systems Inc. (AIS), later known as Election Systems & Software (Diebold), whose machines record and count the votes in many voting precincts across the country. Hagel won his two Nebraska Senate races in 1996 and 2002 with 56 and 83 percent of the vote, respectively. (Few expected Hagel to win his 1996 race against popular governor Ben Nelson. Whether his “machines” helped Hagel in 1996 and Obama in 2012 is in dispute. Whether Obama owes Hagel any favors is also in dispute.) It is also worth pointing out that Hagel supported the Clinton administration’s decision to raid the Florida home of Lazaro Gonzalez, abduct six-year-old Elian Gonzalez at gunpoint, and send him to Cuba—from which he had fled with his mother to escape the brutal Castro regime. [41705, 41706, 41707, 42239, 42240]

Republicans begin discussing the possibility of demanding that the U.S Senate pass a budget before they will vote for any increase in the debt ceiling. (Although an annual budget is required by law, the Democrat-controlled Senate has neglected to pass a budget in more than 1,300 days.) Senator Jeff Sessions (R-AL) states, “I think it should be a firm principle that we should not raise the debt ceiling until we have a plan on how the new borrowed money will be spent. If the government wants to borrow money so it can spend more, then the government ought to tell the Congress and the American people how they will spend it.” [41276]

Members of 70 environmental and socialist groups send Obama a letter encouraging him to bypass Congress and the legal process with executive orders and EPA regulations “...to achieve urgently needed reductions in the carbon pollution that is disrupting our climate and damaging our health.” [41278, 41279, 41368]

According to DailyCaller.com, “Planned Parenthood’s most recent annual report for 2011–2012, released Monday, reveals that the abortion and women’s health provider received \$542.4 million from taxpayers in government grants and reimbursements—constituting 45 percent of the organization’s revenue.” (Planned Parenthood is the nation’s number one abortion provider, and kills more than 300,000 fetuses per year—333,964 in 2011, or one every 94 seconds.) [41280, 41282, 41288, 41296]

WOWT.com reports that a local (Nebraska) fast-food franchise “is slashing employee hours so franchise owners don’t have to pay health benefits. Around 100 local Wendy’s workers have learned their hours are being cut. ...The company has announced that all non-management positions will have their hours reduced to 28 a week. Gary Burdette, Vice President of Operations for the local franchise, says the cuts are coming because the new Affordable Health Care Act requires employers to offer health insurance to employees working 32-38 hours a week. Under the current law they are not considered full time and that as a small business owner, he can’t afford to stay in operation and pay for everyone’s health insurance.” [41330, 41331, 41395]

On January 8 Vice President Joe Biden, head of Obama’s gun control task force, meets with various anti-gun groups at the White House. According to FoxNews.com, “The administration has vowed, by the end of the month, to produce a comprehensive plan for addressing gun violence in the wake of the Newtown, Conn., school shooting massacre in which 20 children and six adults were killed. The administration says mental health and the entertainment industry also may be examined.” Biden tells meeting participants that Obama will not wait for Congress to pass gun control legislation and is willing to issue Executive Orders. “Were here today to deal with a problem that requires immediate action, urgent action. [Obama] is going to act. There are executive orders, executive action that can be taken. We haven’t decided what that is yet, but we’re compiling it all... as well as legislative action, we believe, is required. ...There is a pretty wide consensus on three or four or five things in the gun safety area that could and should be done.” (Obama can do quite a bit to restrict gun ownership without seeking Congressional approval. The National Instant Criminal Background Check System, often referred to as the “Brady Check,” allows government psychiatrists to make the final determination as to whether an American can purchase a weapon. This could easily be abused by Obama, for example, by prohibiting anyone who has ever sought counseling—even marriage counseling—from owning a gun.) [41290, 41291, 41326, 41333, 41337, 41339, 41379]

According to BeforeItsNews.com, “A retired four-star admiral is now claiming that ...Obama intentionally conspired with America’s enemies to stage a bogus attack and the kidnapping of an American ambassador so he could ‘negotiate’ the release of a ‘hostage’ and bolster his mediocre approval ratings just prior to the election. *The Washington Examiner*, quoting retired Four-Star Admiral James Lyons, writes: ‘[T]he attack on the



American Consulate in Benghazi... was the result of a bungled abduction attempt.... the first stage of an international prisoner exchange... [that] would have ensured the release of Omar Abdel Rahman, the 'Blind Sheik'...' But something went horribly wrong with Obama's 'October Surprise.' Although the Obama Regime intentionally gutted security at the consulate prior to the staged kidnapping, former Navy SEALs Tyrone Woods and Glen Doherty disobeyed direct orders to stand down, saved American lives, single-handedly killed scores of attackers... and the attackers, believing that the Obama Regime had betrayed them, tortured Ambassador Chris Stevens and dragged his body through the streets." [41294, 41412]

Al Arabiya News reports, "The release of an Egyptian blind sheikh, jailed in the United States for the 1993 World Trade Center attack, will be urged by Egyptian President Mohamed Mursi [Morsi] during his upcoming visit to the U.S., the leader said on Monday. The announcement follows his pledge, during his presidential campaign earlier this year, to free Omar Abdul Rahman. The preacher is currently serving a life sentence and the planned request for his release appears to be gesture, by Mursi, to Gama'a al-Islamiya, a Salafi group." (Morsi's visit with Obama will likely take place before the end of March. According to author and columnist Michelle Malkin, "a member of the radical Egyptian terrorist group Gamaa Islamiyya (the very group the blind sheik is alleged to lead)... joined an entire delegation of Egyptian lawmakers who met with top State Department and White House officials [in June]. They reportedly discussed the possible release of the blind sheik with at least one Obama national security official." The September 11 protests at the U.S. Embassy in Cairo were in support of the sheikh's release. there is little doubt that Obama would be willing to release Rahman—if he can figure out how to do it without enraging most Americans.) [41312, 41313, 41314]

GovtSlaves.info posts an Internet announcement for a Sandy Hook fundraiser that "predates the massacre by four days. First it was the United Way, now the fundraising site Youcaring.com has a 'Fundraiser for the Families Involved in the Tragic Newtown, CT Shootings.' This event was dated December 10 2012. As we all know the shooting took place on December 14." [42004, 42005, 42138]

Newsmax.com reports that Senator Lindsey Graham (R-SC) "is calling for a delay in confirming ...Obama's pick for CIA director [John Brennan] until the administration provides answers on the deadly Sept. 11 assault in Libya that killed the U.S. ambassador and three other Americans." Graham states, "The stonewalling on Benghazi by the Obama administration must come to an end. ...This ever-changing story should be resolved. It is imperative we understand who changed the talking points just weeks before a presidential election and why." (The White House, of course, objects to Graham's statement. Press Secretary Jay Carney tells reporters, "It would be unfortunate I think if in pursuit of this issue, which was highly politicized, the Senate would hold up the nomination of John Brennan to be director of the Central Intelligence Agency.") [41295, 41329]

ThePostEmail.com reports, "The U.S. Supreme Court has denied two requests for a review of the constitutional qualifications of ...Obama after having scheduled the

petitions for a conference on January 4, 2013. (By refusing to hear the case, the Court is essentially stating that the natural born citizen requirement of the Constitution, as intended by the nation's Founding Fathers, is irrelevant.) [41299]

Obama selects Myrlie Evers-Williams, widow of Medgar Evers, to deliver the invocation at his inauguration. (Evers-Williams is not a minister.) Obama chooses Richard Blanco, a gay Cuban-American, to be the "inaugural poet." Obama states, "Richard's writing will be wonderfully fitting for an inaugural that will celebrate the strength of the American people and our nation's great diversity." (Why an inauguration needs an official poet is not clear.) Louie Giglio, pastor of the Passion City Church of Atlanta, had been selected to give the benediction—but that offer was immediately rescinded after the Obama team learned he has delivered anti-gay sermons. [41300, 41327, 41380]

Senator Richard Blumenthal (D-CT) announces plans to introduce legislation requiring background checks for the purchase of ammunition. [41315, 41316]

On *The O'Reilly Factor*, Charles Krauthammer says, "I think what's happening here is that in a second term, Obama is going to show who he really is. Remember what he said to the Soviet president, 'After the election, I'll be more flexible,' which means he can be more of who he wants to be. [The] Number one item on his agenda is to cut down defense, the Defense Department... [Defense Secretary nominee Chuck Hagel] is prepared to do the dismantling that Obama wants to do, would never have admitted he wanted to do, but [that] will likely be carried out now in a second term." Obama wants to slash defense spending because he has "this ideological vision of America as a superpower too big for its britches... He wants to cut it down to size." [41319, 41367]

On January 9, at ThePostEmail.com, editor Sharon Rondeau asks why, if the Sandy Hook school shootings occurred on December 14, there were web pages about the event prior to that date. A United Way page soliciting support is dated December 11; a video tribute to the slain teachers and students was uploaded to Vimeo.com on November 8; a fundraiser for the Newtown, Connecticut families was announced on December 10. (The video on Vimeo.com is deleted at 11:05 a.m. on January 9.) RumorMillNews.com notes that Attorney General Eric Holder and Connecticut Governor Dan Malloy "met on November 27th to unveil 'Project Longevity,' which will provide the state with federal money for "agents, academics, and social workers" to work with the FBI and the ATF on gun issues. Ron Pinciaro, executive director of Connecticut Against Gun Violence, stated, "The community needs to show a little more outrage on these things and demand that it be a top priority." (The United Way of Western Connecticut blames Google for the December 11 posting date.) A "rest in peace" Facebook page for Sandy Hook teacher Victoria Soto was allegedly created on December 10—four days prior to the school massacre in which she allegedly killed. A "Sandy Hook Elementary Victims Fund" page was allegedly created on December 13, one day before the shootings. (Strangely, the Social Security Death Index database shows killer Adam Lanza's death as December 13—one day before the school shootings. That date error may have been a mere mistake, or perhaps a discrepancy intended by the government to turn Second Amendment advocates into "conspiracy nuts" who should be ignored. It is, after all, in the

government’s best interests for gun supporters to be ridiculed.) [41301, 41302, 41303, 41304, 41306, 41307, 41308, 41309, 41310, 41311, 41322, 41420, 41628, 41769, 41781, 42138, 42162]

Leftist radio talk show host Mike Malloy tells his audience, “These Goddamn birthers! Will you people please, please, get together with your AR-15s in a big circle, pointing inward, and on my count, open fire!” [41450]

Politico reports that Obama will nominate his chief of staff, Jacob Lew, to replace Timothy Geithner as Secretary of the Treasury. (Lew previously served as budget director under Bill Clinton and as head of the Office of Management and Budget under Obama. Lew also worked for leftist Congresswoman Bella Abzug and House Speaker Tip O’Neill. From 2006–2008 Lew was the Chief Operating Officer of Citigroup’s \$54 billion Alternative Investments unit—which made money by betting that the U.S. housing market would collapse. Lew received a bonus of \$944,578 from Citigroup in 2009, despite the fact that the company received a taxpayer bailout. Conveniently for Lew, he received the payment after he had already filed a public financial disclosure statement to accept a job with the Obama State Department. Lew once promised, “We’ve put a plan forward that would get us to primary balance by the middle of the decade.” By “primary balance,” Lew meant not counting interest payments—which means the budget would not be in balance. Lew is arguably almost totally unqualified for the job of Treasury Secretary—but he is a partisan political hack who will do Obama’s bidding.) [12791, 13263, 17319, 17791, 28042, 28045, 28067, 28069, 28082, 29113, 29119, 29126, 29130, 29141, 29235, 33935, 33946, 38573, 41336, 41366, 41499, 41530]

In February 2012 Lew appeared on the Sunday talk shows and claimed that Obama’s 2013 budget proposal would “get the deficit under control” and “do it in a way that’s consistent with American values so that everyone pays a fair share.” Lew also stated, “[O]ne of the things about the United States Senate that I don’t think the American people realize is that it takes 60 not 50 votes to pass something.” Lew was incorrect; budget issues require only a simple majority vote. Lew has also claimed that the ObamaCare tax for not having health insurance is not a tax, after the Supreme Court called it a tax. Lew will likely be happy to move to the Treasury Department because it will better shield him from direct dealings with Obama Valerie Jarrett—with whom he has had run-ins.) [12791, 13263, 17319, 17791, 28042, 28045, 28067, 28069, 28082, 29113, 29119, 29126, 29130, 29141, 29235, 33935, 33946, 38573, 41336, 41366]

Senator Jeff Sessions (R-AL) states, “Jack Lew must never be Secretary of Treasury. His testimony before the Senate Budget Committee less than two years ago was so outrageous and false that it alone disqualifies. On the most important question of our time, the unsustainability of our national debt course, Lew, as [Obama’s] budget director, appeared before Congress and continued to insist that ...Obama’s budget—which Lew had crafted—would not add to the debt of the United States. His original statement, to a national television audience, was as follows: ‘Our budget will get us, over the next several years, to the point where we can look the American people in the eye and say we’re not adding to the debt anymore; we’re spending money that we have each year, and

then we can work on bringing down our national debt.’ Nothing could be further from the truth. I have called it the greatest financial misrepresentation in history. His budget, according to his own OMB analysis, would have never produced over 10 years an annual deficit of less than \$600 billion. Overall, as reported in the White House budget tables, the plan would have added \$13 trillion to the gross debt by 2021—never putting us in a position to ‘bring down our national debt.’ To ‘look the American people in the eye’ and make such a statement remains the most direct and important false assertion during my entire time in Washington. He stuck to this position in his testimony—although Secretary [Timothy] Geithner before the Committee later did not—and [Obama] continued to make this assertion even in the last months of the campaign. To confirm Mr. Lew would be to acquiesce in a policy of dishonesty to the American people.” [41336, 41392]

According to CapitalNewYork.com, “Lew reportedly angered both Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell and House Speaker John Boehner during the administration’s debt ceiling battle in 2011. The *New York Times*, in a profile last month, said those negotiations ‘ended uncharacteristically badly’ and that Boehner’s office viewed him ‘as an uncompromising know-it-all.’” According to Politico, “Several Republicans said Tuesday they don’t view Lew as a man interested in hearing GOP concerns. One aide called him ‘tone deaf’ in understanding the compromises that Republicans could accept during high-stakes talks. ‘No matter what you’re proposing or no matter what compromise you’re trying to forge, he comes at it from a position of, ‘Whatever you want, I have to be against,’ the GOP aide said. ‘It doesn’t advantage him in the negotiation, he doesn’t get a different policy outcome than he would otherwise. It just irritates people. ...It’s as much personality as anything else.’” One House HOP aid tells NationalReview.com’s Andrew Stiles, “We’ve always viewed [Lew] as a classic big-government liberal, someone who has consistently stood in the way of efforts to deal with our debt and deficit.” (In fact, Lew was the author of the Obama budget proposals that received zero votes in the Senate. If for nothing else, Lew deserves criticism for his childish scribble of a signature—which, if he is confirmed as Treasury Secretary, will appear on currency and be unintelligible to everyone.) [41343, 41344, 41345, 41346, 41366, 41459]

DailyCaller.com reports that approximately one of every four children in America relied on food stamps in 2011, or 19.9 million out of 73.9 million under age 18. [41318]

WashingtonGuardian.com reports, “Planners of ...Obama’s second inauguration are soliciting high-dollar contributions up to \$1 million to help pay for the celebration in exchange for special access. The changes are part of a continuing erosion of Obama’s pledge to keep donors and special interests at arm’s length... He has abandoned the policy from his first inauguration to accept donations up to only \$50,000 from individuals, announcing last month that he would take unlimited contributions from individuals and corporations. A fundraising appeal obtained by The Associated Press shows the Presidential Inaugural Committee is going far beyond Obama’s previous self-imposed limits and is looking to blow away modern American presidential inauguration fundraising records by offering donors four VIP packages named after the country’s founding fathers. ...Donors at the [George] Washington’ level are offered ‘premium

partner access' for a minimum donation of \$250,000 from individuals and \$1 million from corporations. The package includes four tickets to the inaugural ball..." [41323, 41324, 41437]

Former New York City mayor Ed Koch comments on Obama's selection of Chuck Hagel as his new Secretary of Defense: "It's very disappointing, I believe he will ultimately regret it. It undoubtedly will reduce support for him in the Jewish community, but I don't think [Obama] worries about that now that the election is over. ...I believe it will encourage the jihadists. They will say: 'Ah, we are winning the battle. America is beginning to desert Israel.'" (Senator John Cornyn (R-TX) will be among the Senators likely to vote against Hagel's nomination because of his Iran-appeasing stance.) [41332, 41348]

Secretary of Labor Hilda Solis announces she is leaving the Obama administration. Obama remarks, "Over the last four years, Secretary Solis has been a critical member of my economic team as we have worked to recover from the worst economic downturn since the Great Depression and strengthen the economy for the middle class." Solis, the daughter of Mexican and Nicaraguan immigrants, is firmly in the union camp and has been an advocate of easing restrictions on illegal immigrants. She is politically to the far left and has addressed the Democratic Socialists of America (DSA) and sent a representative from her office to a worker's rights forum held by Socialist International. Solis supports expanding the H-1B visa program that lets U.S. companies hire tens of thousands of foreign workers in jobs like software design (which could just as easily be performed by Americans). In 2009 Solis paid \$6,400 to settle tax liens against her husband's business—the day before Solis' nomination was to be considered by a Senate committee. Solis supports organized labor's "card check bill" (the Employee Free Choice Act), which would eliminate the right to a secret ballot in union organizing drives, yet she was upset that the election of the head of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus was not held by secret ballot. [731, 732, 751, 1060, 1105, 1106, 1695, 9339, 12226, 12227, 12228, 12229, 12243, 12307, 12423, 18121, 18122, 23978, 24195, 24671, 28926, 31194, 32064, 41335]

During her tenure at the Department of Labor, Solis appeared in a "We Can Help" public service announcement directed to illegal immigrants in which she stated, "You have the right to be paid fairly. ...it is a serious problem when workers in this country are not being paid every cent they earn. Remember, every worker in America has a right to be paid fairly, whether documented or not. So, call us. It is free and confidential, at 1-866-487-9243. We can help." As a congresswoman, Solis opposed beefing up the border fence, supported expansion of illegal alien benefits (including driver's licenses and in-state tuition discounts), endorsed "sanctuary cities," and pushed for illegal immigrant amnesty. Upon joining the Department of Labor, Solis "showed her support for American labor" by skipping the black limousine the job provided and ordering a new Chevrolet Equinox—apparently unaware the vehicle is manufactured in Canada. Despite the fact that illegal immigrants cannot work in the United States, Solis had the Labor Department take part in workshops held by the Mexican Consulate in 50 U.S. cities at which illegal aliens were counseled on their rights and told how to obtain an Individual Taxpayer

Identification Number (ITIN) from the IRS. [731, 732, 751, 1060, 1105, 1106, 1695, 9339, 12226, 12227, 12228, 12229, 12243, 12307, 12423, 18121, 18122, 23978, 24195, 24671, 28926, 31194, 32064, 41335]

To boost Obama's "green jobs" numbers, Solis had the Department of Labor go so far as to count bus drivers who operate hybrid vehicles and diesel mechanics. In 2012 Solis' department released a smart-phone and mobile application to warn workers when it is hot. The "Heat Safety Tool" displays a "risk level" when it gets too hot and humid—as if the workers can't figure that out for themselves. (The application cost the taxpayers \$643,997.60 to develop.) During the 2012 campaign Solis mocked Ann Romney, saying, "Michelle Obama is a fine example of what the women are in our society. Those working moms that have had to work so hard now, stretch their dollars, and may not even be able to move up in the workplace if their wages haven't kept up. That's what we're fighting for... so they can put money away to save. Many women aren't able to do that and that may not be the case with the nominee—the potential nominee for the Republican Party's spouse—but I'm just telling you that that's what I'm hearing day in and day out." [731, 732, 751, 1060, 1105, 1106, 1695, 9339, 12226, 12227, 12228, 12229, 12243, 12307, 12423, 18121, 18122, 23978, 24195, 24671, 28926, 31194, 32064, 41335]

Congressman Jeff Duncan (R-SC) comments on Obama's plans to impose new gun controls via executive orders: "We live in a republic, not a dictatorship. The Founding Fathers never envisioned executive orders being used to restrict our constitutional rights. [Obama] should not be able to act unilaterally when it comes to our constitutional rights. Executive orders were meant as a way for the president to implement legislatively passed laws, not to make law. I will use every means at my disposal to combat the agenda of the Executive branch to undermine our Second Amendment rights. I will also fight any legislative action that is taken to implement more gun control." [41355]

As noted in Part I of *The Obama Timeline*, while serving as director of the Joyce Foundation board (1994–2001), Obama distributed millions of dollars to gun control organizations like the Council Against Handguns and the Violence Policy Center. Between 1994 and 2001, the Joyce Foundation gave \$18.6 million to about 80 anti-gun and anti-Second Amendment projects, including \$1.5 million to the Violence Policy Center. The Joyce Foundation is closely linked to the Soros Open Society Institute, which advocates a worldwide ban on civilian firearm ownership. As an Illinois State Senator, Obama voted against a bill that specifically allowed homeowners the right to use a gun in self-defense during a home invasion. He proposed increasing Illinois firearm and ammunition excise taxes from 11 to 66 per cent, thus raising a \$55 tax on a \$500 rifle to \$330. Obama voted for a bill that would ban almost all hunting rifles, shotguns, and target rifles. The bill would also have authorized the Illinois State Police to raid homes and forcibly confiscate banned guns. Obama voted for a bill that would have shut down all Illinois firearm-manufacturing businesses, such as Springfield Armory, Armalite, Rock River Arms, and Les Baer. Obama voted for a bill prohibiting Illinois citizens from purchasing more than one gun per month. He voted for a bill that would have banned most single-shot and double-barreled shotguns as 'semi-automatic assault weapons' even though they are not, along with hundreds of models of rifles and handguns. Had the bill

had passed, Illinois residents would have had 90 days to turn in their guns or face felony charges. During his Illinois Senate career Obama voted four times against legislation that would allow a homeowner to use a firearm in defense of his home and family. Obama proposed legislation prohibiting gun stores from operating within five miles of a school or a park. Inasmuch as most communities have schools and parks scattered widely throughout their areas, the legislation would effectively ban gun stores unless they relocate far from population centers. [93, 315, 326, 339, 346, 353, 444, 445, 834, 1282]

On *Special Report*, Charles Krauthammer comments, “I think we are going to end up exactly where we started. We’re probably going to try an assault weapons ban. It will be a little bit tighter [than the last one], but it didn’t work. It lasted for 10 years. ...If we had honest debate, the gun owners would admit, ‘Yes of course, guns contribute to homicide.’ ...Japan had 11 gun homicides last year. That is a weekend in Chicago. ... We have a 200-year history and culture of gun ownership. We have a Second Amendment. ... So unless you are willing to confiscate [guns]—which would be unconstitutional, and would cause insurrection in the country, [as] Australia did—these things will not have an effect, except at the margins. That is the tragedy here.” [41342]

On January 10 DailyCaller.com reports, “A second Environmental Protection Agency official stands accused of using a personal email address to shield communications with environmental activists from public disclosure. Court documents show that EPA Region 8 Administrator James Martin corresponded with the Environmental Defense Fund—where he previously worked as an attorney—through his private email account. EPA Administrator Lisa Jackson recently came under fire for her use of email aliases, before she announced her resignation.” (The EPA suspiciously releases *some* of Jackson’s emails, which she wrote using the phony name Richard Windsor. Senator David Vitter (R-LA) remarks, “This strikes me as incredibly fishy and begs a number of important questions.”) [41340, 41558]

Obama administration officials argue in federal court against the release of photographs of Osama bin Laden taken after he was shot and killed by Navy SEALs in 2011. The release was demanded by a Freedom of Information Act request filed by Judicial Watch. [41442]

Obama officially nominates Jacob Lew, his chief of staff, to replace Timothy Geithner as Secretary of the Treasury. (Whether Lew properly paid his taxes is not known. Geithner famously neglected to pay Social Security taxes for several years and, at his 2009 confirmation hearings, shamelessly blamed the mistake on TurboTax software. Geithner’s father, Peter Geithner, as director of the Asia program at the Ford Foundation, oversaw the microfinance program that Obama’s mother, Stanley Ann Dunham, worked in while she was with that same foundation. Peter Geithner also attended the International School of Bangkok, Thailand. It has been alleged that he had CIA ties. Dunham herself was no stranger to tax avoidance and was once sent a Notice of Federal Tax Lien Under Internal Revenue Laws for \$17,609.87. Obama’s mother apparently did not believe she had to pay her “fair share” of taxes.) [520, 533, 540, 541, 542, 554, 555, 809, 811, 824, 889, 890, 937, 1176, 1735, 1736, 2156, 2204, 2205, 2206, 2275, 41363]

On Laura Ingraham's radio program, investor and CNBC anchor Lawrence Kudlow calls Obama's choice of Jacob Lew a "nutty appointment" and says, "...Jack Lew is completely—and I mean completely unqualified to be Treasury Secretary. He has no financial experience. He has no international experience. He has no currency experience. He ripped off Citibank for a couple of million dollars. He was there for one year. I mean, there's about a million people—give me a phone book, and I'll find somebody more qualified for Treasury Secretary than former OMB director Jack Lew. This is all of a piece. It is completely irresponsible. ...He'll probably be confirmed, because there are more Democrats [than Republicans] in the Senate. He'll probably be confirmed, but it's most regrettable. He's actually to the left of [Timothy] Geithner. I mean, Lew is the guy if you read all these accounts in the Bob Woodward book and what not, Lew is the guy who stymied the budget talks last year between Obama and Boehner. I think at one point, Boehner told Obama, 'Get this guy out of the room.' Lew is a big taxer. He won't cut spending. He is a left-left liberal guy, and as I say, he has no standing on Wall Street or any of these world financial capitals. So it's a nutty appointment." [41383, 41396]

Author and talk show host Mark Levin tells his radio audience, "Why don't we require background checks before people are sworn into public office? Background checks on members of Congress, including background checks to see if there are any mental issues. Because I have to be honest with you... I think there's [sic] a lot of mental cases on Capitol Hill. Harry Ried. Ms. Pelosi... when she's talking and her eyes are popping out of her head and stupid words are coming out of her mouth. ... We know [Senator] Al Franken used to be a coke-head. ... I mean, we could have had a background check on Barack Obama, right? Just a law enforcement check. All of these politicians. Take a look at Joe Biden. [We] could have had a background check on him and make sure he's mentally... up to the job, because in the past we know he's said things that are bold-faced lies. So this is the Levin suggestion for keeping America safe. Nobody is sworn in, as a member of the House, a member of the Senate, vice president or president, until they have a background check. ... You see, were not the subjects. They're our servants. And it's about time we told these political hacks, these temporary political hacks, these left-wing, power-grabbing nobodies, that they don't get to do background checks [on us] and create databases and tell us what kind of health care we're gonna have, or what kind of automobile we're gonna drive, or what kind of weapon we can have, or how many bullets can be in a magazine, and all the rest. No, no, no. It's the other way around. We get to push them around; they don't get to push us around. We gotta get this citizen government thing straight." [41467]

Bloomberg.com reports that Obama defeated Mitt Romney by 81–18 percent in New York City in the November election. Obama won the Bronx, which is 80 percent black and Hispanic, with 91 percent of the vote. (The city is 29 percent Hispanic, 23 percent black, and 13 percent Asian. The last Republican presidential candidate to win the city was Calvin Coolidge in 1924. With the high percentage of New Yorkers dependent on government for welfare, food stamps, and housing subsidies it is unlikely that the city will ever again vote for any Republican—or even any Democrat if he promises to slash federal spending.) [41347]



On top of the absurd idea of minting a \$1 trillion platinum coin to enable Obama to spend “money” even if the debt ceiling is not increased comes an equally absurd proposal to issue IOUs in place of cashable checks when the debt ceiling is reached. Paul Krugman, the resident economic crackpot at *The New York Times*, suggests calling the IOUs “moral obligation coupons” which would “declare the intention of the government to redeem these coupons at face value in one year.” (White House press secretary Jay Carney has so far refused to rule out the \$1 trillion coin scheme, despite the fact that the Obama administration must certainly know such an action would virtually guarantee a lowering of the government’s credit rating and ensure that Obama would go down in history as an economic moron who caused massive inflation.) [41349, 41350, 41351, 41354, 41370, 41377]

WashingtonPost.com reports, “The government is establishing new rules for mortgages that will make it harder for some borrowers to qualify but that are designed to prevent the kind of risky lending that nearly caused the housing market to collapse during the financial crisis. The Consumer Financial Protection Bureau on Thursday will roll out the first of several far-reaching changes to the nation’s mortgage market, limiting upfront fees and curtailing practices such as interest-only payments that can leave homeowners stuck with unsustainable loans. The agency also will set standards for how much income a consumer must have to obtain a mortgage.” (HotAir.com comments, “In other words, the government is going to force lenders to stick to rules they liked before the government forced them to stop using them. After all, it was government intervention that created the housing bubble by pressuring lenders into ignoring these criteria—first by force, with the Community Reinvestment Act in the 1990s. Later, when the CRA didn’t work quickly enough, Congress created incentives for expanding subprime lending by pushing Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac into buying up massive amounts of questionable loans, making lending a risk-free proposition for paper-sellers like Countrywide Mortgage and others, and then securitizing them in the financial markets as low-risk bonds. ... This isn’t a bad idea, conceptually, but I have a better proposal. Why not just get government out of the lending business and let the people whose capital is at risk decide how to invest it and lend it? Had we done that from the beginning, we never would have [had] the bubble in the first place.”) [41352, 41353, 41360, 41361]

The Associated Press reports, “Weekly applications for U.S. unemployment benefits ticked up slightly last week, the latest sign of stability in the job market. The Labor Department said Thursday that applications rose 4,000 to a seasonally adjusted 371,000, the most in five weeks.” (Strangely, the Associated Press believes that more people getting laid off is a sign of “stability in the job market.”) [41362]

American Express announces it will cut 5,400 jobs. Morgan Stanley plans to lay off 1,600 employees. [41364, 41399]

FoxNews.com reports, “The National Rifle Association emerged from a meeting Thursday with Vice President Biden and accused his gun violence task force of leading an ‘attack’ on the Second Amendment—just hours after Biden gave a glimpse into the

gun-control recommendations expected to hit [Obama's] desk in a matter of days. [Biden] said earlier that 'an emerging set of recommendations' focuses on launching 'universal' background checks, restricting high-capacity magazines and allowing federal agencies to do more research on gun violence. ...But the NRA, after sitting down with Biden and other firearms groups Thursday afternoon, blasted the effort as primarily focused on restricting gun rights. 'We were disappointed with how little this meeting had to do with keeping our children safe and how much it had to do with an agenda to attack the Second Amendment,' the group said in a written statement. 'While claiming that no policy proposals would be 'prejudged,' this Task Force spent most of its time on proposed restrictions on lawful firearms owners—honest, taxpaying, hardworking Americans. It is unfortunate that this administration continues to insist on pushing failed solutions to our nation's most pressing problems. We will not allow law-abiding gun owners to be blamed for the acts of criminals and madmen.'" [41369, 41376, 41387]

At ToThePointNews.com Jack Wheeler writes that the House of Representatives has more power over Obama's spendthrift habits than most people realize. Wheeler notes Article I, Section 9, Clause 7 of the United States Constitution: "No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law; and a regular Statement and Account of the Receipts and Expenditures of all public Money shall be published from time to time." "This is the 'Power of the Purse' clause, which Article I, Section 7, Clause 1 makes clear is exclusively held by the House of Representatives: 'All Bills for raising Revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives; but the Senate may propose or concur with Amendments as on other Bills.' Actually, there are *two* 'powers of the purse'—to spend money or to deny its being spent. For the US Federal Government to spend any money, one single dime on anything, three things need to happen in this order: 1) an Appropriation must be authorized and passed by the House, 2) such Appropriation must then be passed by the Senate (any differences in the House and Senate versions must be reconciled via joint agreement and passage), and finally 3) be signed into Law by the President. To *deny* the federal government the authority to spend any money, one single dime on any program or activity, *only* one thing needs to happen: the House does not pass an Appropriation for it. Period. Neither the Senate, nor the President, nor the Supreme Court, nor any federal agency secretary or bureaucrat, has the constitutional authority to spend one single dime by themselves, without a majority of the House giving it to them. *That* is the power of the purse." [41373]

Wheeler points out, "There is a federal law that specifically codifies the power of the purse clauses, and provides specific punishment for their violation by any 'officer or employee of the United States government.' This punishment is 'suspension from duty without pay or removal from office,' and up to two years in federal prison. This Federal law is: *The Antideficiency Act*. The original version was enacted into law in 1884. Although revised occasionally since to make its meaning clear in terms of 'modern' language, its purpose remains: to be the enforcement mechanism implementing Article I, Sections 7 & 9. It was last revised during the Reagan presidency, and is codified as Title 31 of the United States Code (31 U.S.C. §§ 1341, 1342, 1349, and 1350). ...The law states: "1) An officer or employee of the United States Government or of the District of

Columbia government may not—(A) make or authorize an expenditure or obligation exceeding an amount available in an appropriation or fund for the expenditure or obligation; (B) involve either government in a contract or obligation for the payment of money before an appropriation is made unless authorized by law...” With his threats to defy Congress if it fails to increase the debt ceiling, Obama has made it clear that he “plainly intends to spend whatever money he wants, debt ceiling or no, Congressional appropriation or no. If and when he does so, he needs to be prosecuted in violation of the Antideficiency Act. Eric Holder, as the most corrupt and dishonest Attorney General in US history, will of course not prosecute Zero [Obama]—he will act as his defense attorney. But the House as a whole, individual senators and congressfolk, conservative legal foundations et al, may initiate law suits against [Obama].” [41373]

“There are 30 Republican Governors now,” notes Wheeler. “If a number of them banded together, with their States suing Zero for violation of the Antideficiency Act, then, under the Original Jurisdiction clause of the Constitution—Article III, Section 2, Clause 2: ‘In all Cases... in which a State shall be Party, the supreme Court shall have original Jurisdiction’—the case must go directly to the Supremes, bypassing all lower courts. So we don't even need lily-livered Congress Pubs [Republicans], just Pub Governors, a number of whom do have the moxy.” [41373]

According to WashingtonExaminer.com, the number of anti-abortion demonstrators in the nation's capitol for the annual March for Life in late January could exceed the number of visitors for Obama's inauguration. “One critical sign of how big the march will be: Hotels pre-booked for participants sold out a month ago while many Washington hotels report lukewarm interest for rooms during the Inauguration.” Jeanne Monahan, president of the March organizer, the March for Life Education and Defense Fund, states, “We're going to have record breaking crowds.” (As many as 400,000 attended in 2012, but 2013 is the 40th anniversary of the *Roe v. Wade* decision.) [41378]

The National Organization for Women (NOW), and many Democrats, complain that Obama has selected white men to fill the positions of Secretary of Defense, Secretary of State, and Director of the CIA. [41382, 41386]

A fearful Obama—who, as an Illinois state senator, voted against legislation giving homeowners the right to arm themselves for protection—signs legislation giving himself Secret Service protection for life. (Under previous legislation signed by Bill Clinton, Obama and George W. Bush would lose Secret Service guards 10 years after leaving the White House.) Meanwhile, some members of Congress are outraged after learning that ex-presidents have had the taxpayers pick up the tab for absurd “office expenses” that include DirecTV premium movie channels like Cinemax, HBO and Showtime. Congressman Jason Chaffetz asks, “Do you really need Showtime in your office? I mean, no government employee would be able to get away with that. There's no incentive for them to be frugal and it's obvious none of them are. If I went through this, you can kind of pick on each president here.” According to DailyCaller.com Chaffetz “re-introduced the ‘Presidential Allowance Modernization Act’ in the House on Tuesday. The bill died in committee during the last Congress. That legislation would give all former presidents

an annual \$200,000 pension and an additional \$200,000 allowance. But the allowance would be decreased by one dollar for every dollar over \$400,000 a former president earns privately.” (Bill Clinton would therefore lose the entire allowance—and have to pay for pornography out of his own pocket. Nancy Reagan has consistently declined the \$20,000 pension provided to presidential widows. If the legislation passes, it can be assumed that Chaffetz will be removed from the Obama Christmas card list.) [41384, 41389, 41398, 41406, 41533]

On January 11 DailyCaller.com posts man-on-the-street responses from residents of Washington, D.C. after they learned their Social Security taxes were going back up to their normal level: “I would rather not state my opinion of [Obama] and Congress right now because if you can’t say something nice, you might as well not say nothing at all. I just think it’s a travesty what they’re doing to the American workers and the American people.” “Obama’s a dick.” “I don’t make any more money, I just pay the man more taxes. It pisses me off.” “I’m still Obama all the way. We have to take some sacrifices.” “We may all have to pay more—the middle class and also the upper class.” “[Obama] got his job [only] because he said the right things.” “He’s a puppet just like every other president was a puppet.” [41381]

At LewRockwell.com author and investor Peter Schiff describes some of the ways the federal government lies about inflation. “[One] example is found in health insurance costs, which is a major line item for most families. ... Believe it or not, health insurance costs are assigned a weighting of less than one percent of the overall CPI [Consumer Price Index]. In contrast, the Kaiser Survey revealed that in 2012 the average total cost for family health insurance coverage was \$15,745, or almost one third of the median family income.” (*The Obama Timeline* refers readers to Shadowstats.com for inflation statistics that are much more realistic than those provided by the government.) [41385]

Attorney General Eric Holder, frightened to death of additional Operation Fast and Furious information seeing the light of day, files a “motion to stay” asking the U.S. District Court in Washington, D.C. to delay indefinitely a Judicial Watch lawsuit demanding the release of documents under the Freedom of Information Act. Holder remains in civil and criminal contempt of Congress for refusing to turn over documents related to the gun scheme, but the U.S. Attorney who should be prosecuting Holder refuses to do so—because he reports to Holder. The administration has attempted to shield the documents by claiming “executive privilege.” At Breitbart.com Matthew Boyle writes, “There are two types of presidential executive privilege: the presidential communications privilege and the deliberative process privilege. Use of the presidential communications privilege would require that [Obama] himself or his senior-most advisers were involved in the discussions. Since [Obama] and his cabinet-level officials continually claim they had no knowledge of Operation Fast and Furious until early 2011 when the information became public—and Holder claims he didn’t read the briefing documents he was sent that outlined the scandal and how guns were walking while the operation was ongoing—Obama says he’s using the less powerful deliberative process privilege. The reason why Obama’s assertion of that deliberative process privilege over these documents is weak at best is because the Supreme Court has held that such a

privilege assertion is invalidated by even the suspicion of government wrongdoing. Obama, Holder, the Department of Justice, the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives and virtually everyone else involved in this scandal have admitted that government wrongdoing actually took place in Operation Fast and Furious.” [41649, 41650]

Aaron Swartz, Internet freedom and civil liberties activist, computer programmer, and one of the developers of RSS software and Reddit, commits suicide after being mercilessly hounded by federal prosecutors for downloading scholarly articles from JSTOR. Glenn Greenwald writes at Guardian.co.uk, “Swartz never distributed any of these downloaded articles. He never intended to profit even a single penny from anything he did, and never did profit in any way. He had every right to download the articles as an authorized JSTOR user; at worst, he intended to violate the company’s ‘terms of service’ by making the articles available to the public. Once arrested, he returned all copies of everything he downloaded and vowed not to use them. JSTOR told federal prosecutors that it had no intent to see him prosecuted, though MIT remained ambiguous about its wishes. But federal prosecutors ignored the wishes of the alleged ‘victims.’ Led by a federal prosecutor in Boston notorious for her overzealous prosecutions, DOJ [Obama’s [Department of Justice] threw the book at him, charging Swartz with multiple felonies which carried a total sentence of several decades in prison and \$1 million in fines.” (*The Wall Street Journal* reported that the federal government rejected a plea bargain offer from Swartz just two days before he killed himself, demanding prison time and a guilty plea for every charge filed against him—even though all he did was illegally download articles he never distributed to others and which few people would ever be interested in reading. On January 15 the House Oversight Committee Chairman, Darrell Issa, announced a formal investigation into the Justice Department’s conduct in the case.) [41516, 41517, 41518, 41519, 41581, 41687, 41688]

“...Nobody knows for sure why federal prosecutors decided to pursue Swartz so vindictively, as though he had committed some sort of major crime that deserved many years in prison and financial ruin. Some theorized that the DOJ hated him for his serial activism and civil disobedience. Others speculated that, as [Cory] Doctorow put it, ‘the feds were chasing down all the Cambridge hackers who had any connection to Bradley Manning in the hopes of turning one of them. I believe it has more to do with what I told the New York Times’ Noam Cohen for an article he wrote on Swartz’s case. Swartz’s activism, I argued, was waged as part of one of the most vigorously contested battles—namely, the war over how the internet is used and who controls the information that flows on it—and that was his real crime in the eyes of the US government: challenging its authority and those of corporate factions to maintain a stranglehold on that information. In [a] speech on SOPA [Internet regulation legislation that would give the government censorship powers], Swartz discussed the grave dangers to internet freedom and free expression and assembly posed by the government’s efforts to control the internet with expansive interpretations of copyright law and other weapons to limit access to information.” [41516, 41517, 41518, 41519, 41581]

While Aaron Swartz was being bullied by federal prosecutors and threatened with decades in jail for downloading articles without permission, Dr. Peter Gleick was reinstated as president of the Pacific Institute. According to Townhall.com's John Ransom, Gleick, a "global warming scientist... who was chairman of the ethics committee at the American Geophysical Union, admitted last year that he stole some documents—and he may have forged others—from the conservative think-tank the Heartland Institute." (Gleick's goal was to discredit the Heartland Institute for not buying into man-caused global warming theories. Swartz gets prosecuted for downloading articles, but Gleick is not prosecuted for stealing actual paper documents and attempting to destroy a well-respected institution.) Upon being reinstated, Gleick said, "I am glad to be back and thank everyone for continuing their important work at the Pacific Institute during my absence. I am returning with a renewed focus and dedication to the science and research that remain at the core of the Pacific Institute's mission." (The Pacific Institute's mission is "to create a healthier planet and sustainable communities. We conduct interdisciplinary research and partner with stakeholders to produce solutions that advance environmental protection, economic development, and social equity—in California, nationally, and internationally.") [41743, 41744]

Attorney Orly Taitz reports that the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals will hear her petition for a Writ of mandamus to expedite Default Judgment and post judgment discovery. in *Taitz et al v. Democratic Party et al*. Taitz writes, "This is a Racketeering case, whereby the complaint states that Obama, 'Obama for America' (financing organization for Obama campaign), [Former House Speaker Nancy] Pelosi, Registrar of the Health Department in the State of Hawaii Alvin Onaka and Commissioner of Social Security Michael Astrue engaged in a racketeering scheme to defraud the nation and put in office citizen of Indonesia Barack Obama, aka Barack (Barry ) Soetoro, aka Barack (Barry) Soebarkah in the position of the U.S. President and Commander in Chief by virtue of fraud and use of forged IDs and a stolen Connecticut Social Security number 042-68-44-25. According to databases and E-Verify and SSNVS Obama is using a Social Security number which was never assigned to him. ... While other defendants in this case filed an answer, Commissioner of Social Security Michael Astrue never filed an answer. Plaintiff Orly Taitz is asking the Fifth Circuit to expedite Default judgment against Astrue, as this is a matter of National Security. We have a criminal, a foreign national with a stolen Social Security number, about to be sworn in for 4 more years. Taitz requests to expedite the judgment before the swearing in." (Taitz has attempted to force Astrue to release Obama's application for a Social Security number. He has refused to comply, arguing the information is private. The information is not, however, private as Obama released tax returns to the public which revealed his number. Many assume that Obama never filed a request for a number and simply used various stolen numbers over the years.) [41388]

Senator Jay Rockefeller (D-WV), age 75, announces he will not seek reelection in 2014. (The chances that Republicans can pick up Rockefeller's seat are good. Republicans stand to do well in the mid-terms because the GOP senators up for reelection are generally in safe seats, while the more vulnerable seats are held by Democrats in Louisiana, Arkansas, Alaska, Montana, North Carolina, and South Dakota. That does not insure that the Republicans can win control of the Senate, but the task should be less

challenging than it was in 2012.) In New Jersey, Democrat Senator Frank Lautenberg—who turns age 89 on January 23—has not yet declared his intentions for 2014. (Most Democrats probably want Lautenberg to retire, giving the much younger Newark Mayor Cory Booker a good shot at winning the seat. If Lautenberg wins reelection and dies in office, which is not unlikely, Republican Governor Chris Christie could name his temporary replacement.) [41390, 41391, 41397, 41403]

Time, Inc. announces it will lay off 700 of its 8,000 employees. *The New York Times* is also considering lay-offs if it cannot persuade enough employees to accept “buyouts.” [41400, 41410]

Some American workers who are paid every two weeks rather than weekly discover on January 11 that Social Security taxes reverted to their normal 6.2 percent level. Ryan Ellis, tax policy director at Americans for Tax Reform, tells Fox News, “My hope is that people under the age of 40 will start asking serious questions as to why they’re paying more into a Social Security system that they are increasing unlikely to get the full benefit of. I hope everybody does. It’s not a Republican or Democrat thing.” [41401, 41411]

Obama meets with Afghan President Hamid Karzai and, according to FoxNews.com, “endorsed the opening of a ‘Taliban office’ in a third-party country to ‘facilitate’ reconciliation talks—just one plank of the post-war plan the two leaders discussed during Karzai’s visit to Washington.” (To many, that may sound as though Obama is more willing to legitimize than defeat the Taliban.) Obama remarks, “So, you know, I think that, have we achieved everything that some might have imagined us achieving in the best of scenarios? Probably not. You know, there’s a human enterprise, and you know, you fall short of the ideal.” (More than 70 percent of all U.S. casualties in Afghanistan have occurred not during the Bush administration, but since Obama entered the White House.) [41402, 41443, 41461]

Gerard Batten, a Member of Parliament, responds to the Obama administration’s call for Great Britain not to leave the European Union (EU) because it would not be in America’s interests. Batten says, “This is a direct attempt to interfere in British domestic policies... and they’re trying to frighten the British people by saying we’d lose influence, and it jeopardizes our special relationship... The politest thing I could say today is ...Obama should butt out of British affairs. ...All the arguments that ...Obama put out... these are totally false. Every argument about why Britain should stay in the EU can be easily refuted and it’s been done on many occasions, so they have to resort to this kind of scare-mongering. And I’m sorry but I think the Americans should mind their own business.” [41484, 41485, 41498]

Proving that liberal elitists often do not have to obey laws written for the “little people,” Irvin B. Nathan, the attorney general for the District of Columbia, announces he will not press charges against NBC’s *Meet the Press* host David Gregory for violating the city’s gun laws by possessing (and displaying on the air) an illegal 30-round rifle magazine. According to WashingtonTimes.com, “In 2012, the [Washington, D.C.] police arrested at least 105 people for charges that included possession of a magazine that can hold more

than 10 rounds.” One of the persons charged “was James Brinkley, an Army veteran and federal employee, who was arrested and jailed while legally transporting his unloaded Glock 22 to the range with the two standard 15-round magazines that came with the pistol.” LegalInsurrection.com points out that Nathan is a personal acquaintance of Gregory and his wife, “high-powered attorney” Beth Wilkinson. In fact, “...in 2011 Nathan and Wilkinson participated together in a charity mock trial for the Washington, D.C. Shakespeare Theatre Company.” (If you break the law but your wife is an attorney and the pal of the attorney general, you catch a break.) [41404, 41409, 41427]

At NationalReview.com Lawrence Kudlow comments on Obama’s Treasury Secretary nominee Jacob Lew: “[T]he real problem is that Lew is a left-liberal Obama spear-carrier, whose very appointment signals a sharp confrontation with the Republican House over key issues such as the debt ceiling, the spending sequester, next year’s budgets, and taxes. From all the way back when he was staff advisor to [former House Speaker] Tip O’Neill, Lew has been a man of the left. So as treasury secretary, I expect the former Obama budget director to push for trillions of dollars in new tax hikes, absolutely minimal spending restraint, and no serious entitlement reform. Instead of being a fresh face who can generate a clean start for a new slate of fiscal compromises, Lew—who doesn’t play well with the other kids—is going to represent the same old Obama confrontation with the Republican House. ...Lew is to the left of the departing Tim Geithner, just as Chuck Hagel is to the left of Leon Panetta, and John Kerry is to the left of Hillary Clinton. It gives you a sense of Obama’s second-term direction, which is likely to move toward high taxes at home and a weak national-security stance abroad.” (Hagel is a member of the board of the Ploughshares Fund, a far-left, anti-military organization which supports the removal of all nuclear weapons from the U.S. arsenal.) [41408, 41531, 41532]

The White House informs House Budget Committee Chairman Paul Ryan (R-WI) it will fail to submit its budget proposal to Congress by the first Monday in February, as required by law. (Obama has met the deadline only once during his first term.) [41495]

WND.com notes a 2009 Al Jazeera interview with Chuck Hagel, Obama’s choice for the next Secretary of Defense, in which he stated, “How can we preach to other countries that you can’t have nuclear weapons but we can and our allies can? There is no credibility, there’s no logic to that argument. And we have been losing on that argument. ...I think and many people in the United States of America and Russia and in other parts of the world believe it has to go and that it is the elimination, the phasing out of nuclear weapons. ...[W]e can then, all leaders of all mankind, can start to concentrate more deliberately on the needs of the men and women and the children of their countries... eradicating poverty, and hunger and a sense of despair that so overtakes societies.” (It is not surprising that Iran, and probably Russian president Vladimir Putin, support Obama’s selection of Hagel.) [41413, 41414]

Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid (D-NV) and other Democrat leaders urge Obama to ignore Congress if it does not approve a no-strings-attached increase in the debt ceiling and come up with a legal way to continue borrowing money. [41415, 41423]



The White House responds to petitions calling for state secessions with a statement from Jon Carson, director of the Office of Public Engagement, which reads in part, “No one disputes that our country faces big challenges, and the recent election followed a vigorous debate about how they should be addressed. As ...Obama said the night he won re-election, ‘We may have battled fiercely, but it’s only because we love this country deeply and we care so strongly about its future.’ Whether it’s figuring out how to strengthen our economy, reduce our deficit in a responsible way, or protect our country, we will need to work together—and hear from one another—in order to find the best way to move forward. I hope you’ll take a few minutes to learn more about [Obama’s] ideas and share more of your own.” (In other words, “We are going to continue expanding the power of government and limiting your freedoms, and those of you who do not like it can drop dead.”) [41416]

Attorney and author Mark Levin tells his radio audience, “You know folks, I’ll be honest with you. I just told a friend of mine—even though I sit behind this microphone and I try to be civil and so forth—I can barely contain my fury about what’s going on in this country. I’m just being honest with you. I can barely contain it. I’m so frustrated by this tyranny, you have no idea. Now we can analyze it, we can intellectualize it, we can parse it and so forth and try to unravel it. But I’m just telling you, from an emotional point of view, it is just so damned infuriating to see the greatest country on the face of the earth run by a bunch of Lilliputians, who are constantly attacking it from within. No discussion on the news programs about [Obama] exercising an authority he does not have under our constitution. Nothing. No discussion about all the lives saved and all the people protected as a result of the Second Amendment. Nothing. They continue to perpetuate the lie, the big lie that somehow, some new regulation, some new government fiat would have prevented what happened in Newtown, Connecticut. And then they pretend that they’re for law enforcement. They pretend that they’re hard on crime—when they’re not.” [41419]

“We have evidence over one decade after another of how the very same people pushing for gun control against law-abiding American citizens support radical left-wing judges who are soft on criminals, support weakened sentencing rules, decriminalizing this and that. Since when was Obama strong on fighting crime? Since when has Obama supported law enforcement? But here he is, you know, ‘we gotta stop gun violence.’ No, we have to stop violent criminals. There’s a fury in me—I’m just being honest with you—that I’m trying to contain. [Joe] Biden, the moron Senator from Delaware, taking his train back and forth and back and forth on Amtrak. Oh wow, what a guy. Anyway, so they may do by executive fiat—we’re trying to read between the lines—a national gun database. Now, why would we need a national gun database? Well, listen, we need to know who has the weapons, at all times, and how many weapons they have and what weapons they have. How come? Why? The guy that killed all those people in Newtown, Connecticut, we know who he was and we know who had the weapons, his mother. So what does this national database have to do with anything? Nothing. Absolutely nothing. Oh, okay, but we need one anyway, right? To prevent what exactly? To prevent what?” (The Obama administration wants a national gun database, of course, so that it can more easily confiscate guns—as soon as it believes it can do so without being stopped.) [41419]

