

The Complete Obama Timeline

November 2014

On November 1 the ObamaCare Web site for small businesses, the Small Business Health Options Program (SHOP), goes live—after a 13-month delay. Like Healthcare.gov, the site is full of glitches. (The major networks barely cover the story.) [68730, 8772]

Obama takes credit for the release of Marine Sergeant Andrew Tahmooressi, saying, “I thank the individuals assisting my negotiating team in our efforts to bring closure to this case. All Americans should join the Tahmooressi family in celebrating his newfound freedom.” NationalReport.net writes, “Tahmooressi’s return to US soil comes after closed door congressional sessions, harshly critical of Obama’s inaction, resulted in stepped-up diplomatic efforts led by US Ambassador Earl Anthony Wayne and Mexico’s Attorney General Jesús Murillo Karam. Former New Mexico Gov. Bill Richardson, Reps. Ed Royce (R-CA) and Matt Salmon (R-AZ) met with Mexico’s AG and the US Ambassador to urge the Afghanistan War vet’s release on humanitarian grounds. Also traveling with the entourage was talk show host Montel Williams—himself a former marine—and Tahmooressi’s mother Jill, who for months has spoken of her son’s mental state during his incarceration. She recently appealed to the Mexican government on her son’s behalf when her request for assistance from the Obama administration fell upon deaf ears.” [67347]

In honor of the first-annual “International Day to End Impunity for Crimes Against Journalists,” Obama issues a statement: “History shows that a free press remains a critical foundation for prosperous, open, and secure societies, allowing citizens to access information and hold their governments accountable. Indeed, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights reiterates the fundamental principle that every person has the right ‘to seek, receive, and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers.’ Each and every day, brave journalists make extraordinary risks to bring us stories we otherwise would not hear—exposing corruption, asking tough questions, or bearing witness to the dignity of innocent men, women and children suffering the horrors of war. In this service to humanity, hundreds of journalists have been killed in the past decade alone, while countless more have been harassed, threatened, imprisoned, and tortured. In the overwhelming majority of these cases, the perpetrators of these crimes against journalists go unpunished. All governments must protect the ability of journalists to write and speak freely. On this first-ever International Day to End Impunity for Crimes against Journalists, the United States commends the priceless contributions by journalists to the freedom and security of us all, shining light into the darkness and giving voice to the voiceless. We honor the sacrifices so many journalists have made in their quest for the truth, and demand accountability for those who have committed crimes against journalists.” (The statement is laughable, considering it comes from an administration that has possibly abused the media worse than any in the last 70 years. Townhall.com’s Katie Pavlich writes, “Currently the United States is listed as 46th on the Reporters

Without Borders Press Freedom Index behind countries like Botswana, Ghana and the United Kingdom. ...Obama's statement is not only garbage, it's government propaganda a free press is designed to protect against.") [67364]

Health insurance agent C. Steven Tucker writes, "This year, for the first time in 20 years I can not even quote a replacement product because Barack Obama has issued a GAG ORDER to the health insurance industry instructing them not to disclose their January 2015 health insurance rates until after the mid-term elections. This is unprecedented. Normally health insurance premiums are released for public viewing 60 days before the January 1st effective date. Where are the reports on these cancellations and the gag order from NBC, ABC, CBS and CNN? The only news organization that I am aware of that has reported on any of this is the Fox News channel. I can guarantee you one thing, not one of my clients who received a cancellation notice is voting Democrat on Tuesday." [67435, 67436]

A federal court tosses out an Obama administration housing regulation. Reuters reports, "U.S. District Judge Richard Leon said the Fair Housing Act allows for only direct discrimination claims and not those based on so-called disparate impact allegations. Leon wrote that the administration's view that the language of the Fair Housing Act assumes that disparate impact claims are permitted 'appears to be nothing more than wishful thinking on steroids.' The ruling was a win for the American Insurance Association and other business groups that oppose disparate impact claims, which allow for a broad range of business decisions related to housing to be subject to civil rights litigation. As an example of such a claim, the National Fair Housing Alliance sued Allstate Corp in 2012 for refusing to insure flat-roofed houses in Delaware, claiming the practice had a discriminatory effect on poor minorities most likely to live in such buildings." [67420, 67437, 67510]

In a visit to Moline, Illinois, Michelle Obama campaigns for Democrat candidates. Remarkably, she says, "And this state is leading the nation in job creation." (The claim is absolute nonsense. NewsBusters.org points out, "...Illinois, pending possible revisions to September's single-month result, was 37th in the nation in job growth during the past 12 months." Illinois has fewer jobs in 2014 than it had in 2008. The unemployment rate in Illinois is higher than the national average (6.6 percent versus 5.9 percent). In the first quarter of 2014 Illinois ranked 34th in job growth among all states. *The Washington Post* reported, "In another job-related milestone for Texas, the BLS reported today [October 22] that annual payroll employment in Texas increased in September by more than 400,000 jobs from a year ago for the second straight month, and established a new all-time state record for job growth over a 12-month period with a 413,700 gain from September 2013. Over the last year, Texas has added almost 1,600 new jobs every business day—a hiring rate of almost 200 jobs every hour!") [67391, 67395, 67396, 67397, 67398]