The leftist think tank, Center for American Progress, gives Obama an 11-page “wish list” of gun control recommendations. [41432]

On January 12 attorney Orly Taitz announces protests against the “squatter in chief... In front of the White House on Sunday, January 20, tentatively from 10–4 and in front of the Supreme Court on Monday January 21 10–4.” Taitz writes, “Corrupt officials and judges are committing treason and criminally complicit in cover up of forged IDs for Obama. Regime propaganda media is not reporting. The only way for us to spread the word is by being there in Obama’s face with signs [that read] ‘Squatter in the WH with forged IDs and a stolen Soc. Sec number.’ ‘Obama using forged IDs, Supreme Court to decide February 15th.’” (February 15 is the date of the Supreme Court conference at which the justices will decide whether to hear Taitz’s case against Social Security administrator Michael Astrue, who has refused to release documents pertaining to the issuance of the stolen Social Security numbers Obama has used.) [41417, 41418]

Obama receives a “routine fitness evaluation” at the Pentagon’s TRICARE Health clinic. (The annual check-ups are usually performed at Bethesda Naval Medical Center. The Ulsterman Report comments, “My take—either Barack Obama has some kind of new physical ailment, or this new addition to his physical examination being titled a ‘fitness exam’ is nothing more than yet another publicity campaign by Dear Leader. Watch next month as the media is fed a report indicating ...Obama is the most impressive physical specimen to have ever resided within the White House or perhaps the world. Nay—the entire universe! He, along with his ‘Get Moving’ wife Michelle are nothing less than physical perfection for which all of us mere mortals can aspire to.”) [41421, 41422]

The Obama administration throws water on the \$1 trillion coin scheme. Treasury Department spokesman Anthony Coley issues the statement: “Neither the Treasury Department nor the Federal Reserve believes that the law can or should be used to facilitate the production of platinum coins for the purpose of avoiding an increase in the debt limit.” (Interestingly, the administration only states it would not implement the coin scheme and refuses to call it the dumbest idea in 500 years—probably because it does not want to insult the many Democrats who believe the idea is brilliant.) [41426, 41430, 41431]

In Taylor, Michigan a riot breaks out when poor people attempt to collect housing vouchers from the federal government. Detroit’s CBS affiliate reports that “...thousands of people were waiting to get housing vouchers” and many “had been waiting outside in the cold since the night before. ...According to reports, only 1,000 vouchers were available for distribution. An estimated 3,000 to 4,000 people were in attendance. When it came time for the vouchers to be distributed, police said there was a mad rush for the door, with people jockeying for position to be the first inside the building. Officers tried to control the crowd, but couldn’t. Fearing the situation was more than they could handle, event organizers shut the entire thing down and turned off the lights inside the building. Witnesses say that’s when things really got ugly.” [41425]

ThePostEmail.com reports, "Eight Wyoming state representatives and two state senators have introduced legislation for the 2013 session which would nullify any federal law imposing a limitation on the size of firearm magazines or semi-automatic weapons. ...South Carolina has reportedly introduced similar legislation." At TheNewAmerican.com Alex Newman writes, "There are teeth in the proposed law too: Any federal official attempting to enforce unconstitutional statutes or decrees infringing on gun rights passed after January 1 of this year would be charged with a felony. If convicted, criminal officials would be punished by up to five years in state prison and a \$5,000 fine. The legislation also authorizes the state attorney general to defend citizens of Wyoming if federal authorities seek prosecutions under unconstitutional gun control rules." State Representative Kendell Kroeker says, "We take the Second Amendment seriously in Wyoming. ...If the federal government is going to pass laws taking back our rights, it is our right as a state to defend those rights. ...We're a sovereign state with our own constitutional form of government. We've got a right to make our laws, and if the federal government is going to try to enforce unconstitutional laws on our people and take away the rights of Wyoming citizens, then we as a state are going to step up and make that a crime." Other states proposing new gun rights legislation include Texas, Missouri, Tennessee, South Dakota, South Carolina, and Alaska. More will certainly follow. [41428, 41429, 41446, 41447, 41639]

In Kentucky, Jackson County Sheriff Denny Peyman holds a news conference and tells reporters he will defy any Obama orders that violate the Second Amendment. "My office will not comply with any federal action which violates the United States Constitution or the Kentucky Constitution which I swore to uphold. Let them pull that stuff in other places if they want, but not in Jackson County, Kentucky. ...I'm for people defending themselves. There are some places in this county that takes me 45 minutes to get to. If they have a gun, they could do a better job of defending themselves than waiting for me. ...On the whole, we are very serious about Second Amendment rights in Kentucky. Even Democrats who run in this state have to at least pay lip service to this issue. We're not hearing too many people say, 'If Obama wants to take your guns, doggone it, let him have them.' We'll see when push comes to shove. It's going to have to go into the courtrooms. It's not going to be, I mean we don't want a bloodbath in our community when they come in to take guns. It's going to have to be taken care of in a court room before it gets to that point." [41490]

Gun and ammunition sales are brisk at a Boise, Idaho gun show. Organizer Paul Snider tells KBOI2, "These guns and ammo are going out the door in arm loads. Some people can hardly walk they've got so much stuff. ...I don't think they are panicking yet [about a possible Obama gun confiscation scheme] but they are very concerned about what might come down the line." [41542]

WhiteHouse.gov gains a new petition: "We petition Barack H. Obama (aka Soetoro aka Soebarkah) to resign due to his use of a stolen CT SSN, forged BC and SS. On February 15, 2013 Supreme Court of the US will hear in conference Noonan et al v Bowen A12606 brought by Attorney Orly Taitz. This case... brings forward undeniable evidence of Barack Obama being listed in his school records in Indonesia as an Indonesian Citizen

and using his step father's last name Soetoro. In [his] mother's passport records, as a child he was listed under the last name Soebarkah. E-verify and SSNVS show him using in his tax returns a CT SSN 042-68-4425, which was never assigned to him..." (On January 14 the White House deletes the petition for violating the "terms of participation.") [41434, 41435]

In an interview with Al Jazeera, author and MIT linguistics professor Noam Chomsky says, "During the last election, I happened to be talking to a well-known black activist very much involved in civil rights and other activism, and he told me a story. He said that after Obama's first election in 2008, he was visited by a group of African American women leading activists who wanted to talk to him. He said he was there when they came out of the meeting and asked them what he was like. And their answer was this man has no moral center. That's their reaction and I think they're right. If you look at his policies, I think that's what they reveal. There's some nice rhetoric here and there but you look at the actual policies, they're pretty shocking. The drone assassination campaign's a perfectly good example. It's just a global assassination campaign." [41460]

On January 13 former Secretary of State and pretend-Republican Colin Powell (who probably could have had the GOP presidential nomination in 2008 had he wanted it) appears on *Meet the Press* to boost Obama's chances of getting Chuck Hagel approved as Secretary of Defense. Powell states, "Most of the national security community that I know—many secretaries of defense, ambassadors—think Hagel is a solid guy. He speaks his mind, is a good supporter of Israel, but he's not reluctant to disagree when appropriate. ...He'll do a great job." (Powell is either lying or ignorant. Hagel is anti-Semitic and anti-Israel and has never been a "good supporter" of the Jewish state—which is why Iran is happy with Obama's selection.) [41433]

Newsmax.com reports, "Just days after he was sworn in as a new U.S. senator, Texas Republican Ted Cruz already is making waves in Washington—and creating another 'birther' controversy. The mainstream media initially gave little or no coverage to presidential candidate Barack Obama's failure to produce a birth certificate, then lambasted those who questioned his eligibility for the White House. But the press is already bringing up the question of Cruz's eligibility for president—which suggests that Democratic sympathizers are worried about his possible run for the White House in 2016. ...Cruz was born in Canada to an American mother and a Cuban father who were working in the petroleum industry, and he lived in Canada for four years before his family moved to Texas. ...Politico on Monday ran a story headlined 'Ted Cruz draws presidential buzz, but is he eligible?' adding that he has 'the aura' of a future contender. 'The problem is, no one knows what a natural born citizen is,' said University of California, Davis law professor Gabriel Chin, who argued in 2008 that John McCain was not eligible to be president because he was born in the Panama Canal Zone. 'There's nothing definitive legally.' Harvard Law School law professor Laurence Tribe, an adviser to Obama, said Cruz should prepare a thorough explanation of his eligibility to put the issue at rest: 'I'd need to know more, but it certainly doesn't sound like a sufficient explanation.'" [41436]

YourBlackWorld.net reports, “As the one month anniversary of the Sandy Hook Elementary School tragedy passed, the White House has announced a change of plans for ...Obama’s assault weapons ban. The announcement comes after Vice President Joe Biden and Attorney General Eric Holder met with gun supporters and gun manufacturers and sellers to come up with a viable solution for the surge in gun violence. Following the meetings, the White House calculates that a ban on assault weapons will be too tough to get through Congress. Instead, the White House is considering more ‘politically achievable’ goals, such as strengthening background checks and keeping guns away from the mentally ill. The news will be disappointing to those who believed ...Obama would possibly use Executive Orders as well as Legislative Orders to solve the problem of gun violence as Biden disclosed.” [41438]

NoDisInfo.com posts a December 12, 2012 screen shot of an Internet article titled, “Talking to Your Child About the Sandy Hook Tragedy.” The article, written by a rabidly anti-gun Cheri Lovre of the Crisis Management Institute, was posted December 10, 2012—four days *before* the school shootings. (The article’s date was subsequently changed to December 13, which was still one day prior to the killings.) [41521]

On WABC Radio’s *Aaron Klein Investigative Radio*, rock singer and gun-rights activist Ted Nugent remarks, “A person who lives by logic and studies history and tries to implement the lessons learned by history cannot begin to rationally explain the [anti-gun] conduct of [Obama] or his attorney general or this administration. It is psychotic, it is crazy, it is illogical. ... Obama’s dream already exists, and those are called gun-free zones, and that is where the most innocent lives are lost. What kind of monster would want more of these? Because if you ask for more gun-free zones, if you further disarm innocent Americans, you are literally engineering slaughters.” Another Klein guest, former New York City mayor Ed Koch, calls for a complete ban on civilian gun ownership. [41444, 41449]

Obama informs Congress that he authorized the use of U.S. combat aircraft in a January 11 military operation in Somalia in support of French efforts to rescue an intelligence office held hostage by the terrorist group al-Shabaab. PJMedia.com reports, “One French commando was killed in the operation and another is missing. Al-Shabaab claimed that the commando is now their hostage. And French army consultant Denis Allex, the pseudonym for the intelligence officer, is presumed dead.” (Obama was willing to authorize a cross-border effort to rescue one Frenchman, but refused to do the same on September 11, 2012 to rescue four Americans in Libya.) [41463, 41465]

Wal-Mart angers customers by curtailing orders for additional ammunition until the battle over gun control becomes more clear. (In other words, Wal-Mart executives are trying to avoid the wrath of Obama, who could cause the corporation tens of millions of dollars worth of grief with harassing IRS audits and lawsuits over unrelated issues. Wal-Mart claims the story is not correct, but one customer recorded his telephone conversation with a company customer service representative and that call suggests the claim is accurate—or was accurate at least until Wal-Mart was bombarded with criticism.) [41473, 41477, 41524, 41555]

Author and economist Walter Williams tells DailyCaller.com the Founding Fathers' "stated reason [for declaring a right to bear arms] was to allow the American people to protect themselves from the United States Congress—that is, government. That's why we have the Second Amendment. A lot of people are saying we should somehow control or restrict arms. And I would ask the question: Are we under any less a threat of tyranny from Washington than we were in 1787? And I would say no. ...If push comes to shove, Americans would at least have a means to offer some kind of resistance, as people have done around the world. ...[Rapists] are cowards, and if they think women can defend themselves, they'll restrain their behavior or think twice. The gun industry makes all kinds of interesting holsters where women can carry their guns, such as the bra holster. Guy acts like rape? 'Well, yeah, let me get undressed, and then politely blow the guy away.'" [41479]

Politico reports that insurance companies are telling the Obama administration the ObamaCare penalties for not having health insurance will be far too low to force customers (especially young, healthy Americans) to buy policies. The insurers "want more incentives—such as a late enrollment fee—to get healthy people to sign up quickly. Without getting the healthy folks in, the fear is that everyone's health insurance premiums could shoot through the roof when all those sick people get their coverage." Justine Handelman, vice president for legislative and regulatory policy at the Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association, remarks, "The key really is, how do you get younger people to buy coverage If you can jump in and out every time you need services, costs will go up." (In other words, ObamaCare is bumping up against the reality critics warned about. If one cannot be denied a policy because of pre-existing conditions, there is no incentive to buy a policy until one becomes sick or injured. If the penalty for not having insurance is less expensive than the cost of a policy, the penalty will not force many people to buy coverage. In 2016, the penalty will be the greater of \$695 or 2.5 percent of income. With an income of \$40,000 the penalty would therefore be \$1,000—far less than the cost of insurance.) [41493, 41494]

On January 14 Obama holds a press conference and again demands an increase of the debt ceiling with no strings attached: "While I'm willing to compromise and find common ground over how to reduce our deficit, America cannot afford another debate with this Congress over how to pay the bills they've already racked up. To even entertain the idea of this happening, of America not paying its bills, is irresponsible. It's absurd. They will not collect a ransom in exchange for not crashing the American economy. The full faith and credit of the United States of America is not a bargaining chip." (Obama is himself using it as a bargaining chip by demanding that spending continue unabated. He is also not "willing to compromise." If he were, he would identify spending cuts to which he is willing to agree.) CBS News' Major Garrett asks, "As you well know, sir, finding votes for the debt ceiling can sometimes be complicated. You yourself as a member of the Senate voted against a debt ceiling increase. And in previous aspects of American history: President Reagan in 1985, President George Herbert Walker Bush in 1990, President Clinton in 1997, all signed deficit reduction deals that were contingent upon or in the context of in raising the debt ceiling. You yourself four times have done that; three

times those were related to deficit reduction or budget maneuvers. What... I think many people are curious about is this new adamant desire on your part not to negotiate when that seems to conflict with the entire history, in the modern era, of American presidents and the debt ceiling and your own history on the debt ceiling, and doesn't that suggest that we are gonna go into a default situation because no one is talking to each other about how to resolve this?" A hostile Obama gives a lengthy answer in which he pays lip service to debt reduction, while listing areas in which he wants to spend money to "grow the economy." Obama claims he "is happy to have conversation about how to reduce the deficit—but he wants the debt ceiling increased first. [41448, 41451, 41471, 41475, 41476]

Not hesitating to use scare tactics to get his way with the debt ceiling issue, Obama tells reporters, "If congressional Republicans refuse to pay Americans' bills on time, Social Security checks and veterans' benefits will be delayed." (Even if the debt ceiling is not lifted, there is more than enough incoming tax revenue to pay interest on the national debt, Social Security checks, and veterans' benefits. Although some spending would have to be slashed, it would certainly not have to be those items. For Obama to suggest otherwise is nothing more than an effort to frighten senior citizens into supporting a debt ceiling increase with no spending cuts at all.) Obama shamelessly adds, "We might not be able to pay our troops, or honor our contracts with small business owners. Food inspectors, air-traffic controllers, specialists who track down loose nuclear materials, wouldn't get their pay checks." (Obama has no desire to save money by laying off unnecessary federal workers; instead he picks functions that will most alarm Americans. Obama also proposes no solutions to the debt problem. His sole purpose at the press conference is to assign blame to Republicans for the fiscal problems of the past, present, and future. Obama spends the entire press conference acting as though he just entered the White House and had nothing to do with the government spending of the prior four years.) It is worth noting that on March 16, 2006, then-Senator Obama said, "Increasing America's debt weakens us domestically and internationally. I therefore intend to oppose the effort to increase America's debt limit." [41456, 41470, 41475, 41476, 41497, 41684]

Asked about his gun control plans, Obama responds, "My starting point is to focus on what makes sense, what works. ...Members of Congress are going to have to come to terms with their own conscience. ...I'm confident there are some steps we can take that don't require legislation. How we are gathering data on guns that fall into the hands of criminals, how we track that." (With Operation Fast and Furious, Obama has already demonstrated that his administration is incapable of tracking guns.) No reporter asks Obama why his administration has prosecuted far fewer gun crimes than the Bush administration. (According to WashingtonExaminer.com, weapons prosecutions have been reduced "some 40 percent since a high of about 11,000 under former President Bush. ...Gun prosecutions peaked at 10,937 under Bush in 2004. A current ...report shows that the Obama administration is prosecuting about 6,000 weapons cases.") [41454, 41457, 41458, 41475, 41476]

As usual, Obama neglects to allow any questions from Fox News. (Obama has called on a Fox reporter only once in his last six press conferences.) [41548]

*The Washington Post's* Dana Milbank writes, “[T]here was no precipitating event that led [Obama] to schedule the last-minute session in the East Room—lending credibility to the theory that he summoned reporters so he could bait Republicans. ... Calling the opposition’s [debt ceiling] stance ‘absurd,’ Obama advised Republicans that they ‘have two choices here: They can act responsibly and pay America’s bills, or they can act irresponsibly and put America through another economic crisis. But they will not collect a ransom in exchange for not crashing the American economy. ... And they [had] better choose quickly, because time is running short.’ And that was just the opening statement. The hectoring continued through the Q&A. Exactly one month after the massacre at an elementary school in Newtown, Conn., Obama said of debt-reduction talks: ‘What I will not do is to have that negotiation with a gun at the head of the American people.’” [41480]

Katie Pavlich reports at Townhall.com, “MidwayUSA, one of the nation’s largest shooting, hunting and outdoor companies, is expediting orders of AR-15 parts and accessories as talk of an executive order from ... Obama continue in Washington D.C. The company is doing its best to deliver parts ordered by customers before executive action is taken.” Meanwhile, Senator Charles Schumer (D-NY) calls on stores to stop selling weapons and institute a voluntary moratorium until Congress can pass additional gun legislation. [41452, 41453]

Linn County, Oregon Sheriff Tim Mueller sends a letter to Vice President Joe Biden informing him that he will not enforce any new federal gun laws he considers unconstitutional. Mueller writes, “We are Americans,” Mueller wrote. “We must not allow, nor shall we tolerate, the actions of criminals, no matter how heinous the crimes, to prompt politicians to enact laws that will infringe upon the liberties of responsible citizens who have broken no laws.” [41536]

Gun sales have skyrocketed in KOTA Territory and across the country.

Michael Mooney, owner of Southern Hills Tactical in Custer, South Dakota, tells KOTA TV, he sold 85 assault weapons in three days, with prices ranging from \$650 to \$3,000. Mooney states, “[I have] Never seen sales like this at all. In the month of December there was nearly 2.8 million sales transfers done though NICS, which is roughly a million more than the previous December.” [41544]

Gun stores in Kentucky see dramatic sales increases. Open Range sales consultant Aaron Hatfield tells WAVE 3 News, “They’ve been though the roof. They’re scared of what’s going to happen and the unknown.” 14News.com reports, “Hatfield says buyers have come out of the woodwork. At first, he said sales were amazing, now he says, many dealers have little on the shelves. A section normally full of ARs [AR15s] and Lever Action Rifles are all gone. Gun sellers can’t replenish their stock. Hatfield said the wholesalers are running out of guns and ammunition and manufacturers can’t keep up with demand.” Open Range’s shooting ranges are going unused because the store does not have enough ammunition to supply the customers. Hatfield says, “We have twelve



pistol lanes and five rifle lanes and without ammo to sell, what are people going to shoot on those lanes?” (It is worth noting that the “AR” in the name AR-15 does not mean “automatic rifle.” It stands for ArmaLite Rifle. The AR-15 design was sold by ArmaLite to Colt, and has since been licensed to many manufacturers. It is not an automatic weapon. That is, it does not shoot multiple rounds with one trigger pull, as does a “machine gun” or the M16 it resembles. Because the AR-15 has a pistol grip, the weapon may “look aggressive”—but it remains nothing more than a rifle that requires one pull of the trigger for each round fired. Civilian versions of the AR-15 have been manufactured for decades, and by Colt since 1963. To enact a ban on “semi-automatic rifles” would essentially be to enact a ban on all rifles. A 100-year-old hunting rifle is “semi-automatic.”) [41545, 41546]

JPMorgan lowers its fourth quarter 2012 Gross Domestic Product estimate from 1.5 percent to a mere 0.8 percent (annualized). Morgan Stanley lowers its estimate from 1.5 percent to 0.7 percent [41455]

DetroitNews.com reports, “Chrysler CEO Sergio Marchionne said the automaker plans to build some Jeeps in China for the local market—and later, in Russia.” The Chinese production goal in 2014 is 100,000. (The media and the Obama administration excoriated Mitt Romney during the campaign for suggesting that Chrysler, after getting bailout cash from U.S. taxpayers, was planning to build Jeeps in China. Romney was correct—despite PolitiFact calling his claim “the lie of the year.”) [41468, 41676]

The Ulsterman Report hears from his Republican insider, who states, “I recently gave you a rundown of my beliefs regarding the threat of globalism and how the leadership in the Republican Party must change if we are to have the ability to actually slow down or defeat that movement. I am going to elaborate on that a little bit. [I] Spent the last two weeks communicating with a whole lot of people inside and outside the D.C. corridor on topics ranging from the [Chuck] Hagel and [John] Brennan picks, to rumors another Supreme Court position is about to open up. You asked me what I thought about Hagel and Brennan. I’ll just tell you that both of the picks are designed more to give Obama cover than actually put in place competent people in those positions. [Obama] has John Kerry, messed up the delivery on [Susan] Rice, and then threw us Hagel and Brennan. Of those two, I am much more concerned with the Brennan pick actually. The mainstream media has avoided any mention of Brennan’s significant role in the Benghazi tragedy. Only some of the secondary media have discussed it which means about 90 percent of Americans have no clue how involved the guy is with not only the policies that led to that fiasco, but more importantly, the cover-up that followed. And it’s not just Benghazi. Brennan is big on those drones, and that alone is reason why Obama gave him the CIA position. And if you take the roads of CIA, State, NSA, DHS, and FBI for the last four years, they all led to John Brennan. And then he would answer directly to [Valerie] Jarrett.” [41469]

“Now I want to elaborate more on this Brennan thing to make sure I’m being absolutely clear here. First, take Brennan’s own history. He was a big part of the G.W. Bush era right? But what people who say they are paying attention seem to forget is that he was

also a player in the Bill Clinton administration as well. Late 90's. Now I'm going to share with you something told to me from [the White House insider] who I am praying gets back in the fight with us on all of this because what they know about that time and how it applies to this time would really be helpful to us. John Brennan was instrumental in delaying an American response against Osama Bin Laden. His position then was all about calculated risk. In fact, if you take Brennan's position back then when America could have taken Bin Laden out, it sounds very similar to the version you received that came from Valerie Jarrett when she was manipulating [Obama's] delayed response to the Bin Laden raid of 2011. So we have a guy now being considered for the Obama CIA who was instrumental in the terrorist attack of September 11th through his work both in the Clinton and G.W. Bush administrations. Someone who I feel was as much an architect of 9-11 as Osama Bin Laden. A guy who was also instrumental in the raid on the Bin Laden compound of 2011. The guy who announced the Seal Team Six involvement that likely led to some of them being shot out of the sky a short time later. The guy who has helped to develop the Obama drone program, the kill lists that Obama loves so much, and who admitted publicly of drone strikes throughout North Africa and the Middle East. Strikes with basically no Congressional oversight. Strikes that if you look over the timeline, became predictors of conflict hotspots in those same areas. Brennan's drones would go in, create some isolated destruction and chaos, and then much larger chaos in those locations would then follow." [41469]

"Let's bring in the Benghazi issue then. Brennan is head of [Obama's] National Counterterrorism group. During his time there he has worked very closely with our favorite [Attorney General], Mr. Eric Holder. Their work has resulted in the single greatest expansion of police state surveillance on American citizens in the history of this country. Once again, the mainstream media is silent on this fact. Remember, it was the FBI who Obama said he sent to Benghazi to investigate the attack that killed four Americans. It was the FBI who delayed that investigation because they said it was too dangerous and it's the Holder FBI who says the investigation is 'ongoing.' Right. The cover-up is right there in front of everyone but this Obama administration doesn't care. They know there isn't enough people wanting to challenge them so they'll just go right on lying to us. So who do you think had the authority to write up the notes for Susan Rice to lie over and over again to the public when she was sent out after the Benghazi story broke? John Brennan was the guy. He was the one who took out all mention of terrorism. He was the one who helped to fabricate the false anti-Islam video narrative. And for his good work, he's given the CIA position with what I'm sure is the directive to keep Benghazi and who knows what else, covered up. And to continue to expand the surveillance program on American citizens. And to certainly keep expanding the Obama drone program both domestically and abroad. John Brennan is a hardcore globalist nightmare who is helping set the stage for the next four years and beyond." [41469]

"Now I'm really going to step out on the ledge here because like you told me, this forum gives me an opportunity to do that without fear of reprisals. So here it goes. I am putting to you the very real possibility that John Brennan wanted Osama Bin Laden alive in the late 90s so the events that developed into September 11th, 2001 could take place. Read that again and if you are asking yourself if I'm really saying what I'm saying, the answer

is yes. And I'm also going to say that what was going on in Benghazi in the months and weeks before the more recent September 11th attacks are very similar to what Brennan was coordinating during his years inside the Clinton administration. Bin Laden had become a liability and a tool for some serious propaganda. Benghazi was part of something to create another Bin Laden. I want you to think back on America before the 2001 attacks, and after. What has happened since then? A huge expansion of the federal government, even further expansion of the United Nations, the destruction of the U.S. dollar, the rise of China. All of this in just a decade. Imagine if another similar event, perhaps one with even more destruction, were to take place? How much greater and faster and more complete will the globalist expansion be then?" [41469]

"Let me bring in our current Republican leadership on this topic. Senator [Lindsey] Graham [R-SC] is making a little noise on Brennan. He is at least tipping people off that it's the Brennan pick that is the far more dangerous one versus Hagel. Hagel is more of a PR tool. Former Republican now working for a Democrat... etc. Like you already covered in your article on him, Hagel is a version of a globalist himself though, and he never really was a Republican, so he gets the approval from Jarrett. But Graham is right to place more attention on Brennan. But how far will someone like Senator Graham actually demand the truth about Benghazi during a confirmation hearing? I don't have any confidence in him at all. None. Graham runs scared. Him [sic] and McCain are the same on that. Both of them are so worried about being liked they forget their job as Republican Senators is not to get along but to represent the voters who put them there in the first place." [41469]

"So that brings me back to the 2014 midterms. I know some of your readers complain that I'm jumping to the next battle but I have no choice. That's what I see in front of me now. Where is that Tea Party motivation from 2010? If conservatives don't rise up again and take seats back in the Congress, then the chips will really start to fall around us. The word has gone out that every big issue is going to be in play in the coming months. Immigration, guns, taxes, spending, military budget, environmental regulations, all of it. The whole progressive globalist agenda is going to be pushed into the open and accelerated during Obama's second term and the only thing standing in the way of that agenda being completed are the few remaining true conservatives in Congress. They want to destroy conservatives, and they're doing it. Day by day. Conservatism is dying. I see it all around me now. People who just a few months ago would have spoken up are silent. If 2014 does not go well enough for us, then those two Supreme Court positions Jarrett talked about having wrapped up before the election, will happen. I have no doubt about it now." [41469]

"As you know, normally I'm a much more upbeat kind of guy but things around here are getting pretty somber. We have no power. No leadership. No focus. It's pathetic. I want to respect these people, as human beings if nothing else, but they are really making it hard to do that. I am very worried about 2014. I sense some kind of set up around here and I'm not the only one. Something is up. Things don't feel right. The debt ceiling issue. We were all promised a real fight but now the word is out that some kind of deal is already in the works that basically caves and kicks the can down the road again. Nobody

wants to lead around here. And the ones who speak up are shut down and threatened. I'm talking terrible kinds of threats too. Not just committee positions. Quality of life things. It's gotten really strange and weird for some of us up here. Sorry for the downer update but that's my frame of mind right now. Something is really wrong right now and I don't have a clue how to fix it beyond praying the voters do the right thing in 2014. If [the White House insider] calls Eric Holder the Obama administration's firewall, then how about [if] the American people make 2014 the firewall for liberty and freedom for the country? Of course then I have to ask why should they? How can we trust the politician who calls themselves Republican or Conservative who then turns right around and joins up with the globalists in Congress and the White House? Help!" [41469]

Radio talk show host Mark Levin responds to Obama's press conference, telling Fox News Channel's Megyn Kelly, "I'm not into imperial presidents who act imperial and speak imperial and Obama forgets there's a Constitution. Yeah, he keeps telling us he won reelection. Congratulations, but guess what? The Constitution wasn't up for election, it's not up for a plebiscite or a referendum. He has to comply with it, too. He was sent back to Washington, but he's got a strict list of rules that he has to follow... So when he gets up there and starts saying, if Congress doesn't do this, I'm going to do this unilaterally, it violates separation of powers a lot of the times. And this is a man who's been pushing the edge of the envelope as far as I'm concerned, whether it's the appointment clause, whether it's his unilateral action on immigration, whether it's trashing the commerce clause and the tax clauses under ObamaCare. Now they're talking about executive orders on the Second Amendment. They've issued regulations on First Amendment attacking religious liberty. This notion that he might be able to lift the debt ceiling, you know, unilaterally under the Fourteenth Amendment. What the hell is this? He was elected president. Congratulations. This guy makes Richard Nixon look like a man who followed the law all the time. I think we have an imperial president, he sounds imperial, he's arrogant as hell and so I'm furious about this and I'm going to tell you why. We are a magnificent country. We don't need to be turned upside down. We don't need to run from crisis to crisis to crisis. He's bankrupting this country. He says we've had a discussion about the debt. When did we have a discussion about the debt? We've had a debate about taxes. The man's never around to have a discussion about anything. So, yes, he causes me to be furious when I watch him and listen to him." [41472]

FreeBeacon.com reports, "School districts in Pennsylvania, Alabama, New Jersey, and Rhode Island have hired armed officers in the weeks since the mass shooting in Newtown, Conn... Additionally, schools in Florida, Tennessee, Arizona, and New York are in the process of hiring armed officers or recommending they be placed in schools." (The Democrat politicians and the mainstream media may think guarding school children is foolish, but parents and school districts apparently disagree.) [41474]

Congressman Steve Stockman (R-TX) threatens to push for Obama's impeachment if he uses an executive order to implement gun control. Stockman states, "I will seek to thwart this action by any means necessary, including but not limited to eliminating funding for implementation, defunding the White House, and even filing articles of impeachment. ...Any proposal to abuse executive power and infringe upon gun rights must be repelled

with the stiffest legislative force possible. Under no circumstances whatsoever may the government take any action that disarms any peaceable person—much less without due process through an executive declaration without a vote of Congress or a ruling of a court. ...If [Obama] is allowed to suspend constitutional rights on his own personal whims, our free republic has effectively ceased to exist.” [41478, 41486, 41537]

Former Attorney General Edwin Meese tells Newsmax.tv any ban on guns ordered by Obama “...would not be legal. It would not be constitutional. And, indeed, if he tried to override the Second Amendment in any way, I believe it would be an impeachable offense. ...It should be remembered that [Obama] cannot by executive order do things that affects the public at large unless there is some congressional basis for it. In other words, some Congressional authority he has been given. An executive order without specific congressional authority can only apply to those portions of the government that are under his control—in their words, the executive branch. Now there are some things he can probably do in regard to the actions of the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives, or some other governmental agency in its operations. But to impose burdens or regulations that affect society generally, he would have to have Congressional authorization.” [41496]

According to the Associated Press, “More than 54,000 Mexicans have signed a petition calling on the United States to take further steps to combat weapons trafficking. Mexico says the majority of guns used by the country’s violent drug cartels are smuggled over the border from the United States. ...About 70,000 people have died in Mexico in drug violence since 2006, according to the written copy of a speech presented by Mexico’s interior secretary in December.” (Some might argue that the Mexicans should build a border fence.) [41481]

Politico reports, “The White House has identified 19 executive actions for ...Obama to move unilaterally on gun control, Vice President Joe Biden told a group of House Democrats on Monday, the administration’s first definitive statements about its response to last month’s mass shooting at Sandy Hook Elementary School. Later this week, Obama will formally announce his proposals to reduce gun violence, which are expected to include renewal of the assault weapons ban, universal background checks and prohibition of high-capacity magazine clips. ...The executive actions could include giving the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention authority to conduct national research on guns, more aggressive enforcement of existing gun laws and pushing for wider sharing of existing gun databases among federal and state agencies...” (Some of the 19 proposals likely came from the far left Center for American Progress, a think tank on which Obama frequently relies.) [41483, 41486, 41491, 41502]

On *Special Report*, Brit Hume comments on Obama’s press conference: “If you heard it and you didn’t know when it was, you might think that the election campaign was still in full swing. I mean it was unusually partisan. Most presidents, you know, they may make sort of quiet references to the other party. [Obama] is more directly partisan under normal circumstances than any[one] that I can remember. And I think he senses that the Republican Party is in bad odor with the public and that if he can deepen that problem for

them, it softens them up to do things his way. But it is striking. He was strikingly aggressive and partisan. [On the debt ceiling issue] This is a place where the Republicans have more leverage than they did in the recent fight over the so-called fiscal cliff. What was at the center of that was the fact that the law already was going to raise taxes on everybody. And that was the fact of life Republicans really never could get around, which is why they basically, you know, had to go along for what—by the time they voted on it—was a tax cut for most people. This situation is different: The debt ceiling doesn't get raised by itself; and it has to be done, and everybody knows it eventually has to be done. So they understand it's not a popular step, as [Obama's] own [past] vote against it shows. They're trying to extract some spending cuts as a price for that. And [Obama] is accusing them of wanting to, you know, leave the lame, the halt, and the blind and the children and the elderly people out in the cold. This is a real partisan brawl." [41488]

Hume continues, "...Gun control has proven in recent times to be a remarkably dangerous issue for Democrats. And it has repeatedly gotten them into political trouble because the passion and devotion of people who care about gun rights is such that they will come out and vote against you if you're wrong on that issue even if you're right as far as they're concerned on everything else. They have real intensity, and Democrats have to be careful. What almost always happens in these things is there will be some event that will generate apparent support in a large number of people, and large majority of the public, for major new gun control, but it tends to dissipate over time and one senses that it's already begun to dissipate in the aftermath of [the shootings in] Newtown." [41488]

On *Hannity*, author Ann Coulter says that if Obama issues objectionable executive orders related to gun control "...we should respond with the next Republican president having executive orders [that say] we won't ban abortions, but we will just ban abortionists and abortion clinics. How would that be? I mean, they're not serious about doing anything about shootings in America. Dianne Feinstein has a concealed carry permit, for good reason. ...This business that New York is pushing through about banning the extra-capacity magazines—like all liberal solutions, this has nothing to do with the problem we're supposed to be addressing. If you are going into a gun-free zone, as all of these mass shooters do—all but one since 1950 have shot up 'gun-free zones'—you have time to drop the magazine and insert another one. You have time and preparation to have more than one gun." [41487]

Mark Levin tells his radio audience, "Now, if Obama unilaterally acts [on gun control]—and I think there's a fan-dance going on here where his spokes-idiot [Jay] Carney is out there saying, 'No, we've decided we're not going to do this'—if Obama, though, plays the role of Hamlet and in the end says 'I have no choice: The Republicans are going to destroy our economy, our debt rating, all this that and the other, therefore I must unilaterally act,' he should be impeached. Because that means Congress' core power—in addition to declaring war—Congress' core power, that is control over spending and taxing, will have been seized by [Obama] in one executive order. No Congress would tolerate this from any president. I don't care if the president was Abraham Lincoln. This Congress would not have tolerated it from Richard Nixon. No Congress can tolerate such

a complete and brazen frontal assault on its enumerated power. No Congress. No twisting of the language in the 14th Amendment or any way else, because we will cease to be a federal government of three coequal branches. We will cease to be that. And what are we going to do, ladies and gentlemen? Throw our entire system away? Our entire Constitution away? Our entire financial system away for Obama? Why? So, if [Obama] commits a high crime and misdemeanor, which in this case is a brazen frontal attack on the Constitution itself in a way that no president has ever attacked the Constitution—seizing power unilaterally from the Congress—then we have no choice, do we? Do we, than to remove him from office? What do you think about that one, Colin Powell?” [41489]

On *Special Report*, Kirsten Powers—a Democrat—comments on Obama’s press conference: “I thought [Obama’s] tone was very petulant, and [he was] acting sort of annoyed that people were asking him questions, and they actually were doing follow-up questions, which they normally don’t all do, and that was good. They were pressing him on ...things, his being asked about his past vote [as a Senator on the debt ceiling]. And I think that he didn’t do a great job of explaining the situation because I think that this back and forth that’s going on about whether we’re going to default or not isn’t really the point, and Obama put it out there like, “we’re gonna be like Greece and we’re gonna go under,’ when we’re not, but at the same time it would be very disruptive, and that is correct. So he didn’t need to exaggerate.” Asked about Obama’s threat that Social Security checks and veterans’ benefits would be delayed, Powers responds, “Yeah, well that would only be if he decided that... which is highly unlikely. I think that that’s not what would happen. So it’s scare tactics. Look, the Republicans have a fair position here, which is they want to extract some spending cuts. They didn’t get them in the last round of negotiations, and [Obama] should meet them half way, I think. But it seems to be he’s setting this up that if you don’t go his way... you like to starve children.” [41510]

On January 15 former House Speaker Newt Gingrich appears on CBS’ *This Morning* and says, “Well, I think it’s amazing that we’re having all this discussion about gun control:. [Obama’s] hometown, Chicago, is the murder capital of the United States. Over 500 people were killed there last year. Vice President Biden doesn’t seem to want to go there. I’m trying to get the House Republicans to hold hearings there. It’s illegal to have all the guns that are killing people in Chicago. If gun control works, Chicago ought to be safe.” [41503]

Investigator Mike Zullo of Sheriff Joe Arpaio’s “cold case posse” addresses the Surprise, Arizona Tea Party. Zullo and other members of Arpaio’s team continue to investigate Obama’s past and identify the individuals who forged his birth certificates and selective Service registration form. [41266, 41267, 41464, 41466, 41685]

In Las Vegas, the National Shooting Sports Foundation begins its 35th annual Shooting Hunting and Outdoor Trade Show (“SHOTS”). As many as 60,000 hunters, recreational gun owners, members of law enforcement, and industry professionals are expected to attend. [41541]

At the North American International Auto Show in Detroit the taxpayer-subsidized General Motors, and manufacturer of the taxpayer-subsidized Chevy Volt, unveils a Cadillac version of the poor selling electric/gasoline vehicle. (GM sold a mere 23,461 Volts in 2012—and lost money on each one. How much GM expects to lose on the Cadillacs is not reported, although the vehicle will likely sell for \$60,000–\$70,000.) [42460]

The editors at NationalReview.com suggest, “The House should pass a bill to redefine the debt limit so that it constrains primary spending but not debt service. Under this reform, a Treasury that had hit the statutory borrowing limit could continue to borrow what it needed exclusively for paying interest on the national debt and to roll over existing debt obligations, but it could not borrow for any other government spending until the limit had been increased. This would take default entirely off the table. ... This proposal would improve, rather than undermine, America’s creditworthiness, as it would both avert any possibility of default and compel a discussion about getting our government finances into order. It would enable Congress to exercise its exclusive Article I authority to borrow while meeting its 14th Amendment obligation to assure ‘the validity of the public debt of the United States, authorized by law.’” [41482]

The Obama team is reportedly \$8 million short in its quest to raise \$50 million to pay for inauguration parties and other related activities. [41492]

*The Jerusalem Post* reports that Obama “has stated repeatedly in private conversations that ‘Israel doesn’t know what its own best interests are,’ regarding Jerusalem’s advancement of new settlement plans, influential Jewish American columnist Jeffrey Goldberg reported Tuesday. Following the November 29 UN vote to upgrade the Palestinians to non-member observer state status, Israel announced that 3,000 housing units would be built in areas beyond the Green Line, and zoning and planning for thousands of other units throughout Judea and Samaria would be authorized, including in the controversial project between Jerusalem and Ma’aleh Adumim called E1. In his weekly Bloomberg column published on Tuesday, Goldberg wrote: ‘When informed about the Israeli decision, Obama, who has a famously contentious relationship with the prime minister, didn’t even bother getting angry. He told several people that this sort of behavior on [Prime Minister Binyamin] Netanyahu’s part is what he has come to expect, and he suggested that he has become inured to what he sees as self-defeating policies of his Israeli counterpart.’” (In other words, “How dare the Israelis build houses and apartments in Israel!”) [41603]

WhiteHouseDossier.com reports, “Long term unemployment under ... Obama is at the highest level since at least the end of World War II, threatening to create a permanent underclass of workers who will find it difficult or impossible to obtain jobs in the future. What’s more, Obama’s insistence on repeatedly extending long term unemployment benefits may be fueling the unemployment problem. According to data recently released by the St. Louis Federal Reserve, the average duration of unemployment is now at about 40 weeks, double the previous highest level of about 20 weeks that prevailed during the last three recessions. A separate paper released by the Boston Federal Reserve paints a



pernicious picture of the problem: Employers seem to be throwing out the resumes of the long-term unemployed and only hiring those who have been without a job for less than six months. Meanwhile, with the guarantee of benefits rolling in, the long term jobless might not be looking aggressively enough for work, the paper states.” [41501]

San Antonio radio station WOAI reports, “A Texas lawmaker says he plans to file the Firearms Protection Act, which would make any federal laws that may be passed by Congress or imposed by Presidential order which would ban or restrict ownership of semi-automatic firearms or limit the size of gun magazines illegal in the state... Republican Rep. Steve Toth says his measure also calls for felony criminal charges to be filed against any federal official who tries to enforce the rule in the state. ‘If a federal official comes into the state of Texas to enforce the federal executive order, that person is subject to criminal prosecution.’ ...He says his bill would make attempting to enforce a federal gun ban in Texas punishable by a \$50,000 fine and up to five years in prison.” (It is worth noting that during the “prohibition era,” when the manufacture, transportation, and sale of alcoholic beverages was outlawed by the Eighteenth Amendment, law enforcement officials in many areas refused to comply with the law and even actively blocked federal officials from its enforcement. The Amendment was passed on December 18, 1917 and ratified on January 16, 1919. It was rescinded by the Twenty-First Amendment, which was passed on February 20, 1933 and ratified on December 5, 1933. Guns may not be as popular as alcohol, but they are popular enough to suggest that millions of Americans will simply ignore any significant anti-gun regulations imposed by Obama. Just as the federal government could not get Americans to stop drinking beer and whiskey, it will not get them to voluntarily give up their guns.) [41504, 41561, 42033]

The fascist governor of New York, Andrew Cuomo, signs into law the most restrictive gun rules in the nation. According to NYDailyNews.com, “Owners of an estimated one million previously legal semiautomatic rifles, like the Bushmaster model used to kill 20 children and six seven adults in Newtown, Conn., a month ago, will be able to keep their weapons, but will have a year to register them with police. ...In addition to outlawing a broader array of military-style weapons, the measure restricts ammunition magazines to seven bullets, ...creates a more comprehensive database of people barred from owning guns, and makes New York the first state to require background checks to buy bullets. The system will also help flag customers who buy large amounts of ammo. In another provision, therapists, doctors and other mental health professionals will be required to tell state authorities if a patient threatens to use a gun illegally. The patient’s weapon could then be taken away.” (The mental health provision may end up causing people who need such care to avoid it because they will be afraid they will be forced to give up their weapons.) [41505, 41506, 41522, 41552, 41557, 41623]

At AmericanThinker.com Michael Filozof later describes some of the details of the Cuomo gun-grabbing legislation: “The most widely reported provision of the law is the total ban on the sale of military-style rifles classified as ‘assault weapons,’ effective Jan. 15. The provision forever prohibits anyone other than a law enforcement agency from acquiring such weapons, including the popular hunting and target variants of the AR-15 rifle. Current owners of such rifles must register them with the state by 2014, and the

registration must be renewed every five years. This gives the state a list of persons from which to confiscate them in the future, and the five-year renewal provision gives the state an excuse to find ways to deny ownership once every five years. Current owners of such rifles may never sell them to another New York State resident in the future. ...The new law prohibits the sale of *any* quantity of ammunition by anyone other than a licensed dealer and requires that such dealer perform a criminal background check on the purchaser and forward the purchaser's name, address, age, and occupation, and the quantity, caliber, and make of the ammunition, to a State Police database. Thus, the ammunition database creates a de facto universal long gun registry. A hunter who purchases a box of five 12-gauge deer slugs may think that his purchase is innocent enough; however, it will have the effect of informing the State Police that he owns a 12-gauge shotgun, enabling them to confiscate it in the future if they so choose. ...Since many gun owners have vowed to defy the 'assault weapons' registration, it is highly likely that the State Police will use the ammunition database as a means to discover and confiscate unregistered rifles. ...The ammunition registration is crucial to the law's confiscation scheme." [42308]

Filozof continues, "The law affirmatively requires that a person's firearms must be confiscated if any order of protection is filed against him—no matter how bogus the complaint may be." (A woman who is angry with her ex-boyfriend could "get even with him" simply by filing a false complaint that he is stalking her—and he will then have to give up all his guns.) The law "also requires that a 'mental health professional' (including a physician) who believes that an individual is a danger to himself or others must report his diagnosis to the police for purposes of firearm confiscation. Such a diagnosis is highly subjective and could be easily politicized. ...But the law exempts such 'professionals' from civil liability; thus, any 'mental health professional' who believes that all gun owners are 'nuts' could initiate the confiscation of a person's firearms, and the gun owner is forbidden to file a civil suit to challenge the 'diagnosis.' ...The legislation "requires that gun owners report any 'loss or theft' of a firearm or ammunition to the police within 24 hours. Failure to do so is a criminal offense. Read literally, a deer hunter ...who drops a single 12-gauge slug in the snow and cannot find it is a criminal unless he reports the loss to the police. ...The New York SAFE Act is one of the most breathtakingly brazen assaults on the Constitution and on individual liberty in the history of the United States. Cuomo has gleefully thumbed his nose at the Supreme Court's *Heller* and *McDonald* decisions in 2008 and 2010 affirming the right to keep and bear arms. The intent of the law is to suppress and criminalize the common use of firearms, including guns not defined as 'assault weapons.' ...Above all else, remember that even if you do not live in New York, you cannot be complacent. The gun-banners are coming after you next." [42308]

Cuomo, who no doubt has his sights set on the White House in 2016, brags that the legislation includes a "Webster provision," that calls for a life sentence for anyone who kills a "first responder." (Cuomo apparently believes most of the citizens of his state are stupid. The man who shot and killed two firefighters in an incident in Webster, New York, killed himself. A life sentence hardly dissuades a killer who is willing to take his own life.) Cuomo is also pushing legislation that would make late-term and partial birth

abortion legal and available “on demand.” The proposed legislation would also allow non-physicians to perform abortions, and eliminate parental notice requirements. [41523, 41827]

In their eagerness to pass the legislation, Cuomo and the New York legislators did not realize that their restrictions on high-capacity magazines and carrying guns near schools did not include an exemption for police officers—almost all of whom carry 9mm guns with 15-round magazines. [41622, 41642, 41662]

It is later reported that the New York legislation, tough as it is, was watered down. According to TheRealRevo.com, Democrat legislators in the state senate had called for: “1. Confiscation of ‘assault weapons’ 2. Confiscation of ten round clips 3. Statewide database for ALL Guns 4. Continue to allow pistol permit holder’s information to be released to the public 5. Label semiautomatic shotguns with more than 5 rounds or pistol grips as ‘assault weapons’ 6. Limit the number of rounds in a magazine to 5 and confiscation and forfeiture of banned magazines 7. Limit possession to no more than two (2) magazines 8. Limit purchase of guns to one gun per person per month 9. Require re-licensing of all pistol permit owners 10. Require renewal of all pistol permits every five years 11. State issued pistol permits 12. Micro-stamping of all guns in New York State 13. Require licensing of all gun ammo dealers 14. Mandatory locking of guns at home 15. Fee for licensing, registering weapons.” New York Assemblyman Steve McLaughlin was told, “I would recommend not to have that list shared because it really has the capacity to, uh, dampen the enthusiasm to compromise.” (New York state senators had actually proposed *confiscating guns*—yet Obama, his fellow Democrats, and media leftists continue to insist that they have no plans to confiscate guns. Cuomo himself has stated, “Confiscation could be an option. Mandatory sale to the state could be an option. Permitting could be an option—keep your gun but permit it.” Senator Dianne Feinstein (D-CA) said on *60 Minutes* in 1995, “If I could have gotten 51 votes in the Senate of the United States for an outright ban, picking up every one of them... Mr. and Mrs. American turn em all in. I would have done it.” In 2007 then-Congressman Rahm Emanuel (D-IL) called for no one on the government’s no-fly list be allowed to own a gun. Of course, it is the government that decides what names go on that list of more than 400,000 Americans.) [41709, 41710, 41737, 42023, 42443]

New York State Senator Greg Ball remarks, “We haven’t saved any lives tonight [by passing this legislation], except for one: the political life of a governor who wants to be president.” The legislation was forced through the state senate without debate, and without the usual three-day public review period required by law. *New York Post* editor Fred Dicker states, “This is a Trojan Horse. This is not about semi-automatic rifles. This is a sweeping set of gun laws the governor is using. The governor is using the tragedy [of Sandy Hook]... as a justification for sweeping changes in gun laws including regulating every single gun millions of New Yorkers now own. ...It’s another reason people are going to be leaving New York.” (Criminals in New York are no doubt celebrating the disarming of their victims.) [41505, 41506, 41522, 41552]

The NRA issues a statement: “The National Rifle Association and our New York members are outraged at the draconian gun control bill that was rushed through the process late Monday evening. Governor Andrew Cuomo and the New York State Legislature orchestrated a secretive end-run around the legislative and democratic process and passed sweeping anti-gun measures with no committee hearings and no public input. Hammered out in a backroom in Albany, S. 2230 was quickly drafted and released 20 minutes prior to the Senate vote. It passed as the clock ticked toward midnight. This legislation lowers New York’s arbitrary magazine capacity limit from ten rounds to seven. It also greatly expands the state’s existing ban on commonly owned semi-automatic firearms, and will require New York gun owners to undergo background checks on ammunition purchases. These gun control schemes have failed in the past and will have no impact on public safety and crime. Sadly, the New York Legislature gave no consideration to that reality. While lawmakers could have taken a step toward strengthening mental health reporting and focusing on criminals, they opted for trampling the rights of law-abiding gun owners in New York, and they did it under a veil of secrecy. The legislature caved to the political demands of a Governor and helped fuel his personal political aspirations. New York lawmakers have ignored and excluded gun owners throughout this legislative process, but the NRA and our New York members remain committed to having a meaningful conversation about protecting our children and will speak frankly about the lawmakers who have failed to do so.” [41547]

Texas quickly posts an Internet ad that reads, “WANTED: Law abiding New York gun owners seeking lower taxes and greater opportunities,” and notes that because Texas has no state income tax, “you’ll be able to keep more of what you earn and use that extra money to buy more ammo.” [41627]

Tens of thousands of New York gun owners can be expected to defy Governor Cuomo’s gun law. In fact, suggests Newser.com, their defiance may turn out to be one of the greatest acts of civil disobedience in the state’s history. Brian Olesen, president of the American Shooters Supply, tells the *New York Post*, “I’ve heard from hundreds of people that they’re prepared to defy the law, and that number will be magnified by the thousands, by the tens of thousands, when the registration deadline comes.” The *Post* reports, “Officials estimate at least 1 million semiautomatic rifles are owned in the state, sources said. And come April 15, 2014—when Cuomo is expected to be running for re-election—they all have to be registered with the State Police. National Rifle Association President David Keene states, “While we don’t get involved in campaigns to resist the law, I will say this: Historic experience here and in Canada shows that when you try to force gun owners into a registration and licensing system, there’s usually mass opposition and mass noncompliance. I think it’s going to be very difficult for the governor to get mass compliance with this new law.” State Rifle and Pistol Association President Tom King, a member of the NRA board of directors, comments, “They’re saying, ‘F--- the governor! F--- Cuomo! We’re not going to register our guns,’ and I think they’re serious. People are not going to do it. People are going to resist.” [41969, 41970, 41971]

Donald Trump tells *Human Events*, “Well, I like John Boehner very much and I respect him very much, so I don’t understand the reasoning behind the last [budget] negotiation.