Carter Andress, president of AISG, Inc. (American-Iraqi Solutions Group), writes at Townhall.com, "As someone who led the company that transported 550 metric tons of yellowcake uranium—enough to make fourteen Hiroshima-size bombs—from Saddam's

nuclear complex in the Iraq War's notorious 'Triangle of Death' for air shipment out of the country, I know Baathist Iraq's WMD potential existed. In early 2008, we secretly moved over several nights 140 truckloads carrying 5500 barrels of extremely heavy radioactive material provided to Iraq as part of the French-supplied Osiraq reactor destroyed by Israeli fighter bombers in 1981. The virulently anti-Semitic Saddam had announced 'here begins the Arab bomb' and the Israelis took him at his word. The recent article in the New York Times, however, caught us all by surprise. Random caches of old chemical weapons found post-invasion were old news, but not 'roughly 5,000' warheads and bombs, many filled with still active, nerve agent. That's an enormous quantity even if evidently left over from the 1980s Iran-Iraq War. ...At the least, this shocker (after so many years of repetitious 'Bush lied [about WMD], people died') further points to the world's inability to trust that the UN inspectors could ever realistically certify Saddam clean of his nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons programs. ...There's no question in my mind, Saddamist Iraq would have reconstituted its WMD programs once UN sanctions faded away—a push Security Council veto-wielding members Russia and France were actively working toward because of oil field opportunities.” [67300, 67348, 67374]

“...The greater problem, however, of significant quantities of chemical weapons hidden at some date prior to the US invasion points to a current and growing threat. The leader of the neo-Saddamists allied now with ISIS is Izzat al-Douri, a former Iraqi army general and last member of the senior Baathist leadership not executed or imprisoned. There is a distinct possibility that Saddam's minions hid these munitions with the intention of disinterring them for deterrent use once again. And in fact, this is why Saddam's military and secret police leaders never ceased to believe Iraq possessed WMD and could therefore project terror onto the Kurds and the rest of the region (Israel and Iran, specifically) until the end because Iraq did possess WMD, even after the dictator's death by hanging. ...Much of the area where the 'antique,' yet still potentially potent chemical weapons discovered by US forces is now in the hands of ISIS, the forces of al-Douri, and their allied Sunni Arab tribes undergirding the 'caliphate' occupying almost a third of Iraq. With hundreds of Western passport holders fighting in Syria and Iraq, the most immediate threat to the United States is the spread of jihadi terrorism to Europe now that ISIS has a border with Turkey, a gateway to the EU. Can one even imagine the impact of a weaponized sarin-gas attack in Paris?” [67300, 67348]

Breitbart.com reports, “The possible spread of Ebola and other diseases has become a focal point in a federal trial where a controversial California dentist [she is also an attorney] is suing the U.S. government in an effort to stop immigration authorities from moving detained aliens out of border areas. During a hearing on Tuesday, U.S District Judge Andrew Hannen heard from various witnesses including epidemiologists, border patrol officials, and others on the lawsuit that was originally filed in July by Orly Taitz. Following the testimony, Hannen said he would take all the facts into consideration and issue a ruling in the near future. The original suit filed by Taitz in July... sought to halt the transportation of illegal aliens who carried disease or had criminal records. However, in the most recent amendment to the lawsuit, Taitz added the issue of Ebola citing the current administration negligent response to the threat. According to Taitz's lawsuit [the

Obama] administration and [Obama's] supporters have sought to open the borders in order to bring cheap labor into the country. Taitz claimed that the Obama signed the 'Deferred Action for Children Arrivals' knowing that it would act as a magnet for additional immigrants to enter the country illegally thus causing the summer border surge in South Texas. That surge brought a series of diseases such as scabies, tuberculosis, and measles. In August, Hannen denied Taitz's request for an injunction and gave her until September to file an amendment. Taitz did, now mentioning Enterovirus 68 and Ebola while asking not only for the travel injunction but for a travel ban from countries with Ebola." [67319]

Republican candidate for the U.S. Senate from Iowa, Joni Ernst, moves to a seven-point lead over Congressman Bruce Braley (D-IA) in a *Des Moines Register* poll conducted October 28-31. (Braley even trails by three points in his own Congressional district.) [67321, 67330, 67331]

Former Vice President Al Gore sends a Democrat fundraising email that reads, "There is nothing more pressing in our time than confronting and solving the climate crisis. We have no time to spare. We must act now. Luckily, we have all the tools we need to solve this challenge. All we need is political will—but political will is a renewable resource! That's why the election on November 4th is so monumentally important. ...Obama is now leading on this issue—but we need to elect more Democrats dedicated to putting the future of our planet before the interests of Big Oil and Coal and other large carbon polluters who demand the right to use our atmosphere as an open sewer without any accountability." An email from Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid (D-NV) also begs for campaign contributions: "But I'm emailing once more because this moment is absolutely critical. I know you're a busy person, but this is an absolute MUST-READ: Our Final Weekend Get Out The Vote Push is on the chopping block: We're still \$1,389,071 short with 24 hours left. If we don't fill that budget gap, we'll be forced to scale back our plans to mobilize 575,000 voters this weekend. These are voters who could determine the outcome of the whole Senate. I'm begging for your help to close the gap IMMEDIATELY. If we fall short before the last end-of-month deadline tomorrow, our chance to keep the Senate gets a whole lot smaller." [67327, 67328]

Gore has made a fortune from his global warming scare tactics and criticism of "big oil," partly because far too many Americans believe oil is used for gasoline and home heating and little else. Those who naively believe the nation can stop relying on oil and start relying solely on wind or solar power are largely unaware of the tens of thousands of products that are made from petroleum. One of the most important is plastic; without oil there would be no plastic. [68038]

Walmart reduces prices on more than 20,000 products in an effort to boost sales. According to MiamiHerald.com, on November 3 the company "will relaunch its 24-hour holiday cyber savings event, in which customers can take advantage of free shipping on millions of items from Walmart.com. Orders must exceed \$50 for free shipping. Walmart said it has expanded its online offerings to include 7 million items—one million more than last holiday season." [67329]

Russian chess master Garry Kasparov tweets, “The Obama Doctrine: ‘Do as little as necessary to appear to be doing something without actually committing to a cause or course of action’” and “Obama & most of EU [European Union] have ‘anti-paranoia.’ (Is there a word for this?!) Pretending you don’t have enemies doesn’t mean you don’t have enemies!” [67334]

WRTV reports that “thousands of Hoosiers [Indiana residents] are learning they will need to get new health insurance. This impacts 30,000 Anthem customers in the state” whose policies don’t satisfy ObamaCare requirements. “...Customers will have to pick a new plan between November 15th and December 31st if they want coverage in the new year.” DailyCaller.com notes, “Indiana joins Virginia (the hardest hit with 250,000 cancellations), Kentucky, Colorado, North Carolina, New Mexico, Tennessee and Maine, among the more than dozen states and the District of Columbia that are experiencing another round of health insurance cancellations this year.” [67342]

Breitbart.com reports, “A campaign ally for incumbent Senator Jeanne Shaheen (D-NH) is under criminal investigation by the Portsmouth Police Department for allegedly assaulting a campaign volunteer for former Senator Scott Brown, Sergeant Chris Kiberd confirmed to Breitbart News via telephone on Saturday.” [67346]

On *Justice with Jeanine*, Donald Trump tells Judge Jeanine Pirro, “Probably, maybe from the beginning, there has never been a greater enemy to Israel than Barack Obama. It’s incredible the way he treats them, the way he’s speaking to them. I think he treats our known enemies much better. ...Look, they [in the Obama administration] don’t like him [Prime Minister Binyamin Netanyahu] and they don’t like Israel. ...I speak to friends of mine who are Jewish, I say, ‘How are you supporting this man? He’s [Obama is] the worst thing that has ever happened to Israel.’ Now what’s going to happen is, the way it’s going, Iran will have a nuclear weapon. ...And it’s very close. As soon as that happens it’s a whole new ball game.” [67353]

On November 2 Senator Rand Paul (R-KY) appears on *Meet the Press*, *Face the Nation*, and State of the Union to, as HotAir.com puts it, “make one last pitch to tea partiers, whether conservative or libertarian, to swallow hard and pull the lever for underwhelming dinosaurs like [Senator] Pat Roberts [R-KS] on Tuesday.” On *Meet the Press*, Paul says, “I think [the GOP has] to show up and then you have to say something. I’ve spent the last year showing up, everywhere from Howard University to Berkeley to the Urban League to Ferguson, to the NAACP. But showing up is not enough. We have to show that we have a policy. You know what I’m sensing when I’m showing up in the African-American community in our big cities? I’m sensing—they say this to me time after time, ‘We [black voters] are being taken for granted. The Democrats don’t show up, [I] haven’t seen my congressman lately.’ I think there’s a huge opportunity for us. While not everybody is ready to become a Republican, many people say they are glad I’m there and they want us [Republicans] to compete for their vote.” [67332, 67333, 67343]

During the *Meet the Press* panel discussion, former White House press secretary Robert Gibbs says, “I will say, as a Democrat sitting here, you have to be impressed with what Rand Paul was saying. To have a positive talking point before the election is hugely important. I think Jeb Bush is also one to watch. It’s interesting on the Clintons here. In the south, Democrats are desperate for the party to become the party of Bill Clinton again. I don’t know if they’re all in on Hillary, but they wish Bill Clinton could be running.” (*The Obama Timeline* believes one of its prior observations is worth repeating: Much of Hillary Clinton’s 2016 support will come from voters who like the idea of Bill Clinton being back in the White House because they believe he will be something of a “co-president.” If he were to drop dead before 2016, his wife’s chances of getting elected drop dramatically.) On the Senate race in New Hampshire, Andrea Mitchell says, “And I think [Senator Jeanne] Shaheen [D-NH] is in real trouble. She should have a lot of built-in advantages...” Joe Scarborough observes, “I keep hearing from Democrats—and I keep thinking that Shaheen’s going to win New Hampshire—I keep hearing from Democrats that she’s in big trouble.” (Shaheen has led GOP challenger Scott Brown in most polls.) [67345, 67366, 67367, 67382]