Republicans were in an incredibly strong position. They got nothing and they gave up their most powerful card. Republicans just didn't seem to have the ability to deal with this issue. ... They gave up an unbelievably powerful card. If they allowed it to go over the cliff, even for a day or two, I think they would have won on every single item they wanted and gotten the big deal. ... I think times have changed. Obama feels emboldened and empowered with his election win. He will do things this time that he would not have done then. Obama will just work around Republicans. He will play the 14th amendment card, there's no doubt. Republicans have given up their biggest card. ... The best opportunity was lost and now Republicans aren't in a strong a position either way. But for the good of the country they need to hold firm for the big deal. If they don't, the country will go hell. Not for us. For our children and grandchildren. We will never be able to recover." [41507]

Senator Rand Paul; (R-KY) tells CBN News, "I'm against having a king. I think having a monarch is what we fought the American Revolution over and someone who wants to bypass the Constitution, bypass Congress—that's someone who wants to act like a king or a monarch. I've been opposed to executive orders, even with Republican presidents. But one that wants to infringe on the Second Amendment, we will fight tooth and nail, and I promise you there'll be no rock left unturned as far as trying to stop [Obama] from usurping the Constitution, running roughshod over Congress. And you will see one heck of a debate if he decides to try to do this." [41508]

Senator Paul tells BusinessInsider.com that Secretary of State Hillary Clinton "has to accept responsibility for Benghazi. That's the problem with government—government is anonymous and so no one is accountable. The reason you want somebody to be accountable is that you don't want someone to make that decision again. She needs to be held accountable for it, and I think she needs to answer questions for it. ... In government, there is usually an incentive to overspend when it comes to security. You're in charge of security in Benghazi and someone asks you for a 16-person detail—and the security people on the ground in Libya are asking you for it—it's impossible to say no. So how did someone possibly say no to that security? That's an incredible ineptness. It was an enormous mistake. It was a career-ending mistake, I think." (Clinton will no doubt be fuming when she learns of Paul's remarks. It may be the opening salvo in the 2016 presidential race, and his warning that she will not be allowed to ignore her incompetence—even if the media tries its best to help her do so.) [41563]

Author and radio talk show host Laura Ingraham says, "The more I think about it, the more it seems that Colin Powell's appearance on the *Meet the Press* was well coordinated with the White House, with his dear friend, with whom he campaigned, Barack Obama. ... What was so special about yesterday late morning [that Obama chose it for his press conference]? It was directly within the maelstrom of a news cycle driven by Colin Powell's [remark about a] 'dark vein of intolerance' within the Republican Party." (Powell calls Republicans racists, and the next day Obama calls a press conference to excoriate Republicans.) Ingraham notes Obama's statement, "I think there are a lot of Republicans at this point that feel that, given how much energy has been devoted in some of the media that is preferred by Republican constituencies to demonize me, that it

doesn't look real good socializing with me." Ingraham adds, "When I hear [Obama] make comments about 'They don't like to socialize,' 'They demonize me,' I feel like we're playing the victim card here, maybe playing the race card. ...I'd rather have a colon cleanse than to actually have to listen to Colin Powell on the Republican Party. What was more coordinated?" The Susan Rice testimony on Benghazi, or the Powell appearance on *Meet the Press*?" [41509]

The White House finally gets around to (barely) condemning Egyptian President Mohamed Morsi for calling Jews "the descendants of apes and pigs" and "we should employ all forms of resistance against them"—but Obama still plans on giving Egypt F-16s and 200 tanks to use against Israel. Press Secretary Jay Carney tells reporters that Morsi "should make clear that he respects people of all faiths, and that this type of rhetoric is not acceptable or productive in a democratic Egypt." (Barry Rubin, director of Global Research in International Affairs, comments, "Acceptable? It is the norm now." Rubin tells DailyCaller.com that Morsi's statements were "not equivalent to an American politician making a gaffe... but are a core aspect of the Islamist and [Muslim] Brotherhood ideology, from which its policy behavior will flow [as it gains additional power].") [41203, 41209, 41511, 41512, 41513, 41535, 41633]

Members of the House of Representatives succeed in loading up a Hurricane Sandy relief bill with pork, raising the \$17 billion price to \$60.4 billion. The legislation passes 241–180, mostly with Democrat votes (179 Republicans vote no), and essentially spends every dime of additional 2013 income tax revenue gained from the "fiscal cliff" deal. [41553]

*The Telegraph* reports, "Germany's Bundesbank is to repatriate gold reserves held abroad to tighten control and combat currency crises in the future, pulling a chunk of its holdings from New York and all its bullion from Paris. The move marks an extraordinary breakdown in trust between leading central banks and has set off ferment among gold enthusiasts, with some comparing it with France's withdrawal of gold from the US under President Charles de Gaulle as the Bretton Woods currency system crumbled in the late 1960s. ...The latest shift in strategy follows criticism by the German Court of Auditors, who said in a confidential report that the gold held abroad had 'never been verified physically' and was not under proper control. A growing chorus of lawmakers in the Bundestag has demanded a return of all Germany's gold in case the financial crisis escalates. Veteran gold trader Jim Sinclair said the Bundesbank's move is a pivotal event in the gold market and the latest warning for investors that they should keep metal bars under their physical control, rather than relying on paper contracts. 'This sends a message about storing gold near you and taking delivery no matter who is holding it. When France did this years ago it sent panic amongst the US financial leadership. History will look back on this salvo as being the beginning of the end of the US dollar as the reserve currency of choice,' he said." A Bundesbank spokesman states, "No, we have no intention to sell gold." The relocation of over 600 metric tons of gold, the largest such move in history, "is in case of a currency crisis." [41566, 41567, 41583, 41629, 41630, 41735, 41736, 41840, 41886, 42089, 42141, 42288]

At Forbes.com, Agustino Fontaavecchia later writes, “[T]he gold coming from the U.S. [300 tons] will probably have to be flown in [back to Germany]. This will probably have to be done in 3 to 5 ton shipments, the maximum insurance companies will cover, meaning it will take between 60 and 100 flights. ...Germany’s gold repatriation raises questions as to their belief in both the strength of the global economy and the European Monetary Union, and their trust of fellow central banks. It also suggests the Bundesbank, with a reputation for independence, has felt the pressure of the public, and those federal audits.” (It also suggests that Germany has no reason not to suspect that the U.S. government will continue to print money to cover its massive deficits.) GoldMoney.com’s Alasdair Macleod later reports that the gold will be shipped over a *seven year period*, which “tends to confirm suspicions that the gold does not actually exist. ...[T]he whole exercise is a public relations stunt. ...[I]ndependent deductive analysis has concluded that the central banks have been supplying the market with physical bullion in order to suppress the price, all of which is either officially denied or goes unanswered.” Macleod speculates, “[T]here is not enough physical gold left in the vault to deliver to Germany, which is why they are stalling for time. What was presented to us last Wednesday was just a desperate attempt to stop the whole issue becoming more public.” (It is worth noting that in late 2012 the Federal Reserve refused a request to audit the gold it is supposedly holding for Germany. Author and investor Peter Schiff asks, “One cannot help but wonder if the refusal triggered the demand.”) [41630, 41735, 41736, 41886, 42288]

TenthAmendmentCenter.com reports that a state senator in South Carolina has filed “...a Joint Resolution to Nullify Executive Orders infringing upon the second amendment, and the right to keep and bear arms. This Joint Resolution has been referred to the Senate Committee of Judiciary. SB 224 states, ‘Any federal executive order restricting, abridging, or otherwise infringing upon the free exercise of a citizen’s second amendment right to keep and bear arms is unconstitutional and shall not be enforced by any federal, state, or local law enforcement agency within South Carolina.’” [41515]

National Rifle Association (NRA) president David Keene tells *Newsmax*, “Our concern is the same that most Americans should have whenever a president tries to circumvent Congress, because what the president is really saying is ‘I’m going to do these things myself, and I’m not going to submit them to the representatives of the people. We don’t know what [Obama is] going to try to do by executive order. There are obviously some things he can’t do and there are some things he shouldn’t be doing, but in order to implement these various changes he’s going to have to go to Congress to get the money to fund it. So there are going to be votes on these things, there is going to be a debate in Congress, and our members and other gun owners, and believers of the Second Amendment, are going to have the right to be heard. ...Congress, regardless of the issue, whether it’s firearms regulation or anything else, should be very jealous of its own prerogative and I expect this Congress will probably take action against [Obama]. You don’t have to go as far as impeachment. You could cut off the funds to implement these kinds of things. You can take congressional action to reverse what he does in any instances.” If Obama seeks to abrogate or restrict Second Amendment rights, Keens says, “We could go to court. We could ask our friends to go to court, and we could certainly

ask our friends in Congress to take action to reverse what [Obama] does. The NRA is viewed by [Obama] and others as the roadblock standing in the way of his violating the Constitution in these instances. It's not the NRA, it's the people we represent. They keep talking about how powerful we are. It's not us, it's the people of this country who understand the Constitution, value the Second Amendment, and are very jealous of the right that they have." [41520]

Keene continues, "The fact is that right now the American people are smarter than their politicians. The Gallup Poll and others show that they don't support a so-called assault weapons ban. They know we had one, and they know it didn't work. Right now I don't see the Congress passing an assault weapons ban, which is why [Obama] is sort of seen to be backing from that. His more rabid advisers want to proceed regardless, but it's going to depend on how much of his political capital he's willing to spend in such a fight. [Obama] says these are assault weapons designed to wreak havoc in battle. The AR-15 is not an assault weapon designed to wreak havoc in battle. It's a semi-automatic commercial rifle. If we equipped our Army with it, we would lose to every third-world, tin-pot dictator because military assault weapons are full automatic machine guns. So what happens is you create a caricature and then you sell it and pretty soon even people who think they're being fair accept it and you're dealing in mythology rather than reality." [41520]

"One reason we're having the battle is that following the tragedy in Connecticut the administration really asked the wrong question. The question they asked was not how do we protect our kids, what do we do to prevent or minimize the chances of this happening again. The question they asked was what can we do about guns, because that's what they wanted to do and have wanted to do for some time. On the question of how do we protect our kids, there is area for common ground. One thing, since the 1960s we have been concerned—and it was in the 1960s that the mental health system in this country began to collapse—about the violently mentally ill getting their hands on firearms. If you go back to one of the most famous early mass shootings, it was the fellow who climbed onto the clock tower at the University of Texas after telling his psychiatrist what he was going to do: climb up onto the clock tower and shoot students. And we said at that time that we need to be looking at this and finding ways to prevent these people from getting their hands on firearms. We have proposed over time that those who've been adjudicated to be potentially violently mentally ill should be included on the list that are checked when someone tries to buy a gun so that they will be prohibited from buying one. At one point, some years ago, [Senator] Chuck Schumer on national television shook hands with Wayne LaPierre, our executive vice president, and said, 'I'll help you do that.' It hasn't been done. Nothing's been done." [41520]

Asked if the Obama administration is politicizing the shootings at the Sandy Hook Elementary School in Connecticut, Keene responds: "Of course they are. The entire anti-Second Amendment network in this country, led by politicians and funded by [New York City Mayor] Michael Bloomberg, was just waiting for an opportunity to pursue the agenda that they've wanted to pursue for some time. Sandy Hook gave them that opportunity and they swung into action. Obama [is someone] who long before he ran for



office was an anti-Second Amendment activist. This is a [person] who before he was re-elected told Sarah Brady, the head of one of the leading anti-Second Amendment groups in this country, that he had to operate, at that time, under the radar. This is a [person] who's doing what he's always wanted to do and it has less to do with gun violence than it has to do with pursuing an ideological agenda." [41520]

"We have a system now where if you want to buy a firearm in a gun shop or at a gun show from a licensed firearm dealer, you go through the Instant Check System. Last year, something like 77,000 people who tried to buy firearms were denied the purchase because they were in prohibited categories, felons and the like. Attempting to buy a firearm, if you're in one of those prohibited groups, is in itself a crime. I believe the government has prosecuted [only] 47 or 48 of those 77,000 people. And when we raised that question, we were told the government doesn't have time to be doing all of this; we have more important things to do. Well, if the laws that we have are not enforced because the government just doesn't have the time to do it, why would they go out and seek more laws? It's not because they're trying to solve a problem. It's because they don't believe Americans should have the right to own and use firearms. But I'm convinced that we'll be able as a united community, not just the NRA but the millions and millions of Americans who care about the Second Amendment, who are hunters, who are shooters, who use firearms for self-defense, who collect firearms, or who simply believe in the values that the Second Amendment represents, we're going to prevail. We've prevailed in the past and we will this time as well." (Providing false information on ATF Form 4473 when buying a weapon is a felony punishable by up to 10 years in prison. Jim Baker, an NRA representative present at a meeting with Joe Biden, tells DailyCaller.com that Biden said, "And to your point, Mr. Baker, regarding the lack of prosecutions on lying on Form 4473s, we simply don't have the time or manpower to prosecute everybody who lies on a form, that checks a wrong box, that answers a question inaccurately." The government does not have the time or manpower to prosecute people who break the law, so the Obama administration recommends passing more laws that can be ignored. Expanding background checks is meaningless if almost no one is prosecuted for lying on the forms. Biden allowed Baker a mere five minutes to make its case with regard to how best to deal with gun violence.) [41520, 41624, 41643, 41644, 41660, 41683]

According to DailyCaller.com, "The Federal Bureau of Investigation's National Instant Criminal Background Check System (NICS) is reporting that they have records on 5,216,732 illegal or unlawful aliens. These records are kept under the 'Prohibited Category Description' of those in the United States that are not allowed to purchase a firearm." (The number suggests that there are far more than 11 million illegal immigrants in the United States, the number most often used by politicians and the media.) [41540]

On *The O'Reilly Factor*, syndicated columnist Charles Krauthammer observes that Obama has deliberately tried to destroy the Republican party "...ever since Election Day. I wrote a column the first week of December pointing out his entire strategy for the fiscal cliff was to split the Republicans. His offers had nothing to do with solving the fiscal issue or solving the debt. He showed no interest in reducing the debt since he was elected in 2008. He appoints a commission. Two years later, he ignores it. ...He wants the

entitlement state. ...But his strategy with the fiscal cliff—as is his strategy with the debt ceiling—is to split, fracture and therefore neuter Republicans in the House, because that is all that stands between him and total dominance of Washington in his second term. ...When you look where the Democrats were in 2000, when they lost, they had no leadership. Who was going to lead the party after the Gore defeat? In 2004, who was leader of the party? Nobody even heard of Barack Obama. ...Every time a party loses, you get a book coming out saying [there is a] permanent Republican majority, [or a] permanent liberal majority. Nothing in the country is permanent.” [41539]

On January 16 Alex Jones, of the controversial InfoWars.com, calls for the impeachment of Obama. Jones writes, “The time has now come for a bill of impeachment to be introduced and debated in Congress. Obama’s crimes are public, and the debate in the House will serve as a court in which to display the tyrannical activities of ...Obama and his cohorts. As in the case of Richard Nixon, the exposure of Obama’s crimes may cause him to resign in disgrace. If he does not step down, the full House will then vote to begin the impeachment trial in the US Senate. The time has now come to make your decision—to stand up to evil or get on your knees as a willing slave.” Jones lists some of Obama’s crimes against the United States Constitution and its citizens: “He has clearly communicated his intent to eviscerate the second amendment rights of American citizens by pursuing executive orders to curtail the right to keep and bear arms without congressional authorization and in violation of the second amendment. ... He has aided America’s enemies, violating his oath, by sending funds to insurgents in Syria who are being commanded by Al-Qaeda terrorists. He has violated federal law by overseeing a cover-up surrounding Operation Fast and Furious, the transfer of guns to Mexican drug cartels direct from the federal government. He has lied to the American people by overseeing a cover-up of the Benghazi attack which directly led to the deaths of four American citizens. The cover-up has been called ‘Obama’s Watergate,’ yet four months after the incident, no one in the administration has been held accountable. He has brazenly undermined the power of Congress by insisting his authority came from the United Nations Security Council prior to the attack on Libya and that Congressional approval was not necessary.” [41514]

“...He has ignored Congressional rejection of the cybersecurity bill and instead indicated he will pursue an unconstitutional executive order. He has signed into law the National Defense Authorization Act which includes provisions that permit the abduction and military detention without trial of U.S. citizens, violating Habeas Corpus. Despite Obama claiming he would not use the provisions to incarcerate U.S. citizens, it was his administration that specifically demanded these powers be included in the final NDAA bill. He has enacted universal health care mandates that force Americans to buy health insurance, a clear violation of the Constitution in exceeding congressional power to regulate interstate commerce. Obama has also handed out preferential waivers to corporations friendly to his administration. He has declared war on America’s coal industry by promising to bankrupt any company that attempts to build a new coal plant while using unconstitutional EPA regulations to strangle competition, ensuring Americans see their energy costs rise year after year. He has violated the Constitution’s Takings and Due Process Clauses when he bullied the secured creditors of automaker

Chrysler into accepting 30 cents on the dollar while politically connected labor unions and preferential others received better deals. He has violated Article II of the Constitution by using signing statements as part of his executive usurpation of power. ...For these, and other offenses which constitute high crimes and misdemeanors, including perjury of oath, abuse of authority, bribery, intimidation, misuse of assets, failure to supervise, dereliction of duty, conduct unbecoming and refusal to obey a lawful order, we call for the immediate impeachment of Barack H. Obama.” [41514]

BeforeItsNews.com posts the following: “On January 15, 2013 a law enforcement officer in the north end of the greater Houston area stopped a semi tractor-trailer driver, who was heading in a southerly direction, during a routine check for drugs. During a search of the cargo of the trailer, he discovered packages of road signs that read the following: ‘Martial Law in effect.’ The driver had a bill of lading in his possession stating that this cargo’s destination was to the Department of Homeland Security.” (This claim has appeared on various Facebook pages. *The Obama Timeline* has no way of confirming the story. It is repeated here only to inform *Timeline* readers, who are free to make their own judgment about its veracity.) [41854]

At WND.com Erik Rush reports that, according to an “international business interest with strong ties” to China and the United States, “Obama had a mid-level U.S. official meet with a Chinese officer in 2011 to find out if the Chinese were open to a land and resource swap for debt forgiveness. The upshot of this is that the Chinese are now engaging in experimental ‘farming’ and ‘scientific’ studies in several locations in the U.S. (in various states). The personnel involved are all Chinese military, and the plan is to use these as the base for the expansion of ‘land settlements’ in payment of the U.S. debt to China. ...Also in 2011, the Bank of China reportedly sent a team to the U.S. to do land analysis and valuations based on resources that have been identified on federally held lands. The group was tasked to visit various pre-selected sites, including some on the Gulf of Mexico, and arrive at resource-based values between \$2 trillion and \$5 trillion (enough to satisfy America’s debt to China). According to this scenario, the issuing of new drilling licenses in the U.S. have been stopped on federally held land until the Chinese can be in position to take over new oil production. ...So Obama has sold America out—literally—which will come as little surprise to many readers, this plan apparently being the brainchild of Obama’s senior adviser, Valerie Jarrett, and members of China’s Politburo Standing Committee. Thus, the under-reported but long-standing goals of Jarrett, Obama, David Axelrod and a host of communist Obama cronies to bring America under communist sway will finally come to fruition. Such activities have been rumored over the last couple of years, but had not been substantiated. However, this data has been verified by sources I know to be reliable; in fact, I have reported on their information previously, much to the consternation of the Chinese government. *It is the Chinese who are pushing for the disarming of the American populace.* They do not want to bear the brunt of the backlash from the American public when their work and aspirations are exposed. Three weeks ago, I was told that ‘this will happen in weeks, not months,’ and it is now occurring.” [42463]

Ken Salazar, Secretary of the Interior, announces he will leave the Obama administration at the end of March and return to Colorado. (Michelle Malkin comments, “Screw up, cover up, move up, pack up. After trampling the rule of law, defying court orders, doctoring scientific conclusions, threatening the media for asking inconvenient questions, and destroying countless jobs in the name of environmental protection, ...Obama’s loathsome cowboy Interior Secretary Ken Salazar is finally headed for the exit door. ...Good riddance and DLTDHYOTWO [don’t let the door hit you on the way out]. For the sake of my fellow Coloradans, let’s hope Salazar isn’t headed for the revolving door back into another position of power. We’ve had enough.”) [41550].

Israeli Prime Minister Binyamin Netanyahu responds to Obama’s remark that Israel does not know what its own best interests are, saying, “I think everyone understands that only Israel’s citizens are those who will be the ones to determine who faithfully represents Israel’s vital interests.” (Netanyahu faces an election on January 22. Obama would like to see him lose, but his comment may have backfired. It may prompt some Israelis to respond, “Who is Obama to tell us what to do and what to think? We’ll elect whoever we want to elect.”) Obama once said of Netanyahu that he is a “political coward—an essentially unchallenged leader who nevertheless is unwilling to lead or spend political capital to advance the cause of compromise.” (That is, Obama—who rarely shows evidence of any willingness to compromise—thinks Netanyahu should agree to turn over more Israeli land to the Palestinians in exchange for peace that never materializes.) [41604, 41605]

FoxNews.com reports that an Egyptian court has sentenced a woman and her seven children to 15 years in prison for converting from Islam to Christianity. (This is the direct result of Obama’s efforts to oust former president Hosni Mubarak so that he could be replaced with Muslim Brotherhood member Mohamed Morsi. The “Arab Spring” is an Arab nightmare for those who do not fall into line and support Islamist Shari’ah law. About 10 percent of Egyptians are Coptic Christians, which was allowed under the Mubarak regime. Under Morsi, they are all at risk of persecution—apparently with the blessings of Obama—who is giving Morsi \$1.5 billion in aid, tanks, and F-16 fighter planes to use against Israel.) [41634, 41635]

Gustavo Cruz-Lozano turns himself in to authorities on charges of threatening to kill Hidalgo County, Texas Sheriff Lupe Treviño. Cruz-Luzano also claims that he killed Border Patrol Agent Brian Terry on December 14, 2010. [41652]

In *The Wall Street Journal* Keith Hennessey, director of the National Economic Council for President George W. Bush, suggests a plan to deal with the debt ceiling: “Step one is for House Republicans to argue for and pass a debt-limit increase combined with present and future spending cuts. ...Obama will reject deep spending cuts and accuse Republicans of playing dangerous games with our financial system. So what next? [Obama] wants a very large increase in the debt ceiling—he and his team have demanded either no limit at all, or a five-year increase, which means at least a few trillion dollars. His obvious goal is to punt the issue past the 2014 midterm election. Yet if he has to ask Congress for a new increase every few months, the spending problem his administration

has exacerbated in his first term will dominate the policy agenda—when he wants to work on other issues. That brings us to step two, which is for congressional Republicans to offer ...Obama a choice. He can have a long-term debt-limit increase if he agrees to cut spending, or he can have repeated, short-term increases without spending cuts. If [Obama] continues to dodge the country's long-term spending problem, the solution is to force him to ask Congress every few months to give him the authority to borrow more while facing questions about why he refuses to restrain spending. ...Step three is the critical lever for applying public pressure to Democrats to cut spending. Congressional Republicans would explain that they will support the first alternative—a long-term debt-limit increase coupled with spending cuts. They will allow short-term debt increases to occur—but they will not support them. This means that if ...Obama agrees to cut spending, he will get his long-term debt-limit increase and most Republicans would vote for it. If, however, he refuses to cut spending and instead chooses repeated short-term increases, then he and House Minority Leader Nancy Pelosi would have to ensure that all 197 House Democrats vote aye. House Speaker John Boehner would commit to delivering only the 20 or so Republican votes that are needed to ensure the bill passed. ...The point of this strategy is to force Democrats to take responsibility for more borrowing without spending cuts, over and over again. [41666, 41745]

White House press secretary Jay Carney whines about a National Rifle Association ad that criticizes Obama's calls for gun control and opposition to school guards while his daughters attend a private school with armed guards. Carney, who apparently believes his children and Obama's children are more important than those of the average American, says, "Most Americans agree that [Obama's] children should not be used as pawns in a political fight, but to go so far as to make the safety of [his] children the subject of an attack ad is repugnant and cowardly." (In other words, "Do as I say and not as I do, and do not dare criticize me for doing what I do—at your expense.") Slate.com's Matt Yglesias remarks, "[I'm] Pretty comfortable saying that [Obama's] children are in fact more important than yours." [41529, 41568, 41571]

Surrounded by children—to better shame legislators into supporting his gun control proposals—Obama calls on Congress to approve his "common sense measures" to reduce gun violence. Obama asks for universal background checks and a ban on "assault weapons" and high capacity magazines. He states that he has 23 executive actions covering changes to education and mental health that he plans to sign immediately. "I intend to use whatever weight this office holds to make them a reality. If there's even one thing that we can do to reduce this violence, if there's even one life that can be saved, then we have an obligation to try. And I'm going to do my part." Predictably, Obama demands that Congress "restore a ban on military style assault weapons" because "weapons designed for the theater of war have no place in a movie theater." (Obama does not explain why merely adding a pistol grip or a barrel shroud—which does nothing but protect the shooter from being burned if he touches a hot barrel—somehow transforms a rifle into a powerful weapon of war. U.S. troops would have been massacred in Iraq and Afghanistan if they had only AR-15s while the enemy had automatic fire weapons.) [41527, 41528, 41556, 41572, 41663]

Obama also demands that Congress confirm B. Todd Jones as director of the ATF. (Jones is currently the acting director.) Jones issued a video message to all department employees in which he stated, “[I]f you make poor choices, that if you don’t abide by the rules, that if you don’t respect the chain of command, if you don’t find the appropriate way to raise your concerns to your leadership, there will be consequences...” That message was a threat to Operation Fast and Furious whistleblowers. Jones is a longtime pal of Attorney General Eric Holder, with whom he worked when Holder orchestrated the whitewash of the Waco, Texas massacre of innocent civilians. Jones was also involved in Operation Fast and Furious from the beginning. [16066, 23918, 23938, 23943, 23945, 23981, 25324, 34532, 41527, 41528, 41560, 41668]

Obama had also considered Andrew Traver for the ATF position. As noted previously in this *Timeline*, Traver was the politically-connected bureau chief in the ATF’s Chicago field division. He was opposed by the National Rifle Association and other Second Amendment groups because of his gun control beliefs. Even within the ATF, Traver’s appointment was opposed because of his “inexperience” and “lack of professionalism.” PajamasMedia.com pointed out, “Like ...Obama, Traver has been tied to the left-wing Joyce Foundation, which bankrolls various anti-gun organizations and which counts among its many initiatives an attempt to subvert Second Amendment scholarship. Traver lent his voice to a deceptive NBC News article, purposefully blurring the lines between fully automatic military machine guns and civilian-legal, semi-automatic rifles that fire one bullet when the trigger is pulled.” [16066, 23918, 23938, 23943, 23945, 23981, 25324, 34532, 41527, 41528, 41560, 41668]

On CBS, enthusiastic Obama-booster Bob Schieffer says of Obama’s gun control comments, “This is one of the best speeches I’ve ever heard him deliver, but it’s going to take more than that from the White House. He’s going to have to get his hands dirty. He’s going to have to get in there and—and work this problem until he gets it done. But unless we figure out a way to make sure that something like Newtown never happens again, we’re not the country that we once were. I think we still are. I think there’s hope. I think something’s going to happen here.” (Schieffer’s support of Obama apparently has left him unable to recognize reality. Obama essentially caved in to the NRA with his list of proposals, few of which are significant. Additionally, Obama has no prayer of getting Congress to agree to strict gun control legislation—not with a GOP-controlled House and a Senate with 21 skittish Democrats up for reelection in 2014.) Schieffer also remarks that “surely defeating the Nazis, uh, was a much more formidable task than taking on the gun lobby.” (As if comparing to Nazis an organization of responsible Americans who promote gun safety and responsibility is not bad enough, Schieffer has his facts wrong. The NRA supports the right of civilians to have weapons in order to prevent thugs like the Nazis from coming to power. It is the Nazis who confiscated guns from civilians—as Obama would do if he could get away with it. Schieffer is also wrong in that Obama’s efforts to restrict gun ownership do not represent a fight against the NRA but a fight against the U.S. Constitution and the American people.) [41565, 41619]

According to Newsmax.com, Obama’s list of 23 executive orders are as follows:

“1. Issue a Presidential Memorandum to require federal agencies to make relevant data available to the federal background-check system. [Obama does not define “relevant.” Is the posting of anti-Obama cartoons on the Internet relevant? Is signing a secession petition relevant? Obama’s planned actions may be in violation of the Fourth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution.]

2. Address unnecessary legal barriers, particularly relating to the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act, that may prevent states from making information available to the background-check system. [What makes a legal barrier “unnecessary?”]

3. Improve incentives for states to share information with the background-check system. [Is Obama threatening states with the loss of federal funds if they do not cooperate with his demands for data on private citizens?]

4. Direct the attorney general to review categories of individuals prohibited from having a gun to make sure dangerous people are not slipping through the cracks. [This could be accomplished with a telephone call and certainly does not require an Executive Order. In any event, it is a request for criminal profiling. Does reading LewRockwell.com make one “dangerous?” Does Attorney General Eric Holder now have free will to come up with his own categories of “dangerous?” On what Constitutional basis can Obama and Holder define as “dangerous” citizens who may never have broken any laws but who may disagree with them politically? Does a “Live free or die!” bumper sticker make one dangerous and prohibited from owning a gun?]

5. Propose rulemaking to give law enforcement the ability to run a full background check on an individual before returning a seized gun. [What will be the criteria for not returning a gun?]

6. Publish a letter from the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms and Explosives to federally licensed gun dealers providing guidance on how to run background checks for private sellers. [Obama is here laying the groundwork for procedures to be followed by private citizens exchanging guns, such as the sale of a gun to one’s brother-in-law or leaving a rifle to one’s grandson in a will.]

7. Launch a national safe and responsible gun ownership campaign. [Use taxpayer funds to create anti-gun propaganda.]

8. Review safety standards for gun locks and gun safes (Consumer Product Safety Commission). [Make guns more difficult to access and use, giving the advantage to the armed burglars who do not comply with the laws.]

9. Issue a Presidential Memorandum to require federal law enforcement to trace guns recovered in criminal investigations. [Will the federal government be involved in *every* local crime involving a gun? What are the manpower requirements? What will it cost? How might such federal power be abused?]

10. Release a Department of Justice report analyzing information on lost and stolen guns and make it widely available to law enforcement. [Will data from Operation Fast and Furious be included?]

11. Nominate an ATF director. [This is not an “Executive Order;” it is simply a reminder to Obama to do his job. Preferably he will choose someone who will not come up with schemes like Operation Fast and Furious but who will enforce existing laws, going after criminals rather than law-abiding citizens who happen to own guns.]

12. Provide law enforcement, first responders, and school officials with proper training for active shooter situations. [One would think all law enforcement officers and first responders have already had such training.]

13. Maximize enforcement efforts to prevent gun violence and prosecute gun crime. [That is, actually enforce existing law—which federal officials and law enforcement officers apparently need to be reminded by Obama to do.]

14. Issue a Presidential Memorandum directing the Centers for Disease Control to research the causes and prevention of gun violence. [President Jimmy Carter ordered such a study in order to gin up support for gun control. After four years and millions of dollars, the study—conducted by gun control advocates—ultimately concluded, “Gun control laws do not reduce crime.”]

15. Direct the attorney general to issue a report on the availability and most effective use of new gun-safety technologies and challenge the private sector to develop innovative technologies. [Make guns more expensive to own and operate, thereby discouraging their use.]

16. Clarify that the Affordable Care Act does not prohibit doctors asking their patients about guns in their homes. [Obama wants to encourage, if not force, doctors to snitch on gun owners. ObamaCare does, in fact, prohibit physicians from asking such questions. Obama’s order therefore illegally revokes an act of Congress. If a rape victim confesses to a psychologist that she has fantasies about killing the rapist, must that doctor report her so that any gun she may own can be confiscated?]

17. Release a letter to healthcare providers clarifying that no federal law prohibits them from reporting threats of violence to law enforcement authorities. [That is, frighten healthcare providers into becoming snitches.]

18. Provide incentives for schools to hire school resource officers. [Obama suggests \$150 million to hire “up to 1,000” armed resource officers and school counselors—for a nation with close to 100,000 public schools. It would be more effective—and cost less—to simply allow teachers and other school employees to carry their own guns.]



19. Develop model emergency-response plans for schools, houses of worship and institutions of higher education.
20. Release a letter to state health officials clarifying the scope of mental health services that Medicaid plans must cover.
21. Finalize regulations clarifying essential health benefits and parity requirements within Affordable Care Act exchanges.
22. Commit to finalizing mental-health parity regulations.
23. Launch a national dialogue led by Secretaries [Kathleen] Sebelius and [Arne] Duncan on mental health.” [This is also not an “Executive order;” it is a feel-good measure.]

None of the 23 items would have prevented the Sandy Hook tragedy. (In fact, there is conflicting information as to whether an “assault rifle” was even used. Some reports claim four handguns were found inside the school and the only rifle was inside the trunk of the car the killer used to drive there. One news video shows police officers examining the gun in the trunk of the car, yet the medical examiner told reporters all the wounds were from a rifle.) Congress can, if it chooses to do so, block many of the 23 orders simply by refusing to approve the tens of millions of dollars needed for implementation. With regard to item number two, HIPAA legislation severely limits the sharing of health information. Obama apparently wants law enforcement agencies to be able to obtain information from mental health providers. If an individual ever suffered from depression or perhaps sought marital counseling, for example, the government may be able to obtain that information and deny a gun permit—arguing that the person is “unstable.” Turning doctors into “gun snitches” may be the net result. Obama’s main goal, until he finds a way to confiscate guns, is to develop a comprehensive list of all gun owners—to make those confiscations easier. Obama’s dependence on Executive Orders is a result of the likelihood that he will not be able to get significant gun control legislation passed by Congress. Twenty-one Democrat Senators are up for reelection in 2014, and many of them are in states where their reelection can arguably not be taken for granted—and six of those 21 states voted for Mitt Romney over Obama in 2012. Among the Democrat senators who may be reluctant to vote for any strong gun control legislation are Mark Pryor (D-AR), Max Baucus (D-MT), Tim Johnson (D-SD), Kay Hagan (D-NC), Mary Landrieu (D-LA), and even Al Franken (D-MN)—all of whom are from states with large rural populations of gun-owners. [41525, 41526, 41527, 41549, 41569, 41573, 41576, 41577, 41582, 41625, 41626, 41628, 41686, 41704, 41769]

To help “shape the narrative,” the White House releases letters from school children pleading for gun control. According to the Associated Press, “Eleven-year-old Julia, who lives in the District of Columbia and dotted the ‘I’ [sic] in her name with a heart, wrote that she has four brothers and sisters and ‘I know I would not be able to bear the thought of losing any of them.’ She said it should be ‘very hard’ for people to buy guns and closed by acknowledging that Obama can’t do it alone. ‘I know that laws have to be passed by Congress but I beg you to try very hard to make guns not allowed. Not just for

me, but for the whole United States,' Julia wrote, signing the letter with 'my love and regrets.'" (Julia is among the children appearing with Obama as he announces his gun control proposals. The White House does not release any pro-gun letters from children who understand the U.S. Constitution and who have been taught how to use guns responsibly in self-defense.) [41543]

Al-Qaeda terrorists linked with al-Qaeda attack a BP natural gas field in Algeria and take 41 hostages, including seven Americans. State Department spokesperson Victoria Nuland says, "We are obviously closely monitoring the situation." The jihadists threaten to kill the hostages one by one if France continues to fight Islamist terrorists in Mali. (Mali is the main source of uranium for France's nuclear power industry.) Obama and Secretary of State Hillary Clinton are silent. (It is worth noting that during the presidential debates Mitt Romney mentioned the threat of radical Islamists in Mali and was ridiculed for doing so. Americans are now scurrying to find Mali on a map, confirming what Roman historian Tacitus wrote: "War teaches geography.") [41564, 41578, 41584, 41585, 41613, 41968]

DailyCaller.com reports that Congressman James Sensenbrenner (R-WI) "is calling on ...Obama to denounce an online video game that encourages players to shoot and kill National Rifle Association officials. In a letter to Obama, Sensenbrenner on Tuesday voiced concern about the video game, 'Bullet to the Head of the NRA,' which allows players to assassinate NRA President David Keene with a scoped firearm. 'Making threats against public figures who speak out either for or against gun control prevents us from having a reasonable, thoughtful debate,' Sensenbrenner wrote in his letter. 'Although we may have strong disagreements on the best ways to reduce gun violence, it is my hope that we can both agree that video games targeting specific individuals who speak out on this issue, is counterproductive.'" (The NRA has added as many as 250,000 new members since the Sandy Hook school shooting.) [41534, 41551]

Annoyed that too many Americans are signing petitions on the WhiteHouse.gov web "We the People" web page, the Obama administration increases from 25,000 to 100,000 the threshold at which it will respond to the petition. (The original threshold was 5,000.) [41538, 41607]

MyFoxNY.com reports, "A southwestern Pennsylvania hospital will stop delivering babies after March 31 because its obstetricians are either leaving or refocusing their practices, and because hospital officials believe they can't afford it based on projected reimbursements under looming federal health care reforms. The Windber Medical Center, about 60 miles southeast of Pittsburgh, is losing two obstetricians and two others are shifting their focus more to gynecology. Hospital officials say the population of women of child-bearing age is dropping and that the number of births the hospital would be called upon to perform isn't enough for it to provide the service in the face of lower reimbursements under the federal Affordable Care Act [ObamaCare]" [41559, 41589]

The Ulsterman Report hears from the Republican insider, who states, "Like me you were probably watching [Obama's] gun control speech today. [I] Was told this morning the

presentation today was a revised version that was completed just last night after a bunch of back and forth between the White House and Senate leaders. Guessing that would be Harry Reid mostly. Last week [Obama] was ready to go all in on the executive order scenario. Confiscation was going to be in play. Then the backlash came and it forced Obama to back off. He didn't want to but after Reid said it was a no go, and the NRA was preparing to go to war with the White House, [Obama] was given a revised script and that is what we heard this morning. You could tell too. Obama stumbled over the words more than usual. He didn't have the time to prep the script like he normally does. Probably fuming he was forced to read the new version also. This time WE WON and OBAMA LOST. If people want to know how to go at the administration, this is how you do it. Be informed, and make your voices heard. His is an example of how the new media I have been telling you about can work against the globalists. It can be a huge weapon against them. And a big thank you to the NRA. It took on Obama and didn't back off. A big part of the plan coming from the White House was to cripple the NRA and make it a liability for 2014 and beyond. That didn't work and it will be a liability, but one that is going to hurt Democrats, not conservatives. Big time backfire for the Obama White House. I was told it 'rocked them on their heels.' They fundamentally don't understand the American people and they didn't see this backlash coming. They have the media, and the glossy presentations, but they don't really understand the American people and this debate was a pure example of that being played out. I love it!" [41562]

"Congrats to the state governments that were willing to voice opposition too. They did that and took on a lot of risk. Heard a list is being made and federal dollars might be taken away from them. Those state leaders knew that could happen but took on the administration anyways. That's real leadership and courage being put on display for all of us and voters living in those states need to let those leaders know it is appreciated. You know how I feel about how important the 10th Amendment is, and today was also a big victory for the 10th Amendment against the Obama White House. Now from here it's clear Obama wants to try and use the issue as leverage for the 2014 midterms. They are hoping they can salvage something out of what became a fiasco for them. I just don't sense enough Democrats willing to play along on this one though. Apparently the NRA and some other groups were lining up primary challengers to Democrats who went along with [Obama's] gun control plans and letting those Democrats know it was coming. That scared the heck out of them. Barack Obama is entering his lame duck phase, and the Democrats know it. After 2014 he becomes a museum piece. [Obama] knows that too and it's really ticking him off. We have to rub that in his face 24/7 while also building the conservative base back up into the kind of powerful entity it should be." [41552]

"When people get involved, and make some noise, they still have the power. Use the new media, contact the lawmakers both state and federal, and talk to the people around you. That is power. That is what makes America so great and that is what happened today. [Obama] had his little moment, and was pretending it meant something, but he said nothing. That 21 [23] point plan or whatever it was, was hollow. It was a gutted version of what he was hoping to do as recently as a few days ago. Instead, he had to roll over and made a weak threat to Congress but that threat starts in the Senate and they already told him to shut up. Obama backed off. He lost this time, and it was all because of the

American people. His media will try to spin it as something different, and if he gets another chance, [Obama] will be right back to pushing for confiscation, but for now, we won this particular fight. This victory is a lot bigger than you'll hear in the regular media. It's a lot bigger than anyone who stood their ground will ever know about. The Obama White House was trying to go very big on this gun control thing, and couldn't pull it off. And Barack Obama is livid about it. Like a spoiled brat he can't believe he had to scrap the original speech for today's version. Today was a great day for the good guys. Of course, there's always another fight just around the corner, so we have to be ready. Let your readers know they did a great job on this. Each of them were a part of forcing [Obama] to back off. Let's do it again!" [41552]

Politico reports that Obama will make Deputy National Security Adviser Denis McDonough his next chief of staff, replacing Jacob Lew—who will become Secretary of the Treasury, if he is confirmed by the Senate. (In March 2011 McDonough addressed the All Dulles Area Muslim Society Interfaith/Government Summit at a mosque in Sterling, Virginia. McDonough noted a 2010 Muslim Iftar dinner at the White House, and called it “a tradition stretching back more than two centuries to when Thomas Jefferson hosted the first Iftar at the White House.” The claim, previously made by Obama, that Jefferson hosted an Iftar is without any factual basis. McDonough also made the absurd statement, “The bottom line is this: When it comes to preventing violent extremism and terrorism in the United States, Muslim Americans are not part of the problem; you're part of the solution.” McDonough called the mosque a “typically American place” and told the audience it reminds him of his childhood Catholic church in Minnesota. McDonough laid it on thick, telling the Muslims, “You create jobs and opportunity as small business owners and executives of major corporations. You enrich our culture as athletes and entertainers. You lead us as elected officials and Members of Congress. And no one should ever forget that Muslim Americans help keep America safe every day as proud soldiers, sailors, airmen, Marines and Coast Guardsmen. Indeed, some of these heroes have made the ultimate sacrifice for our nation and now rest in our hallowed national cemeteries. ... We're exposing the lie that America and Islam are somehow in conflict. That is why ... Obama has stated time and again that the United States is not and never will be at war with Islam.” Islam is, of course, in conflict with the United States. Shari'ah law is grossly incompatible with the U.S. Constitution, and many concepts within the ideology of Islam—such as “honor killings,” the denigration of women, and female genital mutilation—are considered barbaric by most Americans.) [18318, 18324, 18325, 18331, 18334, 18372, 18435]

At AtlasShrugs.com Pamela Geller notes that McDonough, “a former senior fellow at the uber far left Center for American Progress, is the man most responsible for orchestrating the Benghazi jihad cover-up. McDonough rewrote the CIA talking points on Benghazi, misrepresenting the video, when the true motive behind the terrorist attack was well known. But lying to the American people was what was most important to Obama, not American lives, to ensure his re-election.” [41586]

Obama issues a “Religious Freedom Day” proclamation that reads in part, “Because of the protections guaranteed by our Constitution, each of us has the right to practice our

faith openly and as we choose. As we observe Religious Freedom Day, let us remember the legacy of faith and independence we have inherited, and let us honor it by forever upholding our right to exercise our beliefs free from prejudice or persecution.” (Of course, Obama has prevented Catholics from practicing their faith as they choose by forcing them to provide free contraceptives, abortifacients, and sterilization.) [41598]

Newsmax.com reports, “The conservative group FreedomWatch is suing the White House task force that led to the gun control proposals offered by ...Obama Wednesday. FreedomWatch’s suit is based on the argument that the White House group conducted illegal meetings with lobbyists without public notice that’s required. The suit, which was filed in Florida federal court, seeks to eliminate the task force and prevent any of its proposals from becoming law, The Hill reports. The 1972 Federal Advisory Committee Act requires presidential task forces that include non-federal government officials to meet in public and publish notice of meetings in the Federal Register 15 days ahead of time.” FreedomWatch founder Larry Klayman states that Obama and Vice President Joe Biden “have thumbed their nose at the law and instead been holding closed door meetings with special interest lobbyists on both sides of the issue. The American people, whose rights to gun ownership stem from colonial times and are enshrined in the U.S. Constitution, are being illegally shut out of the process.” [41570]

According to CampusReform.org, “Sixty percent of high school and college students say they plan on owning guns at a later stage in life, an academic study from American University revealed on Monday. According to the study, about 40 percent of the American students surveyed said they definitely planned to own firearms once they had established their own households. Another 20 percent said they were ‘contemplating’ owning guns. ...David Burnett, the public relations director of the conservative student group Students for Concealed Carry, told Campus Reform on Tuesday he was not surprised by the study’s result. ‘With every single spree killing we’ve seen in this nation in the past twenty years, with every sexual assault that takes place, nine every day on college campuses, with every robbery report we have, with every campus that goes on lockdown, these gun free zones are proven to be indefensible and impractical,’ he said. ‘College campuses put [gun-free zone] pictures on the door and expect psychopaths to abide by them. I think more and more college students have been waking up to this reality in the past five years since Virginia tech and they don’t want it.’ [41574]

According to DailyCaller.com, “In 1999, State Senator Barack Obama voted ‘present’ on a bill that would require adult prosecution for discharging a gun in or near a school. That legislation came as a response to the tragic Columbine High School shooting that year. SB 759 provided that anyone 15 years of age or older charged with aggravated battery with a weapon in school or within 1,000 feet of a school would be charged as an adult. It passed the Illinois State Senate in a 52-1 vote, with 5 members voting present—including Obama. ...A Chicago Tribune editorial even accused Obama of being a ‘gutless sheep’ for missing a vote on crime legislation in late 1999.” [41591]

Texas Governor Rick Perry issues a statement: “The Vice President’s committee [on gun violence] was appointed in response to the tragedy at Newtown, but very few of his

recommendations have anything to do with what happened there. Guns require a finger to pull the trigger. The sad young man who did that in Newtown was clearly haunted by demons and no gun law could have saved the children in Sandy Hook Elementary from his terror. There is evil prowling in the world—it shows up in our movies, video games and online fascinations, and finds its way into vulnerable hearts and minds. As a free people, let us choose what kind of people we will be. Laws, the only redoubt of secularism, will not suffice. Let us all return to our places of worship and pray for help. Above all, let us pray for our children. In fact, the piling on by the political left, and their cohorts in the media, to use the massacre of little children to advance a pre-existing political agenda that would not have saved those children, disgusts me, personally. The second amendment to the Constitution is a basic right of free people and cannot be nor will it be abridged by the executive power of this or any other president.” [41575, 41601]

Meanwhile, Texas legislators quickly introduce a bill to nullify Obama’s gun control orders in the state. The legislation would make it a misdemeanor for any state or federal official to “enforce or attempt to enforce any acts, laws, executive orders, agency orders, rules or regulations of any kind whatsoever of the United States government relating to confiscating any firearm, banning any firearm, limiting the size of a magazine for any firearm, imposing any limit on the ammunition that may be purchased for any firearm, taxing any firearm or ammunition therefore, or requiring the registration of any firearm or ammunition therefore.” [41595, 41689]

Congressman Trey Radel (R-FL) tell Shark-Tank.net, “What I would say to Democrats who are friends with ...Obama right now is, ask yourself, what are you going to do when a Republican gets in, and you may not agree with or like very much, and begins doing the same thing [as Obama with illegal Executive Orders, recess appointments, czars, etc.]? ...[We] have completely lost our checks and balances in this country, the Congress needs to hold [Obama] accountable for the decisions that he’s making right now, and that [is] why again, I would say that all options should be on the table [including impeachment].” [41579, 41580, 41590]

A new citizens’ petition at WhiteHouse.gov calls for the elimination of armed guards for Obama, Joe Biden, and their families by establishing “gun-free zones” around them. [41596, 41597]

The Associated Press reports, “Newly released documents show that federal immigration agents were prepared to arrest an undocumented immigrant and registered sex offender days before the November elections. However according to the internal agency documents, the agents were ordered by Washington to hold off after officials warned of ‘significant interest’ from Congress and news organizations since the suspect was a volunteer intern for New Jersey Sen. Robert Menendez. ...U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement agents in Newark had arranged to arrest Sanchez at the local prosecutor’s office on Oct. 25. That was fewer than two weeks before the election. Noting that Sanchez was a volunteer in Menendez’s Senate office, ICE officials in New Jersey advised that the arrest ‘had the possibility of garnering significant congressional and media interest’ and were ‘advised to postpone the arrest’ until officials in

Washington gave approval. The documents describe a conference call between officials Washington and New Jersey to ‘determine a way forward, given the potential sensitivities surrounding the case.’” (In other words, the Obama administration intentionally delayed the arrest of an illegal immigrant sex offender so that the news would not harm Menendez’s chances of reelection. That could be considered an impeachable offense if Obama had anything to do with it.) [41608, 41609, 42013]

On *The O’Reilly Factor*, Senator Marco Rubio (R-FL) says, “I actually believe [Obama] doesn’t have the guts to admit he doesn’t believe in the Second Amendment although he states that he is. The Second Amendment is in the Constitution. I didn’t write the Constitution, neither did you, neither did he. If he doesn’t want the Second Amendment to be in the Constitution or if he wants to reform the Second Amendment then have the guts to admit that. ...I’m gonna let you in on a secret. I mean, [Obama] is a liberal. He sees this as an opportunity to get some of these things done. This is what he’s wanted to do his entire political career. He sees an opportunity to do it, and he’s gonna utilize every rhetorical device to get to that point. I actually think [Obama]—and he just doesn’t have the guts to admit it—is not a believer in the Second Amendment, although he states that he is. If he wants to reform the Second Amendment, then have the guts to admit that.” (Rubio is correct. Obama’s past statements and actions as a state legislator in Illinois make it clear that he opposes the Second Amendment and would confiscate all civilian guns if he thought he could get away with it, but he lacks the courage to say so.) [41588, 41620, 41667]

Rubio continues, “Let’s remember what the impetus for all this was. It was this horrible tragedy in Connecticut, which, by the way, all of us were outraged by, all of us are sad about, and all of us would want to see never happen again. And by the own admission of the White House what they proposed today would do nothing to have prevented what happened in Connecticut, or [in Aurora,] Colorado before that, or any of these other places where this has occurred. The issue America faces is not guns; it’s violence. I think the fundamental question is, ‘What is happening in our culture and in our society that’s leading to people committing these atrocities, whether it’s mental illness or some other violent propensities that have come into our culture and into our society?’” [41588, 41620]

On *Hannity*, Senator Rand Paul (R-KY) announces he will introduce legislation to nullify Obama’s gun control orders by cutting funding for his actions. Paul states, “In this bill, we will nullify anything [Obama] does that smacks of [illegal] legislation. And there are several of the executive orders that appear as if he’s writing new law. That cannot happen. I’m afraid that ...Obama may have this king complex sort of developing, and we’re going to make sure that doesn’t happen.” [41594, 41602, 41612]

On January 17 Whole Foods CEO John Mackey appears on *CBS This Morning* to make amends to his liberal customers for referring to ObamaCare as fascism. Mackey had stated, “Technically speaking, [ObamaCare is] more like fascism. Socialism is where the government owns the means of production. In fascism, the government doesn’t own the means of production, but they do control it—and that’s what’s happening with our health

care programs and these reforms.” Although Mackey was most assuredly correct, he repents and states, “I made a bad choice of language. I was trying to distinguish it between socialism so I took the dictionary definition of fascism, which is when the means of production are still owned privately but the government controls it—that’s a type of fascism. However, I realize that that word has so much baggage associated with it from World War II, with Germany, with Italy and Spain, that’s a very provocative word, so I regret using it. What I do believe in is free-enterprise capitalism, and I’d like to see our health-care system really unleash the power of free-enterprise capitalism to create innovation and health-care progress. I don’t think we have that—I think we’re moving away from that. So I do regret using that word, I won’t be using it in the future.” (National Review’s Jonah Goldberg observes, “And so you have this carve out for liberals. They get to use the word fascist—incorrectly—all of the time. But if a conservative (or in this case a libertarian) uses it accurately, and not particularly pejoratively either, it’s offensive or stupid.”) [41674, 41675]

Katie Pavlich reports at Townhall.com that “Obama’s top campaign adviser Jim Messina is still sending campaign emails (the campaign ended over two months ago). This time, Messina is asking supporters to help push ...Obama’s gun control agenda. ...This is the campaign that never ends and it goes on and on my friends, some people started working it not knowing what it was and they’ll continue working it forever just because this is the campaign that never ends, and it goes on and on my friends... (repeat, forever).” [41587]

Congressman Hank Johnson (D-GA) calls for Congress to “do away with the entire process of legislatively raising the debt ceiling. The requirement to pass the debt ceiling is legislatively based, it’s not constitutionally based and it’s unnecessary. It was a political tactic that benefited some at the time that it was passed but now it may benefit a few politicians, but it’s to the detriment of the nation so therefore, it’s time to do away with the entire process of legislatively raising the debt ceiling.” (During a 2010 meeting of the House Armed Services Committee, Johnson told Admiral Robert Willard, head of the U.S. Pacific fleet, he was worried Guam would tip over if too many Marines were stationed there: “My fear is that the whole island will become so overly populated that it will tip over and capsize.” The Admiral managed to hold back his laughter and calmly replied, “We don’t anticipate that.”) [41592, 41593]

Johnson also charges that the NRA opposes gun control because Obama “is a black” and his being in the White House is “something they still cannot get over. They couldn’t get over the first election, [and] they’re still shell-shocked at the second election. That’s a pun, shell-shocked.” (Johnson is apparently unaware that the NRA has opposed unconstitutional gun control legislation and the confiscation of weapons for decades. It opposed the so-called “assault weapon” ban signed into law by Bill Clinton—and Clinton is not black.) [41611]

The BBC reports, “Algerian forces have moved against Islamic militants holding hostages at a gas facility in eastern Algeria, officials say. Four foreigners were freed but a number of people were killed in the military operation, Algerian state news agency APS reported. Algerian soldiers had been surrounding the facility near In Amenas that



kidnappers occupied on Wednesday. Reports quoting militants said at least 34 hostages and 14 kidnappers died.” Obama and Secretary of State Hillary Clinton have yet to comment. The Associated Press later reports, “Algerian copter attack kills 35 hostages and 15 kidnappers in Sahara standoff.” [41599, 41600, 41606, 41610, 41616, 41618, 41653]

The Associated Press reports that Obama “is featuring eight Americans as ‘citizen co-chairs’ of his inauguration, a new role created to highlight his first-term accomplishments... The honorees announced Thursday include a woman with a brain tumor who no longer is denied health care for a pre-existing condition; an autoworker who got her job back after the General Motors bailout; and a gay pilot-in-training kicked out of the Air Force before the president repealed the military’s ‘don’t ask, don’t tell’ policy. ...After Obama’s swearing-in ceremony Monday, the eight co-chairs will ride on an inaugural parade float highlighting the inaugural theme of ‘Our People: Our Future,’ then attend the official balls that night.” (The float could also be called, “Depending on Government and the Taxpayers.”) [41614]

Marines marching in the parade are ordered to remove the bolts from their rifles to render them inoperable. [42461, 42492]

While the Obama inauguration team may have been busy finding people who can showcase their dependence on government, WashingtonExaminer.com reports, “There are going to be far fewer porta-potties at ...Obama’s second Inauguration than his first. And while crowd estimates for Monday’s event are less than half the 1.8 million who flooded the Mall in 2009, the bathroom count has been cut by about two-thirds, meaning potentially long lines at the portable restrooms.” [41615]

Despite entering the fifth consecutive year of \$1+ trillion federal deficits, *The New York Times*’ resident delusional economics writer, claims, “The budget deficit isn’t our biggest problem, by a long shot. Furthermore, it’s a problem that is already, to a large degree, solved. The medium-term budget outlook isn’t great, but it’s not terrible either—and the long-term outlook gets much more attention than it should.” Krugman claims the problems will pretty much all go away if the economy recovers, as tax revenues will increase while unemployment benefits decline. (Note to Krugman: Those two factors may shave \$100 billion off the \$1.2 trillion deficit. They will certainly not reduce it to zero.) Krugman also fails to account for the possibility—if not the likelihood—of higher interest rates, which could easily add \$100 billion or more to the deficit. Krugman claims that Congress should worry much about Social Security because its greatest actuarial problems are in the future, so we need not act now. (Another note to Krugman: the Social Security system has operated at a deficit since 2010. It is *already* paying out more in benefits than it collects in tax revenue.) Krugman writes, “[T]here’s a reasonable argument for leaving the question of how to deal with future problems up to future politicians”—yet he believes a “case for urgent action on climate change” can be made. (It may seem to some as though Krugman is a comedy writer masquerading as an economist, but *The New York Times* expects its readers to take him seriously. Regrettably, many of them do. Krugman is not alone among irrational leftist, however.