On *Fox News Sunday*, George Will disputes the claim “that this is a *Seinfeld* election, an election about nothing, which is what the media says every time there’s a danger that the Republicans are going to get a mandate. This is a way of preemptively denying a mandate.” “Actually,” says Will, “this is a Casey Stengel election and a Mae West election. [In] 1962, Casey Stengel’s managing the New York Mets en route to 120 losses. He looks down the dugout one day at all the rejects from other teams and said, ‘Can’t anyone here play this game?’ ...[I]t’s basically about competence. ...[T]here’s no affirmation of the Republican Party in this that we’ve seen so far, which makes it the Mae West election. Mae West said, ‘When picking between two evils, I choose the one I haven’t tried before.’ And they’re gonna try the Republican.” [67385]

Obama campaigns for Governor Dannel Malloy in Connecticut, where GOP challenger Tom Foley is gaining ground. (Connecticut allows same-day voter registration and voting. ThePostEmail.com’s Sharon Rondeau notes that the applicant can use nothing more than a drivers license to register to vote, and fill out a form on which he must state “whether he is a United States citizen.” Because legal non-citizens, such as those with “green cards,” can obtain a drivers license, a non-citizen can easily register to vote in Connecticut simply by checking a box on a form to claim he is a U.S. citizen. Rondeau was informed by the Secretary of State’s office, “Voters in Connecticut are not required to prove citizenship to vote.”) [67349, 67350, 67354, 67355]

While Obama campaigns for Malloy, Independent candidate Joe Visconti withdraws from the race and endorses Malloy’s Republican opponent, Tom Foley. [67380]

Obama also campaigns in Philadelphia for gubernatorial candidate Tom Wolf. (According to DailyCaller.com, “Obama spoke to about 5,500 attendees at a mid-sized 10,000 seat arena that had to be partitioned off with a curtain to cater to the incoming crowd.” Some reporters estimate the gymnasium was only about 25 percent full.

Someone clearly violated one of the first rules of politics: “Don’t book a room you can’t fill.”) [67370, 67373, 67378, 67379]

Obama makes the return trip to Washington, D.C. in a different aircraft because of minor mechanical problems with the C-32 used to fly to Connecticut and Pennsylvania. (The normal Air Force One aircraft was not used in either direction.) [67372]

The *Las Vegas Review-Journal* suggests that many Nevada Democrats will not vote on November 4 because of “three critical missteps” by Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid (D-NV): “1. Reid is so preoccupied with helping U.S. Senate candidates outside Nevada win re-election—and keeping his job as majority leader—that he isn’t pulling any levers to crank up the turnout machine that won him a fifth term in 2010 and swung the state to President Barack Obama in 2008 and 2012. 2. Reid failed to run a viable Democratic candidate against popular Republican Gov. Brian Sandoval, surrendering the state’s biggest race. Democrats had no one to champion the party brand throughout the 2014 campaign, and no compelling candidacy to drive partisans to the polls. 3. Reid alienated the most important part of his state machine: organized labor. The Culinary and the AFL-CIO delivered the congressional majorities that allowed Reid to pass the Affordable Care Act, and they saved him from his own unpopularity in 2010. Then, when unions screeched about the brutal costs imposed by Obamacare on the Cadillac health plans they had spent decades building, Reid and [Obama] refused to give labor the exemptions they wanted. As a result, unions were slow to spend their resources rescuing the party they feel betrayed them.” [67352, 68095]

Townhall.com reports that the *Charlotte Observer* has pulled an online story (after only 20 minutes online) about an audit of the federal “stimulus funds” the husband of Senator Kay Hagan (D-NC) received. The story remains in Google cache; it notes that “The \$250,644 grant in question went to JDC Manufacturing LLC. JDC Manufacturing is managed by John Hagan, David Hagan, and Charles ‘Chip’ Hagan. Chip Hagan is Senator Kay Hagan’s husband. Grant records show that other companies controlled by the Hagan family received money through this grant. The NCDENR [North Carolina Department of Energy and Natural Resources] says the grant was for an energy-efficiency project at the company’s building in Reidsville, NC. Plastics Revolution was the tenant of that building and the president of that company is John Hagan. JDC Manufacturing hired SolarDyne, LLC to do the solar portion of the project, but SolarDyne was allegedly not the lowest bidder and is now registered to the NC Secretary of State as Green Street Power, LLC, managed by Tilden Hagan, Chip Hagan, and William Stewart.” (The *Charlotte Observer* has given Hagan a lukewarm re-endorsement. To protect Hagan, the leftist media also sat on a story that she had skipped a classified briefing on ISIS to instead attend a fundraiser for herself—in Manhattan.) [67356, 67357, 67366, 67369, 67424]