HotAir.com reminds readers that Slate.com columnist Matthew Yglesias suggested that, because interest rates are currently very low, the government should finance all of its spending with borrowing and temporarily eliminate taxes altogether. It apparently does not occur to Yglesias, or Krugman, that interest rates can go up dramatically and quickly under the right circumstances, and that all money that is borrowed must eventually be paid back.) [41657, 41658, 41659]

According to a Fairleigh Dickinson University PublicMind survey, 36 percent of those polled believe Obama is hiding something important about his past. The Republican/Democrat/Independent breakdown is 64/14/33. Dan Cassino, a professor of political science at Fairleigh Dickinson, tells Politico, “People tend to believe that where there’s smoke, there’s fire—so the more smoke they see, the more likely they are to believe that something is going on.” [41617]

Senator Ted Cruz (R-TX) tells radio talk show host Laura Ingraham that Obama has “drunk the Kool-Aid. He is feeling right now high on his own power, and he is pushing on every front, on guns. And I think it’s really sad to see [Obama] exploiting the murder of children and using it to push his own extreme, anti-gun agenda. I think what [Obama] is proposing and the gun control proposals that are coming from Democrats in the Senate are, number one, unconstitutional, and number two, they don’t work. They’re bad policy. ... There have got to be some Democrats who are up for reelection in 2014 who are very, very nervous right now that ... Obama is picking this fight. The citizens of their states are not interested in the federal government banning gun ownership for law-abiding citizens. That’s part of what this does, is ban certain categories of weapons being owned by people who have never broken the law. ... I’ll make a prediction. I think 2014 is going to be a very, very strong year for conservatives. I think we have a real possibility of picking up a majority of the Senate. [Over] The next two years, [Obama] is going to continue doing what he’s doing now, which is overreaching and really believing that this country has become far left. And that is not this country.” [41621, 41648]

At TheNewAmerican.com Joe Wolverton, II writes, “In just two months the globalists of the UN will gather in New York City to put the final touches on plans to impose strict regulations worldwide on the right of the individual to buy, sell, trade, or own guns and ammunition. On March 18, 2013 in New York City the next round of negotiations is scheduled to begin, with one aim in mind: eradicate private gun ownership. On Christmas Eve, 2012, the United Nations General Assembly approved a resolution to renew negotiations on the global Arms Trade Treaty (ATT).” The measure was approved 133–0, and “Within hours of his securing his reelection, ... Obama placed a late night call to the U.S. United Nations delegation ordering them to vote in favor...” (The Obama administration claims the election had nothing to do with treaty talks being delayed until after November 6.) Wolverton warns, “Section III, Paragraphs 7 and 8 of the [treaty’s] Programme of Action mandate that if a member state cannot get rid of privately owned small arms legislatively, then the control of ‘customs, police, intelligence, and arms control’ will be placed under the power of a board of UN bureaucrats operating out of the UN Office for Disarmament Affairs. This provision includes the deployment of UN peacekeeping forces in a member state to seize and destroy ‘weapons stockpiles.’”

(Although Obama supports the ATT and its gun confiscation implications, no treaty with the United States is valid unless it is approved by a two-thirds majority of the U.S. Senate.) [41631, 41708]

TheHill.com reports, “GOP leaders on Thursday heard from rank-and-file members in a closed-door session, with many urging sequester cuts or a government shutdown to take effect in hopes of forcing the White House into accepting spending cuts. Those options are ‘very much on the table,’ veteran Rep. Tom Cole (R-OK.) told reporters on Thursday, from Virginia, where House GOP lawmakers are meeting for their annual retreat. ... Cole said there was much discussion about ‘whether sequester is a better way to do this because there’s clearly elements that we don’t like in sequester, but I would tell you that the majority of our conference is quite prepared to go there if they don’t see something else. They want to do something dramatic.’” [41654]

At HotAir.com Ed Morrissey observes, “There are three potential inflection points in the next two months on spending. The first is the debt ceiling, which is poor ground for the GOP, as the spending Congress has *already authorized* requires Treasury to borrow funds to comply. Denying a raise in the ceiling to at least the amount necessary for authorized spending amounts to a bad-faith effort to reopen the previous agreement, and it will be perceived that way especially as the media hyperventilates about default. That leaves the sequester in late February and the expiration of the continuing resolution on March 27th, the government-shutdown option. Republicans stand on the best ground on that point for demanding real spending cuts in the final half of the FY2013 budget and the new FY2014 budget. However, if Republicans attempt to evade the sequester—which splits \$1.2 trillion in cuts over ten years evenly between defense and domestic spending—they will undermine their case for a government-shutdown threat in March. Those cuts are painful on both sides, but any significant cuts are going to be painful; if they weren’t, they would have already taken place. ... [I]naction on the last two ‘cliffs’ of the sequester favor the GOP—real spending cuts and a standoff on the real issue of spending. And in fact, House Republicans can pass a final FY2013 budget using normal order well before March 27th and simply state that they will not negotiate with the Senate except through a conference committee, demanding a normal-order budget from Harry Reid. If he refuses, then it’s Democratic inaction that will produce the government shutdown. Republicans are outnumbered in Washington power. They have to look for the best ground on which to fight. This is a big step in the right direction.” [41655]

Aaron Klein reports at WND.com, “Secretary of defense nominee Chuck Hagel sits on the small board of a peace fund that finances an international ‘crisis management’ group that long has petitioned the Algerian government to cease ‘excessive’ military activities against al-Qaida-linked jihadists... The organization, the International Crisis Group, or ICG, called on Algeria to grant legitimacy to the very al-Qaida-linked group reportedly behind the kidnapping of about 40 foreign hostages, including several Americans, at a natural-gas field in Algeria. ... ICG petitioned for the Islamist group to participate in the Algerian government. (In addition to Hagel, other board members at the ICG—which is funded in part by Obama’s billionaire leftist buddy George Soros—include Mohamed el-Baradei, an Iranian shill, the anti-Semitic Robert Malley, who resigned from an Obama

advisory position after it was revealed that he had met secretly with the terrorist group Hamas, and Zbigniew Brzezinski, who was Jimmy Carter's inept National Security Advisor. The ICG is supposedly "an independent, non-profit, non-governmental organization committed to preventing and resolving deadly conflict," but Soros has a reputation for fomenting crises. Obama advisor Samantha Power is also tied to the ICG, which promotes a doctrine called "Responsibility to Protect" that recommends allowing military interventions whenever the "international community" decides it is necessary. Power, who is married to Obama regulatory czar Cass Sunstein, urged Obama to take military action in Libya. the ICG has also recommended intervention in Uganda. The ICG has ties to various Islamic organizations, including the National Iranian American Council (NIAC), a pro-Iran "front group.") [17193, 17217, 17218, 17219, 17220, 17221, 17225, 17229, 17242, 17245, 17246, 17254, 17348, 17390, 17457, 17541, 17543, 18877, 18878, 18974, 19028, 22133, 25443, 25446, 25449, 25450, 25466, 25480, 25486, 25492, 25705, 27478, 39489, 41693]

On January 18, Politico reports that Obama's "remaining campaign apparatus [Obama for America] will relaunch Sunday as a tax-exempt group to support his second term agenda... The new organization will be separate from the Democratic National Committee. Obama's 2012 campaign manager Jim Messina will be the national chair of the group." The group will purportedly focus on "creating jobs and growing the economy from the middle out, and in fighting for issues like immigration reform, climate change, balanced deficit reduction, and reducing gun violence." Sporting a new wig over which the leftist media goes ape (but which Hollywood fashion critic Joan Rivers excoriates), Michelle Obama introduces the campaign plan via an Internet video sent to supporters. ("Obama for America" will be renamed "Organizing for Action," although some might argue that "Obama for Obama" may be a more descriptive name. AtlasShrugs.com's Pamela Geller labels it "Der Fuhrer's Machine.") [41632, 41645, 41665, 41669, 41672, 41677, 41767]

FreeBeacon.com reports, "The number of Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) lawsuits filed against the federal government has increased dramatically under the Obama administration, according to a December study by the Transactional Records Access Clearinghouse (TRAC). A comparison between the last two years of President George W. Bush's second term and the last two years of ...Obama's first term shows FOIA lawsuits jumped by 28 percent, TRAC reports. ...A Bloomberg investigation found '19 of 20 cabinet-level agencies disobeyed the law requiring the disclosure of public information.' ...'Obama is the sixth administration that's been in office since I've been doing Freedom of Information Act work. ...It's kind of shocking to me to say this, but of the six, this administration is the worst on FOIA issues. The worst. There's just no question about it,' Katherine Meyer, a Washington lawyer who's been filing FOIA cases since 1978, told Politico in March 2012. 'This administration is raising one barrier after another. ...It's gotten to the point where I'm stunned—I'm really stunned.'" (The Obama administration is arguably one of the least transparent in history.) [41912]

Politico reports, "House Republicans will vote next week on a plan to raise the nation's debt ceiling for three months, and it will include a provision that would stop pay for

members of Congress if the Senate doesn't pass a budget, GOP officials said Friday." House Majority Leader Eric Cantor (R-VA) issues a statement: "[Obama's] plan to simply borrow more money without any reform in Washington puts us all at risk. The first step to fixing this problem is to pass a budget that reduces spending. The House has done so, and will again. The Democratic Senate has not passed a budget in almost four years, which is unfair to hardworking taxpayers who expect more from their representatives. That ends this year. We must pay our bills and responsibly budget for our future. Next week, we will authorize a three month temporary debt limit increase to give the Senate and House time to pass a budget. Furthermore, if the Senate or House fails to pass a budget in that time, Members of Congress will not be paid by the American people for failing to do their job. No budget, no pay." House Minority Leader Nancy Pelosi (D-CA) responds, "This proposal does not relieve the uncertainty faced by small businesses, the markets and the middle class. This is a gimmick unworthy of the challenges we face and the national debate we should be having. The message from the American people is clear: no games, no default." (In other words, "We don't need no stinkin' budget. Just increase the debt limit, raise taxes again, and let the reckless spending continue.") [41656, 41661]

It is worth noting that no Congress has the legal authority to deny payment of House or Senate salaries. The Twenty-Seventh Amendment to the U.S. Constitution reads: "No law, varying the compensation for the services of the Senators and Representatives, shall take effect, until an election of representatives shall have intervened." [41896]

Senate Republicans draft legislation defining payment priorities in the event the debt ceiling is not increased in time to allow continued spending at current levels. The legislation would insure that all incoming tax revenue would first be allocated toward interest on the national debt, Social Security payments, and active-duty military pay. (Normal tax revenue is sufficient to cover those expenses.) [41755]

Rallies supporting the Second Amendment are planned for "Gun Appreciation Day" at state capitols, gun stores, gun shows, and rifle ranges on January 19. [41636, 41637, 41638]

According to a nationwide Rasmussen poll, "65% of American Adults think the purpose of the Second Amendment is to make sure that people are able to protect themselves from tyranny. Only 17% disagree, while another 18% are not sure." [41640, 41641]

CNN reporter and anchor Tom Foreman reveals that he has written a letter to Obama every day since January 20, 2009. "And I do mean every day. Weekends, holidays, when he was on vacation, and when I was on vacation. I wrote in my office, at home, in moving airplanes, cars, trains and even while running through the woods. I wrote early in the morning, in the middle of the day and late at night. I wrote about things that were important, like unemployment, Afghanistan and women's rights. I also wrote about things that were trivial, like sports, favorite foods and my yearly battle with Christmas lights. The tally: 1,460 letters, well over a half-million words, or enough to fill about seven novels. Laid out as one line of text, these letters would stretch almost 3½ miles or

considerably longer than the inaugural parade route.” (Rick Moran comments at PJMedia.com, “Some may find that bizarre, obsessive, even unnatural. Others may question the journalistic ethics of personally communicating with [Obama] in such a regular and friendly fashion. Evidently, Foreman’s employers at CNN don’t think either of those things and actually gave him space on their website to publish an article explaining himself. ...I can’t recall in 45 years of media watching ever coming across anything as corrupting to professional journalism as this. He actually expected [Obama]—the man he is paid to cover according to the ethics and standards (a stretch with CNN, I know) of professional journalism—to call and chat him up on an informal and friendly basis. It’s hard to pick what’s more bizarre—his belief that his pitiful missives actually stimulated the thinking of [Obama], or that he could entertain the idea of developing a personal relationship with [him]. Why is this guy still working for CNN? The revelation that he had engaged in this fantasy for four years should have elicited sympathy from his bosses—and a paid trip to a sanitarium—or a pink slip. What does it say about CNN that they did neither?”) [41760, 41761]

DailyCaller.com reports, “The Obama administration is attempting to bypass Congress and force publicly-traded companies to reveal their political donations through regulation. The Securities and Exchange Commission’s Division of Corporate Finance has begun the steps necessary to create a regulation that would in many ways mirror the DISCLOSE Act—a bill Senate Democrats have failed to pass through Congress. Created in reaction to the 2010 Citizens United Supreme Court ruling that said corporations and unions could not have limits placed on their political expenditures, the Senate bill would require political organizations to publicly name their donors and the amounts they give. The SEC regulation would do the reverse—force companies to disclose the political groups they support—and have a similar effect.” (In other words, Obama could not get Congress to pass legislation forcing political action committees to disclose their donors, so he is attempting to force the donors themselves to disclose their contributions. The goal is, of course, to use that information to promote boycotts of those donor businesses to discourage them from donating to conservative causes.) [41646]

Leftist anti-gun organizations run “shame on you” ads against Democrats who dare to stand up for the Second Amendment and express resistance to Obama’s requests for strict gun controls. One ad targets Congressman John Barrow (D-GA); another attacks Senator Heidi Heitkamp (D-ND). Barrow’s “transgression” was the statement, “I support [Obama’s] call for stronger enforcement of existing gun crime laws, because that’s been the real problem. But I strongly disagree with proposals that would deny law abiding citizens their Second Amendment rights, and I’m disappointed he did not propose increased security measures for our schools. We need to find practical solutions to gun violence that are consistent with the Second Amendment, rather than having another political debate in Washington that divides Americans.” [41647, 41664]

Politico notes that Obama’s Jobs Council has not met since January 17, 2012. The authorization for the 26-member group expires on January 31. [41650]

Islamist terrorists holding hostages at a natural gas facility in Algeria offer to exchange two Americans for the release of “blink sheikh” Omar Abdel Rahman and Aafia Siddiqui, who are both in U.S. prisons. The offer is rejected. The *Daily Mail* reports, “At least 12 hostages, including one American, have been killed since the start of the operation to free workers kidnapped by Islamic militants, according to Algeria’s state news service, however it noted that its figures were ‘provisional’ and could increase. The service reported at around 11 a.m. EST that nearly 100 of the 132 foreign workers kidnapped had now been freed. More than 30 foreign energy workers still appear to be unaccounted for.” Secretary of State Hillary Clinton tells reporters, “I spoke with the Algerian prime minister again this morning to get an update on this very difficult situation, and to underscore, again, that the utmost care must be taken to preserve innocent life.” (Obama appears to be taking a hands-off approach, allowing the Algerian government to handle the situation. Obama would apparently rather see hostages killed than risk offending Muslims by ordering a military action. According to ReligionOfPeace.com, “Islamic terrorists have carried out more than 20,261 deadly terror attacks since 9/11—and Obama prefers not to confront terrorists if he can avoid it.) [41653, 41670, 41671, 41681]

After several weeks above 50 percent, Obama’s approval rating dips to 49 percent in the Gallup poll. His disapproval rating moves up from 36 to 44 percent. (The next day his approval rating drops to 48 percent. Throughout his entire first term, Obama’s Gallup approval rating averaged 49.1 percent—which falls on the low side, when compared with other Oval Office occupants: Lyndon Johnson, 74.2 percent; John Kennedy, 70.1; Dwight Eisenhower, 69.6; George W. Bush, 62.2; George H. W. Bush, 60.9; Richard M. Nixon, 55.8; Harry Truman, 55.6; Ronald Reagan, 50.3; Bill Clinton, 49.6; Gerald Ford, 47.2; and Jimmy Carter, 45.5 percent.) [41673, 41732]

On *The Laura Ingraham Show*, Senator Ran Paul (R-KY) says, “I’ll only support raising the debt ceiling if we pass a balanced budget amendment. I don’t trust any of these people, Republican or Democrat, to do a good job with our money. There’s no objective evidence that they are good with money. It’s just a blank check... we should not raise the debt ceiling. ... We’re bringing in \$200 billion a month in revenue. Our interest payment is \$30 billion. We have plenty of money to pay for the interest on our debt.” Paul would like Republicans to shut down the government if the Democrats won’t agree to spending cuts, but he says, “Republicans don’t have the spine and don’t have the ability to really push forward to get anything changed.” Paul responds to Democrat Senator Tim Kaine’s charge that his use of the word “nullify” with Obama’s use of Executive Orders to implement gun control is racist because nullification relates to state’s right and that (according to Democrats) always means racism. Paul says, “Senator Kaine is confused about his history. He needs to read his Montesquieu, he needs to read Jefferson, he needs to read our Founding Fathers, who were very concerned about the separation of power. This has nothing to do with ... Obama or that he’s a Democrat. In particular, it’s insulting to say it has anything to do with the color of his skin. ... I opposed George Bush on his executive orders. I opposed Clinton. This has been a longstanding tradition. It’s insulting for anyone to say this has anything to do with race.” Playing the race card “dumbs down the debate. If we’re going to call people names and call them a racist, we can’t have a

debate. These are big battles we need to fight, but they have nothing to do with race.” [41678, 41679, 41680]

ABC News reports that former Presidents George H.W. Bush and George W. Bush will not attend Obama’s inauguration ceremonies. (The elder Bush, age 88, was recently released from the hospital and for him to attend would place his health further at risk.) Bill Clinton and Jimmy Carter will be present. [41682]

HuffingtonPost.com reports, “A business owner in Utah has become the latest employer to blame ...Obama’s health care reform bill for layoffs and has doubled down on his public disdain for the current administration by admitting he singled out Obama supporters. Terry Lee, owner of Cedar City-based Terry Lee Forensics, told the Salt Lake Tribune that he was so impressed by a Vernal, Utah, smoothie bar’s policy of asking liberal patrons to pay more, that he, too, took action to recoup losses he said were incurred by Obamacare.” Lee states, “We had to let two employees go to cover new Obongocare [sic] costs and increased taxes. Found two Obongo supporters and gave them the news yesterday. They wanted the idiot in the Whitehouse [sic], they reap the benefits.” [41692]

At Slate.com John Dickerson writes, “The challenge for ...Obama’s [inaugural] speech is the challenge of his second term: how to be great when the environment stinks. Enhancing [his] legacy requires something more than simply the clever application of predictable stratagems. Washington’s partisan rancor, the size of the problems facing government, and the limited amount of time before Obama is a lame duck all point to a single conclusion: [Obama,] who came into office speaking in lofty terms about bipartisanship and cooperation can only cement his legacy if he destroys the GOP. If he wants to transform American politics, he must go for the throat. ...Obama’s only ...option is to pulverize [the Republican Party]. Whether he succeeds in passing legislation or not, given his ambitions, his goal should be to delegitimize [sic] his opponents. Through a series of clarifying fights over controversial issues, he can force Republicans to either side with their coalition’s most extreme elements or cause a rift in the party that will leave it, at least temporarily, in disarray.” (Slate.com neglects to mention that Dickerson is the political director for CBS News. The more naive may expect a person in such a position to be objective.) [41697, 41698]

At Breitbart.com John Nolte writes, “What is worthy of note... is that a CBS News’ political director [Dickerson] is now comfortable openly calling for the destruction of the Republican Party. He obviously fears no admonitions from his colleagues or his employer. And why should he? Earlier this week, Bob Schieffer, a CBS News ‘living legend,’ was perfectly comfortable publicly comparing the NRA to Nazis. You lump all of this with CNN chief Jeff Zucker applauding Piers Morgan’s shameless feasting off the dead children of Sandy Hook for ratings and attention, and what you have is a media that’s finally... coming out. And yet, even as they do, even as they openly celebrate their left-wing biases out of one side of their mouth, out the other, they will claim they remain objective and unbiased. The Big Lie has officially arrived. And somewhere Dan Rather’s



thinking, ‘Oh, so now it’s okay!?’” (It is worth noting that Morgan’s home has signs that warns, “Armed Response Security Systems.”) [41696, 43878]

Nolte later writes that Obama’s “greatest legacy” may be his destruction of what used to be an objective media. During the 2012 campaign, “Rather than report Truth, the media locked arms and circled Obama’s palace in order to protect him from the mindless hordes of racist, sexist Neanderthals who dared criticize The Lightbringer. ... In order to pretend Obama’s policies worked and to win him reelection, the media completely rewrote and redefined what a successful economic recovery is. Then, before anyone could notice the sleight of hand, the media would quickly change the subject. ... Yes, the media won. It still pains me to say so, but the most dishonest, self-serving, narcissistic, un-American people in the world won. By picking up and running with Obama’s cynically divisive and intellectually dishonest campaign culture weapons, the media successfully pushed [him] over the second term finish line.” [41696, 41699]

Nolte continues, “The media successfully fooled enough people into believing Obama’s policies roared us back into a recovery to win Obama the chance to do four more years of damage. But no one’s fooled to the point where they’re buying newspaper subscriptions or advertisements. The result has been a series of high-profile media layoffs announced even before Obama’s second term became official. All due to an economy the media assured us was humming and did not need new management. And then there’s the issue of the overall economy, stupid. Since Obama’s reelection, the presidential campaign hasn’t stopped. [Obama] and the media have once again locked arms in the hopes of dividing and permanently clobbering the Republican party. We had a Fiscal Cliff followed by gun control, and now we’re entering debt ceiling negotiations. After that will be immigration and after that anything that damages the GOP and tries to distract from the poor getting poorer and job creation barely treading water. ... [T]ake heart in the fact that a dismal economy the media alchemized into something Roaring has already and will only further damage these lying liars. And remember that when people do wake up, that consciousness will only further damage the media’s credibility. All of this, of course, further saps the media’s strength and influence. ... The media might think they are partners with Barack Obama, but in reality they’re his cannon fodder. Obama uses, lies to, dismisses, and openly mocks the media. ... It’s all a house of cards built on dishonesty, which only works for so long. Reality and truth will someday intrude, and when the music stops, Obama will be off somewhere surrounded by an entirely new group of international sycophants, while his discarded media is left without a chair. This will happen. It always does. My only fear is that when it does, I’m so old that prostrate problems make it difficult to do what needs to be done to the media’s final resting place.” [41699]

According to a Fox News poll, “Nearly twice as many voters say there would be less violent crime if more law-abiding Americans owned guns, than if guns were banned. In addition, while American voters generally favor strengthening gun laws, 71 percent do not think tougher laws can stop shootings like the one last month in Newtown, Connecticut. Some 22 percent say new laws can prevent the next Sandy Hook. ... Majorities of gun owners (81 percent), non-gun owners (58 percent), Democrats (58

percent), independents (72 percent) and Republicans (85 percent) say the people who do these kinds of things ‘will always find the guns’ to commit violent acts.” [41722]

On January 19 the Associated Press reports, “Algeria’s special forces stormed a natural gas complex in the middle of the Sahara desert on Saturday in a ‘final assault’ aimed at ending a four-day-old hostage crisis, the state news agency reported. It said 11 militants and seven hostages were killed. The report, quoting a security source, didn’t say whether any hostages or militants remained alive, and it didn’t give the nationalities of the dead. It said the army was forced to intervene after a fire broke out in the plant. ... The latest deaths bring the official Algerian tally of dead to 19 hostages and 29 militants, although reports on the number of dead, injured and freed have been contradictory throughout the crisis.” Creeping Sharia comments, “Like the reporting from Sandy Hook, the news reports on the numbers of terrorists, hostages and number killed are all over the place. Various reports stated there were seven Americans taken hostage and all are now dead. Obama’s policies of appeasement, funding al Qaeda terrorists and redistributing American taxpayer dollars to Muslim dictators around the world is beginning bear fruit. How many more Americans have to die before Obama is removed from office?” [41690, 41691, 41695, 41700]

NYTimes.com reports, “The provisional death toll released by Algeria Saturday, even by the government’s reckoning, was heavy. Out of dozens taken hostage on a site that employed hundreds of workers, 23 were dead while 32 kidnappers were killed, according to the government news service. That represents close to the initial estimate of hostage-takers. The government said it had recovered machine guns, rocket launchers, suicide belts and small arms. The Algerian news agency report did not give the nationalities of the hostages it said were executed Saturday, and it remained unclear whether there were other hostages at the remote plant and whether they were alive. Earlier news reports said at least 10 and as many as dozens of hostages from several nations were in the hands of the kidnappers as of Friday. United States officials had said that ‘seven or eight’ Americans had been at the In Amenas field when it was seized by the militants on Wednesday.” [41700]

Obama issues a statement: “The blame for this tragedy [in Algeria] rests with the terrorists who carried it out, and the United States condemns their actions in the strongest possible terms. We have been in constant contact with Algerian officials and stand ready to provide whatever assistance they need in the aftermath of this attack.” (Obama should be advised that providing assistance “in the aftermath” of an attack does not save lives. The families of the dead American hostages are unlikely to be comforted by his statement.) [41780]

“Guns Across America” holds rallies in 49 states in support of the Second Amendment and to protest Obama’s gun control proposals. At a gathering in Austin, Texas, state representative Steve Toth says, “The thing that so angers me, and I think so angers you, is that [Obama] is using children as a human shield to advance a very liberal agenda that will do nothing to protect them.” [41694, 41711, 41712, 41713, 41725, 41733, 41734]

At the pro-Second Amendment rally in Massachusetts, the crowd is addressed by a former Chinese dissident. He states in part, “Twenty three years ago I was a freshman ...college [student] in China, and I was exercising my freedom of speech and assembly in Tiananmen Square... just like we’re doing today. We grew frustrated by the government corruption and ...by the limitations on our personal freedom. So we demonstrated peacefully. However, our passion and patriotism were crushed by hails of full-metal jackets that came from AK-47s. ...We could not fight back because we did not have an inch of iron in our hands, to borrow a Chinese expression. We were not armed. ...The Second Amendment is the protector against a tyrannical government. ...Freedom is not free. Liberty has costs. ...When a government turns criminal... the body count will not be five, ten or even twenty, it will be in the hundreds, like in Tiananmen Square. It will be in the millions, as proved by the 90-year rule of the Chinese Communist Party. Our constitutional republic may look fuzzy and loving today—but if you think so I’ve got a TSA agent I’d like you to meet. But keep in mind, absolute power corrupts absolutely. When government has a monopoly on guns, they have absolute power. Do you know the Chinese Constitution guarantees almost all the nice things that we have here? It is written in the Chinese Constitution says that the Chinese people enjoy freedom of speech and religion, they have human rights and property rights, and such rights cannot be taken away without the due process of the law. And do you know what? Chinese people do not have the right to keep and bear arms. I assure you that all those nice things written in the Chinese Constitution are not worth the weight of the paper they are printed on because, when government has all the guns, they have all the rights. I was not born a U.S. citizen. I was naturalized in 2007 [applause]. In 2008 I became a proud gun owner [applause and cheers]. To me, a rifle is not for sporting or hunting—it is an instrument of freedom. It guarantees that I cannot be coerced, that I have free will, that I am a free man [applause]. Now suppose the twenty million Beijing citizens had a couple million rifles on hand in 1989. How many rounds should they have been allowed to load into their magazines? ...Do not give up the fight, my friends. It may be a small step that you give up your rifle or a thirty-round magazine, but it will be a giant leap in the destruction of this great republic. In closing, I will quote the words of Captain John Parker [commander of the militia at the Battle of Lexington in 1775]: ‘Stand your ground. Do not fire until fired upon. But—if they [mean to have] a war, let it [begin] here.’” [41762, 41763, 41851]

The now online-only Newsweek promotes Obama as “The Second Coming.” The article is by Evan Thomas who, in 2009, said on MSNBC, “In a way, Obama’s standing above the country, above—above the world. He’s sort of God. He’s going to bring all different sides together.” (Thomas apparently did not notice that Obama did not do that.) Pamela Geller observes, “[W]e see how Obama has brought different sides together. No President has done more to divide the nation outside of Lincoln, but that was to free a nation. Obama means to enslave it. Only the left could paint the epic failure that defines Obama’s reign as godly. The big lie, that’s what they do. And the more consistently wrong they are, the more accolades and power they get. The more right we are (and I have been proven right time and time again), the marginalized and demonized we are. Truth is the silver bullet to these vampires.” [41702, 41703, 41741]

With his tongue planted firmly in his cheek, liberal humorist Andy Borowitz “reports,” “Fox News Channel announced today that it would shut down for what it called ‘routine maintenance’ Monday morning at 11:30 E.T. Fox News president Roger Ailes explained the timing of the shutdown, which will be the first in the history of the network: ‘We wanted to pick a time when we were positive nothing would be happening that our viewers would want to see.’ Mr. Ailes said that Fox had considered shutting down only once before, exactly four years earlier on January 20, 2009, and later regretted the decision to continue broadcasting that day: ‘It turned out that no Fox viewers wanted to watch TV that day. And I mean none.’ According to Mr. Ailes, for the twelve hours Fox News is off the air on Monday the network will broadcast a continuous photomontage of white people. ‘Regular viewers of Fox probably won’t notice anything unusual,’ he said. After the routine maintenance is completed, Mr. Ailes said, Fox News will return to the air Tuesday morning with its regular broadcast schedule: ‘For Fox viewers, it will be like Monday never happened.’” [41714]

At NaturalNews.com J. D. Heyes notes some statistics from the Obama economy: “In 2010, of the 22 million Americans who had obtained master’s degrees or higher levels of education, 360,000 were on some kind of public assistance. Of that figure, 33,655 had PhD’s [sic]. Department of Labor figures show that one in three college grads works in a job the department says requires less than a bachelor’s degree. More than 5,000 PhD’s [sic] work as janitors. Overall, one in six Americans received food stamps in 2011. The dramatic increase in the number of PhD’s [sic] and other higher education Americans is just the latest sign of the ‘new normal’ economy; with an unemployment rate of 7.8–8 percent and job creation chronically low, coupled with wage stagnation and shrinking budgets, prospects for college grads overall have been reduced during the Obama years.” [41718]

At an “Iowa State Society inauguration ball,” Vice President Joe Biden says, “I’m proud to be President of the United States...” He is then corrected. (According to Politico, the next evening Biden invites “more than 200 Democratic insiders to the vice presidential residence Sunday night to chat about the 2012 triumph—but many walked away convinced his rising 2016 ambitions were the real intent of the long, intimate night.” New Hampshire state Senator Lou D’Allesandro says, “I took a look at who was there and said to myself, ‘There’s no question he’s thinking about the future.’” One “Democrat close to the White House” says the 70-year-old Biden is “intoxicated by the idea” of being president—as if it was not obvious to anyone who pays any attention whatsoever to politics.) [41723, 41726, 41849, 41865]

Bill Clinton warns Democrats not to become overzealous with gun control proposals: “Do not patronize the passionate supporters of your opponents by looking down your nose at them. A lot of these people live in a world very different from the world lived in by the people proposing these things. I know because I come from this world. All these polls that you see saying the public is for us on all these issues—they are meaningless if they’re not voting issues. The way the Obama campaign won Florida, won Ohio, won this election by more than projected was the combination of technology, social media and personal contact. [That is] the only way that our side will ever be able to even up the

votes in the midterms [in 2014] and as these issues come up, really touch people and talk to them about it.” [41730, 41742]

On January 20, both Obama and Vice President Joe Biden are sworn into office for their second terms. (The multimillion dollar, outdoor public ceremony will be held on January 21.) [41721]

FoxNews.com reports, “Algerian bomb squads scouring a gas plant where Islamist militants took dozens of foreign workers hostage found ‘numerous’ new bodies on Sunday as they searched for explosive traps left behind by the attackers, a security official said, a day after a bloody raid ended the four-day siege of the remote desert refinery. The official, who spoke on condition of anonymity because of the sensitivity of the situation, said the bodies were badly disfigured and difficult to identify. ‘The bodies could be either Algerian or foreign hostages,’ he said. ... Algerian special forces stormed the natural gas complex in the Sahara desert on Saturday to end the standoff, and the government said all 32 militants were killed. Earlier Sunday, Algeria’s chief government spokesman said he feared the toll of hostages—which stood at 23 on Saturday—would rise as the special forces teams finished their search.” [41701]

One Algerian who escaped the terrorists reports that one said, “We’ve come in the name of Islam, to teach the Americans what Islam is”—and then killed five hostages. At least one of the jihadist kidnappers “spoke perfect English.” Another Algerian says, “The terrorists told us at the very start that they would not hurt Muslims but were only interested in the Christians and infidels. We will kill them, they said.” Robert Spencer, author and the director of Jihad Watch, writes, “[W]e have now in the last few months seen bloody massacres carried out in the name of Islam... at this natural gas plant and at the U.S. consulate in Benghazi; a brutal Sharia regime come to power in northern Mali; and escalating persecution of Christians in Egypt, Pakistan, and Nigeria. Muslim spokesmen and groups in the U.S. routinely dismiss concerns about such things by asserting that their view of Islam, and that of Muslims in the U.S. and the vast majority of Muslims worldwide, is completely different from that of the Muslims who perpetrate these attacks, and that therefore anyone who wonders if such violence in the name of Islam will ever become commonplace in the U.S. is simply ‘Islamophobic’ and hateful. ... What are Infidels to make of all this and much more in the Koran and Islamic tradition, theology, and law enjoining violence against non-Muslims? That Muslims exist who may not believe or act upon these teachings is fine, but it does not cancel or mitigate the fact that Muslims obviously exist who do believe and act upon these teachings. It is astounding that eleven years after 9/11, I would have to point out yet again that the Muslims who disclaim any allegiance to this bloody and brutal Islam are doing nothing to stop its spread among Muslims worldwide—and that non-Muslim authorities maintain a state of blissful denial. As long as this continues, there will be many more jihad attacks like this one in Algeria.” [41715, 41716, 41717, 41858]

According to the Associated Press, “The death toll from the terrorist siege at a natural gas plant in the Sahara climbed past 80 on Sunday as Algerian forces searching the refinery for explosives found dozens more bodies, many so badly disfigured it was unclear

whether they were hostages or militants, a security official said. ...In a statement, the Masked Brigade, the group that claimed to have masterminded the takeover, warned of more such attacks against any country backing France's military intervention in neighboring Mali, where the French are trying to stop an advance by Islamic extremists." [41728]

AtlasShrugs.com's Pamela Geller writes, "[D]espite the American loss of life [in Algeria], [Obama] has not spoken of it or taken any leadership action on this act of war. The American media are following his lead. Every major world leader whose people were kidnapped and/or killed was addressing his parliament, media and the people of their countries: This act of war was a major news story everywhere except in America. U.K. Prime Minister David Cameron canceled a trip to address the House of Commons, where he called the jihadist attack on the BP gas field 'brutal and savage' (there's that word again), and said the assault on the complex was 'large, well-coordinated and heavily armed.' Coordinated by whom? Al-Qaida jihadists. Obama said recently: 'We achieved our central goal, or have come very close to achieving our central goal, which is to de-capacitate al-Qaida, to dismantle them, to make sure that they can't attack us again.' Yet while claiming that al-Qaida is being 'de-capacitated,' he is supplying them. The Algerian jihadis had weapons from Libya—that means we supplied them. Obama has consistently supported jihadists in Egypt, Libya, Syria, Tunisia, Burma, et al. Just as this led to the murder of Americans in Libya, so it has now in Algeria. The attackers who stormed our consulate (or whatever that building really was) in Benghazi were part of al-Qaida. While he tells us al-Qaida is vanquished, their attacks become more lethal, widespread and brazen. ...In pushing his gun restrictions, Obama falsely claimed: 'If there is even one thing we can do to reduce this violence, if there is even one life that can be saved, then we've got an obligation to try.' Where was his obligation in Libya when our boys begged for help, or in Algeria when our people were kidnapped and killed, or at Fort Hood, where the White House is withholding evidence in the prosecution of Nidal Hasan? If our fellow citizens are not safe abroad, and America's enemies act with impunity with no fear of retribution, how safe are we in the homeland?" [41739, 41740]

On *Meet the Press*, Senator Charles Schumer says, "We're gonna do a budget this year, and it's going to have revenues in it. And our Republican colleagues have to get used to that fact." (The Democrat-controlled Senate has refused to pass a budget in over three years, even though it is required by law. With Republicans in the House threatening to hold up raising the debt limit until the Senate passes a budget, the Democrats finally get around to suggesting they may indeed pass a budget—but it will address the deficit with more job-killing tax increases, rather than spending cuts.) [41719]

Also on *Meet the Press*, Obama political consultant David Axelrod says, "There's a larger priority, which is how do you create an economy—rebuild an economy in which the American dream, the American compact is fresh. That's not just dealing with the fiscal crisis; it's about education; it's about research and development; it's about controlling our energy future. All of these are part of the equation, and we can't just do one piece of it." (In other words, Obama has no intention of cutting federal spending and,

in fact, wants increased spending—despite \$1+ annual deficits as far as the eye can see.) [41754]

On ABC's *This Week*, George Will argues that Obama's powers of persuasion are overrated: "A durable myth... to which Mr. Obama subscribes, is that he's tremendously persuasive. I don't think his advocacy of ObamaCare and the health care bill supports that. It did pass with chicanery and reconciliation and lots of other things, but he did not move the country, which is what he's trying to do with the NRA. Obama's approval rating at this point is 52 percent. The NRA's approval rating is 54 percent. ... Since gun control came back to the top of the agenda, the NRA has acquired a quarter of a million new members. So we're going to find out. You saw by putting up the statements by some of the Democratic senators that there's a resistance in the Democratic caucus, because they have six seats up [for election] next time... in states where ... Obama got less than 42 percent of the votes." [41748]

On *State of the Union*, Obama advisor David Plouffe says Obama's second term agenda will include gun control, immigration reform (amnesty), and education. Plouffe states, "We are trying to enlist the American people in these debates [about gun control]. The only way change is going to really happen and make progress is with the American people. ... They need to be involved at the center of this and pushing here." (Plouffe knows that the public is more opposed to than in support of Obama's gun control proposals.) On the same program, Senator John Barrasso (R-WY) suggests that the Senate will not pass the legislation: "I don't think [Senate Majority Leader] Harry Reid even brings it to the Senate floor because he has six Democrats up for election in two years in states where [Obama] received fewer than 42 percent of the votes." [41724, 41727, 41752, 41822]

Plouffe also appears on *This Week*, where he says Obama will not include any budget deal that does not include higher taxes: "We are going to require some more revenues. [House Speaker] John Boehner himself said he thought there was \$800 billion in revenues from closing loopholes. We've dealt with the tax rate issue, now it's about loopholes. And I think the country would be well served by tax and entitlement reform because it would help the economy. ... We need spending cuts and entitlement reform and revenue. Have to have that." (Although Obama has demanded tax increases, he has yet to outline any significant spending cuts.) Remarkably, Plouffe also states, "The barrier to progress here isn't our position of the president [sic]. We've moved more than halfway, which is a fair definition of compromise, and we are gonna require some more revenues." (That is, of course, a whopping lie. In the just-completed fiscal cliff negotiations the Republicans agreed to \$620 billion in tax increases, while Obama and the Democrats would accept only \$15 billion in spending cuts—a 41-to-1 ratio. Plouffe has the audacity to call that moving "more than halfway.") [41139, 41143, 41724, 41727, 41752, 41822]

On Fox News, Democrat analyst Kirsten Powers says the main reason Obama doesn't call on Fox News at his press conferences is "because he doesn't want to be embarrassed—really. When he's asked a question—the same way, uh, you know, when Ed Henry [of Fox] asks questions in the [daily press briefing] to [White House press

secretary] Jay Carney, inevitably Jay Carney ends up looking stupid, because he doesn't know how to answer the question, he's used to pushing people around, and... it'll be tenacious, he'll get about something he doesn't want to be asked about, and you want softballs." [41720]

After the Humana Challenge golf tournament in La Quinta, California, golfer Phil Mickelson tells reporters, "It's been an interesting off-season. And I'm going to have to make some drastic changes. I'm not going to jump the gun and do it right away, but I will be making some drastic changes. ...But if you add up, if you add up all the federal and you look at the disability and the unemployment and the Social Security and the state, my tax rate's 62, 63 percent. So I've got to make some decisions on what I'm going to do." The implication is that high tax rate may prompt Mickelson to leave California—or even the country. (Mickelson later walks back his comments, apologizing to anyone who may have been "upset or insulted" that high taxes might force him to make "drastic changes." He states, "Finances and taxes are a personal matter and I should not have made my opinions on them public." What compelled Mickelson to reverse a perfectly legitimate and logical statement is not known, but media advisors may have explained to him that in the current political environment it is safer to anger conservative fans than liberal fans.) [41747, 41823, 41837, 41838, 41898, 41919, 41961]

Sharon Rondeau, editor of ThePostEmail.com, interviews investigator and "skip tracer" Al Hendershot, who has been looking into Obama's use of a stolen Social Security number (SSN), 042-68-4425. Hendershot and others have learned that various databases link that SSN with *both* Obama and a man named Harrison J. Bounel. The Social Security Administration refuses to release information about Bounel without the "written consent of the individual whose records are being requested"—even though Bounel was born in 1890 and most certainly has been dead for decades. According to Hendershot (and as indicated previously in this *Timeline*), the name Bounel is *also* associated with the address 5046 S. Greenwood in Chicago—which is Obama's Hyde Park mansion on the city's south side. The SSN used by both Obama and Bounel was issued in 1977 in Connecticut—a state in which Obama never lived or worked. It is believed that Obama started using that SSN in 1979. (Obama has used other SSNs as well.) The 1940 census shows a Harrison Bounel living in New York, with a birth year of 1890 and a birthplace of Russia. The 1910 census shows a Harry L. Bounel born in 1860 and living with a family named Robinson in New Haven, Connecticut. (Interestingly, Michelle Obama's maiden name is Robinson.) Whether the two men are related is not known, but it certainly seems possible, if not probable. [20627, 20628, 20833, 20865, 20867, 20882, 20883, 21121, 21122, 21123, 21124, 21450, 21451, 21545, 23704, 23764, 24865, 28220, 28221, 28226, 41730, 41801, 41802, 41921, 41922, 41923, 41924]

In 1977, when SSN 042-68-4425 was issued in Connecticut, Bounel would have been 87 years old. He had perhaps never been assigned a number until then, at which point it may have been necessary for purposes of Medicare coverage and nursing home or hospital care. By 1979 Bounel may have died, making his SSN "available" for someone to steal. (Attorney Orly Taitz has a pending lawsuit against the Social Security administration for its refusal to release related records.) Obama supporters label anyone who questions his



past racists and conspiracy theorists. But it is a fact that Obama has used multiple SSNs; that the SSN he has used most frequently was issued in Connecticut in 1977; that both Obama and Harrison J. Bounel are linked to that SSN; and that both Obama and Bounel are linked to the Chicago mansion address. Unless those facts can be explained in some other way, it is not unreasonable to come to the conclusion that Obama stole the SSN of Harrison Bounel. (Obama's domestic terrorist pals William Ayers and Bernardine Dohrn had experience falsifying identifies during the 1970s while hiding from the FBI. They may very well have assisted Obama in getting an SSN—something he might not have been able to do legally if he was a Kenyan or Indonesian citizen without a U.S. birth certificate. Ayers and Dohrn would certainly have known how to obtain the SSN of a deceased individual who had no family—such as an elderly individual living out his final days at a hospital for indigents; in Bounel's case, Connecticut. Attorney Taitz was informed by a reader that the Fairfield State Hospital was such a place. It was located near Newtown and was referred to as the "Newtown nut house." It was later renamed the Fairfield Hills Hospital. Mentally ill and indigent patients were buried on the hospital grounds. Coincidentally, victims of the Sandy Hook school shooting were brought to that hospital for autopsies.) [20627, 20628, 20833, 20865, 20867, 20882, 20883, 21121, 21122, 21123, 21124, 21450, 21451, 21545, 23704, 23764, 24865, 28220, 28221, 28226, 41730, 41801, 41802]

The Illinois Council Against Handgun Violence holds an event at the police station auditorium in Glenview, Illinois. GlenviewPatch.com reports that a large number of "pro-gun advocates—who were encouraged to come from across the state in a mass email from the Illinois State Rifle Association (ISRA)—argued and yelled at panelists throughout the program." ISRA member Steven Zahareas provides a different description of the events: "The moderator who wanted to start the meeting said, 'Let's start the meeting' and tried to start the meeting and someone from our side said, 'Let's start the meeting with the Pledge of Allegiance' and we did. I was in the front row and I saw for myself that the moderator rolled her eyes and not one of the anti-freedom, anti-Constitutionalists stood up for the Pledge." One speaker "went so far as to say that violent crime in Illinois is down and when a crowd member on our side questioned him about the results [he] admitted that the city of Chicago was left out of the study and statistics. ...[He] compared us to Nazis and made the statement that NRA members are the ones who committed the mass shootings." (NRA members are not committing mass school shootings; they are often perpetrated by young men being treated with anti-depressants such as Selective Serotonin Reuptake Inhibitors (SSRI drugs) whose side effects include making the patient hostile and aggressive.) [41830, 41831, 41832, 41833, 41852]

On January 21 an explosion allegedly destroys much of Iran's Fordow nuclear facility. The incident is reported on January 24 by WND.com, whose source is "a former intelligence officer of the Islamic regime." The site is "...buried deep under a mountain and immune not only to air strikes but to most bunker-buster bombs. ...The regime believes the blast was sabotage and the explosives could have reached the area disguised as equipment or in the uranium hexafluoride stock transferred to the site, the source said. The explosion occurred at the third centrifuge chambers, with the high-grade enriched

uranium reserves below them. The information was passed on to U.S. officials but has not been verified or denied by the regime or other sources within the regime.” As many as 16 North Korean technicians and military officers may have been trapped along with Iranians. The White House refuses to confirm that there was an incident at the facility, even though it has also been reported by *The Times* of London and Germany’s *Die Welt*. White House press secretary Jay Carney tells reporters, “We don’t believe those are credible reports. We have no information that would confirm them and do not believe that those reports or that report is credible.” (WND.com later reports that the explosions “...killed at least 40 people, including two North Koreans.”) [41932, 42048, 42049, 42050, 42051, 42270]

DailyCaller.com reports, “Rapper Lupe Fiasco was thrown offstage and escorted off the premises of a Washington, D.C. concert hall during a pre-inauguration concert Sunday night, after going on an anti-war, anti-Obama rant, according to concertgoers. Josh Rogin, a reporter with Foreign Policy magazine, tweeted late Sunday, ‘Lupe Fiasco just got thrown off stage here at the Hamilton Live after he went on an anti-Obama diatribe mid set.’ So Lupe played one anti-war song for 30 min and said he didn’t vote for Obama,’ he continued, ‘and eventually was told to move on to the next song... Lupe refused to move to the next song so a team of security guards came on stage and told him to go.’” (In the past, Fiasco has referred to Obama as “the biggest terrorist.”) [41746, 41751]

On *Morning Joe*, Obama’s closest advisor, Valerie Jarrett, says, “One of the lessons that we learned in the first term is that [Obama] can’t do this alone. He can’t work with Congress alone and expect that they’re going to put their short-term political interests ahead of the American people. But if we have the American people behind us, then there are no limits to what we can do. So you’re going to see [Obama] traveling around the country more [in his second term]. We’re going to have many more opportunities here at the White House to bring people in and inform them and communicate and engage with them about our agenda. And if we have that, then we’re confident that he can have a very robust second-term agenda, and it will get done.” (In other words, Obama is unwilling to cooperate with Congress and reduce spending, so he will attempt to get the American people to persuade their Senators and Congressmen to go along with his leftist agenda of amnesty for illegal immigrants, more deficit spending, and increasing the scope and power of the federal government.) [41814]

Obama and his family go to church, prior to the inauguration ceremony. They arrive at 8:35. The service ends at 9:39. At 9:25 Obama sends a Twitter message, “I’m honored and grateful that we have a chance to finish what we started. Our work begins today. Let’s go. - bo” (What part of the service he was ignoring when he sent the message is not known.) [41765]

As Congressman Paul Ryan (R-WI) leaves the Capitol Building to attend the inauguration, he is greeted by boos from the crowd—instigated by an attorney in Obama’s Department of Justice (DOJ). (The offending attorney is Daniel Freeman. At PJMedia.com J. Christian Adams, a former DOJ attorney, “Freeman was hired as part of

an unprecedented ideological hiring blitz inside the Department of Justice Voting Section soon after the 2009 inauguration. Freeman had all the right credentials for a job as a career civil servant inside Eric Holder's Justice Department—membership in the Yale Law Democrats and experience with the ACLU attacking Bush administration national security policy. For good measure, he sought out representation of al-Qaeda terrorists at Gitmo. ...Once Daniel Freeman was hired, he became a trusted soldier to Assistant Attorney General Tom Perez. He was assigned to politically important voting cases even though he had no experience in election law. One such politically important case was Eric Holder's battle against South Carolina voter ID. ...Freeman also led DOJ's Section 5 attack against Texas voter ID. In Pennsylvania, Freeman's 2012 DOJ attack turned into a DCCC fundraising letter within hours.") [41770, 41798, 41859, 41864]

Obama is publicly sworn into office for his second term. If his second term is anything like his first, over the next four years Obama will: veto two bills; take 836 flights on Air Force One; play golf 113 times; visit 35 countries; deliver 1,852 speeches (using a teleprompter 699 times); sign 654 bills into law; take 83 vacation days; issue 22 pardons; push 2.6 million more families into poverty; and increase the national debt by another \$5+ trillion. As he did in 2009, Obama enters office with an official unemployment rate of 7.8 percent—but with a national debt that is \$5+ trillion greater, and 8 million fewer Americans in the workforce. Each American household's share of the national debt has increased by about \$50,521 since January 20, 2009. [41573, 41758, 41759, 41774, 41933]

Obama takes the oath of office with the name "Barack H. Obama," rather than speaking his full middle name as he did in 2009. (Why Obama chose to make the change is not known.) [41756]

The invocation—which is more of a speech than a prayer—is delivered not by a minister, priest, or rabbi, but by Myrlie Evers-Williams, the widow of Medgar Evers. She conspicuously mentions "God" only once, but asks for "blessings upon our leaders" and notes "mankind," "womankind," and the "promise of America." Amazingly, Evers even uses the Pledge of Allegiance phrase, "one nation, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all"—intentionally leaving out "under God." (For decades, tens of millions of American school children have recited, "I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one Nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all." Evers, and by extension Obama, apparently find "under God" politically incorrect. At PJMedia.com Paula Bolyard later writes, "After listening to the inaugural prayer, I needed a spiritual shower.") [41757, 41792, 41793, 41860]

Beyonce Knowles "sings" the national anthem for the inauguration. (Considering the \$50 million cost of the event, some might have expected the big-time Obama supporter perform live, rather than lip sync to a recording.) Kelly Clarkson (a Republican) has the courage to sing *My Country 'Tis of Thee* live. (Neither Knowles or Clarkson is able to hit all their high and low notes adequately.) [41795, 41804, 41824]

During the public ceremony, an enormous “Jumbotron” television used to allow crowds near the Washington Monument watch and listen to Obama’s speech malfunctions, producing garbled audio and video. (Some might argue that they did not miss much. Obama’s address is flat, uninspiring, full of the usual liberal claptrap, and missing any hint of eloquence.) [41764]

Obama focuses on the collective, stating in his inaugural address, “Together, we determined that a modern economy requires railroads and highways to speed travel and commerce; schools and colleges to train our workers. Together, we discovered that a free market only thrives when there are rules to ensure competition and fair play. Together, we resolved that a great nation must care for the vulnerable, and protect its people from life’s worst hazards and misfortune. Through it all, we have never relinquished our skepticism of central authority, nor have we succumbed to the fiction that all society’s ills can be cured through government alone. Our celebration of initiative and enterprise; our insistence on hard work and personal responsibility, are constants in our character.” (Obama pays lip service to individualism and responsibility, but the entire theme of his speech is “big government is needed to do everything.” By “free market... [with] rules” Obama means “liberty with chains.” A market is not free when it is bound by high taxes and restrictive federal regulations, just as one has no liberty if wearing chains. The length of the chain connecting one to the ball does not negate the existence of the ball.) [41766]

“But we have always understood that when times change, so must we; that fidelity to our founding principles requires new responses to new challenges; that preserving our individual freedoms ultimately requires collective action. For the American people can no more meet the demands of today’s world by acting alone than American soldiers could have met the forces of fascism or communism with muskets and militias. No single person can train all the math and science teachers we’ll need to equip our children for the future, or build the roads and networks and research labs that will bring new jobs and businesses to our shores. Now, more than ever, we must do these things together, as one nation, and one people.” (“Preserving our individual freedoms ultimately requires collective action” is, of course, a contradiction. Individual freedom is the antithesis of the collective or statism; he may as well have said, “Draining the swamp means adding water.” Obama’s reference to “muskets and militias” is most certainly meant to ridicule supporters of the Second Amendment right to bear arms as old-fashioned relics of the past. And certainly no one in history has *ever* suggested that any “single person” could, would, or should train all the teachers or build the roads and labs. That is Obama’s reliance on the straw man argument, intended to reinforce his “you didn’t build that” argument in favor of big government. He does not explain why he thinks the American people would be too stupid to train teachers and build roads and labs without reliance on government.) [41766]

“A decade of war is now ending. An economic recovery has begun.” (Some, including al-Qaeda and 25 million unemployed Americans, might dispute both of those statements, but Obama’s ego is apparently large enough to accommodate the claim that he is responsible for widespread peace and prosperity—even if it has not yet been seen.) America’s possibilities are limitless, for we possess all the qualities that this world

without boundaries demands: youth and drive; diversity and openness; an endless capacity for risk and a gift for reinvention. My fellow Americans, we are made for this moment, and we will seize it—so long as we seize it together.” (Again, Obama stresses the collective.) He makes sure to include a class warfare remark: “For we, the people, understand that our country cannot succeed when a shrinking few do very well and a growing many barely make it. We believe that America’s prosperity must rest upon the broad shoulders of a rising middle class. We know that America thrives when every person can find independence and pride in their work; when the wages of honest labor liberate families from the brink of hardship. . . . We, the people, still believe that every citizen deserves a basic measure of security and dignity. We must make the hard choices to reduce the cost of health care and the size of our deficit.” He includes another of his infamous straw man arguments: “But we reject the belief that America must choose between caring for the generation that built this country and investing in the generation that will build its future.” (No one has suggested that such a choice must be made.) [41766]

“We recognize that no matter how responsibly we live our lives, any one of us, at any time, may face a job loss, or a sudden illness, or a home swept away in a terrible storm. The commitments we make to each other—through Medicare, and Medicaid, and Social Security—these things do not sap our initiative; they strengthen us. They do not make us a nation of takers; they free us to take the risks that make this country great.” (Obama is here ridiculing Mitt Romney’s “47 percent” remark, and telling Congress he will not accept any changes in the entitlement programs—even though they are driving the nation into bankruptcy and even though we are, in fact, becoming a nation of takers, created by the very government programs that Obama wants to expand.) [41766]

Obama introduces a global warming scare: “We will respond to the threat of climate change, knowing that the failure to do so would betray our children and future generations. Some may still deny the overwhelming judgment of science, but none can avoid the devastating impact of raging fires, and crippling drought, and more powerful storms.” The leftist checklist requires a nod to “equal pay for women,” and Obama states, “It is now our generation’s task to carry on what those pioneers began. For our journey is not complete until our wives, our mothers, and daughters can earn a living equal to their efforts.” (Obama has yet to recognize that for more than 40 years it has been against the law to pay a woman less for doing the same work as a man.) [41766]

Obama addresses the gay marriage topic: “[F]or if we are truly created equal, then surely the love we commit to one another must be equal as well.” And illegal immigrants: “Our journey is not complete until we find a better way to welcome the striving, hopeful immigrants who still see America as a land of opportunity; until bright young students and engineers are enlisted in our workforce rather than expelled from our country.” And gun control: “Our journey is not complete until all our children, from the streets of Detroit to the hills of Appalachia to the quiet lanes of Newtown, know that they are cared for, and cherished, and always safe from harm.” [41766]

“That is our generation’s task,” continues Obama, “to make these words, these rights, these values—of Life, and Liberty, and the Pursuit of Happiness—real for every American. Being true to our founding documents does not require us to agree on every contour of life; it does not mean we will all define liberty in exactly the same way, or follow the same precise path to happiness. Progress does not compel us to settle centuries-long debates about the role of government for all time—but it does require us to act in our time.” (In fact, circumstances sometimes *do* compel us to agree on the role of government—but Obama will have none of that. Government’s role is what *he* wants it to be. Obama is saying, “Those darned conservatives take the U.S. Constitution too literally and must be more flexible.) No Obama speech would be complete without accusing the other side of doing what he himself does. He states, “We cannot mistake absolutism for principle, or substitute spectacle for politics, or treat name-calling as reasoned debate.” (By “absolutism,” Obama means believing in anything he does not. By name-calling, Obama likely does not mean his campaign ad that declared, “Mitt Romney. Not One of Us,” or his campaign’s claims that Mitt Romney was a tax cheat and a felon responsible for the cancer death of a woman whose husband once worked for a company in which Bain Capital had invested.) [41766, 41844, 41879]

Obama concludes his truly forgettable, and partly petty, address: “My oath is not so different from the pledge we all make to the flag that waves above and that fills our hearts with pride. They are the words of citizens, and they represent our greatest hope. You and I, as citizens, have the power to set this country’s course. You and I, as citizens, have the obligation to shape the debates of our time—not only with the votes we cast, but with the voices we lift in defense of our most ancient values and enduring ideals. Let each of us now embrace, with solemn duty and awesome joy, what is our lasting birthright. With common effort and common purpose, with passion and dedication, let us answer the call of history, and carry into an uncertain future that precious light of freedom. Thank you, God Bless you, and may He forever bless these United States of America.” [41766]

HuffingtonPost.com notes, “After delivering his speech in front of the U.S. Capitol, Obama surveyed the scene of hundreds of thousands of Americans, remarking on how special a moment this was for him. ‘I want to take a look, one more time,’ Obama said. ‘I’m not going to see again.’” (Behind the scenes, however, he and his most avid supporters are eager to find a way to eliminate the Twenty-Second Amendment to the Constitution so that he can serve for life and fully “transform” the United States into what they hope will be a socialist utopia.) [41796, 41797]

In his politically correct closing prayer, Episcopal pastor Luis León says, “We pray for your blessing, because without it we will see only what the eye can see. But with your blessing, we’ll see that we are made in your image, whether brown, black or white; male or female; first generation immigrant or Daughter of the American Revolution; gay or straight; rich or poor.” [41839]

At WashingtonPost.com Scott Wilson writes that Obama “used his second inaugural address Monday to make the case for a liberal last-term agenda that would more sharply

define his legacy, arguing that issues such as climate change, immigration reform, gun control and gay rights represent the civil-rights concerns of his generation. The speech served as an epilogue to his first inaugural address, which was defined by the stern tone he employed ‘in the midst of crisis.’ He echoed some of the same broad themes, including the need for the nation’s political leaders to act in common cause to adapt to a changing country and world. But Obama did so with more optimism, partisanship and populism than he did on a far colder day four years ago. The caveats and compromises that he included then to appease leery Republicans uncertain of his political approach were almost entirely absent from the arguments he made Monday.” [41771]

Reason.com and HotAir.com examine some of Obama’s promises and pledges from his 2009 inaugural address: “And those of us who manage the public’s dollars will be held to account, to spend wisely, reform bad habits, and do our business in the light of day, because only then can we restore the vital trust between a people and their government.” “On this day, we gather because we have chosen hope over fear, unity of purpose over conflict and discord. On this day, we come to proclaim an end to the petty grievances and false promises, the recriminations and worn-out dogmas that for far too long have strangled our politics.” “The question we ask today is not whether our government is too big or too small, but whether it works—whether it helps families find jobs at a decent wage, care they can afford, a retirement that is dignified.” “Where the answer is yes, we intend to move forward. Where the answer is no, programs will end. And those of us who manage the public’s dollars will be held to account, to spend wisely, reform bad habits, and do our business in the light of day, because only then can we restore the vital trust between a people and their government.” “To the Muslim world, we seek a new way forward, based on mutual interest and mutual respect. To those leaders around the globe who seek to sow conflict, or blame their society’s ills on the West, know that your people will judge you on what you can build, not what you destroy.” [41749, 41750]

Author and columnist Michelle Malkin notes that Obama and Biden, sworn in for their second terms, are “now officially inheriting problems from themselves.” [41772]

ABC sycophant Diane Sawyer says, “The whole city has a smile on its face”—a statement Newsbusters.org suggests would not have been uttered by anyone in the mainstream media had Mitt Romney been the person being sworn in. [41772]

Also eager to confirm that he is not an objective reporter is CNN correspondent Jim Acosta, who Newsbusters.org calls “positively giddy while covering ...Obama’s inauguration parade...” Acosta says, “You know, I feel like I should pinch myself right now, Wolf [Blitzer]. I can’t believe I have this vantage point of history in the making.” He later gushes, “But one thing you can say, Wolf. It’s good to be [Obama]. It’s almost like being a rock star on every street corner of Washington on this day because every time he hits a new intersection, the cheers go up on both sides of Pennsylvania Avenue, and for [Obama] it’s just a whole new group of Americans to greet as he makes his way towards the White House. And I have to tell you, it’s been pretty exciting to watch all of this unfold from the back of this flatbed truck.” (Whether the easily impressed Acosta will have his shoes bronzed to commemorate the occasion is not known.) [41782]

From the sidelines, NBC weatherman Al Roker yells at Obama and Joe Biden to get their attention. Obama responds with a “thumbs up,” and Biden stops to shake his hand. On MSNBC, Martin Bashir exclaims, “Yes! The Vice President has just shaken hands with Al Roker of the *Today* show. He’s done it!” (Whether Roker will never again wash his right hand is not known. The rumor that Roker and Jim Acosta scattered flowers along the parade route is not true.) [41783]

The media fawning is not limited to just a few reporters. Virtually every reporter on CNN, MSNBC, ABC, CBS, and NBC displays childish giddiness with comments such as, “This is so exciting.” “Just exciting, an inspiration to be here.” “I feel like I should pinch myself right now.” “Pretty exciting for all of us out here.” “I tell you what George, this is pretty exciting.” “A thrilling, thrilling morning. Very exciting.” “I saw the First Lady! There’s the First Lady over there” Well, you know, we’re spectators. We’re tourists here in Washington.” “America threw itself a party today.” “This great pageant of a day in American democracy.” “It’s a day to say congratulations, United States of America. It is a wonderful moment.” “It was a perfect day. The crowds were large, they were joyous.” “An amazing day in Washington.” “A magical moment in a second term that begins today.” “It’s amazing how beloved Barack Obama is by the African American community.” “It’s an amazing moment to have [Obama] being re-elected, and re-inaugurated on Martin Luther king day.” “[Obama] was weaving the new tapestry of America as he sees it.” [41821, 41835]

The media also spends considerable time praising Michelle Obama’s various outfits, but almost none discussing their cost. (One can assume that had Mitt Romney been elected, his wife’s inaugural clothing would have been evaluated from a much different perspective.) [41829]

The inaugural luncheon tops 3,000 calories and includes lobster tails in a New England clam chowder sauce, bison with a red potato horseradish cake, and apple pie with sour cream ice cream. (One video clip shows Michelle “healthy foods” Obama eagerly shoveling food in her mouth as though her life depended on it while House Speaker John Boehner jokes with her husband. She also had her elbows on the table, an etiquette no-no that even children are taught.) [41768, 41773, 41790]

Crowd estimates vary, but it is clear that far fewer people—probably fewer than one-half—attend the 2012 event than the estimated 1.8 million in 2009. Attendees do, however, have the opportunity to buy “Obama Condoms” with the package slogans “Use With Good Judgment,” “The Ultimate Stimulus Package,” “Hope is Not a Form of Protection,” and “Won’t Break As Easily as His Promises”—five for \$20 (or \$3.95 online at ObamaCondoms.com). [41815, 41990, 41991]

Although the mainstream media excoriated George W. Bush for the \$40 million cost of the 2005 inaugural events, there is little or no criticism of the \$50 million price tag for Obama’s “second coming.” (Most of the media attention over the cost is to encourage



contributions by repeatedly pointing out that the Obama team was falling \$10 million short of the \$50 million.) [41784]

Apparently because it's not enough to have been elected to a second term and be continuously fawned over by a leftist media, Obama proclaims January 21, 2013 a "National Day of Hope and Resolve, 2013." His self-congratulatory proclamation reads in part: "Four years ago, the American people came together to chart a new course through an uncertain hour. We chose hope over fear and hard work during hardship, confident that the age-old values that had guided our Nation through even its darkest days would be sufficient to meet the trials of our time. Together, we have brought a decade of war toward a responsible end. We have saved our economy from collapse and fought for a future where everyone has an equal chance at opportunity. Millions of men, women, and children have made service their mission, reaffirming that America's greatest strength lies not in might or wealth, but in the bonds we share with one another. Today, I have sworn an oath to preserve the fundamental freedoms and protections that are the lasting birthright of all who call this land home. I stand humbled by the responsibilities entrusted to me by our people, and I pray God's grace will see us through the tests we will surely face in the days ahead. But even as I assume once more the solemn duty of this Presidency, let us also remember that the oath I spoke shares much in common with those taken by every service member and every immigrant, and with the pledge we make before our flag. These are the words of America's citizens, and they represent our greatest hope." [41799, 41800]

Author and columnist Mona Charen comments, "...Obama's quotations and allusions in his inaugural address served only to highlight the flatness of his own prose. 'We hold these truths to be self-evident,' he intoned, repeating the echoing words of the Declaration of Independence. What followed was: 'Today we continue a never-ending journey to bridge the meaning of those words with the realities of our time. For history tells us that while these truths may be self-evident, they've never been self-executing.' Clunk. 'Self-executing' is a word best left to legal documents. It has as much poetry as a filing cabinet. As for 'never-ending journey,' it's a phrase that belongs in the juvenile fiction section—if there. Obama's second inaugural poached lines from Lincoln's speeches. The effect was like inserting snatches of Mozart into a Mariah Carey song. ...Obama's speech also seemed to allude to Lincoln's message to Congress before signing the Emancipation Proclamation. Lincoln said: 'The dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate to the stormy present. ...As our case is new, so we must think anew and act anew. We must disenthrall ourselves, and then we shall save our country.' Obama, able to wring banality from the best material, said: 'But we have always understood that when times change, so must we, that fidelity to our founding principles requires new responses to new challenges, that preserving our individual freedoms ultimately requires collective action.' Clunk. Bounding from bromide to platitude, Obama alighted on his true theme—to excoriate his opponents and to deny that choices must be made between providing lavish welfare state benefits and ensuring the prosperity of future generations." [41794]

Fox News' senior political analyst Brit Hume comments, "I think we had a clarifying moment today, and that [Obama's] speech served a real purpose and should put to rest, in

my view, for all time the idea that Barack Obama really is a moderate. Barack Obama is a liberal. I don't think he's a radical, but he is an out and out liberal and now, newly reelected, he intends to pursue the course of that liberalism. He is going to pursue it as if he had, from the election, an enormous mandate. I think he had a narrow win, but a decisive win. And the battle lines are now clearly drawn. I don't think there's much hope at all, barring unforeseen developments, which are always possible, that we're going to have any kind of the unity in Washington that some people have longed for for so long.” [41777]

On Fox News, Charles Krauthammer says the inaugural address was “...Obama unbound. I think what's most interesting is that Obama basically is declaring the end of Reaganism in this speech. Remember, he once said that Ronald Reagan was historically consequential in a way that Bill Clinton was not. And what Obama meant is that Reagan had changed the ideological course of the country. In 1981, in his inaugural address, within two minutes Reagan had declared, ‘government is not the solution, government is the problem.’ Today's inaugural address was a rebuke to that entire idea. This speech today was an ode to big government. It was a hymn to big government. ...He said, number one I'm gonna defend what liberalism has achieved in the twentieth century, where he mentioned Social Security, and Medicare, and Medicaid. So I'm not gonna let any of that be chipped away. And then second, he said, the vision for the future is climate change and “green” energy, there's gonna be his new expansion of liberalism in the new century. And then the third element was this expansion of civil rights where he talked about immigrants and gays and he even shoe-horned the gun rights under the rubric of security. He outlined *the* liberal agenda, the big government agenda of the future.” [41775]

“Remarkably, there's an absence of any mention of the economy, of deficits, of what outsiders would say is the great challenge of our time, heading over a cliff, a real cliff of debt into sort of a Greek future. There is *nothing* of that in this speech. Obama has zero interest in that. And this was a declaration that his interest is to restore us to the liberal ascendancy of 60 years that Reagan stopped—he gave us these three decades, and Clinton, in the middle of the three decades said, in his '96 State of the Union address, ‘the era of big government is over.’ This [Obama] speech was a declaration, ‘the era of big government is back. I'm the man who will do it.’ A remarkable speech. ...You get a sense of a man who said, ‘all right, ‘I've won my second election. I never have to face the electorate again. I'm gonna be who I wanna be, and I'm gonna change the ideological trajectory of the country. That's my job. That's why I'm here historically.’ And he sees himself as a world historical figure, and this speech is sort of a declaration of it.” [41775]

Obama, says Krauthammer, “is not terribly interested in the economic agenda. You would think [in] a country with historically high unemployment—historically we've never had higher chronic unemployment—with a recovery that's the weakest since the Second World War, and with \$16 trillion of debt, [he] would address that in his inaugural address. And the only extent he does... is a sort of class war argument where he seems to attribute it to the selfishness of the rich, without giving it any serious consideration. So, to the extent he's interested in the economy he will use it for little class war, for a little

leveling, a little reduction of inequality. He's showing that that's not his main interest. The main interest is changing the nature of the relationship between citizen and state, where he restores the prestige of the government, the importance of the government—which used to be the case in the heyday of liberalism before Ronald Reagan.

...[G]enerally speaking, when [Obama] speaks of 'we,' working together, being responsible for each other, he's not speaking of our common duties or even of civil society, of the free associations. He means *government*. Government is what he means by 'we.' And that's an idea from the mid-twentieth century, and he's here to revive it." [41775]

Political scientist and Columbia University professor Ian Bremmer tweets the GOP interpretation of Obama's speech: "Together, we shall pursue my objectives."

One of MSNBC's Obama fan-boys, Chris Matthews, says that Obama's address "Reminds me of another second inaugural—Lincoln's. So much of Lincoln in that speech, the Gettysburg address to the second inaugural itself. I thought [what] was interesting was an attempt to draw a balance. Of course, he's a man of the progressive side, but, he tried to draw a balance there between a government rule by an elite and a government ruled by a mob, both being a problem. Then he talked about the government we want, which is infrastructure, education, regulation, all the good things, and then recognized that government can't solve all the problems. I thought that was a reaching-out, if you will..." [41811]

NBC's Chuck Todd is less fawning: "It was a robust defense of a lot of progressive ideals in a way, and, yes, you heard pragmatic pieces [of] the speech saying, you know, we're not going to get everything we want, things like that, we do need to learn to compromise. It was pretty clear that he was defending government and defending progressivism in a way that you didn't always hear on the campaign trail, frankly." [41811]

The editors of *National Review* remark that Obama, "being sworn in for a second term, was doing the thing he does best: giving a speech largely divorced from reality. ... The very form of government cited by [Obama]—a republic—necessitates a particular conception of citizenship (another word [he] leaned heavily upon) and of the citizen's relationship to the state. It is the American conception of citizenship in a constitutional republic that defines the unique political character of our nation, and that is the very thing that ... Obama promised to ignore: 'Progress does not compel us to settle centuries-long debates about the role of government for all time—but it does require us to act in our time.' Progress sometimes does require us to settle questions about the role of government: Either government is to have the power to force citizens to violate their consciences in the name of insurance reform or it is not. Either the items in the Bill of Rights mean what they say or they do not. Either the Second Amendment is about hunting or it is about something else. Either the authority of the federal government has discoverable limits or it is unlimited. Taxes are either a tool for raising revenue or a tool for achieving some vision of what the president's admirers like to call 'social justice.' [Obama] will have to answer these questions one way or another. Indeed, he has done so

implicitly, and his refusal to make his assumptions explicit does not unmake them.”  
[41776]

Examiner.com reports, “On Monday, renowned author and humanitarian Dr. Jim Garrow made a shocking claim about what we can expect to see in Obama’s second term. Garrow made the following Facebook post: ‘I have just been informed by a former senior military leader that Obama is using a new ‘litmus test’ in determining who will stay and who must go in his military leaders. Get ready to explode folks. ‘The new litmus test of leadership in the military is if they will fire on US citizens or not.’ Those who will not are being removed.’ So, who is the source? Garrow replied: ‘The man who told me this is one of America’s foremost military heroes.’ Understand, this is not coming from Alex Jones or Jesse Ventura, or from anyone else the left often dismisses with great ease. Garrow is a well-respected activist and has spent much of his life rescuing infant girls from China, babies who would be killed under that country’s one-child policy. He was also nominated for Nobel Peace Prize for his work. ... This comes on the heels of Sunday’s report in the Washington Free Beacon (WFB) that the head of Central Command, Marine Corps Gen. James Mattis is being dismissed by Obama and will leave his post in March. The WFB article states: ‘Word on the national security street is that General James Mattis is being given the bum’s rush out of his job as commander of Central Command, and is being told to vacate his office several months earlier than planned.’ Did Gen. Mattis refuse to ‘fire on U.S. citizens?’” (*The Obama Timeline* is unable to confirm the claim, but after five years of researching Obama’s past finds it entirely within the realm of possibility. Mattis is an intelligent, independent minded general who speaks his mind—traits the Obama administration may not want in its military leaders. Mattis was not even given the courtesy of a phone call from the Pentagon or the White House. According to ForeignPolicy.com, he was handed a note telling him he had been relieved of his command. Garrow, founder of the Bethune Institute, is a philanthropist and reportedly a 2009 Nobel Peace Prize nominee.) [41778, 41805, 41887, 42044, 42045, 42046, 42047, 42264]

Secretary of Defense Leon Panetta states, “I’m glad we were able to get some rescued, but we did lose three Americans [in the Algerian hostage event]. That just tells us al-Qaeda is committed to creating terror wherever they are, and we’ve got to fight back.” (By “we” Panetta means the Algerian government. The Obama administration stood silently by, took no action, and issued almost no statements. Now that he is retiring, Panetta has figured out that the United States has to fight back against continuing jihadist attacks. Had he realized that months earlier, four Americans might not have been killed in Libya on September 11, 2012.) The slaughtered Americans were Victor Lynn Lovelady, Gordon Lee Rowan, and Frederick Buttaccio—who the mainstream media ignores as it focuses on Michelle Obama’s new wig and scattering flowers along the parade route in front of her husband. [41780, 41787]

While Leon Panetta finally figures out that radical Islamists remain a threat to the United States and Western civilization, the attack in Algeria acts as a recruiting tool for al-Qaeda. *The Washington Post* reports, “A week of violence in Algeria and Mali has transformed al-Qaeda’s North Africa branch into a cause celebre for militant Islamists

around the globe, boosting recruitment and fundraising for the jihadists and spurring fears of further terrorist attacks in the region and beyond. Even after suffering tactical defeats in both countries in recent days, the movement known as al-Qaeda in the Islamic Maghreb is being lionized in Internet chat rooms and in official statements by extremist groups, some of which are urging reprisal campaigns against Western interests.” (Obama may consider al-Qaeda to be vanquished, but its members do not share that view. The Post is incorrect to label the Algerian attack a “defeat” for the terrorists. From their perspective it was a success: they killed 37 non-Muslims and attracted thousands of new recruits.) [41788, 41789]

It is worth noting that many of the weapons used by the terrorists in Algeria likely came from Libya and became available after Obama worked to oust Moammar Gaddafi from power. At PowerLineBlog.com, John Hinderaker observes, “The overthrow of Moammar Gaddafi has turned out to be a terrible blunder. It has empowered radical Muslims, led directly to the Benghazi debacle, and scattered Gaddafi’s armory among terrorist elements, including al Qaeda. There has been, of course, no accountability for the Libya decision, either with respect to the Obama administration or others outside the administration who supported Obama’s policy.” [41806]

At Time.com, Bruce Crumley plays down the significance of the terrorist attack in Algeria, writing, “The initial conclusions, however, may not be as dire as one might expect following the horror of the In Amenas attack. Although 37 foreigners lost their lives after Islamist extremists took hundreds of gas-refinery workers prisoner Jan. 16, the early view from some counterterrorism officials is that In Amenas represents a nightmarish exception to increased but much lower-grade action by jihadi forces in coming weeks.” AtlasShrugs.com’s Pamela Geller notes that there have been more than 20,000 deadly Islamist attacks since September 11, 2001, and comments, “Notice how TIME leaves out why hundreds of hostages were released without harm, because they were Muslims and the jihadists were out to ‘kill Christians and infidels.’” (In other words, the terrorists would have killed many more had they been “infidels.” Crumley is too stupid to recognize why the body count was “not as dire” as it could have been.) [41785, 41786]

House Republicans plan a January 23 vote to increase the debt ceiling—but only enough to fund government operations through May 18. (Obama, of course, would prefer that the debt ceiling be raised enough to make the issue go away until after the 2014 mid-term elections. By passing a temporary measure, House Republicans can focus on debt reduction for several months while taking away Obama’s threat of stopping Social Security payments or military paychecks.) The White House announces that Obama would be willing to sign a stop-gap measure into law. The rudely non-conciliatory statement says Obama would support the legislation because it lifts “the immediate threat of default and indicates that congressional Republicans have backed off an insistence on holding the Nation’s economy hostage to extract drastic cuts in Medicare, education, and other programs that middle-class families depend on.” [41791, 41846, 41850]

Congressman Paul Ryan (R-WI) responds to Obama's inaugural speech suggestion that Republicans oppose entitlement programs. Ryan says, "No one is suggesting that what we call 'earned entitlements,' entitlements you pay for, you know, like payroll taxes for Medicare and Social Security, are putting you in a 'taker' category. No one suggests that whatsoever. The concern that people like me have been raising is we do not want to encourage a dependency culture. This is why we called for welfare reform. This is what welfare reform in 1996 was. This was what the new rounds for welfare reform we're calling for do, which is to increase social mobility, economic opportunity, self-responsibility, those kinds of things. But earned entitlements, where you pay your payroll taxes to get a benefit when you retire, like Social Security and Medicare, are not taker programs. And I think when [Obama] does kind of a switcheroo like that, what he's trying to say is we are maligning these programs, that people have earned throughout their working lives. And so it's kind of a convenient twist of terms to try and shadowbox a straw man in order to win an argument by default, is essentially what that rhetorical device is that he uses over and over and over." [41807]

At WashingtonExaminer.com Byron York writes, "There were plenty of messages in Obama's speech. He will push for immigration reform. He will push for gay rights. (Obama used the words 'equal' or 'equality' seven times in his speech, versus just once in his first inaugural address.) He will push on global warming. And he will keep pouring billions of taxpayer dollars into 'green energy' projects that have so far yielded little energy and fewer jobs. But the economy? Other than declaring, 'An economic recovery has begun,' Obama had nearly nothing to say. That should not be a surprise. Since last November's election, [Obama's] supporters, in political office and in the press, have spent a lot of time talking about his second-term agenda. The economy somehow never tops their lists. Obama himself, when asked to name his top priorities on 'Meet the Press' recently, put immigration reform at the head of the list." (Creating more Democrat voters is more important to Obama than creating jobs for 25 million Americans.) [41809, 41810]

Former House Speaker Newt Gingrich observes that in much of Obama's speech he said the "right words" but disguised what he meant by them: "For instance," Gingrich tells Newsmax.com, "he talked about how children need to feel safe. One left-wing reporter asked me if it was a call for gun control. I said that it was a call for armed guards in schools. He wasn't clear. ...To conservatives, we have a choice. Because [Obama] talked about having a good work ethic, I'd say: 'Let's reform unemployment compensation, with a requirement that you educate yourself so you can get a new job—because we should not be paying people to do nothing'—and we can cite it as being a part of Barack Obama's agenda. ...I'd say, let's look at this speech and underline everything you agree with. If Ronald Reagan had given this speech, and you read it—and, not knowing who gave it—you could see that it was almost identical to something he would have said. But 20 percent is goofy left-wingism—and we'd cheerfully fight him on that. The whole section about climate change is nonsense. The great energy revolution we're living through is called 'oil and gas.'" [41812]

Breitbart.com's Ben Shapiro interviews attorney, author, and radio talk show host Mark Levin. Levin states, "I don't think Obama knows exactly what he's going to go for in his second term, as he will look for opportunities to exploit as events unfold. I am sure they've drawn up a partial list, and we already know that it includes, but is not limited to, gun control; attacks on the First Amendment such as religious liberty; amnesty for illegal aliens; union expansion; institutionalizing ObamaCare; institutionalizing voter corruption; de-industrialization via the EPA; destroying the capitalist-based economy via tax increases, smothering regulations, massive deficit spending, and endless borrowing; and hollowing out our military; etc." An Obama second term "...will do extreme damage to the nation in many respects. I think Obama sees himself as correcting historic wrongs in this country, as delivering the fruits of the labor of other people to people who he believes have historically been put upon. I think there's a lot of perverse thinking that goes on in his mind, radical left-wing thinking. He was indoctrinated with Marx and [Saul] Alinsky propaganda. You not only see it in his agenda but in his words—class warfare; degrading successful people—unless, of course, they help finance his elections, causes, and organizations; pretending to speak for the so-called middle class when, in fact, he is destroying their jobs, savings, and future. Obama's war on our society is intended to be an onslaught in which the system is overwhelmed." [41816, 41817]

"I think the Republican Party, its apparatus, its so-called leadership, the parasitic consultants, represent an institution that is tired, old, almost decrepit, full of cowardice and vision-less. It has abandoned the Declaration of Independence and any serious defense of constitutional republicanism. The Democrat Party is now a radical 1960s party; it's the anti-Constitution, anti-capitalism, anti-individual party. It largely controls the federal government, including the massive bureaucracy and much of the judiciary—what I call the permanent branches of the federal government. The Democrat Party represents the federal government, and the federal government expands the power of the Democrat Party. They're appendages of each other. On the other hand, the GOP today stands for capitulation, timidity, delusion—so mostly nothing. Republicans may speak of the Constitution, limited government, low taxes, etc., but what have they done about them? Next to nothing if not nothing. Even when [George W.] Bush ... was president and the Republicans controlled Congress, what did they do? They went on a spending binge. They expanded Medicare, the federal role in local education, drove up the debt, etc. Meanwhile, we are lectured by putative Republicans like Colin Powell, Condoleezza Rice, Tom Ridge, and a conga line of others trashing often viciously NOT Obama and what the Democrats are doing to our nation, but conservatives, constitutionalists, and tea party activists who are the only people left standing for liberty against tyranny in this country." [41816, 41817]

Levin warns, "To be perfectly honest, many countries haven't come back from this. It's happening from within. When an individual like Obama uses the instrumentalities of government against us, when he uses the power that the Constitution grants to a president to evade the Constitution and abuse power, when he uses liberty to exploit opportunities to promote the tyranny of centralized government, it's extremely difficult for people who are not paying attention or who are not engaged in the political process to help us stop what's taking place. ... Only when things get so bad do many of them realize what's

happening, and that's usually too late. Reestablishing the civil society will be extremely difficult. I have hope, but I'm not going to delude myself or others that this is just another election cycle or just another president or just another agenda we can easily overcome if we win the White House back in 2016. [Obama] is making institutional, structural changes to our country." [41816, 41817]

"Do I think the country can survive? I think America will certainly exist. But what kind of America? The question is whether we will be a free and prosperous people or just another miserable place where rights are denied and needs are scarce and distributed by the government. I believe knowing the perilous state of the nation, and not pretending otherwise, and knowing that only we conservatives have any hope of stemming this tide and gradually reversing course, we will fight this in every legitimate way we can. And hopefully our already significant ranks will grow. We have no choice but to stand and fight. Everything is at stake. ...The one positive aspect I see today, there are more people in America now who have at least a general concept of how the Constitution is supposed to work, including the Bill of Rights, and a general concept of what the Declaration of Independence means, including the emphasis on the value of every individual. This was not so 10 or 20 years ago. That's not to say that such an understanding can easily transfer into modern politics. But I think, in part, that's why you see so many millions of people frustrated, because they know our government shouldn't be operating this way. ...The choice is in our hands right now." [41816, 41817]

At CommentaryMagazine.com Peter Wehner writes, "...Obama's inaugural address was eloquent and moving in parts. It was also deeply partisan and polarizing, something that is unusual for a day normally devoted to unity and common purpose. But not in Barack Obama's America. In his inaugural speech he did what he seemingly cannot keep himself from doing: portraying himself and his followers as Children of Light and portraying his opponents as Children of Darkness. You are either with Obama—or you are with the forces of cruelty and bigotry. In Obama's world, there is no middle ground. He is the Voice of Reason; those who oppose him are the voice of the mob. They are the ones who (to cite just one passage from his speech) mistake absolutism for principle, substitute spectacle for politics, and treat name-calling as reasoned debate. ...And for all of his self-perceived similarities with Abraham Lincoln, he is the antithesis of Lincoln when it comes to grace, a charitable spirit and a commitment to genuine reconciliation. Mr. Obama is, at his core, a divider. He seems to relish it, even when the moment calls for a temporary truce in our political wars. ...Obama's speech was not a call to unity; it was a summons to his liberal base to fight—on global warming, for gay rights, for gun control, for renewable energy, and for a diminished American role in world affairs. And [Obama's] speech also signaled that he will oppose, with passion and demagoguery, anyone who attempts to reform our entitlement programs. He is fully at peace with running trillion dollar deficits as far as the eye can see. He not only won't lift a finger to avoid America's coming debt crisis; he will lacerate those who do. ...What we are seeing is the authentic Obama, a liberated and fiercely committed progressive who believes he is an agent for social justice and fairness. He feels the election completely vindicated him and his agenda. He has sheer contempt for his opponents. And in his second term he will



crush them if they stand in his way. Call it the transmogrification of Hope and Change.” [41818]

At TheDailyBeast.com Megan McArdle writes, “The liberals and the conservatives in my twitter feed seemed to be listening to different speeches. The liberals were electrified with the bold stances [Obama] was taking, gay marriage and climate change chief among them. Conservatives read it as a lot of empty platitudes about togetherness, followed by a bit of eye-poking to make it clear that anything we did together would necessarily be directed by Obama, not his opponents. ...I side with the liberals on one thing: it was arguably the most liberal speech [Obama] has given. Which is news, of a sort. But I side with the conservatives in thinking that this was largely a big yawn. [Obama] gave a speech which makes his base happy, but entirely on symbolic grounds. He promised nothing of substance, and covered no issue which actually commits him to delivering anything. Obama is against ‘perpetual war,’ but also wants to support democracy and ‘act on behalf of those who long for freedom.’ He wants shorter voting lines and ‘a better way to welcome’ immigrants. He wants children to be safe and cared for. The last is a vague hope shared by all Americans (no really—even the ones who disagree with you about stuff!) The rest are carefully phrased to offer no actual benchmarks.” [41819]

*National Review’s* Rich Lowry writes, “For the Left, this is what winning looks like. ...Obama gave a second inaugural address that just as easily could have been delivered by progressive darling Elizabeth Warren.” Although Obama “didn’t repeat the phrase that Republicans threw back at him so often during the 2012 campaign—‘you didn’t build that’—the speech was a meditation on the same theme of the limits of individual action. The address was a paean to collectivism, swaddled in the rhetoric of individual liberty and of fidelity to the Founding. ...In Obama’s telling, the high points of our national life are found in collective action, in the growth of government, in teachers trained and roads built. ‘Now, more than ever,’ he declared, ‘we must do these things together, as one nation and one people.’ ...All of his bows to modesty were formalistic. He mentioned ‘outworn programs,’ without even promising to eliminate any. He said we have always had a suspicion of central authority, but of course he didn’t endorse it. He said we don’t have to settle the debate over the size of government once and for all, while insisting that we keep expanding it on his terms. All in all, it was a brazen performance, as audacious in intent as it was banal in its expression. He used the Founders’ authority to advance an expansive conception of American government that would have been unrecognizable to them. Amid the pomp and the circumstances, Republicans should have heard a direct challenge. [Obama] did them, and everyone else, the favor of enunciating the battle lines and the stakes of the fights to come.” [41828]

Reuters reports that black workers are hurt more than whites by staff reductions in the U.S. Postal Service because they make up about 20 percent of the workforce but only about 13 percent of the U.S. population. Robert Zieger, emeritus professor of history at the University of Florida in Gainesville, says, “There’s a long tradition of the public sector being more friendly, or less hostile, to African-American workers. The Post Office is the best example.” [41867]

On January 22 attorney Mario Apuzzo (*Kerchner v. Obama*) reminds readers at ThePostEmail.com that although Obama may have been sworn into office a second time, he cannot legally serve as president because he is not a natural born citizen because his father was not a U.S. citizen. Apuzzo explains the differences between the terms “citizen,” “born citizen,” and “natural born citizen.” A natural born citizen is an individual *born on U.S. soil to two U.S. citizen parents*. Obama does not meet that test. Nor do Louisiana Governor Bobby Jindal or Senator Marco Rubio (R-FL). Merely being born on U.S. soil, without regard to the citizenship of the parents, makes one a “born citizen.” A “generic” citizen may be a natural born citizen, a born citizen, or a naturalized citizen (an immigrant who becomes a U.S. citizen through the legal naturalization process). [41803]

After an environmental review, Nebraska Governor Dave Heineman gives the green light to the latest proposed route for the Keystone XL pipeline through his state. Whether the Obama administration will allow its construction remains to be seen. Environmental extremists continue to pressure Obama to block the pipeline. At HotAir.com Erika Johnsen writes, “The State Department is all set to conclude yet another of their reviews of the project, so now it’s only a question of which path-of-wrath ...Obama will choose: Inflaming the green lobby by giving the green light to one of their most highly detested items of protest; or thwarting American economic growth, job creation, and energy security (all of which [Obama] proclaims are on his own list of goals) by rejecting the use of oil sands that will then just be bought up and used by the Chinese anyway.” The State Department’s Victoria Nuland says, “We don’t anticipate being able to conclude our own review before the end of the first quarter of this year.” Fifty-three U.S. Senators (44 Republicans and nine Democrats) sign a letter to Obama urging him to quickly approve the pipeline. They write, “We urge you to choose jobs, economic development and American energy security.” [41808, 41826, 41904]

Israeli Prime Minister Binyamin Netanyahu wins reelection, although his Likud party loses some seats in the assembly. (Obama—who called Netanyahu a political coward the day before—will be angered by the results. He prefers a leader who is willing to appease the Palestinians and give up Israeli land.) The Associated Press writes, “**HAWKISH NETANYAHU LIKELY TO BE RE-ELECTED.** Israelis, who head to the polls Tuesday, no longer seem to believe that peace with the Palestinians is possible.” (NationalReview.com’s Jay Nordlinger comments, “I have two comments on the AP’s spin: First, they have called Netanyahu ‘hawkish,’ and that he is. But I wonder whether they would refer to a dovish leader as ‘dovish.’ Second, it may be that Israelis voting for Netanyahu are realistic: realistic about what it takes to make peace, keep peace, and ensure national survival. Maybe they think that Netanyahu stands between them and annihilation by Iran. Maybe they think that he is the one to look out for Israeli interests when there is a hostile, or semi-hostile, in the Oval Office. Maybe they think that true peace with the Palestinians can be forged only on a realistic basis, not on wishful thinking.”) [41813, 41825, 41879, 41957]

At WhiteHouseDossier.com Keith Koffler reports, “One of ...Obama’s top advisers suggested to the Washington Post the other day that neither Republicans nor the

American political system are 'worthy' of Obama's political agenda. 'There's a moment of opportunity now that's important,' said White House Communications Director Dan Pfeiffer. 'What's frustrating is that we don't have a political system or an opposition party worthy of the opportunity.' ...People should understand that Pfeiffer is not just the West Wing Minister of Propaganda. He's a smart political veteran who is one of a small handful of aides deeply trusted by [Obama]. If he thinks this way, you can be sure the attitude is pervasive and extends straight to the top." [41885]

According to Gallup, 38 percent of Americans watched the inauguration ceremonies, down from 60 percent in 2009. Only 33 percent rated his speech excellent, compared with 46 percent in 2009. Only 37 percent of those surveyed are "more hopeful" about the next four years; the percentage was 62 percent after the 2009 inauguration ceremonies. [41820]

The "less hopeful" Obama economy prompts a fight at an East St. Louis food stamp office. According to DailyCaller.com, "A dispute over a place in line... escalated into a brawl was captured on camera... The video, first reported by St. Louis' FOX2, shows four women shouting and punching each other as security guards attempt to separate them. East St. Louis Mayor Alvin Parks told the FOX affiliate that the behavior was unacceptable, especially in light of recent mass shootings, and called for metal detectors to be installed at the Illinois Department of Human Services office in East St. Louis, where the fight occurred Tuesday afternoon. ...'Definitely something needs to be done, it's ridiculous,' DeShanea Stevenson, who frequently went to the social services location, told FOX2. 'They just do that all the time, at the aid office. That's what happens. It's like nobody really cares.'" [41899, 41900]

At Forbes.com Dr. Scott Gottlieb writes, "A California insurance broker, who sells health plans to individuals and small businesses, told me that she's prepping her clients for a sticker shock. Her local carriers are hinting to her that premiums may triple this fall, when the plans unveil how they'll billet the full brunt of Obamacare's new regulations and mandates. California is hardly alone. Around the country, insurers are fixing to raise rates by double digits. They're privately briefing politicians in Washington on what's in store. Those briefings are leaving a lot of folks up and down Pennsylvania Avenue jumpy. ...There's buzz in Washington that to ease the price hikes, the Obama team may slow down some of the most expensive regulations. This might include the law's mandatory community rating. ...But premiums will still rise because, in the end, everything has a price. The law's prohibition against traditional insurance underwriting is just one of its costly provisions. Washington can try to force health plans to price insurance below the cost of these mandates. But then the health plans will simply lose money and move out of markets. ...To try and get a handle on rising costs, the Obama Administration will start to go after the healthcare providers. [Obama] seemed to hint about all this when he referenced the need to 'lower the cost' of healthcare in his inaugural address. ...This is the next iteration of healthcare reform. Call it Obamacare 2.0. Doctors will become the next bogymen in Washington. The target is already being fixed to their hide. As for the rest of us, our health insurance will become increasingly illusory. The prices Washington pays for medical services will gradually fall below the

rates where things will be readily supplied. That's the legacy of Medicaid, and increasingly Medicare as well. Don't worry, though. The medical services that you'll have a hard time accessing are mostly the stuff you'll only need if you get really sick." [41918]

House Speaker John Boehner (R-OH) tells reporters, "It is time for us to come to a plan that will in fact balance the budget over the next 10 years. It is our commitment to the American people, and we hope the Senate will do their budget, as they should have done over the last four years." Meanwhile, White House press secretary Jay Carney dodges a reporter's question about whether Obama thinks the Senate should pass a budget as required by law, by responding, "Anyone who believes that the stalemates and confrontations we've had over fiscal and budget policy over the last couple of years have been because of the Senate action on the budget, I think, misunderstands the situation. [Obama] has been very clear about his budget priorities ...[and] we won't allow the American economy, the American people be held hostage over whether ...the Republicans are going to allow the debt ceiling to be raised." (In other words, Obama does not want the Democrat-controlled Senate to pass a budget because that will expose the fact they have no intention of reducing spending and, in fact, want it increased.) [41845]

Addressing the Ripon Society, Boehner states, "[G]iven what we heard yesterday about [Obama's] vision for his second term, it's pretty clear to me and should be clear to all of you that he knows he can't do any of that as long as the House is controlled by Republicans. So we're expecting over the next 22 months to be the focus of this administration as they attempt to annihilate the Republican Party. And let me tell you, I do believe that is their goal. To just shove us in the dustbin of history." (Why it took Boehner four years to figure out what should have been obvious is unclear.) HotAir.com agrees with Boehner's analysis and observes, "It makes no sense for Obama to push an assault-weapons ban which he knows is doomed and which will only cause headaches for red-state Democrats in the Senate except as a pure public-opinion cudgel against the GOP. Make Senate Republicans filibuster it or have the bill die in the House and then hope that the ensuing burst of calculated outrageous outrage from Democrats about failing Our Children prepares the way for a Democratic takeover in 2014." [41909]

Boehner also says, "Looking back, what I should have done the day after the election was to make it clear the House has passed a bill to extend all of the current tax rates, the House has passed a bill to replace the sequester with cuts in mandatory spending, and the Senate ought to do its work. We're ready, able and willing to work with the Senate as soon as they produce a bill. It should have been what I said. You know, again, hindsight is 20-20." Asked about immigration, Boehner states, "I think there's a bipartisan group of members that have been meeting now for three or four years. Frankly, I think they basically have an agreement. I've not seen the agreement. I don't know all the pitfalls in it, but it's in my view, the right group of members." (In other words, the GOP is ready to cave in on amnesty legislation.) [41983, 41984]

Congressman Eric Cantor (R-VA) states, “All we’re saying is: If [Obama] and the Senate, if this country needs to incur more debt—Senate, please show us your plan to repay that debt, please show us your plan to control spending.” (The Democrat-controlled Senate is certainly not eager to draft a budget. If it includes continued high levels of spending and no cuts, they will be labeled tax-and-spend liberals in the 2014 elections. If it includes necessary spending cuts, they will antagonize their own Democrat constituents—who want the federal gravy train to continue unabated. But the continued emphasis on the Senate going 1,350+ days without a budget may ultimately force Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid (D-NV) to cave in and produce one. The retirement of Senate Budget Committee chairman Kent Conrad (D-ND) may also have an impact. His chairmanship has gone to Senator Patty Murray (D-WA), who lacks Conrad’s fiscal abilities but is a far more political animal. HotAir.com’s Ed Morrissey notes, “...Murray is not a budget wonk who really knows her stuff. She’s also not an independent voice on budget matters, but a reliable political hack who will front for Reid rather than produce an honest budget by working with Republicans.” Murray will help Reid fashion a budget that works not for the nation, but for the Democrats.) [41877]

Rush Limbaugh comments on the mainstream media’s handling of the inauguration coverage: “I don’t think the news media has been this happy since they forced Nixon to resign. ...I mean, when were they happy? That was orgasmic nirvana for them back then, but I think this is even a bigger deal, because there’s so much involved in this. I mean, all the pretense is gone. It’s not just that Obama won, and it’s not so much what Obama’s plans are. It’s not so much what Obama’s agenda is, other than—and I mean this and I’ve never been more serious. I think the number one objective for these people they think has been met, and that is the elimination of any viable opposition to Obama. I think they really are ecstatic and happy over what they think now is the final nail in the coffin of conservatism. I think that has been the prime motivating factor for many people in the media, the biggest objective. The biggest obstacle to them has been domestic political opposition and eliminating it, getting rid of it, discrediting it, making it infinitesimally small. I think that’s what they’re really celebrating. Obama is the vessel for it, and Obama fits the bill. I mean, he’s the first African-American president, the glib, they think he loves them. It’s just all made to order. It is as though they have conquered the country and that they alone run it, and they’re drunk with power and delirious with that achievement, and they think it’s final. They think it’s over. They think it’s the end of the NRA, the end of the pro-lifers. It’s the end of any viable, serious opposition to them on anything. They think it’s happened. And to the extent that there’s still pockets of opposition, they feel confident they can take that out, too. They’re very confident. They see more and more conservatives caving, basically conceding and walking away from any opposition. I mean, it’s amazing. They are deliriously happy and it is the universe in which we find ourselves. Primarily it’s an Inside the Beltway phenomenon, but that’s how they perceive the whole country to be going.” [41821]

Reports that Beyonce Knowles lip-synced the national anthem for the inauguration ceremonies create a stir. A representative of the United States Marine Corp band. Kristin DuBois, stated that Knowles did not perform live: “All music is pre-recorded for the ceremony because there are so many eventualities and conditions that day. We

performed, live, the band. But we received last-minute word that Beyonce was going to use the pre-recorded vocal track. Those were the instructions we were given. We don't know what the reason why." The disclosure that Knowles was faking it clearly upset the singer—and perhaps her White House friends Barack and Michelle, who apparently came to her rescue by telling the Marine Corps to revise their story and say that no one in the band could know for certain if she was performing live. According to Fox News, "Beyonce was a no-show at the inauguration performance rehearsal on the Capitol steps." Others present claim the band was not performing live either. (It was obvious to television viewers that Knowles was not singing live, and obvious that Kelly Clarkson was.) [41824, 41871]

MediaBistro.com reports that ratings for the inauguration for "the 'big three' cable news channels were down substantially... from the 2009 inauguration. Whereas approximately 17 million people watched Obama's address on CNN, MSNBC and Fox News in 2009, only around 7 million watched on those three channels in 2013." [41834]

FreeBeacon.com reports that Obama's "Secretary of Defense nominee Chuck Hagel is tied to an organization that publishes articles downplaying the activities of terrorist groups such as Hamas and Hezbollah while referring to Israel as a 'far-right racist state' and America as a 'military bully.' The two-time senator serves on the advisory board of Global Strategy Forum (GSF), an organization that has published many anti-Israel articles and urged ...Obama to distance America from its Middle East ally." [41853]

Addressing the audience at the 56th Annual Weatherby Foundation International Hunting and Conservation Awards, National Rifle Association executive vice president Wayne LaPierre slams Obama over his inaugural remark, "We cannot mistake absolutism for principle." LaPierre says that Obama "wants to turn the idea of 'absolutism' into a dirty word, just another word for 'extremism.' He wants you to accept the idea of 'principles' as he sees fit to define them. It's a way of redefining words so that common sense is turned upside-down and nobody knows the difference. ...As families, when we're broke and all our credit cards are maxed out, we're forced to tighten our belts. But when the government is broke and our bond rating is tumbling and the president wants more new social programs, borrowing more money is supposed to be 'principled.' And anybody who questions that is a no-good 'absolutist'—Obama code for extremist." [41844, 41848, 41882]

"...Obama is saying that the only 'principled' way to make children safe is to make lawful citizens less safe and violent criminals more safe. Criminals couldn't care less about Barack Obama's so-called 'principles!' They don't have principles—that's why they're criminals. Obama wants you to believe that putting the federal government in the middle of every firearm transaction—except those between criminals—will somehow make us safer. ...There are only two reasons for [Obama's proposed] federal list of gun owners—to tax them or take them. And to anyone who says that's excessive, Barack Obama says you're an 'absolutist.' He doesn't understand you. He doesn't agree with the freedoms you cherish. If the only way he can force you to give them up is through scorn and ridicule, he's more than willing to do it—even as he claims the moral high ground.