The alleged “Republican war on women” notwithstanding, retiring Senator Tom Harkin (D-IA) warned Iowans at a recent event not to vote for GOP Senate candidate Joni Ernst just because she is attractive. BuzzFeed.com posts video of Harkin’s comment: “You know, in this Senate race, I’ve been watching some of these ads, and there’s sort of this

sense that, ‘Well, you know, I hear so much about Joni Ernst. She is really attractive, and she sounds nice.’ Well I got to thinking about that. I don’t care if she’s as good looking as Taylor Swift or as nice as Mr. Rogers, but if she votes like [Congresswoman] Michele Bachmann [R-MN], she’s wrong for the state of Iowa.” (Needless to state, had a Republican made a remark like that about a Democrat candidate it would not have taken sleuthing by BuzzFeed.com to make it public.) [67362, 67363, 67381]

At WND.com Lord Christopher Monckton writes, “The midterm elections are around the corner, and if the Republicans win the Senate—which is a possibility, though it will not be easy—they will have the opportunity to do what should have been done long before now: to set up a formal inquiry into the numerous grave irregularities in Mr. Obama’s birth certificate. For Sheriff Joe Arpaio of Maricopa County, Arizona, the clock is ticking on the investigation of the manifestly bogus ‘birth certificate’ that is still posted at the crime scene that is the White House website. ...One of the many dismal failures of the GOP since 2008 has been its failure to get to grips with the birth certificate issue. The reason for the Republicans’ cowardice was very clearly spelled out to me by a senior and experienced GOP congressman over dinner at my club in Washington, D.C., a couple of years ago. ‘We all know the birth certificate is bogus,’ he said, ‘but we also know that anyone who dares to raise the issue will have his or her reputation trashed by the communist left.’ ...When I first visited Sheriff Joe some years ago, it was at once apparent that he had more than enough credible evidence to go before a Federal District Court and demand orders of the court obliging the extremely reluctant ‘Democrat’ administration in Hawaii to hand over for forensic examination not only the original ‘birth certificate’ but also the relevant birth records of the Kapi’olani hospital. The attorney general of Arizona, in failing to permit the sheriff to apply for the necessary orders, is guilty of the grossest negligence.” [67390]

“...Now, I very much understand the embarrassment and humiliation that the entire governing class of the United States would have to endure if a conviction resulted from the prosecution of the person who forged the ‘birth certificate.’ (I am not free to say who she is.) ...All of these consequences of the bogus “birth certificate” would be severe. They would be embarrassing. But not half as embarrassing as the knowledge that the world is sniggering behind its hand at the failure of the United States to maintain a system of justice sufficiently robust to bring prosecutions where the evidence is so plain. If the GOP wins the Senate, and even if it does not win the Senate, let it at last find the guts to do what it should have done long before now. Let it say yes to Sheriff Joe’s request that it should initiate a congressional investigation of this affair. And let the states’ attorneys general of Hawaii and Arizona step down. They should be ashamed of themselves. They are not fit to hold office. Let theirs, together with that of the head of the Secret Service, be the first of countless heads that must roll throughout the governing class to root out the corruption of which the flagrantly bogus “birth certificate” is an enduring and disfiguring symbol. Enough is enough. It is time for Uncle Sam—and the GOP—to find the cojones to act.” [67390]

On November 3 Katie Pavlich writes at Townhall.com, “According to new reporting from Fox News’ Catherine Herridge, the White House sat on intelligence detailing the

location of ISIS hostages James Foley and Steven Sotloff for five weeks before attempting a rescue. When a rescue operation was eventually launched, the location of the hostages had changed and shortly afterward, Foley and Sotloff were beheaded on video.” According to a former Pentagon official, the White House was hesitant and continually asking ‘the intelligence to build up more.’” (The situation was similar with the eventual killing of Osama bin Laden. The White House reportedly had several opportunities to capture or kill bin Laden but Obama was always reluctant to give the approval, probably because he listened to advisor Valerie Jarrett more than the Pentagon and the intelligence community. Afraid to approve an operation that might fail, Obama chose to do nothing. Eventually, according to insider reports, the decision was essentially made for him.) [67365]