...When Barack Obama says, ‘we cannot mistake absolutism for principle,’ what he’s saying is that precision and clarity and exactness in language and law should be abandoned in favor of his nebulous, undefined ‘principles.’ I’ve got news for [Obama]. Absolutes do exist. Words do have specific meaning, in language and in law. It’s the basis of all civilization. It’s why our laws are written down: So the ‘letter of the law’ carries the force of the law. That’s why our Bill of Rights was written into law, to ensure the fundamental freedoms of a minority could never be denied by a majority. Those are the principles we call unalienable rights. Without those absolutes, without those protections, democracy decays into nothing more than two wolves and one lamb voting on what to eat for lunch.” [41844, 41848, 41882]

“Fifty years ago, after he had been appointed to the Supreme Court by Franklin Delano Roosevelt, liberal Justice Hugo Black said, and I quote: ‘There are ‘absolutes’ in our Bill of Rights, and they were put there on purpose by men who knew what words meant and meant their prohibitions to be ‘absolutes.’” End quote. ...Justice Black understood the danger of self-appointed arbiters of what ‘freedom’ really means—like ...Obama—who want to redefine freedom, whittle away freedom and infringe upon the freedoms that we the people reserve to ourselves. They’re God-given freedoms. They belong to us as our birthright. No government ever gave them to us and no government can ever take them away. ...We believe that if neither the criminal nor the political class is limited by magazine capacity, we shouldn’t be limited in our capacity either. We believe in our country. We believe in our Bill of Rights. And we believe in our Second Amendment, all of our Second Amendment. Because we believe in the freedom and safety that it, and it alone, guarantees absolutely. Mister [Obama], you might think that calling us ‘absolutists’ is a clever way of ‘name-calling’ without using names. But if that is ‘absolutist,’ then we are as ‘absolutist’ as the Founding Fathers and framers of the Constitution ...and we’re proud of it!” [41844, 41848, 41882]

On January 23 Secretary of State Hillary Clinton testifies about the Benghazi terrorist attack before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. She states, “As I have said many times since September 11, I take responsibility.” (Clinton’s statement is meaningless because no one has been held accountable for the mistakes that led to the deaths of four Americans. Not one State Department official has been fired. Clinton essentially says, “I accept responsibility but I will not accept any blame.”) “Nobody is more committed to getting this right. I am determined to leave the State Department and our country safer, stronger, and more secure. Taking responsibility meant moving quickly in those first uncertain hours and days to respond to the immediate crisis and further protect our people and posts in high-threat areas across the region and the world. It meant launching an independent investigation to determine exactly what happened in Benghazi and to recommend steps for improvement. And it meant intensifying our efforts to combat terrorism and support emerging democracies in North Africa and beyond.” (In other words, “I did everything right after the terrorist attack, but I won’t talk about what I did wrong before the attack.”) “Benghazi didn’t happen in a vacuum. The Arab revolutions have scrambled power dynamics and shattered security forces across the region. And instability in Mali has created an expanding safe haven for terrorists who look to extend their influence and plot further attacks of the kind we saw just last week in Algeria.”

(“Let’s not talk about where those terrorist got their weapons.”) [41836, 41841, 41847, 41869]

Asked by Senator Ron Johnson (R-WI) about the cause of the Benghazi attack, whether it was planned or an “anti-video” demonstration that got out of hand, and why the truth did not come out as soon as it was learned, a clearly riled up Clinton responds, “No doubt they were terrorist, they were militants, they attacked us, they killed our people, but what was going on and why they were doing what they were doing... The fact is, we have four dead Americans. Was it because of a protest, or was it because of guys out for a walk one night who decided they’d go kill some Americans? What difference at this point does it make? It’s our job to figure out what happened and do everything we can to prevent it from ever happening again, Senator.” (In other words, “That Obama, U.N. ambassador Susan Rice, press secretary Jay Carney, and I lied to the American people about the cause of the attack being a demonstration about a YouTube video is irrelevant. Don’t you understand, Senator, that my presidential ambitions in 2016 are more important than the truth?” One HotAir.com reader’s translation: “The buck stops here. Oh, and thanks for the buck. Now, may I be excused?”) [41847, 41855, 41857, 41869, 41873, 41874, 41875]

Clinton’s “What difference... does it make?” will most certainly be considered offensive by millions of Americans. The incredibly indifferent, insensitive, and arrogant response indicates that she will say and do anything to protect her political future, even if it means protecting Obama—which she surely does not enjoy doing. The point of the Senate hearing was to better understand why the attack, which resulted in the deaths of four Americans, occurred in the first place. For Clinton to respond, “What difference does it make?” is to treat those four lives as irrelevant and make a mockery of the hearing. It is also an insult to every American who has a shred of decency. Clinton, half the Senators, and many in the mainstream media may consider the meeting a farce and nothing more than political theater, but her “performance” should enrage millions. “What difference does it make?” will likely be repeated frequently for a long time to come, especially if Clinton runs for president in 2016. (Whenever a leftist suggests that the attack on the World Trade Center towers on September 11, 2001 was the work of George W. Bush, Dick Cheney, and an “evil cabal of Jews,” he may well be met with the response, “What difference does it make?”)

Johnson later tells Newsmax.com, “I think that the administration was caught in a lie, and I think it’s important to the American people that when the administration is caught in a lie that it is revealed.” Of Clinton’s “What difference does it make?” answer, Johnson says, “You’re better off sharpening your argument than raising your voice. ...I’m struck that State Department professionals didn’t have a standard operating procedure in place for when something like this happens, that there was no standard operating procedure where officials were immediately briefed. Why don’t’ you just get on the phone with the people who work for you?” [41881]

Clinton admits to Johnson that she has spoken with only one of the survivors of the Benghazi attack. (A reasonable person might have expected Clinton to speak with all of them, offer her condolences for the ordeal they went through, and ask them for their first-



hand accounts of what took place. That she did not do so suggests she is either very cold-hearted or had no interest in learning the truth—because she already knew what the Obama administration had decided would be the “official story.”) [41914]

Senator Rand Paul (R-KY) notes 64 post-Benghazi recommendations made by an independent Accountability Review Board, and says to Clinton (after she denied having seen requests for additional security in Benghazi), “A lot of them are common sense and should be done, but the question is—it’s a failure of leadership that they weren’t done in advance, and four lives were cost because of this. I’m glad that you’re accepting responsibility. I think that ultimately with your leaving, you accept the culpability for the worst tragedy since 9/11. And I really mean that. Had I been president at the time, and I found that you did not read the cables from Benghazi—you did not read the cables from Ambassador Stevens—I would have relieved you of your post. I think it’s inexcusable. The thing is, is that—we can understand that you’re not reading every cable [about trivial matters]. ...[But] I think it’s inexcusable that you did not know about this and that you did not read these cables. I would think by anyone’s estimation, Libya has to have been one of the hottest of hot spots around the world. Not to know of the request for security—really, I think cost these people their lives. Their lives could have been saved had someone been more available, had someone been aware of these things—more on top of the job. ...I don’t suspect your motives... but it was a failure of leadership not to be involved.” (Few will be surprised if both Paul and Clinton enter the presidential race in 2016, but the Senator is making clear to the Secretary of State that he will not go easy on her if they are the eventual Republican and Democrat nominees.) [41856, 41863, 41869, 41876, 41913]

Clinton distances herself from U.N. ambassador Susan Rice, claiming, “I personally was not focused on talking points. I was focused on keeping our people safe.” (In other words, “I had nothing to do with Rice appearing on five Sunday talk shows to claim a YouTube video was responsible for the Benghazi attack—even though I made the same claim for days.”) Rice has now been thrown under the bus by both Obama and Clinton. [41873]

Aside from Johnson and Paul, no Senators ask Clinton challenging or probing questions. The Democrats, in fact, fall all over themselves praising Clinton—as though she told no lies about Benghazi and had nothing to do with anything that went wrong. (Rush Limbaugh plays recordings of some of the lies: Obama: “I don’t care how offensive this video was, it was terribly offensive and we should shun it.” Clinton: “This video is disgusting and reprehensible. It appears to have a deeply cynical purpose, to denigrate a great religion and to provoke rage.” Jay Carney: “Let’s be clear. These protests were in reaction to a video that had spread to the region.” Obama: “You had a video that was released by somebody who lives here, sort of a shadowy character, an extremely offensive video.” Carney: “The unrest we’ve seen has been in reaction to a video.” Obama: “A crude and disgusting video sparked outrage throughout the Muslim world.” Susan Rice: “It was a spontaneous, not a premeditated response, a direct result of a heinous and offensive video.” Obama: “I know there are some who ask, ‘Why don’t we just ban such a video?’ The answer is enshrined in our laws. Our Constitution protects the right to practice free speech.” With the exception of Johnson and Paul, the Senators

questioning Clinton essentially pretend as though those statements had never been made.) [41873]

The White House insider comments on Clinton's testimony, telling The Ulsterman Report, "What I think about Hillary's show this morning? All bullsh-t. Every single second of it. Want to know something the media isn't telling you? That neither the Republicans, the White House, or Hillary's people are telling you? EVERY F-CKING QUESTION WAS AGREED TO BEFOREHAND. Hillary had notes for every question. Watch her look down every time a question is asked. She sucks at hiding it. That's the tell. They negotiated the terms of the questioning weeks ago. She was prepared. There is no real investigation by the Senate. There is no real search for justice here. None. Zero. Zip. Nada. Complete bullsh-t. Normally there's [sic] agreements between staff prior to this kind of thing, but this time the Hillary camp and the Obama White House locked down the questions. Hillary wanted to protect her ass, and the White House sure as hell was looking to protect their boy. And this was all agreed to at least two weeks ago. Probably longer. These Senate Republican f\*ckers left me hanging before the election. They can all go to hell. Every last one of them. Will the House go after Hillary any different? Don't count on it. And she thinks she has a shot at 2016? We'll see about that. Some of us skeletons still remember how to open the closet door." [41861]

"Keep touching base with [the Republican insider]. He's doing good work up there. Pissing people off which is what needs to happen. He's got the energy I just don't have for this stuff anymore. I can't stand being around those people. Lying sick f-cks every last one of them. Republicans. Democrats. All the same now. At least in my eyes. You might see it different but I'm seeing 20-20 for the first time in a long time. I just can't even watch this sh-t anymore. Makes me want to go outside and kick the dog. You need to step away from all this from time to time too. It's going to use you up and you'll end up with a face like mine. Nobody deserves that. If people still care enough in this country about what is happening it's going to be up to all of them to set things right again. Don't count on Republicans. Sure as hell don't count on any of these Democrats. Sure as hell don't count on used up old f-cks like me. Start local and work out from there. That takes real work. Hard work and that's what they are counting on. Most people are way too lazy and uninformed to handle that. So in the end, not a damn thing changes. Same old corruption but taken to a whole other level. And they're working it up to keep it going after 2016. A longer term shakedown. Breaking the whole country right over the wheel. Community organizing on a global scale. The next few years will be all about setting that platform up and people who were willing to fight them a couple years ago are now just shrugging and saying there's nothing to be done about it. God I hate this White House." [41861]

By a vote of 285-144 the House of Representatives passes legislation extending the debt ceiling long enough to cover federal spending through the middle of May. The legislation also requires the Senate to produce a budget by April 15. (The budget requirement is a good move by Republicans because the public is far less sympathetic toward Senate Democrats than it is toward Obama. The question shifts from the Obama-favored, "Why are those evil Republicans demanding cruel spending cuts in exchange for a hike in the

debt ceiling?” to the GOP-favored, “Why can’t the darn Senate pass a budget?” Additionally, delaying the debt ceiling decision until May forces Obama and the Democrats to deal with the automatic sequestration cuts scheduled for March 1. The Republicans may have the upper hand in those negotiations because they have grown increasingly willing to allow those cuts to take effect, while the Democrats wish to avoid them at all costs. With the “fiscal cliff” Obama had the advantage: if Congress did not act, taxes would go up for all Americans. With the sequestration cuts the GOP may have the advantage: If the Democrats do not agree to substantial, specific spending cuts, they will have to accept automatic across-the-board cuts in all discretionary programs—cuts that will anger their nanny-state constituents.) [41883, 42097]

Congressman Todd Young (R-IN) introduces the “Regulations from the Executive In Need of Scrutiny Act,” or “REINS Act,” to require Congressional approval for any new federal regulation that will cost the economy more than \$100 million to implement. Young states, “What the REINS Act is designed to do is give Congress ultimate authority, the ultimate say-so as to whether these regulations become the law of the land after the administrative agencies have worked their will. ...First and foremost, it would prevent Congress from passing really vague laws, punting on the hard issues and then leaving those hard issues up to regulatory agencies. ...We have the power of the purse, so on a case by case, regulation by regulation basis we have done our work and tried to address these things. There are just far too many regulations out there, 10 regulations a day in recent years. In order for us to keep our eye on the ball and have an opportunity to vote down those regulations that really ought not to become law in the first place, I think we need a systemic reform rather than a case by case reform.” [41974]

FoxNews.com reports on some of the businesses and individuals in California that are leaving the state—or considering it—because of its high tax rates. Peter Farrell, president of ResMed, “a medical-device maker in San Diego that employs 600 workers and is considering moving its offices out of state,” says, “If you have excessive regulations and excessive tax, that’s just not where you want to be. California is unfriendly. It’s become an unfriendly business environment.” “Nevada tax accountant George Ashley said he’s received more than 100 inquiries from higher-earning Californians about the possible tax advantages and feasibility of relocating to a state with lower taxes.” Ashley states, “We have had a 10-fold increase from various parts of California, particularly Los Angeles and the Bay Area where many people are seeking a way to leave the state. They are fed up with the situation and they feel like they are being unfairly treated.” One San Diego resident told Fox “he estimates he and his wife will save \$30,000 a month by moving to Arizona. He said it’s not that he is against paying his fair share, but more than 50 percent of state residents pay no personal income taxes at all, and that, he said, is ‘unfair.’” [41862]

CAV News reports that the Obama administration is in the process of shutting down the “...Tethered Aerostat Radar System (TARS), which utilizes moored balloons hovering at about 15,000 feet to identify low flying aircraft and missiles that may penetrate the border and cross into U.S. airspace. The system is utilized by the U.S. Air Force, North American Aerospace Defense Command (NORAD), and U.S. Customs and Border

Protection for a number of missions including detection of drug smuggling and preservation of the air sovereignty of the continental United States.” One TARS employee comments, “Not only will this closure mean hundreds of people will be out of jobs, but it also means our borders will not be safe, especially along the remote U.S. Mexico Border like in Texas. These defense radars detect low flying aircraft infiltrating our borders. Without these defense radars, low flying aircraft will go undetected. It will be open season for any drug/gun/slave smugglers, terrorists flying in with nukes, low altitude missiles, or even a full scale low elevation invasion/attack against America.” [42009, 42010, 42160, 42161]

Outgoing Secretary of Defense Leon Panetta lifts the ban on women serving in combat. According to the Associated Press, the action will open “hundreds of thousands of front-line positions and potentially elite commando jobs after more than a decade at war.” (Obama and Panetta apparently believe that women should be able to arm themselves against the Taliban in Afghanistan, but not against rapists and burglars at home.) At TakiMag.com, Jared Taylor reminds Panetta and Obama, “Men go to war precisely so that their mothers, wives, sisters, and daughters *don’t* have to go.” (If women are allowed to serve in combat, the legal justification for not requiring them to register for the Selective Service upon reaching age 18 ceases to exist. Panetta and Obama may want to think twice before proceeding with their politically correct plan—unless they want to anger millions of young women.) One Defense Department official says the military’s goal is “to provide a level, gender-neutral playing field.” (Columnist Walter Williams responds, “I’d like to think the goal of the military should be to have the toughest, meanest fighting force possible.”) [41870, 42127, 42128, 42318]

The Ulsterman Reports hears from the Republican insider, who writes, “I understand [the White House insider’s] frustration but I completely and 100 percent disagree with [his] basic premise regarding the Clinton hearing this morning. People cannot expect a red meat fireworks show when the Senate is involved. It just doesn’t work that way. That kind of thing might happen very soon in the House, but the Senate has almost always functioned much more low key. The fact Hillary Clinton was challenged as strongly as she was by certain Senators [Ron Johnson and Rand Paul] ... was actually very encouraging and it is my understanding the Hillary people are scrambling to try and avoid headlines being created later during her visit to the House. That is a very positive outcome. I see you already posted the Rand Paul video of his remarks to Mrs. Clinton. How great was that? And when Senator Johnson was able to get her to yell out ‘What does it matter?’ [‘What difference does it make?’] that was one of the more remarkable moments I’ve seen happen in a Senate testimony environment in some time. That soundbite will come back to hurt her if she chooses to continue her political career. The real downside of course is that once again little blame was placed at the feet of Barack Obama and was clearly a main priority for Mrs. Clinton today and so far she is holding up her end of that agreement between herself and the White House. I really believe that is what is the main reason for [the White House insider’s] tone in [his] update to you this morning and I can’t blame [him] for that. I’m just as frustrated. But maybe some of that will be lessened after the House hearings.” [41866]

“Now there was something [the White House insider] mentioned that might have been missed by most of your readers. It touched on something the media has hinted at, but behind the scenes has a lot of us scrambling to prepare for and that is Barack Obama’s campaign machine being kept in place and even strengthened to not only be used as powerful political leverage for the 2014 midterms and then during and after the 2016 election, but well beyond that time frame as well. I think the phrase was ‘community organizing on a global scale.’ I will confirm that [the White House insider] is 100 percent correct about that. It’s called Organizing for Action and it’s actually bypassing the traditional DNC [Democrat National Committee] and its goal, if what I’m told is correct, is to raise hundreds of millions of dollars and utilize ‘issue bombing’ to exert tremendous pressure on politicians to vote as Barack Obama/Valerie Jarrett would want them to vote or face further damaging public relations courtesy of the Organizing for Action machine. This also means the current Obama team thinks they are capable of choosing Obama’s 2016 successor and, make no mistake, that also means then that the same agenda that has so many of us frustrated and fearful now will NOT stop after 2016. It really will be the total globalization of the Obama presidency. He will extend his influence well beyond just eight years in the White House. Now let that sink in. The possible ramifications of that scenario should scare the heck out of all of us who already recognize just how bad things are going now.” [41866]

“If they pull it off, it would basically mean a way to effectively secure a third term and more for Barack Obama, but on an even more global scale than the traditional role of American president that Obama already feels he’s much too important to be constrained by. As bad as the 2012 election outcome was, people need to understand they could still get much-much worse. I’m not about to give up and I hope I can count on you and all the other alternative media and true patriots to help fight back. You can do better. I can do better. We all can do better. I still believe there is a lot more of ‘us’ than ‘them.’ We just need to re-organize. It’s the future and the future is now.” [41866]

Rush Limbaugh comments on Hillary Clinton’s Senate testimony: “It was a puke fest. It was unlike anything I’ve ever seen. It was right out of a banana republic. And I’ve seen it all. I mean, in my 62 short years I’ve seen a lot. I’ve never seen groveling, butt kissing, sucking up. I’ve never seen anything like Hillary Clinton’s appearance before a joint congressional committee on that Benghazi guy who went nuts over there in Libya. And I guess everybody’s favorite part, she lost her cool at one point. By the way, she opened up crying, which is part of the script. But our favorite part, she was asked by Senator Johnson why they stuck with the story of the video to explain why the Benghazi guy went nuts. And Hillary said, ‘What difference does it make? What difference, at this point, does it make?’ Exactly right, but what difference does any of it make? What difference does it make that 50 million Americans are on food stamps? What difference does it make that [Obama’s] acceptance speech, his inaugural address, was perhaps one of the most partisan and divisive speeches in American presidential history? What difference does it make? Exactly right. After all this time, what difference it make?” [41868]

“You know what this was? This was perhaps, folks, one of the best illustrations of the whole concept that we’ve spoken here about on numerous occasions of the ruling class,

the political class. It doesn't matter what party, they're all part of the ruling class, the political class in D.C., and when the rubber hits the road, they all circle the wagons around each other. Well, the Republicans join in circling the wagons. The Democrats never do when it's a Republican involved, but for the most part they do. They close ranks, and they protect one another because what they're protecting is themselves. ... We had all of these senators praising her intelligence, praising her stamina, because she traveled all those million miles, and a lot of these senators said, 'You know, people that have never done that, they don't know what it takes. We do. We've made those trips, Mrs. Clinton, and we understand just how tough you are. And we understand how much stamina you've got. It was really impressive, and you've done it all for the country. You've given up everything. You've sacrificed so much, and we are so happy to have you here. We are blessed to have you in our presence. Why, this is the greatest day in our republic short of Obama's second inaugural. This is the most wonderful day, to have you here with your stamina, your intelligence, all of those miles traveled, your devotion.'"

[41868]

"They praised her competence, her brilliance, her beauty, her compassion, her caring, her concern, her glasses, her wardrobe, her qualifications, her love of country, her devotion to ambassadors. They made a point to say that her devotion to the ambassadors is personal, it's not just professional. She loves every one of them, and she's cried over every one of them. And what difference does it make whether there was a video or not. Who the hell is bringing that up now? They went for a full hour-and-a-half, by the way, before anybody asked about the video. And the video, for weeks, was the sole reason given why Benghazi went up in flames. The video was the reason why there were four Americans killed. ... And then Senator [Ron] Johnson finally got to the question, [and Clinton responded] 'What difference does it make? What are we talking about here? What difference does it make? It's old news.' And that's been the Clinton M.O. [modus operandi] for decades. So what was happening here was the cleansing of Mrs. Clinton's record in advance of her presidential run in 2016, setting her up. Folks, this was banana republic kind of stuff. You talk about two different worlds in isolation. The ruling class, the political class, existing within its own borders, and its own world, and its own set of rules and taking care of each other and making sure that everything is fine. This is a perfunctory hearing. We had to get it out of the way, waiting for Mrs. Clinton to testify. She's been so devoted to the secretary of state job. She got sick. She's given so much to her country. She got sick. She got really bad sick, stomachache, flu. She was sniffing, blowing her nose. She had a sore throat, was really bad." [41868]

"...Do you realize just this week [Clinton's 2008] her campaign debt was paid off? Do you think there's any coincidence in the fact that her campaign debt was paid off and her appearance before the joint committee today to talk about the guy in Benghazi? I don't. I don't think there's any coincidence at all. She got the campaign debt paid off. She's free and clear, ready to go for 2016. They're just trying to make amends because they gave her the shaft. It was hers in 2008, folks, and here came Obama, and we all know what happened. The press got behind Obama. Nobody would tell the truth about Obama, and Hillary said, 'What do I have to do? I propped up Clinton, I moved to Arkansas, I did health care, and then I put up with Gennifer Flowers and Monica Lewinsky—the 'bimbo

eruptions.’ I lived in Arkansas. I worked at Rose Law Firm. ‘I had to learn about pork bellies and so forth in order to make some money in the stock market, ’cause my husband couldn’t earn any money ’cause he’s a creep. What am I gonna do? What am I gonna do?’ And then they got this Obama guy, and she was devastated. So Obama makes her secretary of state, keeping her viable, keeping her close, keeping the Clintons close. She does secretary of state, travels millions of miles. She uses all of her intelligence, all of her stamina, all of her devotion, her competence, her brilliance, her beauty, her compassion, her caring, her concern, her qualifications, her wardrobe, her earrings, her love of country, the hairdos, the various dresses, devotion to ambassadors.” [41868]

“And today was when everybody circled the wagons for her and she got a clean slate. Everything’s fine. There wasn’t anything wrong. ‘What difference does it make how these four Americans died? I don’t know about Susan Rice. I couldn’t care less about Susan Rice!’ She threw Susan Rice under the bus, ’cause that’s part of the deal, too. So now it’s all over. Her record’s cleansed, the campaign debt’s retired, and Mrs. Clinton’s path is set. She’s soon to be leaving the secretary of state gig, a little recharge of the batteries. She’ll head home, keep a little eye on Bill now just to make it look good, but basically she got a ‘Get Out of Jail Free Card.’ Now it’s time to take a look down the road at the future, make sure that all the ducks are in a row. Biden is no Obama. Taking Biden out is gonna be easy. Biden has run for president numerous times and never gotten close. He’s getting all full of himself right now, but he’s a sitting duck. So 2016 is waiting to happen [for Clinton], that is if Obama decides to abdicate. You know, Obama may not give up the crown, just like Queen Elizabeth. ...Hillary is waiting to be president, but it all depends on whether Obama will abdicate the throne. Will he leave the Oval Orifice in 2016?” [41868]

Hillary Clinton also testifies before the House Foreign Affairs Committee, where she also “takes responsibility” without really accepting any responsibility—and without revealing any relevant new information. As with the Senate hearing, Democrat legislators shower Clinton with praise and ask softball questions, while the Republicans ask tougher questions that she generally avoids answering directly. (Several media pundits declare that the few tough questioners on the Republican side were the result of Clinton’s gender.) That Clinton is able to lie to protect a Democrat in the White House should surprise no one. She had eight years of practice between 1993–2000. At CainTV.com, Dan Calabrese reminds readers that during the Watergate investigation Clinton was fired by the general counsel and chief of staff of the House Judiciary Committee for lying and unethical behavior. Jerry Zeifman, a lifelong Democrat, fired her “Because she was a liar. She was an unethical, dishonest lawyer. She conspired to violate the Constitution, the rules of the House, the rules of the committee and the rules of confidentiality.” [41836, 41841, 41847, 41872, 41884, 41889, 41907, 41953]

Calabrese writes, “...Zeifman said [Clinton] was one of several individuals—including [Senator Edward Kennedy’s counsel Burke] Marshall, special counsel John Doar and senior associate special counsel (and future Clinton White House Counsel) Bernard Nussbaum—who engaged in a seemingly implausible scheme to deny Richard Nixon the right to counsel during the investigation. Why would they want to do that? Because,

according to Zeifman, they feared putting Watergate break-in mastermind E. Howard Hunt on the stand to be cross-examined by counsel to the president. Hunt, Zeifman said, had the goods on nefarious activities in the Kennedy Administration that would have made Watergate look like a day at the beach—including Kennedy’s purported complicity in the attempted assassination of Fidel Castro. The actions of Hillary and her cohorts went directly against the judgment of top Democrats, up to and including then-House Majority Leader Tip O’Neill, that Nixon clearly had the right to counsel. Zeifman says that Hillary, along with Marshall, Nussbaum and Doar, was determined to gain enough votes on the Judiciary Committee to change House rules and deny counsel to Nixon. And in order to pull this off, Zeifman says Hillary wrote a fraudulent legal brief, and confiscated public documents to hide her deception. ...The brief was so fraudulent and ridiculous, Zeifman believes Hillary would have been disbarred if she had submitted it to a judge.” [41884]

During the House hearing, Congressman Jeff Duncan (R-SC) says, “You let the consulate become a death trap, and that’s national security malpractice. ... You said you take responsibility. What does responsibility mean Madam Secretary? You’re still in your job. And there are four people at the Department of State who have culpability in this that are still in their jobs. I heard the answer about firing or removing personnel. I get that, but this was gross negligence. ... There [was] a lot of evidence that led up to the security situation. You mentioned transparency. You haven’t provided the call logs of the messages, instant messages during the attack between the post and the operation center. In an air of transparency, will you release these communications between Benghazi, Tripoli and Washington?” Clinton responds, “I will get an answer to you on that, but I will tell you once more, the reason we have Accountability Review Boards is so that we take out of politics, we take out emotion, what happened, and we try to get to the truth. I think this very distinguished panel did just that, and we are working diligently over time to implement their recommendations. That is my responsibility. I’m going to do everything I can before I finish my tenure.” [41880, 41888, 41916]

Congresswoman Ileana Ros-Lehtinen (R-FL) properly calls it “outrageous” that Clinton was not interviewed by the Accountability Review Board that investigated (some might say whitewashed) the Benghazi attack. Clinton replies, “I was not asked to speak” but would have been “happy to ...if they thought I was relevant.” [41880]

Congressman Mo Brooks (R-AL) quotes U.N. ambassador Susan Rice’s talk show appearances during which she claimed the Benghazi attack was caused by an anti-Muslim video and asks Clinton if she believes Rice was incorrect. Clinton responds, “There is still question [sic] about what caused it, so I don’t wanna, I don’t want to mislead you in any way. That is not, the weight of the evidence right now, but, uh, I think until the FBI completes its investigation we’re not gonna know all the reasons why these people showed up with weapons and stormed our compound.” (In other words, “You are wasting your time, Congressman. If you think I am going to be open and honest you don’t know me.” Four months after the terrorist attack in Benghazi, Clinton knows nothing and uses the FBI as an excuse not to answer questions. Even though Clinton herself claimed on several occasions that the video prompted the attack, she proceeds through the hearings



as though she never heard of them and had no involvement in the Obama administration's efforts to deceive the American people. At Townhall.com, Katie Pavlich notes, "The Obama administration also used \$70,000 in taxpayer money to purchase an advertisement apologizing for the video on Pakistani television. The ad included an official message from ...Obama and Secretary of State Hillary Clinton.") [41893]

At both the Senate and House hearings, Clinton criticizes Congress, claiming they should have approved more money for embassy and consulate security. (Senator Ran Paul reasonably suggests that if the State Department were not buying electric cars and charging stations for the U.S. embassy in Austria it might have more money for security.)

At NationalReview.com Michael Tanner comments on Obama's inaugural address: "Obama sees an America where the only alternative to an ever-growing government that intervenes in every aspect of our lives is an atomistic individualism with no regard for our fellow man. Either we are all wards of the state or we are Ted Kaczynski, hiding alone in our Montana cabin. Civil society and voluntary action—private charity and civic organizations, churches, synagogues, mosques, and businesses large and small—do not exist, or if they do, they are simply distractions from the work of government. We can dismiss such remarks as little more than Obama's] penchant for attacking straw men, but everything he says or does suggests that he believes them to be true." [41878]

At HotAir.com Erika Johnsen writes, "Because 'financial feasibility' apparently ain't no thing in the Golden State, California is getting ready to break ground on their much-vaunted, 'historic,' 'multi-generational' high-speed rail project, which is awesome—because out of the **current** (notice the added emphasis) price tag of \$68 billion, *they're only short \$60 billion* with few concrete plans on how to obtain that money other than eventual federal assistance." The initial \$6 billion in funding comes from California taxpayers (\$2.7 billion) and the Obama administration (\$3.3 billion). (Taxpayers from the other 49 states are funding a railroad in California that few people other than environmentalists and union contractors want, and which will certainly go over budget. How much U.S. taxpayers will eventually have to pony up is not known.) [41911]

Via Twitter, the Department of Homeland Security provides "tips" for dealing with winter weather: "Stay indoors during the storm." "Walk carefully on snow, icy, walkways." "Avoid overexertion when shoveling snow." "Watch for signs of frostbite." "Watch for signs of hypothermia." "Drive only if its absolutely necessary." "Conserve fuel, if necessary, by keeping your residence cooler than normal." (How many millions of Democrat lives are saved by the information is impossible to know.) [41920]

The New York State Rifle & Pistol Association (NYSRPA) announces that, in co-operation with the NRA, it is "having the [Governor Andrew] Cuomo [gun control] law reviewed by a highly qualified legal team. We ask that no other 3rd party legal action be taken without prior consultation. We realize that this law impacts a large number of people, but a proper legal review will take some time. NYSRPA/NRA will be filing a Notice of Claim prior to submitting a brief on the merits of the constitutionality of the new gun law. Involved in the lawsuit will be two of the nations best 2nd Amendment

attorneys. This is a very important proceeding and must be handled properly with the best lawyers.” [41987]

On MSNBC, boorish bootlicker Chris Matthews comes out as Hillary Clinton’s most eager and shameless 2016 supporter, saying: “Secretary of State Hillary Clinton was at her best today appearing before both Senate and House Committees on Foreign Affairs. She showed acuity, eloquence, humanity and charm. To the reasonable question, she offered candor and humility. In place of a hard-line defense of the State Department’s handling of the Benghazi horror, she admitted to the limitations of the intrepid diplomats heading into dangerous terrain. In response to hostile questions, she came back with strength and a challenge of her own. ...Hillary, Hillary, Hillary—she never looked better. Venturing forth in unprotected waters today, she showed how not to be defensive, how not to sweat [and] also how to exhibit humanity and yes, compassion. Even when the witnesses are looking desperately—those people around her—to target her weaknesses. Again, it was a magnificent display of smarts, I think, guts definitely and caring. She looked every bit like a person who could run for president, run well, win big and serve confidently. What a day it’s been for the progressive side of American politics. What a great week it’s been and it’s only Wednesday.” [41897]

On January 24 Senator Dianne Feinstein (D-CA) announces her new version of a legislative ban on “assault rifles.” She [falsely] states, “Military-style assault weapons have but one purpose, and in my view, that’s a military purpose to hold at the hip if possible, to spray fire, to be able to kill large numbers.” According to Emily Miller, at WashingtonTimes.com, Feinstein’s ban will include “handguns and shotguns, in addition to rifles. She would decrease from two to one the number of cosmetic features on a gun to have it be considered an ‘assault weapon.’ This means that if a gun has just one item like a pistol grip or bayonet lug, then it is illegal. Gov. Andrew Cuomo signed into law the same ban in New York last week. Furthermore, instead of grandfathering in current firearms, she would create a national gun registry for the government to track lawful gun owners. Magazines would again be limited to 10 rounds.” (Feinstein’s proposal bans “any semiautomatic firearm which uses a magazine—handgun, rifle or shotgun—equipped with a ‘pistol grip.’” The legislation also defines a pistol grip as “a grip, a thumb-hole stock, or any other characteristic that can function as a grip.” The legislation therefore essentially bans *almost all* widely-used guns.) [41890, 41891, 41892, 41901, 41906, 41948, 42117]

“...[The legislation] Requires that grandfathered weapons be registered under the National Firearms Act, to include: Background check of owner and any transferee; type and serial number of the firearm; positive identification, including photograph and fingerprint; certification from local law enforcement of identity and that possession would not violate State or local law; and dedicated funding for ATF to implement registration.” Feinstein’s legislation would cost Americans \$200 for every weapon they own that falls under the restrictions because that tax is imposed whenever a National Firearms Act weapon is registered or transferred. Her ban would also prohibit the sale of semi-automatic rifles. Owners would have to register them but could not sell them. Upon their deaths the weapons would have to be turned over to the government. Feinstein tells

reporters, “The purpose is to dry up the supply of these weapons over time.” Senator Dick Durbin (D-IL) says, “This just isn’t a matter of—an issue of [the] Constitution, it’s an issue of conscience, an issue of conscience.” (Feinstein’s legislation is unlikely to pass in the Senate unchanged, and even less likely to pass in the House. It is absurd to claim that a rifle becomes an “assault weapon” simply because it has a pistol grip, while an essentially identical rifle that fires the same ammunition at the same rate escapes that classification because it lacks that grip.) [41890, 41891, 41892, 41901, 41906, 41948]

Not surprisingly, Feinstein’s legislation includes an exemption for “weapons used by government officials, law enforcement and retired law enforcement personnel.” (Feinstein gets to keep her guns.) [42021, 42022]

Townhall.com lists the guns that are banned by Feinstein’s “Assault Weapons ban of 2013” proposal:

Rifles: All AK types, including the following:

AK, AK47, AK47S, AK-74, AKM, AKS, ARM, MAK90, MISR, NHM90, NHM91, Rock River Arms LAR-47, SA85, SA93, Vector Arms AK-47, VEPR, WASR-10, and WUM, IZHMASH Saiga AK, MAADI AK47 and ARM, Norinco 56S, 56S2, 84S, and 86S, Poly Technologies AK47 and AKS;

All AR types, including the following:

AR-10, AR-15, Armalite M15 22LR Carbine, Armalite M15-T, Barrett REC7, Beretta AR-70, Bushmaster ACR, Bushmaster Carbon 15, Bushmaster MOE series, Bushmaster XM15, Colt Match Target Rifles, DoubleStar AR rifles, DPMS Tactical Rifles, Heckler & Koch MR556, Olympic Arms, Remington R-15 rifles, Rock River Arms LAR-15, Sig Sauer SIG516 rifles, Smith & Wesson M&P15 Rifles, Stag Arms AR rifles, Sturm, Ruger & Co. SR556 rifles; Barrett M107A1; Barrett M82A1; Beretta CX4 Storm; Calico Liberty Series; CETME Sporter; Daewoo K-1, K-2, Max 1, Max 2, AR 100, and AR110C; Fabrique Nationale/FN Herstal FAL, LAR, 22 FNC, 308 Match, L1A1 Sporter, PS90, SCAR, and FS2000; Feather Industries AT-9; Galil Model AR and Model ARM; Hi-Point Carbine; HK-91, HK-93, HK-94, HK-PSG-1 and HK USC; Kel-Tec Sub-2000, SU-16, and RFB; SIG AMT, SIG PE-57, Sig Sauer SG 550, and Sig Sauer SG 551; Springfield Armory SAR-48; Steyr AUG; Sturm, Ruger Mini-14 Tactical Rifle M-14/20CF;

All Thompson rifles, including the following:

Thompson M1SB, Thompson T1100D, Thompson T150D, Thompson T1B, Thompson T1B100D, Thompson T1B50D, Thompson T1BSB, Thompson T1-C, Thompson T1D, Thompson T1SB, Thompson T5, Thompson T5100D, Thompson TM1, Thompson TM1C; UMAREX UZI Rifle; UZI Mini Carbine, UZI Model A Carbine, and UZI Model

B Carbine; Valmet M62S, M71S, and M78; Vector Arms UZI Type; Weaver Arms Nighthawk; Wilkinson Arms Linda Carbine.

Pistols: All AK-47 types, including the following:

Centurion 39 AK pistol, Draco AK-47 pistol, HCR AK-47 pistol, IO Inc. Hellpup AK-47 pistol, Krinkov pistol, Mini Draco AK-47 pistol, Yugo Krebs Krink pistol;

All AR-15 types, including the following:

American Spirit AR-15 pistol, Bushmaster Carbon 15 pistol, DoubleStar Corporation AR pistol, DPMS AR-15 pistol, Olympic Arms AR-15 pistol, Rock River Arms LAR 15 pistol; Calico Liberty pistols; DSA SA58 PKP FAL pistol; Encom MP-9 and MP-45; Heckler & Koch model SP-89 pistol; Intratec AB-10, TEC-22 Scorpion, TEC-9, and TEC-DC9; Kel-Tec PLR 16 pistol;

The following MAC types:

MAC-10, MAC-11; Masterpiece Arms MPA A930 Mini Pistol, MPA460 Pistol, MPA Tactical Pistol, and MPA Mini Tactical Pistol; Military Armament Corp. Ingram M-11, Velocity Arms VMAC; Sig Sauer P556 pistol; Sites Spectre;

All Thompson types, including the following:

Thompson TA510D, Thompson TA5; All UZI types, including: Micro-UZI.

Shotguns: Franchi LAW-12 and SPAS 12; All IZHMAISH Saiga 12 types, including the following: IZHMAISH Saiga 12, IZHMAISH Saiga 12S, IZHMAISH Saiga 12S EXP-01, IZHMAISH Saiga 12K, IZHMAISH Saiga 12K-030, IZHMAISH Saiga 12K-040 Taktika; Streetsweeper; Striker 12.

Belt-fed semiautomatic firearms: All belt-fed semiautomatic firearms including TNW M2HB.” [41895]

Feinstein—who met with ATF officials just days before the election—does not estimate the number of manufacturing and sales jobs that will be lost as a result of her proposal. Sturm, Ruger & Company, and Sig Sauer weapons are manufactured in New Hampshire, for example, where Senator Jean Shaheen is up for reelection in 2014. (Shaheen will certainly think twice before voting for a Feinstein bill that puts her constituents out of work.) [41895, 42006]

While introducing her gun ban proposal, Feinstein displays 10 “so-called” assault weapons—all of which would be illegal for her to have in Washington, D.C. (She tells reporters she received special permission from law enforcement.) [41902]

The Feinstein bill shows how little many people know about weapons and magazines. At PJMedia.com Bob Owens points out, “[T]he simple fact of the matter is that most shooters prefer semi-automatic, detachable magazine rifles, and for good reason. Self-loading, semi-automatic rifles allow shooters to focus on marksmanship. When not distracted by the machinations of working a bolt-action, pumping a pump-action, or working a lever, shooters [at a rifle range] can focus on the far more important tasks of establishing a natural point of aim and precisely following the six steps of firing a shot. In order to accurately, repeatedly fire shots into a tight group, a shooter has to align the front and rear sights, bring the aligned sights onto the target, find her respiratory pause, focus the eyes on the front sight while focusing the mind on the target, squeeze the trigger, and follow through. That’s hard work, despite what your experience playing *Call of Duty* or *Halo* on Xbox suggests. ...It may come as a surprise to some to learn that the AR-15 is the best-selling, most common centerfire rifle in the United States. Hardly an ‘assault rifle,’ the AR-15 fires one shot per trigger pull like every non-military gun made and sold. It only looks like its military cousins the M-4 carbine and M-16 rifle. When politicians claim that these and similar firearms ‘spray’ bullets, they are not just engaging in hyperbole, they are flat-out lying to you. One shot per trigger squeeze. That’s all.” (One Townhall.com reader argues, “We need a complete ban on assault/automatic weapons that chamber more than one bullet at a time. Including revolvers!” Gun users would, of course, have no problem with such a ban because it would apply to no weapons.) [41947]

Millions of Americans sportsmen own AR-15 or similar rifles. They are popular, writes Owens, because they are “small-caliber, low-recoil, relatively weak” and “pleasant to shoot. ...Once again, those who have claimed that AR-15s are ‘high caliber’ and ‘high powered’ and that the ‘effects are devastating’ of this caliber—I’m looking squarely at you, lying liar [retired General] Stanley McChrystal—are being serially, intentionally dishonest. The 55-62 grain .223 caliber bullets common to the rifle are used to hunt groundhogs, coyotes, and other small game, nothing larger. The round was adopted by the military because the ammunition was far lighter and easier to carry than modern deer cartridges, with roughly half the power and range due to their modular nature. However, parts of an AR-15 can be switched out to hunt any game animal in North America, from squirrels to bears. ...The truth of the matter is that there is no such thing as an ‘assault weapon.’ The term was coined out of thin air by a gun-control zealot in the 1980s, and it refers to any firearm that looks like a military gun that a politician would like to ban. The tens of thousands of rifles that have graced our [rifle range] firing lines are not ‘assault weapons,’ no matter how dishonestly or loudly any politician tries to claim otherwise. They are not more powerful than deer rifles; they bear roughly half the power. They do not have more range than a deer rifle; they have roughly half the range. They do not have more firepower; they put far fewer projectiles in the air than even a common shotgun. There are people in positions of power loudly and aggressively trying to sell you on lies. The question is, why?” [41947]

Secretary of Defense Leon Panetta addresses the administration’s decision to allow women to serve in combat: “One of my priorities as secretary of defense has been to remove as many barriers as possible for talented and qualified people to be able to serve

this country in uniform. It's clear to all of us that women are already contributing in unprecedented ways to the mission. The fact is they have become an integral part of our ability to perform our mission. ...Our military is more capable, and our force is more powerful, when we use all of the great diverse strengths of the American people. Every person in today's military has made a solemn commitment to fight and, if necessary, to die, for our nation's defense. We owe it to them to allow them to pursue every avenue of military service for which they are fully prepared and qualified. Their career success and their specific opportunities should be based solely on their ability to successfully carry out an assigned mission. Everyone deserves that chance." [41894, 41910]

Via Twitter, author and columnist Ann Coulter quips, "If you believed Hillary's testimony she has some Whitewater property she'd like to sell you."

*The Telegraph* reports, "North Korea has announced plans to carry out a third nuclear test as part of 'upcoming all-out action' against America. Defying a resolution issued by the United Nations Security Council on Tuesday that condemned Pyongyang for test-firing a missile in December and tightened existing sanctions on the regime, North Korea's National Defence Commission said the new nuclear test would be part of its action against the 'sworn enemy of the Korean people.' North Korea also vowed to push ahead with launches of more long-range rockets." (Those seeking to find any foreign policy successes by outgoing Secretary of State Hillary Clinton can safely exclude North Korea from the list.) HotAir.com reader Gatsu asks, "Did the NorKs [North Koreans] see the terrible Red Dawn remake and get some crazy ideas?" [41903, 41908, 41941]

The *Boston Herald* comments on Hillary Clinton's Benghazi testimony: "After a full day of testimony before two congressional committees, Secretary of State Hillary Clinton offered little except bluster to the nation's knowledge of what happened in Benghazi during the 9/11 terror attack and why the White House spent days lying about it. ...It was clear prior to election day that the White House had sent U.N. Ambassador Susan Rice to five TV networks to advance *their* narrative that our ambassador to Libya and three others were killed by a mob riled up over a YouTube video. It was a lie then; it's a lie now. But voters reelected Barack Obama, so the lesson is what? It's OK [sic] to lie—even about a terror attack—in the course of a political campaign? Well, it is if you can get away with it anyway." [41905]

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee holds a confirmation hearing for Senator John Kerry (D-MA), who Obama selected to replace retiring Secretary of State Hillary Clinton. Kerry states, "The first priority of business which will affect my credibility as a diplomat working to help other countries create order, is whether America at last puts its own fiscal house in order. My plea is that we can summon across party lines, without partisan diversions, an economic patriotism which recognizes that American strength and prospects abroad, depend on American strength and results at home." (In other words, he wants the GOP to support tax increases so the government can spend even more money.) The hearing is predictable, with Democrats praising Kerry and asking softball questions, and Kerry—who has been wrong on virtually every foreign policy issue since he became a Senator—deflecting hardly difficult questions from Republicans. At PJMedia.com

Bridget Johnson observes, “Kerry’s hearing was not so much a nomination grilling as it was a meeting of old friends seeing off their colleague who sat on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee for 28 years.” [41915, 41944, 41949]

Kentucky Senator Rand Paul is an exception, and asks meaningful questions of Kerry—who dances around them because he knows he will be confirmed. Paul asks, “In the early 1970s, you know, after Vietnam, you were quite critical of the bombing in Cambodia because I think you felt that it wasn’t authorized by Congress. Has your opinion changed about the bombing in Cambodia? How is Cambodia different than Libya?” Kerry replies, “It was an extension of the war that was being prosecuted without the involvement of Congress after a number of years. That’s very different. ...Look, you can be absolutist and apply it to every circumstance. The problem is it just doesn’t work in some instances. When 10,000 people are about to be wiped out by a brutal dictator and you need to make a quick judgment about engagement, you certainly can’t rely on a Congress that has proven itself unwilling to move after weeks and months sometimes.” (It is not true that “10,000 people [were] about to be wiped out” by Moammar Gaddafi, and even if it were the defense of the citizens of Libya is not the responsibility of the United States. If the situation were as critical as Kerry suggests, Congress would have quickly approved of Obama’s decision to act against Gaddafi. Kerry believes Obama can violate the U.S. Constitution and the War Powers Act simply because he doesn’t feel he can “rely on Congress.”) [41915, 41944, 41949]

Kerry tells Paul he would not withhold U.S. aid to Pakistan in an effort to secure the release of a doctor who was imprisoned and tortured for helping the United States locate Osama bin Laden. (Kerry’s response essentially tells everyone around the world, “Don’t bother helping the United States because we will not be there to help you.”) Kerry also states he supports sending tanks and fighter planes even though its President, Mohamed Morsi, has made vile anti-Jew statements. (One of Morsi’s aides claims there was no Holocaust and the Jews simply went to the United States, rather than to Hitler’s gas chambers.) Kerry says Morsi should apologize. Paul responds, “If we keep sending them weapons, it’s not gonna change their behavior.” Kerry states, “The fact that sometimes other countries elect someone that you don’t completely agree with doesn’t give us permission to walk away from their election...” (At PJMedia.com Barry Rubin comments, “Wow. This is truly ignorant. Just because Egyptians—or anyone else—elected a government does not mean that U.S. policy must accept whatever that government does. Yet I think Kerry and Obama actually believe that it *does* mean that. ...Kerry isn’t just wrong, he’s totally clueless. And as just about the most openly arrogant man in American public life, he will never let reality penetrate his ideological armor.”) [42071]

ZeroHedge.com reports that the minimal growth in the nation’s Gross Domestic Product since the “official” end of the recession in 2009 makes this “recovery” the worst in American history. [41917]

The February 2–10 Harrisburg Eastern Sports and Outdoor Show, the nation’s largest, is postponed indefinitely by its organizers after a boycott by gun supporters outraged over a

decision to prohibit “modern sporting rifles” (so-called “assault weapons”) from being displayed or sold at the event. WashingtonExaminer.com reports, “As the assault rifle ban became known, exhibitors, sponsors and the TV stars withdrew by the dozens. The NRA is a huge sponsor of the show and pulled out Tuesday after Reed [Exhibitions] moved to ban assault rifles like Bushmasters and AR-15s at the show.” Although the event also showcases camping and fishing, “The boycott by the NRA and 170 other exhibitors... is what killed the show said one exhibitor. ‘We need to stand firm against those siding with the anti-gun crowd,’ said the exhibitor on background.” Tony Ruggeri, owner of the hunting consulting company Trophyseekers Worldwide, tells Townhall.com, “This is a major, major thing, this is the largest show anywhere in the region, in the country and it’s fallen apart because of this. I paid \$3,000 for a double booth. I won’t be going, I’ll be eating that. I’m not supporting any company that does not support the Second Amendment completely.” (Reed Exhibitions later agrees to refund exhibitor fees.) According to ABC27 WHTM, the Harrisburg, Pennsylvania area will lose an estimated \$80 million in business because of the show’s cancellation. [41925, 41934, 41935]

CNSNews.com reports on the growing numbers of sheriffs across the country who are “standing up to gun control measures proposed by both the administration and Sen. Dianne Feinstein.” (In April, Examiner.com reported, “A news report has been quietly making its way around the alternative media, under the radar screen, concerning a Delaware legal decision to strip county sheriffs of their arrest powers in the state. The mainstream media has not reported the story, but [Beau Biden] the son of Vice President Joe Biden, who serves as Attorney General for the state of Delaware, has issued a mandate to county commissioners informing them that sheriffs in the state’s three counties no longer have arrest powers. ...The move to weaken and dismantle sheriffs offices around the country is viewed by Constitutional watchdogs as an ominous signal in a broader attempt to usurp the rights of citizens on the local level in lieu of an expanded nationalized police force under the control of a federal bureaucracy.”) [41926, 41927, 41951]

*The Telegraph* reports, “Britons and all other westerners were told to leave the Libyan city of Benghazi on Thursday after diplomats received warning of an ‘imminent’ terror threat in the wake of the Algerian hostage siege.” [41928]

Some speculate that Hillary Clinton’s recent absences from work were for cosmetic surgery, not any serious illness or brain clot. On the other hand, others point out what looks to be a left fresnel prism lens in the eyeglasses she wore during her Senate and House Benghazi testimony, which may indicate correction for hemianopia, diplopia, or double-vision caused by a stroke or concussion. Other current speculation relates to the multiple photographs of flies that seem fond of landing on Obama’s face and the fact that he rubs his nose quite frequently. Fruit flies are supposedly attracted to cocaine, and cocaine snorters habitually rub their noses. (That this *Timeline* includes such speculation should not be interpreted as an endorsement of the claims; the reports are included if they lie within the realm of reasonable possibility. The *Timeline* gives no credence, however,



to the claim that Obama is the “Lord of the Flies,” a Hebrew translation for the name Beelzebub, or Satan.) [41929, 41930, 41931, 41937, 41938, 41955]

In a “Google+ chat,” Vice President Joe Biden defends banning “assault rifles,” saying, “You know, guess what, a shotgun will keep you a lot safer, a double-barreled shotgun, not an assault weapon in somebody’s hands that [sic] doesn’t know how to use it, even one that does know how to use it. You know. It’s harder to use an assault weapon and hit something than it is a shotgun, okay? If you want to keep people away in an earthquake, buy some shotgun shells.” (Many gun experts would disagree with Biden’s claim—especially if the target is not in close range. Biden may want to talk to the many SWAT team members who prefer rifles over shotguns. In any event, Biden does not offer advice on what to do if you fire a shotgun and miss and your assailant tackles you while you are distracted by reloading, or if your assailants number in the dozens after a disaster of some sort. Biden is also too uninformed to know that Senator Dianne Feinstein’s legislation includes 10 shotguns among the list of outlawed weapons.) [41945, 41948, 42159]

The week before, Biden told the U.S. Conference of Mayors that while playing golf in 2006, he “happened to be literally, probably, it turned out to be a quarter of a mile [away]... at an outing, um, when I heard gun shots in the woods that we didn’t know where—we thought they were hunters. We got back to the clubhouse of this outing and saw helicopters, it was a shooting that had just taken place in a small Amish, uh, uh, uh, excuse me, a small Amish school just outside of Lancaster, Pennsylvania.” According to LancasterOnline.com the incident occurred on October 2, 2006. There is no record of Biden having played golf at the nearby Moccasin Run Golf Club, which is about six miles from the site of the shooting. No other golf course is closer, but the Atglen Sportsmen’s Club is about a half-mile away from the golf course. No nearby golf course has any record or recollection of Biden ever having played there. “Many local residents discussing the issue online are upset with what they feel is Biden’s exploitation of the tragedy to move his gun violence cause forward.” [41963, 49164]

CNSNews.com points out a “little-noted provision” in ObamaCare that “allows health insurers to charge smokers buying individual policies up to 50 percent higher premiums” than non-smokers, effective January 1, 2014. ... Insurers won’t be allowed to charge more under the overhaul for people who are overweight, or have a health condition like a bad back or a heart that skips beats—but they can charge more if a person smokes. ... Take a hypothetical 60-year-old smoker making \$35,000 a year. Estimated premiums for coverage in the new private health insurance markets under Obama’s law would total \$10,172. That person would be eligible for a tax credit that brings the cost down to \$3,325. But the smoking penalty could add \$5,086 to the cost. And since federal tax credits can’t be used to offset the penalty, the smoker’s total cost for health insurance would be \$8,411, or 24 percent of income.” [41952, 41988, 41998]

Michael Hastings, author of a book about the presidential campaign, Panic 2012, tells MSNBC’s Martin Bashir that many journalists are so enamored of Obama that they lose common sense. “[W]hen they’re near him, they lose their minds sometimes. They start behaving in ways that are juvenile, and amateurish, and they swoon.” [41960]

On January 25 Obama and Hillary Clinton are interviewed together by *60 Minutes* reporter Steve Kroft. (The program will air on January 27.) [41946]

Obama announces that Denis McDonough will be his new chief of staff. Communications director Dan Pfeiffer will be made a senior adviser, and deputy communications director Jennifer Palmieri will be given Pfeiffer's job. (McDonough was a senior fellow at the far left, George Soros-funded Center for American Progress. AtlasShrugs.com's Pamela Geller points out that McDonough "...is the man most responsible for orchestrating the Benghazi jihad cover-up. McDonough rewrote the CIA talking points on Benghazi, misrepresenting the video, when the true motive behind the terrorist attack was well known. But lying to the American people was what was most important to Obama, not American lives, to ensure his re-election." Palmieri was also with the Center for American Progress. She has strong connections to the Clinton administration and the mainstream media.) [27053, 27129, 41586]

Hundreds of thousands of anti-abortion demonstrators attend the annual "March for Life" in Washington, D.C., 40 years after the Supreme Court's decision in *Roe v. Wade* led to 55 million abortions. (Because of the event, area hotel rooms have been sold out for more than one month.) [41936, 41940, 42027]

Maricopa County, Arizona Sheriff Joe Arpaio tells Phoenix radio station KFYY, "I took oaths of office [every time I was sworn in], and they all say I will defend the Constitution of the United States. Now if they're going to tell the sheriff that he's going to go around picking up guns from everybody, they're going to have a problem. I may not enforce that federal law." Arpaio also says he will not confiscate 10-round magazines. "My deputies, I said before, I'm going to arm all my deputies—a month ago I said before this—with automatic weapons and semi-automatic weapons. We're going to be able to fight back.. I don't care what they say from Washington." [41965]

A federal judge rules that immigration agents can proceed with their lawsuit against Obama, Department of Homeland Security head Janet Napolitano, and ICE Director John Morton for enacting policies that prevent them from doing their jobs. According to FoxNews.com, the agents "argue [that] their bosses essentially have forced them to look the other way and not enforce the law—thus overstepping Congress by changing laws through directives rather than legislation." At issue is Obama's "amnesty order" that "suspend[ed] deportation proceedings and offer[ed] temporary work authorization to some immigrants brought to the United States illegally as children. Chris Crane, the president of ICE agents' union that initiated the legal fight, accused the Obama administration of not even consulting with agents when he made his policy change. 'We've repeatedly tried to work with the administration and they've just excluded us from everything since day one,' Crane said on a conference call with reporters announcing the lawsuit. Crane went on to say that the new guidelines left agents powerless to enforce immigration law because they had no way to distinguish who qualifies for deferred deportation. 'The alien has no burden of proof to establish that claim,' Crane said. 'So we're not enforcing the law anymore, we're not enforcing the

policy. It's pretty much just let everyone go.'" (Obama's executive order is illegal as it orders agents to follow rules that are inconsistent with federal immigration laws.) [42038]

DailyCaller.com reports, "Documents published online for the first time Thursday indicate that the FBI opened an inquiry into New Jersey Democratic Sen. Bob Menendez on August 1, 2012, focusing on repeated trips he took to the Dominican Republic with longtime campaign contributor and Miami eye doctor Salomon Melgen. [Melgen's office is raided by the FBI on January 29. The story is ignored by CBS, NBC, ABC, CNN, and MSNBC. In addition to providing Menendez with prostitutes and free trips, Melgen owes \$11.1 million in back taxes—but still manages to help fund the campaigns of Democrats like Menendez.] TheDC reported in November that Menendez purchased the service of prostitutes in that Caribbean nation at a series of alcohol-fueled sex parties. The documents, which The Daily Caller had obtained hours earlier from an anonymous source, also indicate that Carrie Levine, research director at Citizens for Responsibility and Ethics in Washington (CREW), was alerted on April 9, 2012 to Menendez's habit of paying for sex while outside the United States. ...Information made available to [ABC News senior investigative producer Rhonda] Schwartz and Levine at that time included allegations that some of Menendez's prostitutes were as young as 16. The source also alleged that Sen. Menendez was taking 'non-authorized trips' to the Dominican Republic, suggesting that he may have been evading Senate Ethics committee rules covering disclosures when third parties pay for a senator's travel." Not only has Menendez used the services of under-age prostitutes, his Senate office staff included an illegal immigrant and sex offender—whose arrest was intentionally delayed by the Obama administration until after the November election. In response to an inquiry from DailyCaller.com, Schwartz stated, "I'm not going to say anything. I'm not confirming anything." (With the scandal out in the open, Menendez quickly reimburses Melgen \$58,500 to cover the cost of his two trips to the Dominican Republic in 2010. White House press secretary Jay Carney has no comment when reporters ask about the issue.) [41608, 41609, 41939, 41942, 42115, 42145, 42146, 42147, 42148, 42169, 42195, 42196, 42291, 42394]

Menendez faces a severe prison sentence if indicted and found guilty of engaging in sex with a 16-year-old prostitute. WeeklyStandard.com notes the Prosecutorial Remedies And Other Tools To End The Exploitation Of Children Today ("Protect Act"), which states, "A person who travels in interstate commerce or travels into the United States, or a United States citizen or an alien admitted for permanent residence in the United States who travels in foreign commerce, for the purpose of engaging in any illicit sexual conduct with another person shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than 30 years, or both." Illicit sexual acts includes "a sexual act... with a person under 18 years of age..." (Ironically, Menendez has spoken out against child prostitution in Cuba.) [42169, 42195]

Obama learns that the U.S. Constitution applies to him, as well as his "subjects." The Associated Press reports, "In an embarrassing setback for ...Obama, a federal appeals court panel [unanimously] ruled Friday that he violated the Constitution in making certain recess appointments and moved to curtail a chief executive's ability in the future to circumvent the Senate in such scenarios. A three-judge panel of the U.S. Court of

Appeals for the D.C. Circuit said that Obama did not have the power to make three recess appointments last year to the National Labor Relations Board because the Senate was officially in session—and not in recess—at the time. If the decision stands, it could invalidate hundreds of board decisions. The court said [Obama] could only fill vacancies with the recess appointment procedure if the openings arise when the Senate is in an official recess, which it defined as the break between sessions of Congress. The ruling threw into question Obama’s recess appointment of Richard Cordray to head the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau. Cordray’s appointment, also made at the same time, has been challenged in a separate case. The White House had no immediate comment.” Whether Obama will appeal the decision is uncertain, but is likely to ignore it in the short term and direct his illegal appointees to stay put and not resign. (ABC ignores the story, but manages to find time to report on a lawsuit against the Subway fast food chain for selling foot-long sandwiches that are sometimes a bit shorter.) [41372, 41943, 41950, 41954, 41958, 41959, 41962, 41966, 41967, 42011, 42026, 42041]

The power to make recess appointments was included in the Constitution so that presidents could fill important positions that became vacant while the Senate was not in session and the Senators were back home meeting with their constituents. The rule was, of course, important in 1789 when it took a tremendous amount of time for legislators to travel to and from the capitol. It was certainly never intended to enable presidents to make controversial appointments during brief intra-session adjournments. Article II, Section 2, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution reads, “The President shall have Power to fill up all Vacancies that may happen during the Recess of the Senate, by granting Commissions which shall expire at the End of their next Session.” (“The recess” means *the* recess between the annual sessions of the Senate—not “*a* recess” on weekends or coffee breaks.) [41372, 41943, 41950, 41954, 41958, 41959, 41962, 41966, 41967, 42011, 42026]

AtlasShrugs.com posts a photograph of a protester in Cairo’s Tahrir Square that reads [unedited], “From Tahrir Square to the U.S. Media & Muslim Brotherhood: Obama you jerk, Muslim Brotherhoods are killing the Egyptians so how come, they can guarantee you the security of Israel. Hey Obama, your deal with the Muslim Brotherhood is unsuccessful. Obama you idiot, Keep in mind that Egypt is not Muslim Brotherhoods and if you don’t believe that, go and see what’s happening in Tahrir Square << NOW >>.” [41972, 41973]

AlJazeera.com reports, “The [United Nations] Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights has launched an investigation into drone strikes and will review resultant civilian casualties to determine whether the attacks constitute a war crime. Ben Emmerson, a UN special rapporteur on human rights and counter-terrorism, formally launched the inquiry on Thursday, in response to requests from Russia, China and Pakistan.” Emmerson states, “This is not an investigation into the conduct of any particular state. It’s an investigation into the consequence into this form of technology. The reality is that the increasing availability of this technology... makes it very likely that more states will be using this technology in the coming months and years and includes

raising the spectre that non state organisations—organisations labelled as terrorist groups—could use the technology in retaliation.” [41956]

Former Senator Fred Thompson writes, “...I’ve been doing a little traveling this week and I was at the airport in Nashville catching a little television passing by when I heard the most bizarre statement I think I’ve ever heard a public official make. It was Hillary Clinton on television saying it doesn’t really matter the identity of the people who killed our folks over in Benghazi. Whether it was a demonstration that got out of hand or whether or not it was just some people that decided to kill some Americans, does it really matter now? Well, I think it matters. Maybe it matters because we owe it to the people that we sent over there to be killed. Maybe we owe to their families. Maybe we owe it to them because the president promised to bring the perpetrators to justice. Maybe it matters because of that. Maybe it matters because nothing seems to be being done to bring them to justice. Maybe it matters because some people strangely think that in order to bring anybody to justice you gotta know who they are. Maybe it matters because what you are saying here in your testimony is that this whole thing about bringing to justice is just a farce to kick the can of responsibility on down the road a little bit further. Maybe it should matter to you because this ambassador was your person. You sent him over there. You know, the guy who was asking for help and asking for assistance because he was in danger, help that you never sent him. Doesn’t it matter a little bit to you the identity of the people who killed him? Maybe it matters because [Obama] said Al Qaeda was on the run. Maybe it matters because some of these same people are showing up in these other countries attacking our friends and allies. And finally, maybe it matters because the administration thought that it mattered enough to immediately send out people to lie to the American people about the identity of these perpetrators. Maybe it matters because of that. It does matter. There are a lot of unanswered questions about this Benghazi situation, but the number one question I have today to Hillary Clinton is: Madame Secretary, are you not the most overrated secretary of state in the history of our country?” [41982]

Judicial Watch reports, “An astonishing number of naturalized U.S. citizens have been convicted of grave national security crimes—including terrorism, espionage and theft of sensitive technology—yet the government allows them to keep their American citizenship. As unfathomable as this may seem it’s simply business as usual in the Department of Homeland Security (DHS), the massive agency created after 9/11 to keep the nation safe. The agency rarely strips foreigners of citizenship even when they prove to be national security threats who hustle the system. In fact, DHS has no system in place to examine such cases or weed out future threats.” [41989]

Attorney, author, and talk show host Mark Levin asks his radio audience, “Do we know which of our public officials has mental health issues? ... Why don’t we? Shouldn’t there be a mental health check and a background check on every member of Congress before they’re sworn in, and quite frankly on the president and the vice president of the United States? The president of the United States and right behind him the vice president of the United States have more access to guns, maybe not themselves but ... [through] the military, and the use of force than any two people on the face of the earth. So shouldn’t

those two, Obama and Biden, go through background checks, including mental health checks? ...Biden says, according to ABC News, 'a mental health check on gun sales may have averted the 2007 mass shooting on Virginia Tech's campus.'" [41986]

On January 26 ultra-liberal Senator Tom Harkin (D-IA) announces he will not seek reelection in 2014. (His retirement gives the GOP a good shot at picking up his seat.) [41985]

According to a Fox News poll, 65 percent of those surveyed say they would "defy the law" if the government passed gun confiscation legislation. (The Republican response was 70 percent; 68 percent of conservatives; 52 percent for Democrats; and 59 percent of liberals.) [41975]

Reuters reports, "Hackers sympathetic to the late computer prodigy Aaron Swartz claimed on Saturday to have infiltrated the website of the U.S. Justice Department's Sentencing Commission, and said they planned to release government data. The Sentencing Commission site, [www.ussc.gov](http://www.ussc.gov), was shut down early Saturday. Identifying themselves as Anonymous, a loosely organized group of unknown provenance associated with a range of recent online actions, the hackers voiced outrage over Swartz' suicide on January 11." [41976]

A few thousand gun opponents gather in Washington, D.C. in support of gun control legislation. (In their evening news broadcasts ABC and CBS ignored the March for Life anti-abortion event that involved several hundred thousand attendees, but they reported on the gun control protest—which had only about one thousand demonstrators.) [41977, 42011, 42027]

The Associated Press reports that Obama "will launch a campaign next week aimed at overhauling the nation's flawed immigration system and creating legal status for millions, as a bipartisan Senate group nears agreement on achieving the same goals. The proposals from Obama and lawmakers will mark the start of what is expected to be a contentious and emotional process with deep political implications. Latino voters overwhelmingly backed Obama in the 2012 election, leaving Republicans grappling for a way to regain their standing with an increasingly powerful pool of voters. ...[Obama] is expected to revive his little-noticed 2011 immigration 'blueprint,' which calls for a pathway to citizenship for illegal immigrants that includes paying fines and back taxes; increased border security; mandatory penalties for businesses that employ unauthorized immigrants; and improvements to the legal immigration system, including giving green cards to high-skilled workers and lifting caps on legal immigration for the immediate family members of U.S. citizens." (The Associated Press does not explain how the government could even calculate the amount of back taxes owed by an illegal immigrant who has been working illegally and either for cash or with a stolen Social Security number.) [41978]

At Townhall.com Ed Feulner, president of The Heritage Foundation (who will be succeeded by James DeMint in April 2013), notes, "[A] family in the top 20 percent of

income-earners earned 50 percent more than a family in the next 20 percent, but paid 253 percent more in taxes. Even more strikingly, a family's income in the top 20 percent income bracket was 122 percent higher than a family in the third 20 percent bracket. Yet it paid a staggering 943 percent more in income taxes. Are these huge differences justified? Do they help make America a more just society, or is their real purpose to help politicians win votes by redistributing other people's incomes?" [41979]

DailyCaller.com reports, "A federal court delivered a serious blow to the Environmental Protection Agency's renewable fuel agenda, ruling that the agency exceeded its authority by mandating refiners use cellulosic biofuels, which isn't commercially available. The court sided with the country's chief oil and gas lobby, the American Petroleum Institute, in striking down the 2012 EPA mandate that would have forced refineries to purchase more than \$8 million in credits for 8.65 million of gallons of the cellulosic biofuel. However, none of the biofuel is commercially available." In 2011 the EPA fined oil refining companies \$6.8 million for not mixing biofuels in their gasoline and diesel products—despite the fact that the cellulosic biofuels *did not yet exist*. Industry spokesman Charles Drevna said, "As ludicrous as that sounds, it's fact. If it weren't so frustrating and infuriating, it would be comical." (Amazingly, the EPA responds to the court order by increasing its demand for cellulosic biofuels to 14 million gallons in 2013. The Obama administration is apparently begging to be sued again.) [28135, 33579, 41980, 42155, 42207]

In an interview with *The New Republic*, the uncompromising Obama says he can't get more accomplished because of Republicans who are unwilling to compromise: "If a Republican member of Congress is not punished on Fox News or by Rush Limbaugh for working with a Democrat on a bill of common interest, then you'll see more of them doing it." (It is worth noting that the thin-skinned Obama also whined about Limbaugh shortly after his 2009 inauguration. When Republican leaders complained about the enormity of his proposed \$825 billion stimulus package—and the extensive pork it contained—Obama told them, "You can't just listen to Rush Limbaugh and get things done.") Obama continues, "I think [House Speaker] John Boehner genuinely wanted to get a deal done, but it was hard to do in part because his caucus is more conservative probably than most Republican leaders are, and partly because he is vulnerable to attack for compromising Republican principles and working with Obama." Obama says "the more left-leaning media outlets recognize that compromise is not a dirty word" and laughably claims that Democrat leaders are "willing to buck the more absolutist-wing elements in our party to try to get stuff done. ...I can't get enough votes out of the House of Representatives to actually get something passed. ...I think there is still shock on the part of some in the party that I won re-election. ...The House Republican majority is made up mostly of members who are in sharply gerrymandered districts that are very safely Republican and may not feel compelled to pay attention to broad-based public opinion, because what they're really concerned about is the opinions of their specific Republican constituencies." (Needless to say, the same can be said of the Democrat minority in the House. Most of the House Democrats are also in "safe seats" created by the drawing of "friendly" Congressional district lines.) [920, 931, 932, 1030, 41992, 41994, 42014, 42028, 42032]

Obama also addresses the issue of gun control, and—like most leftists—suggests the Second Amendment pertains to hunting. He tells *The New Republic*, “I have a profound respect for the traditions of hunting that trace back in this country for generations, and I think those who dismiss that out of hand make a big mistake.” (No one dismisses that out of hand; they believe he is lying.) “Part of being able to move this [gun control legislation] forward,” says Obama, “is understanding the reality of guns in urban areas are very different from the realities of guns in rural areas. And if you grew up and your dad gave you a hunting rifle when you were ten, and you went out and spent the day with him and your uncles, and that became part of your family’s traditions, you can see why you’d be pretty protective of that.” (Obama—intentionally—misses the point. The Second Amendment has nothing to do with hunting deer, ducks, or rabbits for dinner. It has to do with recognizing that individuals have an inherent right to defend themselves against the tyranny of government.) Obama also makes the laughable claim that he goes “skeet shooting all the time,” which prompts the Drudge Report to post the quote with a photograph of Obama and his closest advisors laughing hysterically. (Some would probably argue that Obama is more likely to have shot heroine than a gun.) [41993, 41994, 42014, 42015]

In addition to guns, Obama is apparently also afraid of football. He tells *The New Republic*, “I’m a big football fan, but I have to tell you if I had a son, I’d have to think long and hard before I let him play football. And I think that those of us who love the sport are going to have to wrestle with the fact that it will probably change gradually to try to reduce some of the violence. In some cases, that may make it a little bit less exciting, but it will be a whole lot better for the players, and those of us who are fans maybe won’t have to examine our consciences quite as much. I tend to be more worried about college players than NFL players in the sense that the NFL players have a union, they’re grown men, they can make some of these decisions on their own, and most of them are well-compensated for the violence they do to their bodies. You read some of these stories about college players who undergo some of these same problems with concussions and so forth and then have nothing to fall back on. That’s something that I’d like to see the NCAA think about.” [42014]

It is worth noting that the softball Obama interview was conducted by 29-year-old Facebook co-founder Chris Hughes—who is also the new publisher, editor-in-chief, and owner of *The New Republic*. The multi-millionaire Hughes, who was also heavily involved in Obama’s online fundraising activities in 2008, claims, “The journalism in these pages will strive to be free of party ideology or partisan bias, although it will showcase passionate writing and will continue to wrestle with the primary questions about our society.” (Many who read the interview may dispute the “free of party ideology or partisan bias” claim.) According to *The New York Times*, the money-losing magazine has about 44,000 subscribers. According to FreeBeacon.com, among Hughes’ first acts as the magazine’s new owner was ousting at least five Jewish columnists—all “well-respected, longtime contributors.” [42067, 42068, 42092, 42093]



Eric Peters, a lover of cars and liberty, writes, “In New York, we have a prequel of what’s to come—the repeal of the Second Amendment and summary criminalization of peaceful citizens merely for possessing the means of self-defense, even in their own homes. ...The tyrants Michael Bloomberg and Andrew Cuomo have made their decision. Now New Yorkers will have to make theirs. And so will the rest of us—if, as seems likely, the federal tyrants succeed in issuing a New York-style fatwa that applies to the rest of the country. Which brings us to the question: What will *you* do? It is a very hard question. Perhaps the hardest question Americans have had to face since 1861. As then, there may be no peaceful way to preserve our rights. There may be blood. As then, one side is absolutely determined to impose its will at bayonet-point. To murder us in the thousands—perhaps millions, this time—if we refuse to submit. There is no reasoning, no discussing. What we face is violence against our persons by people who absolutely will not leave us in peace—no matter how peaceful we try to be—until we have submitted to them utterly and for all time to come. We wish only to be left alone—and demand that our right to defend ourselves against those who will not leave us alone be respected. That self-defense is the most basic of rights—a right conceded even to the lowest animal. They do not acknowledge our rights; they despise the very notion of us having any rights at all. They regard their power over us as limitless in principle—and rage at even the smallest assertion of freedom of action. They loathe our guns because our ownership of guns is an expression of our determination to defend our very lives—and thus, of *self-ownership*.” [42008]

Peters continues, “And that is what cannot be tolerated. Which is why the current bum-rush to disarm us has become absolutely frantic. The moment is at hand. We will either stand up and be reckoned with as free men—or we will sit down forever and accept any degradation, any humiliation. And in that case, we shall have proved worthy of such treatment. Future generations will look upon us with the same mixture of incomprehension and contempt that our generation looked upon those who meekly lined up naked in queue for their turn at the edge of the pit. Because it will come to that, in time. For decades, in a slow and incremental way, they have progressively increased their claims on us. On the most intimate details of our private lives. On our literal bodies and those of our children. We no longer enjoy even the vestigial liberty of being free in our own homes. They are everywhere. They recognize no limits, no boundary beyond which they may not assert themselves over us. They read and record our conversations. They demand to know the minutia of our finances. They tell us with whom we must do business—and under what conditions. They lay claim to an unlimited amount of our income. They deny us even the prospect of real ownership of anything more than the clothes on our backs. They assert their ‘right’—that is, their unchecked power to do us violence—for any and no reason at all, beyond the reason that they have power and we do not. We are on the cusp now of literal, physical enslavement. Of being owned—because we are about to be rendered utterly defenseless. *Legally* rendered defenseless.” [42008]

“If that is not just cause for resistance, then there is no cause for resisting anything, ever. Which is exactly the point being insisted upon: That we have no right to resist, because we have no rights. It is our role to Submit and Obey. Immediately, quietly. To anything

and everything they tell us to do. To complacently accept as natural and right that our lives are the playthings of others—who may do with us as they please. That our lives do not matter. Because we do not own our lives. Our lives are owned by *them*. If we lose this battle, then we have already lost the war. The rest will be a mopping up operation. Having taken away not merely our guns but succeeded in intellectually defrocking us of the principle of self-defense and self-ownership that possessing arms affirms, it will be a very small thing indeed to take away much else besides. To take away anything – perhaps everything. Why not? We have already surrendered—and thus, already accepted the idea that nothing is off limits, that whatever small measure of vestigial liberty we may still possess is not actually possessed but merely *tolerated*... for the moment. And may be taken from us at any time, at their *whim*. A defenseless man should expect no mercy. And a man unwilling to defend himself—and his fellow men—against tyranny *deserves* none.”

“Michael Bloomberg and Andrew Cuomo have made their decision. Diane Feinstein and Barack Obama will soon make theirs. Then it will be *our* turn. I have already made *mine*. It is the same decision made by Joshua Boston (USMC): ‘*I will not register my weapons...*’ ‘*I am not your subject...*’ ‘*I am not your peasant...*’ I am not a ‘tough guy.’ I am not looking for a fight. Rather, I desperately wish to avoid one. I’m a middle-aged American just trying to live my life, work, enjoy my pastimes and my friends and family. To be an American. A free American. I dearly value my life. Which is precisely why, if I am backed into a corner by those who refuse to leave me be—even though I harm none—then I *will* turn and fight. God help me. God help us all.” [42008]

At the National Review Institute Summit, *Washington Post* columnist Charles Krauthammer is asked if Obama will “hand pick” his Oval Office successor in order to clear the pathway to socialism. He responds, “I would just caution you about using the word, ‘socialism.’ The reason is it is too broad a term. It encompasses all kinds of socialism, including the nasty totalitarian examples—the Union of Soviet Socialist Republic, Cuba, Korea. I just would caution you to use the word ‘social democrat’ because that is what he is. ... He is not an acolyte of the ‘Communist Manifesto.’ He is in the tradition of the, you know, the quite remarkable and respectable social democrats in Europe. [The] Labor Party, I think, would be a good example, a good counterpart. So, I am just a little wary about using that. I think you ought to identify him as somebody whose ideal is a society more European, which he sees as a more just society where there’s less inequality. So I think we ought to give him the kind of respect for his ideology that he denies our side in looking at our ideology and the set of ideas that we believe in.” [42012]

“...I think [Obama] sees himself as a man who will reverse [the Ronald Reagan] course. He started with ObamaCare, he’s continued it with the stimulus and the ratcheting up of the amount of spending the government is doing, historically high for peacetime since World War II. I think he sees his next step is to raise the levels of taxation in order that it would meet the levels of spending. Because if you want European levels of entitlements in the country, you’re going to have to eventually have European levels of taxation. So he sees himself as establishing the foundations of the more social democratic society. And I

think he thinks he can do enough in the two terms that that will establish that, so regardless of who succeeds him, it will be established. And I think our task as conservatives is to understand exactly what he wants to do, how he wants to do it, to give it a modicum of respect and understanding as to where that tradition originates, and to say that we think the United States is different fundamentally from Europe—historically and culturally and politically. That we put much more emphasis on the individual, on liberty versus equality. There is a reason that in the New York Harbor there's a Statue Of Liberty—it's not a Statue of Equality. ... We [conservatives] have a sense that when we develop the individual and strengthen civil society, we will emerge with a more free—and in the end a more equal—society in terms of opportunity, openness and fairness.” [42012]

Senator Mike Johanns (R-NE) calls for the resignations of the National Labor Relations Board (NLRB) members illegally appointed by Obama under the pretense of a Senate “recess.” Johanns also call for the Government Accountability Office to identify the NLRB rulings that must be invalidated because the board imposed them without a proper quorum. (The assumption is that the illegal appointees will not resign and Obama will not cooperate—unless and until the issue reaches the Supreme Court and they are forced to step down. On January 31 Senator Roy Blunt (R-MO) introduces legislation to eliminate their salaries and blocking the NLRB from making any further decisions. Even if the legislation passes, Obama would likely defy Congress and the courts and issue a veto.) [42019, 42020, 42170]

On January 27 the U.S. Embassy in Cairo, Egypt temporarily suspends services for the public as a result of security concerns. [42029]

Senator Dianne Feinstein (D-CA) appears on *Face the Nation* and admits that getting her gun control legislation will be an “uphill climb.” On *State of the Union* Feinstein whines, “The NRA is venal. They come after you, they put together large amounts of money to defeat you.” [41995, 41996, 42025]

On *Meet the Press*, Congressman Paul Ryan (R-WI) comments, “If we had a Clinton presidency, if we had Erskine Bowles chief-of-staff at the White House, or President of the United States, I think we would have fixed this fiscal mess by now. That's not the kind of presidency we're dealing with right now. ... Both parties—forget about just the recent past—both parties got us to the mess we are in, this fiscal crisis, Republicans and Democrats. And you know what? It's going to take both parties to solve this problem. That's the kind of leadership we need today.” (The remark is certain to infuriate Obama, who not only hates being criticized but hates the Clintons.) [41997]

Ryan also says that House Republicans can live with the \$85 billion in automatic budget cuts called for in the sequester agreement that take effect on March 1: “What happens on March the 1st is, spending goes down automatically. We are more than happy to keep spending at those levels going on into the future while we debate how to balance the budget, how to grow the economy, how to create economic opportunity.” (Although some call the sequestration cuts “draconian,” \$85 billion represents only \$7 billion in

reduced spending per month—which is arguably insignificant when the government spends \$300 billion every month.) Obama and the Democrats want still higher taxes, while the Republicans want spending cuts. If no agreement is reached, the sequestration cuts kick in.) [42140]

Ryan also says, “I think the sequester is going to happen. ...Don’t forget one other thing. We passed legislation—I wrote it and passed it in the House twice to replace those sequesters with cuts in other areas of government. So we’ve shown precisely how we should protect defense spending by cutting spending in other areas. And, by the way, in our budget last year, we did take money out of Defense, just not nearly as much as [Obama] seems to want to. We think these sequesters will happen because the Democrats have opposed our efforts to replace those with others, and they’ve offered no alternatives. ...[L]et’s not forget, [Obama] had \$1 trillion in tax increases with ObamaCare. Then he just got new tax increases at the beginning of this month, and now they’re calling for even more tax increases, and they’re not calling to cut spending, they’re actually calling for spending increases. So, basically, what they’re saying is they want Americans to pay more so Washington can spend more.” (CNSNews.com explains, “Under recently passed legislation, Congress has until March 1 to agree on deficit reduction, and if it doesn’t, the Defense Department will be forced to cut \$55 billion every year through 2021, and the same amount (\$55 billion) automatically would be cut in non-defense spending.” Ryan assumes that Obama and his fellow Democrats will not agree to any significant spending cuts, and the Republicans are not eager to go along with more tax increases. If the stalemate is not resolved, the sequester cuts automatically go into effect. When the sequester legislation was passed, the Democrats likely assumed that Republicans would never be willing to allow its defense cuts to go into effect—but they may have been mistaken.) [42024, 42052]

Attorney Orly Taitz hears from retired General Charles E. Jones, who responds to her question about an unsubstantiated claim that the Obama administration is attempting to determine which military commanders are willing to obey orders to fire on U.S. civilians. Jones writes, “...[N]o one knows about this matter other than what was written in [the] article. One knowledgeable person added that probably no will ever know the answer for sure. Although none contacted know any more than this article, that went viral, most have their own opinions and don’t put it past a reality. As such people are adopting a heightened awareness and those with a good overall feel (retired military) for the political crises the Republic faces have a positive mindset that the military if given the order to fire on mothers, fathers, brothers, sisters, grand parents, friends and neighbors will simply lay down their guns or turn on those giving any UN-constitutional orders. Most know their Constitutional and legal duty not to engage against civilians, foreign or domestic and the severe consequences if they do. It would be a treasonous mistake to give an order to the military to go against the Constitution and the Laws. I certainly would not want to be in the shoes of any politician, elected or appointed, that issued an order to the contrary because the majority of the military would quickly with deadly force turn on whoever (civilian or military) was foolish or demented enough to go after Americans with military force for any kind of reason. I’ll also add that most Constitutional Sheriff’s [sic] and Constitutional Governor’s [sic] would absolutely not join in such folly. If by chance

anyone who would be foolish enough to plot the takeover of the United States and We The People (the Sovereigns) I suspect it would be their final mistake simply because enough real American's [sic] have awakened to what is happening and now far outnumber any and all possible UN-American treason." [41778, 41805, 41887, 41999, 42000]

At Breitbart.com George Landrith and Peter Roff report on the efforts by Christopher Horner of the Competitive Enterprise Institute to get the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to release emails to and from agency head Lisa Jackson under the fictitious name Richard Windsor. "[T]he EPA was supposed to produce the first installment of some 12,000 secret, previously undisclosed emails. Not because it wanted to but because a federal court order required it to. Under the order, the EPA was to provide the first installment of 3,000 e-mails with three additional installments of 3,000 e-mails to follow. Rather than provide the required emails, however, EPA's cover letter accompanying its production of emails said it 'produced more than 2,100 emails received or sent' by Jackson on an official alias e-mail account. All fine, well and good—except that not one of those emails was from 'Richard Windsor's' account. Not one. ... Instead the EPA provided such absurdly silly and unresponsive e-mails as the daily news briefs published by the *Washington Post*, and EPA national news clippings, a pathetic attempt to avoid a contempt citation that came only after a week's worth of unsuccessful attempts to push the official response date down the road. A pattern exists: the EPA creates a fake e-mail account for its administrator to avoid scrutiny; it doesn't produce any of the fake e-mails even though they are required by law to do so; when specifically required by court order, the EPA seeks endless delays; and, when the delaying tactics prove fruitless, EPA fails to provide either the number or the type of e-mails required. To put it simply, the agency is trying to run out the clock, hoping against hope that people will lose interest and move on to something else. This, in our judgment, must not be allowed to happen." [42007]

"The point of this scheme was to evade public accountability, to conduct official government business under the table, outside of the public eye. When Congress and others asked for Ms. Jackson's EPA correspondence and email, the 'Richard Windsor' e-mails would fall outside that request and, eventually, be destroyed allowing official EPA business to be conducted secretly. That falls well short of conducting business in the open and in a transparent fashion. It also falls well short of the standards required by federal law. ... But the 'Richard Windsor' identity is not an alias: it is a totally fake persona obviously created to evade record-keeping and disclosure requirements. It may not seem it on its face, but it is an issue so serious that anyone who received a 'Richard Windsor' email or corresponded with 'Richard Windsor'—knowing it was Lisa Jackson and not reporting it, should at the very least be barred from succeeding her as administrator of the EPA. ... Yes, America, this e-mail scandal is worse than originally believed. Far worse. And if 'everyone does it' in this Administration as the EPA has claimed [even though it is illegal], ... Obama needs to answer some questions as well. And the United States Senate, which has slew of presidential nominees to confirm in the next few months, has the obligation to start asking." [42007]

*60 Minutes* airs its previously recorded joint—and useless—“interview” with Obama and Hillary Clinton, in which they are asked no difficult questions and no new information is revealed. (At HotAir.com Erika Johnsen later observes that it “was approximately zero parts hard-hitting foreign-policy discussion and all parts mutually complementary chucklefest. Yes, we get it: You two are great buddies, you’ve enjoyed an [arguably, hem hem] successful foreign-policy working partnership throughout Obama’s first term, and everything between you personally and professionally is hunky-dory.” Democrat Kirsten Powers comments on Fox News, “It really was something you would expect from... the state-run media. It was that kind of level of propaganda as far as I’m concerned. First of all, *60 Minutes* was transparently being used as a campaign advertisement [for Clinton in 2016]. ...I can understand maybe in agreeing to the interview, letting them have maybe one softball question in the beginning and then move on to more important things. ...This was a joke. ...Just not challenging basic things like [Obama] claiming that Hillary’s been a great secretary of state in part because they have dismantled al-Qaeda. Now, I’m sorry, is anyone paying attention to what’s going on in North Africa? Why is [Obama] not asked about Algeria, Mali, Libya? These are front and center in the news right now.”) [42016, 42017, 42018, 42030]

Obama tells interviewer Steve “Oprah” Kroft, “I think Hillary will go down as one of the finest Secretary of States [sic] we’ve had. It has been a great collaboration over the last four years. I’m going to miss her. [I] Wish she was sticking around. But she has logged in so many miles, I can’t begrudge her wanting to take it easy for a little bit. But I want the country to appreciate just what an extraordinary role she’s played during the course of my administration and a lot of the successes we’ve had internationally have been because of her hard work.” (In other words, as much as I hate Bill and Hillary Clinton, I’d rather she be elected in 2016 than any Republican—and I’m sure all of you at CBS will help her get elected.”) [42042]

Fox News senior political analyst Brit Hume suggests that although Hillary Clinton can perhaps be called “competent” her limited achievements “...do not add up to a case for greatness... You look across the world, now at the major issues. Are Arabs and Israelis closer to peace? How about Iran and North Korea and their nuclear programs? Have they been halted or seriously set back? Has the ‘reset’ with Russia, which she so famously introduced with the photo-op in Moscow with the reset button, has that led to a new and more cooperative relationship? Is there a Clinton doctrine that we can identify that she has articulated and formed as secretary of state? Are there major treaties that she has undertaken and negotiated through to a successful conclusion? I think the answer to all those questions is that she has not. And those are the kinds of things that might mark her as a great secretary of state. She has certainly been industrious. She has visited 112 countries. Her conduct as secretary of state has been highly dignified. She does her homework. There have been no gaffes or blunders. So I think she has been a capable and hard working secretary of state, but I think the case for her being a great secretary of state is exceedingly weak.” (Most Americans would have difficulty pointing out any significant foreign policy successes by Hillary Clinton. They could, however, point to the Benghazi terrorist attack and the cover-up afterward as a colossal failure on her part.) [42043]

On January 28 David Zurawik writes at BaltimoreSun.com, “The joint appearance by ...Obama and Hillary Clinton on ‘60 Minutes’ wasn’t about the Democratic nomination in 2016, as some analysts have insisted this weekend. Watching the actual interview Sunday night, I am certain it was about something both much more immediate and long lasting. It was ...Obama using TV—and the folks at ‘60 Minutes’ happily allowing themselves to be used—to write the first draft of history on Clinton’s performance as secretary of state. In a most immediate and partisan sense, it was Obama using one of the biggest tents in popular culture to slap down Senators Rand Paul and Ron Johnson for their insistence during the Benghazi hearing last week that Clinton was not worthy of the office she held. It was as if Obama was saying, ‘You guys think you’re going to shape the perception of her tenure with your grandstanding attacks in a Senate hearing. Watch this. I can have the biggest news audience in television, one of the biggest audiences in all of popular culture with this Top 10 show, any time I want it. CBS News always plays ball with me—ever since I gave them that exclusive with my ‘brain trust’ right after the election in 2008. This is how you use TV to write the first draft of history. And, by the way, boys, it isn’t journalism writing the first draft, as you guys like to say. This is stage-managed, prime-time show-biz TV doing it.” [42031]

The State Department reassigns Daniel Fried, Obama’s “special envoy” for closing the terrorist detainee camp at Guantanamo, Cuba. (At HotAir.com Ed Morrissey writes, “So what happened? First, Fried discovered that while our allies liked to complain publicly about Gitmo, they weren’t nearly as enthusiastic about resettling terrorists within their own borders.”) [42035, 42065]

Neil Heslin, the father of a child killed in the Sandy Hook school massacre testifies at a “Working Group Informational Forum” on gun violence prevention held by the state legislature in Connecticut. The audience listens quietly and politely. Toward the end of his statement, Heslin says, “I ask if there’s anybody in this room that [sic; “who”] can give me one reason or challenge this question... why anybody in this room needs to have one of these assault-style weapons or military weapons or high-capacity clips [sic; “magazines’].” The room remains quiet. He looks around and waits, and then challenges the audience: “And not one person can answer that question.” That prompts several individuals to shout responses such as, “The Second Amendment.” A public official interrupts: “Please, no comments while Mr. Heslin is speaking, or we’ll clear the room. Mr. Heslin, please continue.” MSNBC edits the video recording of the proceedings to make it appear as though the audience was not allowing Heslin to speak, and adds the headline, “Emotional father of Sandy Hook victim heckled by gun nuts.” [42119, 42120, 42121, 42122, 42123, 42156]

UPI also performs “selective editing,” completely omitting Heslin’s challenge to the audience. The UPI video starts at the beginning of Heslin’s testimony: “My name’s Neil Heslin. Jesse Lewis was my son. He was a victim at Sandy Hook.” The video then immediately jumps almost 15 minutes to the audience interjections, skipping the comments Heslin made directly to those who had been quietly listening to him. On CNN, Piers Morgan calls it heckling as well. At PJMedia.com Ed Driscoll writes, “Let’s be

clear: this wasn't about having compassion for a man who tragically lost his son; this was strictly about pushing a political agenda. Out of more than 17 minutes of footage, the knee-jerk media focused exclusively on the non-existent 'heckling.' Not on Heslin's plea for a change in gun control policy. Not on his sorrow over never being able to spend another moment with his beloved son and 'best friend.' To the media, this was nothing more than a chance to exploit one man's raw emotions in order to gin up outrage." DailyCaller.com's Jim Treacher writes, "Mr. Heslin has every right to his grief and anger, and he has every right to ask that question. And those other people have every right to answer it, when an answer is demanded of them. None of them are well served by MSNBC deceptively editing the video to create an event that didn't happen. It serves nothing but NBC's own political ends. It's absolutely disgusting." (Twitchy.com posts the full 17-minute video—something the leftist media chose not to do. Confronted by its intentional deception, MSNBC responds, "We're reviewing the video in question.") [42119, 42120, 42121, 42122, 42123, 42156]

The *Telegraph* reports that J. Shelby Bryan, the "long-term boyfriend" of Vogue editor Anna Wintour, "owes the US government more than \$1.2 million ...in taxes." (Bryan served on Bill Clinton's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board. Wintour, who raised more than \$500,000 for Obama's reelection campaign, had hoped to be paid back for her efforts by being named U.S. Ambassador to Great Britain. Obama instead chose his national finance chairman, Matthew Barzun, who no doubt was owed a bigger favor.) [42036, 42037]

On *Special Report*, the panel discusses the puff interview of Obama and Hillary Clinton broadcast by *60 Minutes*. Charles Krauthammer comments, "I love to hear [Obama] whine about Fox News and talk radio. I think we ought to be proud of the fact that we annoy him so much. Obviously, if you look at the line-up on one side, the liberal media, you start with ABC, NBC, CBS, CNN, PBS, MSNBC, the elite newspapers, the one remaining news magazine [*Time*], the universities, Hollywood—it doesn't stop anywhere. And on the other side, talk radio, Fox News. And they [leftists] can't stand the fact that they no longer have a monopoly. So, I think it ought to be taken as a compliment. What I've always said about Roger Ailes and Rupert Murdoch, their genius was understanding and locating a niche audience in broadcast cable news—which is half the American people. The half that have suffered for decades by the fact that you get the news presented from a single perspective over and over again. Finally, the fact that there is a new perspective, talk radio and Fox, and they can't stand it. It's a source of pride, I would say." [42039]

In a purposeless appearance on CNN, *60 Minutes* host Steve Kroft attempts to "defend" his softball interview with Obama and Clinton, telling Piers Morgan, "First of all, I think [Obama] likes *60 Minutes*. It's, you know, we have a huge audience. We have a format that suits him. It's long. We can do 12 minutes or 24 minutes. We do, you know, a good job of editing. And I have been doing these interviews with him since a few weeks before he declared his candidacy. So I covered him during the campaign and have kept doing it in the White House. But I think it's a question of fairness. ...I think he knows that we're not going to play gotcha with him. That we're not going to go out of our way to make



him look bad or stupid, and we'll let him answer the questions.” (In other words, “We intentionally gave Obama and Clinton a free ride, and I'm proud of it!”—which is why Obama likes appearing on the program and refuses to be interviewed by Fox News, Breitbart.com, DailyCaller.com, and other media outlets that do not unquestionably support his agenda.) [42054, 42064, 42096]

While most reasonable viewers likely found Kroft's interview of Obama and Clinton fawning, members of the mainstream media disagreed. The Media Research Center posts some of the remarks: ABC's Elizabeth Vargas exclaims, “Love fest! [Obama] and Hillary Clinton in a revealing and rare joint interview, has everyone reading the tea leaves. ... Was his high praise a first sign that she is his pick for 2016?” CNN's Soledad O'Brien gushes, “Well, it's the exit interview everybody is talking about. Hillary Clinton, [Obama], sitting down together, laughing, chummy, chummy.” CNN's Brianna Keilar: “They really seem to really like each other. It looked like a love fest to me as well.” CNN's Suzanne Malveaux: “I have never seen them gush like this.” CNN's Wolf Blitzer: “[B]oth of them are political superstars in their own right, and when you put them both together it doubles the power, if you will. ... And all of us, you know, who are political news junkies, we can't help ourselves. ... [W]e can't help but think down the road to 2016, is she going to try once again to be the Democratic presidential nominee, will she try to be the first woman president of the United States?” CNN's Carol Costello, to her credit, asks, “So, is this sort of a well thought-out plan on the Democratic side to prepare the way for 2016?” [42054, 42055, 42056, 42057, 42058, 42059]

NBC's Natalie Morales says: “It's great when rivals can then go to mending their fences being good friends. ... And if it raises the discourse up higher, to a higher level, even better.” NBC's Peter Alexander: “There they were, side-by-side, at times chuckling together, it seemed even finishing one another's sentences.” NBC's Matt Lauer: “Did we watch [Obama] giving a warm personal embrace to an outgoing secretary of state or did we watch [Obama] passing the baton to a political ally now?” NBC's Andrea Mitchell calls the interview “Unprecedented. An interview that ... Obama has never done an interview with anyone other than his wife, and here he's doing it with the Secretary of State. ... I've talked to a lot of Democrats who say that if she decides, and she hasn't decided, but if she decides and she's completely positioned for it, to run, she clears the field... Because after eight years of ... Obama, who could come in, and as a woman, and as a non-Obama person originally, be enough of an outsider to challenge a Republican?” (Mitchell does not explain how Clinton could be considered an “outsider.”) CBS's Norah O'Donnell: “There was clearly a warmth between them.” CBS's John Dickerson: “Hillary Clinton just came out of that bruising hearing. This is a much better image for her to be leaving her tenure with.” (The *60 Minutes* interview may very well have been designed to do just that.) [42054, 42055, 42056, 42057, 42058, 42059]

The Hill.com reports that a “Ready for Hillary” political action committee (PAC) has filed with the Federal Election Commission. The PAC “has already been active online, with nearly 50,000 Twitter followers and almost 30,000 people following the group on Facebook.” (Obama's support for Clinton on *60 Minutes* likely seemed to many to be an endorsement for a 2016 presidential run—and no doubt annoyed Vice President Joe

Biden, who has made no secret of the fact that he thinks he should be the nominee.) [42040, 42070]

*The Washington Post* reports that the Obama administration may have difficulty finding 15 people willing to serve on the Independent Payment Advisory Board (Obamacare's death panel"). Peter Orszag, a former director of the Office of Budget and Management under Obama and a chief supporter of the IPAB, states, "It is supposed to be 15 members, with limited salaries who can't do any outside work. It will be challenging to find top 15 health-care experts are who would want that job." Bob Kocher, a former Obama health policy adviser, says, "You're joining an organization that has uncertain authority with the certainty of being deeply political and widely criticized. It doesn't make sense for current thought leaders in American health care to want this." At *The-New-American-Interest.com*, Walter Russell Mead writes, "It isn't hard to see why nobody is clamoring to take a job that offers low pay and lots of regulations and will make everyone in the country hate you. ...If you go for the job, though, try not to dwell on how impossible and unpopular and low-paying your work will be. Instead, think about the fact that you'll be able to tell your grandkids that you were one of the first death panelists." [42124]

On CNN, Erin Burnett annoys leftists by being skeptical of Obama's claim that he engages in skeet shooting "all the time." She remarks, "Obama, the skeet shooter. Yeah, I'm not making this up. I mean, if someone is, it isn't me. ...So, now you're gonna to say you do it all the time, don't you have to kind of, have to, prove it?" At *MediaIte.com*, Obama-defender Tommy Christopher writes, "Such speculation is to be expected from a deranged partisan, but not from a journalist. [Burnett] owes [Obama] an apology." [42062, 42063]

On MSNBC, Senator Sherrod Brown (D-OH) tells Rachel Maddow that Obama will push the envelope with Executive Orders in his second term: "We're going to see [Obama] use his executive powers as much as he's allowed to under federal law and under the Constitution, in a more aggressive way than last time. You're going to see [Obama] use the executive powers that are within his constitutional legal authority. I think much of the progressive agenda is going to be driven that way." (Arguably, some of Obama's previous Executive Orders violated the U.S. Constitution. For him to be more aggressive with that tactic means even more law-breaking.) [42066]