It is worth reminding readers that in May 2011 NewsFlavor.com’s unnamed White House insider provided behind-the-scenes information on the decision to go after Osama bin Laden: “Please get this out ASAP. Want specific people to know we know. RE Osama Bin Laden. Significant push to take him out months ago. Senior WH [White House] staff resisted. This was cause of much strain between HC and Obama/[Valerie] Jarrett. HC [Secretary of State Hillary Clinton] and LP [CIA head Leon Panetta] were in constant communication over matter—both attempted to convince administration to act. Administration feared failure and resulting negative impact on [Obama].” (That is, Obama did not want a repeat of Jimmy Carter’s failed Operation Eagle Claw of April 24, 1980, in which eight U.S. servicemen were killed in a botched attempt to rescue 52 American hostages from the U.S. embassy in Tehran, Iran. Obama, fearful of yet another comparison with Carter, preferred leaving bin Laden free to risking an embarrassing failure.) The insider continues, “Intel [the intelligence community is] disgusted over politics over national security. Staff resigned/left. Check timeline to corroborate. Now Intel already leaking to media facts surrounding how info obtained. Namely from enhanced interrogation efforts via GITMO prisoners. Obama administration placed in corner on this. Some media aware of danger to [Obama] RE this and [are] attempting protection. Others looking for further investigation. We are pushing for them to follow through and already meeting with some access. Point of determination [was] made FOR Obama not BY Obama. Will clarify as details become more clear. Very clear divide between Military and WH. Jarrett marginalized 100% on decision to take out OBL [Osama bin Laden]. She played no part. BD [then-chief of staff William Daley] worked with LP and HC to form coalition to force [Obama] to engage. IMPORTANT SPECIFIC: When 48 hour go order issued, [Obama] was told, not requested. Administration scrambled to abort. That order was overruled. This order did not originate from [Obama]. Repeat—this order did not originate from [Obama]. He complied, but did not originate. Independent military contacts have confirmed. Stories corroborate one another. This is legit. The killing of Osama Bin Laden was in fact a Coup within Obama WH. Speaking with additional contacts RE info.” [20243, 20244, 20291]

At WSJ.com Peggy Noonan writes, “If [Obama’s] party loses big on Tuesday, as appears likely, much of the loss will be due to 3 C’s—competence, coherence and credibility. Competence: The administration has shown little talent for or focused interest in running the federal government well, and has managed the executive agencies very poorly.

Coherence: The administration has been unable to explain persuasively the reasoning behind its current priorities (global warming? really?) or its decisions in areas from foreign policy to Ebola in a way that has allowed the public to follow their thinking. Credibility: If you want your doctor you can keep your doctor, red lines, it's highly unlikely Ebola will come here, there's not a smidgen of corruption in the IRS, etc. ...Absolute failure in any one of the 3 C's will bring trouble, and when you fail in all three you get very big, even historic trouble." Noonan notes that after the Republicans were trounced in the 2006 mid-term elections, you could "hear the sound of an old graciousness" from Bush in his news conference, something that has eluded Obama. "For those who think Mr. Obama has faced unusual levels of rhetoric, consider this question from a reporter to Mr. Bush: 'Thank you, Mr. President. With all due respect, Nancy Pelosi has called you incompetent, a liar, the emperor with no clothes and, as recently as yesterday, dangerous. How will you work with someone who has such little respect for your leadership and who is third in line to the presidency?' This is how Mr. Bush replied. 'I've been around politics a long time. I understand when campaigns end and I know when governing begins. And I'm going to work with people of both parties. You know, look, people say unfortunate things at times. But if you hold grudges in this line of work, you're never going to get anything done. And my intention is to get some things done, and soon—we're start visiting with her Friday with the idea of coming together.' That is the sound of political graciousness. It would be nice to hear it from Mr. Obama on Wednesday." [67558]

Author Brad Thor tweets, "New drinking game --> After @GOP takes it tomorrow, let's count how many times @TheDemocrats start calling for 'compromise.'" [67368]

At WeeklyStandard.com Stephen Hayes notes the use of the term "Seinfeld election" in a multitude of articles. "Others posited something even worse. 'The 2014 campaign has been the most boring and uncreative campaign I can remember,' wrote *New York Times* columnist David Brooks. That wasn't harsh enough for Chris Cillizza at the *Washington Post*, who went further. The election isn't just 'boring,' he wrote, 'it's vapid and inconsequential.'" Hayes argues, "Not only is this election not about nothing, it is being fought over exactly the kinds of things that ought to determine our elections. It's about the size and scope of government. It's about the rule of law. It's about the security of the citizenry. It's about competence. It's about integrity. It's about honor. It's about a government that makes promises to those who have defended the country and then fails those veterans, again and again and again. It's about [Obama,] who offers soothing reassurances on his sweeping health care reforms and shrugs his shoulders when consumers learn those assurances were fraudulent. It's about government websites that cost billions but don't function and about 'smart power' that isn't very smart. It's about an administration that cares more about ending wars than winning them, and that claims to have decimated an enemy one day only to find that that enemy is still prosecuting its war against us the next. It's about shifting red lines and failed resets. It's about a [person] who ignores restrictions on his power when they don't suit him and who unilaterally rewrites laws that inconvenience him. It's about a powerful federal agency that targets citizens because of their political beliefs and a White House that claims ignorance of what its agents are up to because government is too 'vast.' In sum, this is an election

about a [man]who promised to restore faith in government and by every measure has done the opposite. As even Barack Obama acknowledges, the upcoming election is about his policies and those elected officials who have supported them. It's about an electorate determined to hold someone responsible for the policy failures that have defined this administration and the scandals that have consumed it—even if many in the fourth estate will not. And it's about time.” [67393, 67407]

DailySignal.com reports, “Seeking a more robust defense in the event of a bioterrorist attack on the United States, the Bush administration created a \$6 billion fund to prepare the nation for such threats, including the deadly Ebola virus. The Obama administration, however, has not used the range of tools and budget provided by the post-9/11 project, focusing instead on only three targets and diverting at least \$1 billion to other priorities, a review by The Daily Signal found. Nearly five years ago, in fact, the administration's own biodefense science board warned that project funds ‘should not be diverted to support other initiatives, regardless of the merit of other purposes.’ ...From 2004 to 2013, funding for Project BioShield was about \$560 million a year. When the original 10-year funding designation expired, Congress passed a measure—the Pandemic and All-Hazards Preparedness Reauthorization Act of 2013—that authorized up to \$2.8 billion for BioShield from 2014 to 2018. In the year since the original 10-year appropriation expired, Obama has sought significantly less than the original authorized annual funding. He requested \$250 million for fiscal 2014 and \$415 million for fiscal 2015.” [67371]

A case before the Supreme Court, *Zivotofsky v. Kerry*, involves a bizarre dispute about whether Jerusalem is in Israel. TimesofIsrael.com notes, “It's the second time the highest court in the US is considering the constitutionality of a 2002 law that directs the State Department to allow Israel as the country of birth in passports of American citizens born in Jerusalem. The issue is enmeshed in the morass of Middle East politics, and has been represented for the last 12 years by a passport dispute, focusing on whether Americans born in Jerusalem can list Israel as their place of birth. The disputed passport in question is that of Menachem Zivotofsky, a now 12-year-old boy who lives in Beit Shemesh but was born in Jerusalem [to U.S. citizen parents]. When Menachem was born in 2002, it was not long after Congress enacted the law ordering the State Department to consider Jerusalem as part of Israel when registering passports for children born to American citizens in Jerusalem. While Jerusalem is considered by Israel to be its capital city, the international community, including the United States, does not recognize Israel's sovereignty over the city. ...The US has refused to recognize any nation's sovereignty over Jerusalem since Israel's creation in 1948.” Some legislators want the United States to move its embassy in Israel from Jerusalem to Tel Aviv. In the meantime, Obama's State Department doesn't mind the passport listing “Jerusalem” as the place of birth, but it objects to listing it as “Jerusalem, Israel.” [67451, 67452, 67453, 67824]

TimesofIsrael.com describes a portion of the in-court proceedings: “Justice Sonia Sotomayor used strong language in support of the administration's position. Congress and the Zivotofskys are ‘asking the government to lie,’ Sotomayor said. When Alyza Lewin, the family's lawyer, protested, Sotomayor said, ‘How could you tell me it's not a

lie? You, the United States, are being asked to put on the passport that you believe the place of birth of this individual is Israel, and ...the executive [Obama administration] has said, 'No, we don't think it was Israel, we think it was Jerusalem.'" Pamela Geller writes, "Obama's lawyers argue that the case infringes on the president's executive right to conduct his antisemitic foreign policy. ...The 'wise Latina' [Sotomayor] is more stupid than wise, more antisemitic than judicial." [67451, 67452, 67453]

At Forbes.com, pharmacologist and freelance medical writer David Kroll reports, "The Associated Press and other press outlets have agreed not to report on suspected cases of Ebola in the United States until a positive viral RNA test is completed." (Whether that is the result of pressure from Obama's Ebola Czar, Rona Klain, is not reported.) [67459, 67460]

Project Veritas posts another undercover video featuring James O'Keefe showing how easy it is to cast an illegal vote in North Carolina. (O'Keefe simply accessed the state's voter registration lists, which contain more than 700,000 inactive voters, and selected a few dozen names of 30-year-old males from those 700,000. O'Keefe then went to early voting sites, asked if a particular name was on the list, and was given a form to sign and a ballot to vote. O'Keefe was careful not to say, "I am John Doe," which would be an illegal impersonation. Instead, he asked, "Do you have John Doe on the list?" O'Keefe did not sign any forms or actually vote, which would be illegal. But he proved how easy it would be to do so. He repeated the process about 20 times.) [67383, 67384, 67386, 67391, 67425, 67749]

According to the Heritage Foundation, there are about 2.8 million Americans registered to vote in two or more states, and the names of about 1.8 million dead Americans have yet to be removed from voter registration lists. [67444]

The U.S. Supreme Court declines to hear an appeal of a lawsuit challenging the filibuster rules of the U.S. Senate. (Article I, Section 5 of the U.S. Constitution states, "Each House shall be the judge of the elections, returns and qualifications of its own members, and a majority of each shall constitute a quorum to do business; but a smaller number may adjourn from day to day, and may be authorized to compel the attendance of absent members, in such manner, and under such penalties as each House may provide. Each House may determine the rules of its proceedings, punish its members for disorderly behavior, and, with the concurrence of two thirds, expel a member." HotAir.com notes, "*Four House Democrats* signed on for this case. ...Have they read the [Constitution]? Do they know what it means or where that section came from? And... how did this case make it all the way to the top?") [67426, 67427, 67428]