On January 29 Christie Hefner, daughter of Playboy publisher Hugh Hefner and an activist with the leftist Center for American Progress, appears on MSNBC's *Morning Joe* to discuss the increased murder rate in her hometown, Chicago: "Is it higher? Yes. Last year, we hit a record number of murders from guns, and this year, we're already outpacing last year's numbers. Now, there are contributing factors that are not under anybody's control, and it may seem odd, but it is factually true, one of them is actually the weather. There is a dramatic increase in gun violence when it is warmer, and we are having this climate-change effect that is driving that." Host Joe Scarborough responds, "Can I just stop you right there and say, conservative bloggers across America thank you for saying that climate change is responsible for the rising murder rate." (Living in one of

Chicago's bad neighborhoods is, in fact, more dangerous than serving in the U.S. Army in Afghanistan—regardless of the weather.) [42112, 42118]

Obama travels to the mostly Hispanic Del Sol High School in Las Vegas, Nevada to deliver a speech on immigration reform (amnesty legislation). He states, "I'm here today because the time has come for common-sense comprehensive immigration reform. ... It must be clear from the outset that there is a pathway to citizenship. ... We've got to lay out a path—a process that includes passing a background check, paying taxes, paying a penalty, learning English and then going to the back of the line. ... A call for action can now be heard coming from all across America. Now's the time." The audience yells out, "Sí se puede! Sí se puede!" ("Yes we can!") There is, of course, no critical or legal need to provide illegal immigrants with a "pathway to citizenship." Obama routinely uses a false choice argument—a pathway to citizenship or deportation—knowing that few Americans believe it is reasonable to deport 10–20 million illegals. Obama and other amnesty supporters ignore other alternatives, such as strengthening border security, making welfare more difficult for illegals to obtain, and *providing no citizenship route for illegals*. (That is, everyone "living in the shadows" can simply remain in the shadows. The nation would not cease to exist if illegal immigrants never became voting citizens. In fact, it would probably fare better, with smaller budget deficits.) [42034, 42073, 42075, 42079, 42101, 42105, 42116]

Some suggest (probably correctly) that Obama will do his best to prevent immigration reform from passing so that he can spend the next two years blaming Republicans for obstructing progress—in an effort to help Democrats win control of the House in the November 2014 elections. The Democrats would then pass amnesty legislation essentially without the increased border security Republicans want. If Obama is forced to accept amnesty legislation which calls for stronger border security, he will simply tell Department of Homeland Security Janet Napolitano to enforce the new rules "without any enthusiasm." (It should not be necessary to note that the Obama administration filed a lawsuit in an effort to prevent Arizona from enforcing its own immigration law.) Obama tells the Las Vegas audience, "And if Congress is unable to move forward in a timely fashion, I will send up a bill based on my proposal and insist that they vote on it right away." (Obama does not explain why he did not get immigration legislation passed in 2009 or 2010, when the Democrats controlled both the House and the Senate.) [42034, 42073, 42075, 42079, 42101, 42105, 42116]

Obama's version of immigration legislation, of course, would never be accepted by the House Republicans—because it would be long on amnesty provisions and short on border enforcement. That rejection would give Obama an excuse to excoriate Republicans all the way to election day. Others suspect that Obama's speech is merely a "pre-emptive strike," to ensure that if legislation does pass he will get credit for it because he "called for action." Obama's speech is the sole purpose of the trip which, according to Daniel Halper at WeeklyStandard.com, means nine hours of flight time from Washington, D.C. "With Air Force One estimated to cost \$182,000 per hour in flight, Obama's trip—that is, only his travel to and from Vegas—will cost taxpayers over \$1.6 million." (Obama could have delivered the speech from the White House, but that would not have given him an

audience of Hispanics chanting “Sí se puede!”) [42034, 42073, 42075, 42079, 42101, 42105, 42116]

It is worth noting that then-Senator Obama did his best to scuttle immigration legislation in 2007. According to *The Wall Street Journal*, “[W]hen the legislation moved forward, Mr. Obama backed a series of poison-pill amendments. One was pushed by Sen. Byron Dorgan (D., N.D.) to weaken the guest-worker program. Sen. Ted Kennedy (D., Mass.) was outraged because he knew this amendment was really organized labor’s effort to kill the immigration bill, not to help workers. ‘Who is the senator from North Dakota trying to fool?’ Mr. Kennedy snapped from the Senate floor. Mr. Obama voted ‘yea’ on the Dorgan amendment. We know he knew it was a deal-killer because several senators had said so (Sen. Jim DeMint, who had voted ‘nay’ on an earlier version, switched his vote for precisely that reason). Thus Mr. Obama pulled off a trifecta: appeasing Big Labor while telling Latinos he supported the bill and [then] blaming Republicans for its failure. ... What makes Mr. Obama’s 2007 Senate vote so galling—and different from that of others who voted the same way—was that his support for the poison pills betrayed the bipartisan group of senators who had let him in on the writing of the bill.” [42106, 42107]

At PJMedia.com Bridget Johnson writes, “In a last-minute schedule update, ... Obama penciled in a meeting today with police chiefs and sheriffs to talk about his topic of the hour: gun control.” [42069]

At the detainee camp in Guantanamo, pre-trial hearings begin for 9/11 mastermind Khalid Sheikh Mohammed and several other terrorists. [42072]

Responding to Secretary of Defense Leon Panetta’s call for women to be allowed serve in front-line combat, Marine Corps General James Amos tells *USA Today*, “We can’t afford to lower standards. We can’t make adjustments [to] what’s required on the battlefield. That’s not why America has a Marine Corps. ... There’s no intention on my part of changing anything within the IOC [Infantry Officer Course] curriculum. ... We’ve got too much combat experience for me to even suggest lowering the standards. So I’m not going to do it.” (Interestingly, the call for women in combat came from Panetta, not from Obama. That was likely intentional. If there is too much resistance to the concept, Obama can claim that Panetta spoke on his own and did not consult with him. If the suggestion is greeted with accolades and enthusiasm, Obama can claim it was his idea all along.) [42133]

The Senate votes 94–3 to confirm John Kerry as Secretary of State. The three dissenting votes are from Senators James Inhofe (R-OK), John Cornyn (R-TX), and Ted Cruz (R-TX). Inhofe says, “I never agree with [Kerry] on anything, going all the way back to the Sandinistas.” Inhofe is also concerned about Kerry’s willingness to defer to the United Nations and his belief in global regulations to address “global warming.” [42080]

Bloomberg.com reports, “Confidence among U.S. consumers declined more than forecast in January, reaching the lowest level in more than a year as higher payroll taxes took a bigger bite out of Americans’ paychecks. The Conference Board’s index decreased to

58.6, the weakest since November 2011, from a revised 66.7 in December, figures from the New York-based private research group showed today. The January reading was lower than the most pessimistic forecast in a Bloomberg survey, which had a median estimate of 64.” [42076, 42082]

*The New Republic* posts a photograph of Obama skeet shooting to prove that his claim, “we do skeet shooting all the time,” was not a lie. After it is pointed out that the photograph was faked it is removed from the magazine’s web site. (Someone should point out that those who participate in the sport do not say that they “do” skeet shooting. They say that they “shoot skeet.” Someone should also ask Obama what kind of gun he uses. That the magazine would post a fake photograph should perhaps not be surprising, inasmuch as new owner Chris Hughes re-hired former editor Franklin Foer who, according to FreeBeacon.com, “had left after presiding over a scandal surrounding a series of fabricated reports from Iraq.”) [42077, 42078, 42084, 42085, 42086, 42093]

Congressman Lamar Smith (R-TX) tells radio talk show host Laura Ingraham the House of Representatives will not pass the immigration reform legislation proposed by and as described by the Senate’s “gang of eight” immigration work group. Smith says, “It is not inevitable. I don’t think it’s going to happen for lots of different reasons. ...The same individuals who have been for amnesty in the past are for amnesty today. I don’t see any surge in converts to the idea that we should legalize everyone in the country. ...[I]t’s going to cost taxpayers when they become eligible for government benefits, it’s going to cost Americans their jobs. ...I don’t see much good for Americans, for individuals in this country today. ...The large majority of Republicans, and some Democrats as well, will oppose amnesty to virtually everybody in the country illegally. I certainly don’t see a majority of the House voting for mass amnesty. Maybe the House is going to be the firewall here.” [42081]

WesternJournalism.com posts a Carl Gallups interview with Mike Zullo, lead investigator in Sheriff Joe Arpaio’s continuing investigation of Obama’s forged birth certificate. Zullo states, “I’m going into my seventeenth month now of working on this full time. This investigation has never stopped. The only thing that stopped is the media coverage around the investigation. ...You have that level of ‘probable cause.’ I am gonna put my reputation out there that we have evidence beyond a reasonable doubt, a higher standard, beyond a reasonable doubt that this document [Obama’s birth certificate] is an utter forgery. ...I’m telling you, the evidence that we have acquired, newfound evidence that we have never made public... will convince even the greatest skeptics that this document is 100 percent a forgery. And if you want to get to the truth it starts with this document.” [42083]

CSMonitor.com reports, “Five days of protests in Egypt, with dozens of people killed and entire cities in turmoil, have revealed a whopping deficit of public trust in the Muslim Brotherhood, the Islamic group that dominates the leadership of this young democracy of the Arab Spring. In cities like Port Said, the protesters have displayed an open defiance of President Mohamed Morsi’s orders on a curfew and state of emergency. Egypt’s Army chief warns of the state collapsing. And indeed, many Egyptians now talk of splitting up

the Arab world's most populous state. ...As it has slowly risen to power in the past two years, the Muslim Brotherhood has broken many promises about the role it would play in representative government. Its flip-flops and power grabs in forming a new regime have only added to a worry among democracy advocates that Mr. Morsi would define his authority from Islam, or *sharia* law, rather than from constitutional rights and secular pluralism." (Egyptians are learning that the devil they didn't know, Morsi, is far worse than former president Hosni Mubarak, the devil they did know. Americans are—or at least should be—learning that Obama erred in helping to oust Mubarak to pave the way to power for the America-hating and Israel-hating Muslim Brotherhood.) [42104, 42108, 42142]

On *The O'Reilly Factor*, columnist Charles Krauthammer says, "The proposed Senate bill [on immigration reform] is a little softer than advertised. It is true that you have to get certification that the border is closed, is enforced [and that] the border security is working before you can go on to a green card and go to citizenship. However, what most people have not noticed is [that] in the Senate bipartisan bill, there is essentially instant legalization. The day it's signed, everybody gets what you call probationary status. What that means is that everybody who is here comes out of the shadows, registers with the government, tells them where they work, where they live. It is utterly inconceivable that that is ever going to be rolled back because a commission somewhere says the border isn't sufficiently enforced." With regard to the legislation's "back of the line" provision, Krauthammer points out, "What that means is they are going to have to wait years and years for citizenship. But they are not going to the back of the same line that people waiting in Hong Kong and in Brazil are in, because they don't get to get into the country to settle in the country, to work in our country for years. They have to wait in Brazil. ...[T]his talk about high-tech fences is absurd. In '06, the Congress passed a lot of money to build a high-tech fence across the border. In two years ago, Janet Napolitano canceled the project. She spent a billion dollars to do 53 miles of it, and realized it doesn't work. ...What about a regular fence? And don't tell me it doesn't work. The Israelis constructed one across the West Bank, and the terror attacks are down by 99 percent. If you hear the word 'fence,' you will know that they are serious. It's very simple. Fences have worked for 5,000 years, and they work everywhere. Why don't we build one, and then legalize people who are here illegally?" [42103]

On Greta Van Susteren's *On the Record*, Senator Lindsey Graham (R-SC) says, "Hillary Clinton got away with murder [in her Congressional testimony] in my view. She said they had a clear-eyed view of the threats. How could you have a clear-eyed view of the threats in Benghazi when you didn't know about the ambassador's cable coming back from Libya?" [42087]

On January 30 the government reports that the economy contracted 0.1 percent in the fourth quarter of 2012. Two consecutive quarters of negative growth in the Gross Domestic Product (GDP) marks an "official" recession. On CNBC market analyst Rick Santelli observes, "When you act like Europe, you get growth rates like Europe. In our discussions with economists sound like we're in Europe. ...They're always doing the right thing. They're always thinking they know better, and this is the kind of growth—we

have become Europe.” A CNBC host blames the GDP decline on reduced federal spending in the fourth quarter, implying that the government should continue to “stimulate” the economy (even though it hasn’t got the money to do so). Santelli responds, “Why do we need to reduce spending? Because we run trillion dollar deficits, for crying out loud.” HotAir.com notes that “much of this drop [in GDP] seems to be a lack of inventory expansion. Real final sales to end purchasers rose, even if it didn’t go up by much. That would indicate that inventory expansion in Q3 and prior periods was based on overly-optimistic views of the economy.” (GDP growth for the entire year of 2012 was 2.2 percent, far short of the 4.3 percent promised by the White House in 2009. The Obama administration had also predicted that the passage of the stimulus legislation would lower the unemployment rate to about 5 percent in 2013.) [42094, 42095, 42111, 42113, 42114, 42163, 42230]

Although some of the GDP decline was allegedly due to a reduction in defense spending, much of the increase in the third quarter was due to increased defense spending. Additionally, according to Daniel Harsanyi at RealClearPolitics.com, “In the fourth quarter of 2012, Washington spent \$908 billion, which was \$30 billion more than it spent in the last quarter of 2011 and nearly \$100 billion more than it spent in the third quarter of 2012. [The latter two figures are actually \$31 billion and \$98 billion, according to the Treasury Department.] ...If this is poverty, can you imagine what robust spending looks like?” HotAir.com again: “What’s perhaps more *stunning* is the idea that the so-called recovery in its fourth year still cannot stand on its own legs without massive government stimulus. After all, federal spending has remained at the \$3.8 trillion level for four years, with its percentage of GDP around 25%, far above the 20% post-1960s norm. Perhaps that’s part of the reason that the economy is still stagnating, rather than a reason to expect recovery.” Blogger YidWithLid asks, “Will Obama blame Fox or Bush?” (Whether Obama and Joe Biden will promise yet another “recovery summer” is not known.) [42094, 42095, 42111, 42113, 42114, 42163, 42232]

Some point to the stock market and claim its high level proves the economy is not doing poorly—but some of the increase in stock prices is the result of the Federal Reserve pumping newly-created money into the economy. At TrimTabs.com Charles Biderman explains: “Every day, Federal Reserve traders are buying about \$4 billion in long term treasuries and mortgage bonds from major trading houses. How does the Fed pay for those purchases? Simple. The Fed gives the seller a credit on their Federal Reserve statement. Remember, the Fed is a bank that can legally give away money. Meanwhile, the seller of bonds to the Fed can then withdraw some or all of that money, or leave it on deposit with the Fed. In other words, the Fed doesn’t pay anyone anything. All the Fed does is in essence create new money to give the seller. So let us follow that newly created money. The major dealers who sell the bonds to the Fed can take that money and buy other bonds in the open market. The new seller then gets paid with that newly created money, which in the bank clearing system, acts just the same as money you and I work for. Therefore, to make this really simple, the Fed creates \$4 billion a day and eventually some of that money goes into equities. And that, of course, helps keep stock prices elevated. So it doesn’t matter that we are having major problems with the underlying economy and markets that normally would depress stock prices.” [42177]

The Associated Press (AP) writes, “The surprise contraction [in GDP] could raise fears about the economy’s ability to handle tax increases that took effect in January and looming spending cuts.” Alan B. Krueger, chairman of the Council of Economic Advisors, says, “Today’s report is a reminder of the importance of the need for Congress to act to avoid self-inflicted wounds to the economy. The administration continues to urge Congress to move toward a sustainable federal budget in a responsible way that balances revenue and spending, and replaces the sequester, while making critical investments in the economy that promote growth and job creation and protect our most vulnerable citizens.” (The AP warns that the economy may not be able to handle the burden of higher taxes while Obama’s economic advisor calls for still higher taxes and more deficit spending.) [42130, 42131]

Not surprisingly, the Obama administration blames Republicans for the negative economic growth in the fourth quarter of 2012. White House press secretary Jay Carney tells reporters that fiscal cliff negotiations kept Obama from spending as much money as he wanted to, and that harmed economic growth. By claiming that the private economy did not grow because the government did not spend enough (even though it spent more than in the third quarter), the administration is essentially admitting that there has been no private sector economic recovery—despite the fact that Obama campaigned throughout 2012 saying the opposite. “Our economy is facing a major headwinds [sic],” says Carney, “and that’s Republicans in Congress. ... It can’t be, ‘we’ll let sequester kick in because we insist tax loopholes remain in place for corporate jet-owners.’” (It was the Obama administration that demanded the automatic sequestration cuts be included in the last budget agreement, not the Republicans.) Carney claims, “[W]e continue to be poised for positive economic growth and job creation.” (The economy has apparently been “poised” for recovery for four years, but 23 million unemployed Americans are unlikely to take comfort in Carney’s words.) [42135, 42137, 42163]

Carney states, “It’s not a game. It’s the American economy. Talk about letting the sequester kick in as though that were an acceptable thing belies where Republicans were on this issue not that long ago, and it makes clear again that this is sort of political brinkmanship of the kind that results in one primary victim, and that’s American taxpayers, the American middle class.” (Again, Obama demanded that the automatic cuts be included in the last budget agreement as an inducement to get Republicans to agree to tax increases. The Republicans agreed to the automatic cuts in order to get the Democrats to agree to substitute spending cuts. The “game” was implemented by Obama, not the GOP.) [42140]

Asked about the difficulty of getting gun control legislation passed because of reluctant Democrat Senators, Carney laughably claims, “I would note that [Obama] has a strong record of support for Second Amendment rights.” (Part I of *The Obama Timeline* lists the many times Obama voted as an Illinois State Senator to prohibit gun ownership and even to make it illegal for a homeowner to defend himself with a gun. Obama’s anti-gun, anti-Second Amendment record is well documented. Carey is lying.) [93, 315, 326, 339, 346, 353, 444, 445, 834, 1282, 42157]



Desperately seeking a positive spin on the terrible economic news, the editors at Bloomberg.com write, “GDP measures only output, and makes no claims on the quality of that output, let alone on subjective concepts such as social progress or human happiness. ...As useful as GDP is, it has some crucial flaws. It can obscure growing inequality and encourage the depletion of resources. It can’t differentiate between spending on good things (education) and terrible things (cigarettes). It doesn’t measure the economic services that nature provides, such as the dwindling wetlands that once protected New Orleans from storms, or those that don’t come with a market price, such as raising children. It fails to account for the value of social cohesion, education, health, leisure, a clean environment—in other words, as Robert Kennedy once put it, GDP measures everything ‘except that which makes life worthwhile.’” Bloomberg’s “good/terrible” point is absurd. GDP is simply the measure of the production of all goods and services in the economy. It naturally rises, and falls, as the economy expands or contracts. That some people do not consume alcohol does not mean that whiskey, beer, and wine production should not be counted in the GDP. One person’s “good thing” may be another person’s “bad thing”—*but that is irrelevant to the issue*. The issue is that the economy contracted in the fourth quarter of 2012. The nation produced fewer “things” (goods and services), *regardless* of whether they are considered good or bad by particular consumers. Even if the Bloomberg editors were somehow able to measure “social cohesion,” that likely also fell in the fourth quarter. [42164, 42165]

Bloomberg laughably suggests that “non-market production” should also be considered, such as “gardening and housework” and parental care. That claim is also absurd. Automobile production is, for example, one of many things counted in the nation’s GDP. But the fact that some people do not own cars and walk to work does not mean the effort involved in that walking should be counted as part of GDP. There are at least 23 million Americans looking for work in the Obama economy, and no doubt many of them cut grass and do laundry in between sending out employment resumes. But that does not justify counting those chores as part of the nation’s GDP. (Apparently it took George W. Bush being succeeded by Obama for the Bloomberg editors to come up with that concept.) Arguing that the unemployed may be working hard around the house does make them any less gainfully unemployed. (That the media is even bringing up such ludicrous arguments shows the extent to which they are unwilling to accept Obama’s failures.) [42164, 42165]

Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid (D-NV) states, “Just a brief comment on my friend, the Republican leader’s [Mitch McConnell’s], statement. He continues bad-mouthing the recovery. We are in a recovery. The moral of the fourth quarter is a repudiation of the Republican playbook. Growth went down in the fourth quarter because of reduced government spending, and a reticence in the private sector as government fought over the fiscal cliff. And that fight came as a result of the Republicans being so unreasonable. ...The economy was rejecting the austerity and brinkmanship... The Republican playbook of continually complaining about spending is something—we know we have to do something about spending, we understand that, but there’s more to making our economy recover than just continually harping on what’s going on with spending. ...We

also have to do something to have a fair program. ...Is it fair that the Republicans continue to want to go after Social Security, Medicare, even food stamps, that benefits the poorest of the poor, let's start talking about fairness." (In addition to his whining that pointing out reality is "bad-mouthing," Reid is lying. Fourth quarter federal spending did not go down; it increased over the third quarter.) [42209]

The governor of Massachusetts, Deval Patrick, selects his former chief of staff William "Mo" Cowan to fill the Senate seat of John Kerry until the June 25 special election can be held. (Possible contenders for the seat may be Democrat Congressmen Stephen Lynch and Edward Markey, and Republican Scott Brown—who lost his bid for reelection to the other Massachusetts Senate seat in November 2012.) [42088]

PrisonPlanet.com's Paul Joseph Watson writes, "Alleged hacked emails from defense contractor Britam reveal a plan 'approved by Washington' and funded by Qatar to stage a chemical weapons attack in Syria and blame it on the Assad regime, fulfilling what the Obama administration has made clear is a 'red line' that would mandate US military intervention." One email reads, "We've got a new offer. It's about Syria again. Qataris propose an attractive deal and swear that the idea is approved by Washington. We'll have to deliver a CW to Homs, a Soviet origin g-shell from Libya similar to those that Assad should have. They want us to deploy our Ukrainian personnel that should speak Russian and make a video record. Frankly, I don't think it's a good idea but the sums proposed are enormous. Your opinion?" Watson comments, "The fact that the plan involves delivering a CW (chemical weapon) that is 'similar to those Assad should have,' clearly suggests that the idea is to stage a false flag chemical weapons attack that could be blamed on Assad by Gulf states like Qatar and NATO powers. If the claim that such as plot was 'approved by Washington' can be verified, then the Obama administration is complicit in a war crime." (At AtlasShrugs.com Pamela Geller writes, "And the band plays on. American reminds me of a battered victim suffering from Stockholm Syndrome. Will nothing shake America out of her Obama-induced stupor? Obama's tactics seem to emulate the al-Qaeda jihadists he is supporting in Syria. This is evil. Imagine what we don't know.") [42090, 42091]

The Department of Justice (DOJ) announces that Assistant Attorney General Lanny Breuer will leave his job on March 1. (Breuer's departure may be part of a "deal" negotiated by Attorney General Eric Holder to save his own skin in the Operation Fast and Furious fiasco, in which Breuer was heavily involved. Having lost a lawsuit over his illegal recess appointments, Obama may be wary of risking an appeals court decision that forces Holder to turn over to House Republicans all Operation Fast and Furious documents. Obama and Holder may therefore be willing to release additional documents, including some that implicate Breuer and others in the gun scheme, while holding back any that implicate themselves. That is, they may be willing to throw Breuer under the bus in order to save themselves in the hopes that will satisfy the Republicans.) [42099, 42109, 42110]

Senator David Vitter (R-LA) tells radio talk show host Laura Ingraham, "Look, I love and respect [Senator] Marco [Rubio]. I just think he's amazingly naïve on this issue [of

immigration reform]. This is the same old formula we've dealt with before, including when it passed in 1986 and that is promise of enforcement and immediate amnesty. And of course, the promises of enforcement never materialize. The amnesty happens immediately, the millisecond the bill is signed into law. And the same is true here. No, they won't be citizens immediately, [but] they will be legal. They will have a full right to stay in this country forever legally. And then the only question is how long does that take? It's going to happen. Does it take a year, five years, longer? But citizenship is guaranteed at that point as a practical matter. ...Look, as soon as you give these people a legal status, to say that you're going to reverse that is ridiculous. It'll never happen. Soon as you give them a legal status, they are here legally forever and probably they're citizens pretty darn soon thereafter. And if Marco thinks what happens or doesn't happen on the enforcement side—that's not going to happen. I just think he's nuts." (Vitter is most certainly correct. Obama and his fellow Democrats have no intention of strengthening border security; they simply want millions of illegal immigrants to be turned into reliable Democrat voters. Even if immigration legislation calls for better border security, the government's executive branch is responsible for enforcing the law—and Obama, Attorney General Eric Holder, and Department of Homeland Security head Janet Napolitano have already demonstrated a remarkable disregard for the law.) [42102, 42132]

MinuteManNews.com posts a letter from an Irish citizen named Jonathan: "I'm a citizen of Ireland and have been attempting to get a green card [to become a legal U.S. resident] for over 9 years. Once again, America faces the popular discussion of immigration—trying to find the best way forward for America and its 11 million illegals. One of the greatest conservatives of modern time, Mark Levin, had two great guests on tonight's show—[Senator] Jeff Sessions arguing against the current ideas, and [Senator] Marco Rubio, who is part of the group of eight who are trying to come up with legislation to deal with this problem. Because this is an issue that affects me greatly, I had to call in and I was very lucky to be able to discuss a few points with the Great One—Mr. Levin, himself. I personally have a massive problem with granting an illegal worker a permanent visa because America has laws and those laws need to be respected. The biggest issue, to me, is the fact that 11 million people will skip the line in front of people like me who have waited 9 years to get a visa... and still waiting. To put that number in perspective, the American government awards 50,000 DV visas every year. I could wait a lifetime and still never get to achieve my dream, but someone who has broken the law gets to live the dream every day. While Rubio insists that we will all be on the same level, the law of possession will come into play. Does anyone really believe that the US government is going to deport someone illegal just so I can come into the country? That will never work." [42125]

At Time.com Michael Scherer writes, "Two big things happened Tuesday [January 29] with regards to immigration reform: ...Obama announced his plans at a Las Vegas high school, and Florida Sen. Marco Rubio called into Rush Limbaugh's radio program. The second event mattered more." (To state that Obama will not be pleased by that comment is an understatement.) [42129]

WorldTribune.com reports that Obama “has sent what was termed a tough message to Israel that demanded progress toward a Palestinian state as well as restraint toward Syria. Western diplomatic sources said Obama relayed the message to Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu after the latter’s apparent re-election. The sources said Obama warned Netanyahu against a stalemate with the Palestinian Authority as well as any move that could destabilize the Middle East. ‘The message was extremely tough and basically told Israel that it was not to respond to Syria’s chemical weapons threat,’ a source said. The sources said Obama asserted that his administration would make significant changes in U.S. policy in the Middle East during his second term. They said Washington expected the Jewish state to cooperate with U.S. efforts to establish a Palestinian state as well as reduce tension with Iran and Syria.” (Obama apparently expects Israel to “sit back and take it” if it is attacked with chemical weapons.) [42134]

Obama’s claim, “We do skeet shooting all the time” is contradicted by “a source who says he has been to the [Camp David] retreat on a half-dozen visits with Obama” who tells Fox News, “The only time he shot skeet was for [the] President’s Cup. I was there. He stayed for about five minutes, and couldn’t leave fast enough. ...He couldn’t have been more uncomfortable.” (The “President’s Cup is “a shooting competition tradition involving the presidential Marine guards.” [42136, 42143]

WashingtonTimes.com reports, “A jihadist website posted a new threat by al Qaeda this week that promises to conduct ‘shocking’ attacks on the United States and the West. The posting appeared on the Ansar al Mujahidin network Sunday and carried the headline, ‘Map of al Qaeda and its future strikes.’ The message, in Arabic, asks: ‘Where will the next strike by al Qaeda be? A translation was obtained by Inside the Ring. ‘The answer for it, in short: The coming strikes by al Qaeda, with God’s Might, will be in the heart of the land of non-belief, America, and in France, Denmark, other countries in Europe, in the countries that helped and are helping France, and in other places that shall be named by al Qaeda at other times,’ the threat states. The attacks will be ‘strong, serious, alarming, earth-shattering, shocking and terrifying.’” (Obama’s claim that he had al-Qaeda “on the run” may prove to be premature.) [42139, 42173]

Time, Inc. (*Time* magazine and *Sports Illustrated*) eliminates 500 jobs. (According to AdAge.com, Time Inc. counted as many as 12,000 employees as recently as 2007, but was down to 8,000 before today’s cuts.) [42166]

At RealClearPolitics.com Ben Domenech asks why Obama would present an immigration reform proposal more to the left of what Senate Democrats would accept: “Why would [Obama] do such a thing, making passage of an immigration plan less likely by coming out in favor of an even more obviously political ploy in lieu of a real policy solution? Isn’t it obvious? What would be better for [Obama]: the [political] right tearing itself apart in an attempt to pass a controversial reform like [Senator] Marco Rubio’s... or the right tearing itself apart as they kill a completely ill-thought approach like [Obama’s]? The mission isn’t a reasonable solution for very real immigration policy problems, it’s political destruction of the enemy. Thus, Democrats benefit either way, even if the nation doesn’t. ...On the policy front, [Republicans] must separate the

argument about citizenship from the rest of the conversation: there is a clear demand for a solution, but polls—even of Latinos—consistently show us that Americans believe there ought to be a penalty for those who broke the law to come here (that they shouldn't be able to skip ahead in line, essentially). So long as the conversation is about a path to citizenship and 'amnesty,' Republicans lose—their aim ought to be legalizing people, not granting them citizenship.” One approach “would be a permanent non-citizenship approach, which as Peter Skerry outlines [at NationalAffairs.com], would preclude them joining the citizenship track: ‘To strike this balance, we should offer lenient terms of legalization to illegal immigrants but prohibit them from ever becoming eligible for naturalization. They should instead become ‘permanent non-citizen residents.’ ...The conditions for eligibility should be minimal—for example, excluding only those undocumented immigrants with serious criminal records. This new legal status should be granted on a one-time basis to as many of the undocumented as possible, as quickly as possible... The key to this proposal is the straightforward, credible penalty that would be imposed.’” [42189, 42190]

Judicial Watch reports, “The Obama administration is covertly recruiting Muslims to work at the State Department as Foreign Service officers representing the United States in one of 265 American embassies, consulates and diplomatic missions worldwide. It appears to be part of the administration’s Muslim outreach effort, which includes a variety of controversial moves. Among them Homeland Security meetings with extremist Islamic organizations, sending an America-bashing mosque leader (Feisal Abdul Rauf) who blames U.S. foreign policy for the 9/11 attacks on a Middle Eastern outreach mission and revamping the way federal agents are trained to combat terrorism by eliminating all materials that shed a negative light on Muslims. Secretary of State Hillary Clinton even signed a special order to allow the reentry of two radical Islamic academics whose terrorist ties long banned them from the U.S. Now comes news of a secretive State Department campaign, discovered in the course of a Judicial Watch investigation, to add Muslims to its roster. Presumably, the new recruits will be deployed around the globe to help the agency fulfill its mission of promoting the country’s international relations. The campaign seems to be headed by Mark Ward, the Deputy Special Coordinator in the State Department’s Office of Middle East Transition.” [42211, 42218]

The Ulsterman Report writes, “Reports are now incoming regarding a petulant ...Obama, upset over a bi-partisan effort in the Senate to come up with a resolution on the immigration issue, that did so with little to no input from the Obama White House. Obama demanded he be given the spotlight, flying to Las Vegas to give another empty political grandstanding speech that said nothing the day after the Senate announced it was already moving forward on the very same issue. Oh—and the cost to taxpayers for that unnecessary trip was hundreds of thousands of dollars. ...As one of our Insiders stated a few weeks ago, Barack Obama is already entering Lame Duck status. It’s not full blown Lame Duckery by any means—he still wields the considerable and influential support of an adoring media, (while polls once again confirm America as a whole remains lukewarm to both him and his policies) and the bully pulpit of the White House—but Democrats are already starting to pull away from The Man Calling Himself Obama. And why shouldn’t they? What has Barack Obama done for other Democrats? He has helped push the party

so far left that once his celebrity is removed from the already limited attention span of the American public, the party faces the daunting task of trying to repair itself in the wake of the destruction Obama is leaving behind. Their only hope, and that is what was underway with this most recent bi-partisan effort in the Senate, is to already begin the work of mending the proverbial political fences with their Republican counterparts.” [42251]

Ah—and that brings us to the Republicans of course. Just as the eight years of G.W. Bush harmed the GOP’s general brand-name appeal to the public (not entirely deserved by the way—the media slammed the Bush presidency 24/7 for much of those eight years), the Party of Lincoln has just recently started to repair its own damaged operating system. Election 2008 was a near-throw away effort with but one bright spot and a clear marker of where the party should find its strongest base of support, and that was in the candidate for Vice President, Sarah Palin. (Liberals will now scoff at that last line —like well-trained harpies they have learned to instantly react negatively to any mention of Palin) But it was Sarah Palin’s appeal to both fiscal and social conservatives that soon after the 2008 election formed into the considerable force dubbed The Tea Party that swept aside Democrats during the 2010 Midterm Election in the most lopsided national election in a generation. The Old Guard of the Republican Party soon viewed this Tea Party movement with increasing suspicion, due in great part to the simple fact it could not entirely control it. House Speaker John Boehner, who was made Speaker [only] because of the Tea Party [which produced a Republican majority in the House], has spent the last two years attempting to compromise between them and his own Republican establishment. The result has been a fractured and somewhat incompetent party that has more often than not, been outplayed by both Barack Obama and his Mainstream Media support system. In 2012 voters voted celebrity over common sense. Celebrity though is fleeting—and Democrats are now increasingly viewing [Obama] through that prism.” [42251]

“The political dynamics of the last four years are starting to shift now though, and this week’s odd Obama speech in Las Vegas is one of the first real signals of that reality. That was Senate leadership telling [Obama]—We Don’t Need You. The fact is, that has been how things have run since Barack Obama entered the White House. Obama enjoys giving speeches but little else. Democrats have long voiced concern over how little Barack Obama engages in the actual forming of policy. ...Obama rarely speaks to members of Congress, or even members of his own cabinet. Much of what reaches him comes through the filter of powerful figures such as Senior Adviser Valerie Jarrett—whose second floor office is just a short walk from the upstairs study where [Obama] spends so much of his time during his days at the White House. And it is Jarrett who keeps her hand atop the heads of the many Czar appointments of Barack Obama—those shadow figures given access to the policy powers of the Executive Branch with no Congressional oversight. ...Obama’s speech yesterday on immigration policy was little more than a hissy fit. Upset at having even a bit of attention taken away from himself, he flew to Las Vegas despite some Democrats suggesting he not do so for fear of interrupting the still forming agreement between Democrat and Republican leaders. Barack Obama ignored that request—as he has ignored Democrats all along, and flew to Vegas regardless. The teleprompter was loaded up, and by God, he was going to give that speech because HE is

more important than any issue—immigration included. Now it is up to the American people to decide if that in fact is true...” [42251]

On January 31 the Senate Armed Services Committee holds a confirmation hearing for Obama’s choice to head the Department of Defense, the anti-Israel, former U.S. Senator Chuck Hagel. (At Townhall.com former Congressman Bob Beauprez writes, “Iran—the ‘Death to America’ Islamic regime—is effusive with praise [for Hagel], while a large group of retired U.S. military commanders have ‘deep concerns’ and have taken a highly unusual public position in opposition to Hagel’s nomination.”) Senator John McCain (R-AZ) questions Hagel on his opposition to the troop “surges” in both Iraq and Afghanistan, even after they were proven successful. Senator James Inhofe (R-OK) asks Hagel why the Iranian regime supports his appointment. Hagel responds, “I have a difficult enough time with American politics, Senator. I have no idea, but thank you.” Asked why he voted against a resolution designating the Iranian Revolutionary Guard Corps as a terrorist group, Hagel replies that the Guard is part of an “elected, legitimate government.” (So were Hitler’s storm troopers.) Hagel is likely to be confirmed by the Senate because he will have the support of the Democrats—despite his being a Republican (in name only, who endorsed Obama in 2008 over John McCain)—because of his soft stances and eagerness to slash defense spending and the nation’s nuclear arsenal. Ironically, opposition to his nomination comes from Republicans. Some are concerned that Hagel is dangerous because he is not particularly intelligent. What makes him dangerous is that he will not think for himself but will simply do Obama’s bidding—unlike Defense Secretaries Leon Panetta and Robert Gates, who were willing to defy Obama from time to time. [42144, 42150, 42153, 42158, 42174]

According to FoxNews.com, Hagel “was questioned perhaps most aggressively by fellow Vietnam War veteran Sen. John McCain and freshman Texas Sen. Ted Cruz, both Republicans. Hagel was caught by surprise when Cruz played two tapes from appearances on Al Jazeera—one of which showed him not challenging a caller who accused Israel of war crimes, another in which he appeared to agree with the assertion that America is ‘the world’s bully.’ Of the Israel interview, Cruz said: ‘The caller suggests that the nation of Israel has committed war crimes, and your response to that was not to dispute that characterization.’ ...Cruz called the war-crimes suggestion ‘particularly offensive given that the Jewish people suffered under the most horrific war crimes in the Holocaust. I would also suggest that for ...a prospective secretary of Defense not to take issue with that claim is highly troubling.’” Cruz asks, “In a speech on the floor of the Senate you referred to Israel’s military campaign against terrorist group Hezbollah as a quote, ‘sickening slaughter.’ Now, I would suggest the characterizations, do you think it’s right that Israel was committing a, quote, ‘sickening slaughter,’ as you said on the floor of the Senate?” Hagel responds, “I’ve said many, many times, Senator, every nation has a right to defend itself...” Cruz: “Do you think a ‘sickening slaughter’ would constitute a war crime?” Hagel: “No. Depends on—they were attacked. Depends on many factors. If Israel was defending itself, there was slaughter going on on both sides.” Cruz: “Does one typically characterize defending yourself against terrorism as a ‘sickening slaughter?’” Hagel: “No, but again, Senator, I’d want to look at everything.” Cruz also pounds Hagel on having once said, “America is the bully of the world.” (Rush

Limbaugh observes, “Chuck Hagel, if he’s confirmed as the secretary of defense, he’s gonna make damn sure that the United States is not in the position to be anybody’s bully. That’s his job, because that’s what Obama is going to do, downsize the US military.”) [42174, 42226]

Attorney Orly Taitz issues a press release: “Defendant Barack Obama defaulted in *Grinols et al v Obama et al*, a legal action dealing with Obama’s use of forged IDs and a stolen CT Social Security number 042-68-4425. Obama is not furnishing a response as he cannot defend his use of flagrantly forged birth certificate, Selective Service Registration and a stolen Connecticut Social Security number, which was assigned in and around 1977 to an elderly immigrant Harrison (Harry) J. Bounel, born in 1890. National search databases show both Obama and Bounel at the same address 5046 Greenwood Ave Chicago, IL 60615. Bounel received aforementioned number in and around March 1977 as he needed Medicare benefits. He is believed to be deceased and from 1986 Obama has fraudulently assumed Bounel’s social security number and used it while at Harvard and later in Chicago and in DC. As late as November 2009 there were changes in the status of Bounel entered by alleged relative Michelle Obama. ...Last verified address of Harry J. Bounel is 915 Daly Ave, Bronx NY during 1940 census. Later he was listed at the 5046 Greenwood Ave address, Obama’s Chicago residence, a mansion which is listed under multiple parcel numbers and linked to Barack and Michelle Obama, a convicted Syrian financiers [sic] Tony Resko [sic; Rezko] and social security numbers of a high ranked judge and a prominent attorney. Investigation continues, however information gathered thus far is sufficient for removal of Obama from office and his criminal prosecution for use of forged IDs and a stolen CT SSN...” (Defendant Obama failed to file a response to the case within the required 21 days. Taitz is therefore seeking a default judgment against Obama. Obama, believing he is above the law and knowing that he has the mainstream media in his corner, will simply ignore the lawsuit and assume no judge will have the courage to force actions against him.) [42149, 42307]

According to the Department of Labor, there were 368,000 new claims for unemployment benefits in the week ending January 26—an increase of 38,000 over the previous week. [42151, 42152]

Authorization for Obama’s 26-member jobs council expires and is not renewed. (The council has not met since January 17, 2012.) [41650, 42154, 42168]

The Associated Press writes, “Economic jitters compete with Obama agenda. Just as ...Obama is pushing new initiatives on gun control and immigration, the gloomy old problem of a sluggish economy is elbowing its way back into prominence. Consumer confidence is falling, the economy is contracting and large automatic spending cuts are threatening to hit the Pentagon and other programs, with uncertain consequences.” (Some might suggest that Obama’s agenda should be job creation for the 23 million Americans—not gun confiscation and amnesty.) [42167]



The Senate votes 64–34 to approve legislation to extend the debt ceiling until mid-May with the provision that the Senate must also produce a budget by April 15. Obama is expected to sign the bill.

CNSNews.com reports, “In a final regulation issued Wednesday [January 30], the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) assumed that under Obamacare the cheapest health insurance plan available in 2016 for a family will cost \$20,000 for the year. Under Obamacare, Americans will be required to buy health insurance or pay a penalty to the IRS. The IRS’s assumption that the cheapest plan for family will cost \$20,000 per year is found in examples the IRS gives to help people understand how to calculate the penalty they will need to pay the government if they do not buy a mandated health plan. The examples point to families of four and families of five, both of which the IRS expects in its assumptions to pay a minimum of \$20,000 per year for a bronze plan. ‘The annual national average bronze plan premium for a family of 5 (2 adults, 3 children) is \$20,000,’ the regulation says. Bronze will be the lowest tier health-insurance plan available under Obamacare—after Silver, Gold, and Platinum. Under the law, the penalty for not buying health insurance is supposed to be capped at either the annual average Bronze premium, 2.5 percent of taxable income, or \$2,085.00 per family in 2016.” [42171, 42172]

The new regulations from the IRS also state “that parents must pay a federal fine under Obamacare if their children or dependent spouses are uninsured for any part of the year. The regulations clarify provisions of Obamacare that seem to say that a parent will be held liable for Obamacare’s individual mandate penalty if they don’t have insurance coverage for their children. In its final regulations, the IRS states that parents will be made to pay the penalty (called a ‘shared responsibility payment’) if they can claim an uninsured child or spouse as a dependent, regardless of whether they actually claim them or not. ...In other words, if a child goes without government-defined health insurance coverage for any month of the year, their parent must pay a fine to the government, regardless of whether they claim the child as a dependent... The per-person penalty is capped at \$2,085 for 2016, but that cap will rise with inflation every year thereafter.” [42176]

In *Knox v. SEIU* the U.S. Supreme Court ruled Thursday that unions must provide an immediate opportunity for non-members in “closed shops” to object to unexpected dues and fee increases. Fox News reports, “The court ruled for Dianne Knox and other nonmembers of the Service Employees International Union’s Local 1000, who wanted to object and opt out of a \$12 million special assessment the union required from its California public sector members for political campaigning. Knox and others said the union did not give them a legally required notice that the increase was coming. The union, and the 9th U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals, said the annual notice that the union gives was sufficient. The high court disagreed in a 7–2 judgment written by Justice Samuel Alito.” (The two dissenting Justices are Stephen Breyer and Obama appointee Elena Kagan.) [42178, 42179]

At the Price Middle School in Atlanta, Georgia an armed guard wrestles a gun away from a student who shot and wounded a 14-year old classmate. (Vice President Joe Biden has

called placing armed guards in schools a “terrible mistake,” despite the fact that many schools have had them for years.) [42180, 42181, 42182, 42192]

Vice President Joe Biden tells reporters, “Nothing we’re going to do is going to fundamentally alter or eliminate the possibility of another mass shooting or guarantee that we will bring gun deaths down to 1,000 a year from what it is now. But there are things that we can do, demonstrably can do, that have virtually zero impact on your Second Amendment right to own a weapon for both self defense and recreation that can save some lives. I’m not saying there’s an absolute consensus on all these things, but there is a sea change, a sea change in the attitudes of the American people. I believe the American people will not understand—and I know that everyone in that caucus understands—they won’t understand if we don’t act.” [42206, 42245]

A guilty verdict is delivered in the trial of Mohamed Mohamud, an American Muslim who unsuccessfully tried to blow up hundreds—if not thousands—of innocent people at a crowded Christmas tree lighting ceremony in Portland’s Pioneer Square in 2012. Blogger Victoria Taft notes, “Mohamud was already contacting Al Qaeda bad actors before the FBI got there. He’d already written articles for Samir Khan’s magazine, ‘Jihad Recollections.’ He was planning to make a run to Yemen for terror training and talked to a friend in Seattle who Mo Mo said was involved with Al Shabaab--the Al Qaeda affiliate responsible for the murderous attack on U.S. troops in the Black Hawk Down incident in Mogadishu (the family’s home town) in 1993. Furthermore, Mohamud’s parents were worried enough about their son’s radicalization that THEY called the FBI hoping to thwart any of his plans.” (The attempted bombing and trial received virtually no coverage in the mainstream media—probably because the incident contradicts the “Obama has al-Qaeda on the run” storyline.) [42184, 42185, 42186]

On CNN Dana Bash comments on the Hagel confirmation hearing: “I talked to many of [the senators] and what they were saying is that it was all the buzz on the floor, that they were very surprised that Senator Hagel, from their point of view, many people, Democrats and Republicans, is simply not doing as well as many people thought he would. In fact, one senator told me that it is ‘all the talk, I mean, all the talk’ that the senators are shocked about how ill-prepared he is on some of the most basic controversial comments that he made that he and everyone knew were going to be coming at him from the likes of Senator John McCain and Lindsey Graham and others. Even a Democrat who’s on this committee who I spoke to who is supporting Hagel sort of shaking his head in disbelief saying that he’s surprised that he’s not more forceful. And another undecided senator on this committee said that he had three different ways to answer the question on the surge, that he simply got into it with on John McCain [sic]. So simply put, there is, as I said, disbelief, primarily not just because of the fact ...[that] he had [the ability] to prepare for this, but because he’s been on the other side of the dais. He knows how this works and so that’s why there’s a lot of people who were perplexed here. The obvious next question, Wolf [Blitzer], is what will that mean for his confirmation, because those senators gossiping on the floor, they hold his fate in their hands. The answer is unclear. There are still a number of undecided Republicans, most importantly, and if somebody actually does block this filibuster, five Republicans are going to have to join Democrats

[to confirm Hagel], assuming they [Democrats] all vote for him.” (If Hagel is not confirmed, Obama may respond by nominating Michele Flournoy, former Under Secretary of Defense for Policy of the United States.) [42187]

Senator Charles Grassley (R-IA) introduces legislation that would require all employers to verify the legality of their employees through the “E-Verify” system that is used to weed out illegal immigrants with phony Social Security numbers. (It is worth noting that 042-68-4425, the Social Security number most recently used by Obama—he has used more than one—fails the E-Verify system test.) DailyCaller.com reports, “Should Grassley’s Accountability Through Electronic Verification Act of 2013 pass, the program would be instituted permanently and be made mandatory for all employers within one year of its enactment. It would also increase the penalty for employers who hire undocumented workers, and require employers to check the status of all current employees and new hires within three years.” [42197]

Senator Charles Schumer (D-NY) tells reporters, “We are not using border security as an excuse or block to path of citizenship. We just want to make sure, this is very important both substantively and politically, that there is a secure border. We are not going to use it as a battering ram to prevent the 11 million from gaining a path to citizenship.” (In other words, “We Democrats will pay lip service to ‘border security’ but we don’t care if the border is ever properly patrolled—we just want millions of illegal immigrants turned into voting Democrats.” It can also be translated as, “We don’t expect to pass immigration legislation reform at all. We’re just using the issue to get more voters to dislike Republicans so they will lose seats in the 2014 mid-term elections.”) [42194, 42198, 42208, 42224]

On *Special Report*, Charles Krauthammer comments that Hagel’s “problem isn’t a paper trail; his problem is a demonstrated, incredibly remarkable lack of competence. Look, the two lines of attack on him up until today were one, ideological, that the content of what he’s been saying over the years is out of the mainstream, way out there, to the left of Obama. As McCain pointed out, he’s a guy who got the surge completely wrong and he himself called the Iraq war a disaster and he voted to authorize the war. So, the first line on attack was on the content; the second was on how honest is he because he’s been denying essentially the essence of a dozen statements and ideas that he said in the past. And now, he says all of a sudden, ‘Oh no, you know, on Iran, I changed my mind.’ ...All of a sudden, you know, he has seen the light on a dozen issues, overnight, as he’s being challenged in Congress. But what happened today was shocking, because it showed an astonishing lack of competence. I mean, he was wobbly, he was weak, bumbling. ...[H]e didn’t, when he said, when he corrects himself on containment and says, you know, ‘well, I was wrong about supporting containment, our policy is that we don’t have a policy on containment,’ it showed he has no idea about the single most grave issue facing the United States: containment of Iran or not, and he was corrected by a Democrat. And then, on the Israel issue, he was completely humiliated by Senator [Lindsey] Graham [when Hagel was confronted about his use of the term “Jewish lobby”].” (When asked to name even one Senator who had been “intimidated by the Jewish lobby” Hagel had no answer. Nor could he name any improper or failed U.S. policy that was

implemented solely because of the lobby—not that he probably did not consider responding, “the Iraq War.”) [42188, 42210]

No-holds-barred radio talk show host Mark Levin comments on the news that the Obama administration is “covertly recruiting Muslims to work at the State Department.” Levin asks, “What the hell’s happening? Now we’ve backed the Muslim Brotherhood? And then of course, our dear friend Michele Bachmann and Louie Gohmert and three other brave members of the House of Representatives asked questions about the Muslim Brotherhood’s infiltration of our own government and they’re treated like pariahs. Well, the Muslim Brotherhood *has* infiltrated our government; it’s called Barack Obama. No, he’s not a formal member, he’s a sympathizer. There, I said it. Prove otherwise. Meanwhile, you want to look into Obama’s soul? You want to look into his soul? Well, look at his soul. You want to know what I see? I see Chuck Hagel. What kind of commander-in-chief would nominate somebody like Chuck Hagel to be Secretary of Defense? I’ll tell you what kind of commander-in-chief, the kind of commander-in-chief that arms the Muslim Brotherhood, Islamonazi regime in Cairo while he’s hallowing out the greatest military force on the face of the earth under his direct command, the United States military. That’s what kind of commander-in-chief [Obama is]. Chuck Hagel, who’s a sympathizer with the most radical elements in the Middle East, and an Israel hater.” [42211, 42217]

So why would [Obama] nominate somebody like Chuck Hagel? Because [Obama] *is* Chuck Hagel. He’s a sympathizer with the most radical elements in the Middle East and he’s an Israel hater. That’s why he nominated Hagel. So, Chuck Hagel [made] a fool of himself today, at his confirmation hearing. And he’ll still be confirmed, I bet, because the Democrats are lockstep. Even the Jewish Democrat members of the U.S. Senate, they’re lockstep. The Anti-Defamation League, their lips are sealed. AIPAC, Hagel once called them the ‘Jewish lobby.’ Their lips are sealed, they’re all a bunch of cowards. It’s the righteous gentiles who are speaking up. You want to hear the truth? You’ll hear the truth on this microphone. It’s the righteous gentiles who are speaking up. It’s the conservatives who are speaking up. And Chuck Hagel is not just a problem for Israel, he is a huge problem for the United States military. This man believes in unilateral disarmament. Whether it’s conventional weaponry, or nuclear weaponry. And he’s on the record and there’s not a damn thing he can say to reverse course. But then again, so is Obama.” [42217]

CNSNews.com reports, “Sixty-one percent of U.S. small business owners said they were ‘worried about the potential cost of healthcare’ and 56 percent said they were ‘worried about new government regulations,’ according to the Wells Fargo/Gallup small business index released on Jan. 31, which also showed that 30 percent of small business owners are not hiring and fear going out of business within a year. ‘At the bottom of the list, but still at a surprisingly high level, 30% of owners say they are not hiring because they are worried they may no longer be in business in 12 months,’ according to Gallup’s index summary. ‘This is up from 24% who had the same worry in January 2012.’” [42213]

The Obama administration delays a decision on the Keystone XL pipeline for another six months. House Speaker John Boehner issues a Twitter message: “Americans have already waited >4yrs for #KXL, time for [Obama] to say ‘yes.’” [42228, 42229, 42249]