Congressman Luiz Gutierrez (D-IL) warns that there will be a "civil war" in the Democrat Party if Obama does not declare amnesty for illegal immigrants, "because Latinos will not be deciding whether or not they vote, but whether or not they are in the Democratic party." [67430, 67431]

CNSNews.com reports, “The United States Agency for International Development (USAID) is seeking large quantities of Personal Protection Equipment to be used by health care workers treating patients infected with the Ebola virus in West Africa, according to a procurement request posted on the federal business opportunities website, fedBizOpps.gov, on Friday. ...The list of items sought includes 1,080,000 face shields and the same number of surgeon’s gowns; 390,000 face masks with ‘duckbill style’ respirator and the same number of ‘bouffant cap;’ 22,500 2.5-ounce hand sanitizer; and 54,300 examination gloves in sizes small, medium and large. The announcement notes that all PPE has to be ‘packaged/assembled for required use in the field.’” [67432]

In the *Daily Mail*, former CNN host Piers Morgan, a former unabashed Obama supporter, lists “Ten reasons why bluffing, boring, blame-pointing Obama can expect a well-deserved shellacking in the midterm elections.” Morgan writes that Obama has “gone from being a shining, youthful beacon of audacious hope to a greying, increasingly defeatist purveyor of disappointment. ...So why has it all gone so horribly wrong? Here are ten reasons: “1. He breaks his promises... 2. His foreign policy stinks... 3. He’s a bluffer... 4. He can’t get the economy out of the tank... 5. He can’t even do the right things right... 6. He’s boring...7. He blames Republicans for everything... 8. He can’t negotiate... 9. He’s done nothing to improve the lives of minorities... 10. He persists in calling us all ‘folks.’” [67387]

On *America’s News Headquarters*, actor, investor, economist, and author Ben Stein observes, “What the White House is trying to do is racialize all politics, and they’re especially trying to tell the African-American voters that the GOP is against letting them have a chance at a good life in this economy, and that’s just a complete lie. I watch with fascination—with incredible fascination—all the stories about how the Democratic politicians, especially Hillary [Clinton], are trying to whip up the African-American vote and say, ‘Oh, the Republicans have policies against black people in terms of the economy.’ But there are no such policies. The Republicans want a vigorous economy the same as everyone else. That whole idea that the economy is being used in some way to oppress minorities is just an outrageous lie... The Republicans are every bit as much in favor of African-Americans having a good life, I’d say more in favor than the Democrats. The idea that the Republicans are in some way making life difficult for black people is just nonsense, absolute nonsense. They might as well say the Republicans are coming down from the moon, ...it’s just nonsense... The cuts [in a few federal programs] have been absolutely minuscule, absolutely tiny, unbelievably small, and much more important has been the fact that Republicans, by virtue of supporting the policies that stopped the crash in 2008-2009 from being a great depression, stopped a real economic catastrophe. ...The Republicans are the ones who *saved* this economy, not the ones that ruined this economy, and as I say, whatever little tiny cuts they made here or there in welfare programs and they were tiny, absolutely tiny. Look, by the way, let me back up a second... What are they talking about? More people are on food stamps than ever. More people are getting welfare than ever. What cuts are they talking about? More people are getting government subsidized health care than ever. What cuts are they talking about? It’s all a way to racialize voting in this country. [Obama] is the most racist [leader] there has ever been in America. He is purposely trying to use race to divide Americans.

Anyone who investigates it even a little bit knows it's hogwash." [67389, 67418]

According to TheHill.com, "The Department of Justice [DOJ] plans to send federal monitors to 18 states to watch for discrimination against voters. Monitors will head to Arizona, California, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Kansas, North Carolina, Nebraska, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas and Wisconsin." Whether the DOJ will prevent nightstick-wielding members of the New Black Panther Party from "patrolling" outside Philadelphia polling places is not known.) The DOJ states that monitors will make sure "jurisdictions are complying with the Voting Rights Act's requirement to provide bilingual election materials and assistance in areas of need." (Some might justifiably wonder why bilingual election materials must be provided. In order to vote one must be a U.S. citizen. Immigrants cannot become naturalized citizens unless they pass a test on the U.S. Constitution and an English test. If a voter cannot speak English, that suggests he is not a U.S. citizen.) [67392, 67408, 67423, 67439]

In Southern California, where Republican Chris Mitchum (son of actor Robert Mitchum) is trying to unseat Congresswoman Lois Capps (D-CA), the Capps campaign is forced to pull a campaign ad that intentionally misled voters. According to FoxNews.com, the ad "depicts Mitchum appearing to tell an interviewer that he does 'not intend to go to Washington to represent the 24th District.' The tape then cuts off and jumps to a Capps message of approval. The Mitchum remarks, though, actually come from a longer clip that shows him making a point about pet projects. What he actually said is he does not intend to go to Washington 'to bring back baseball fields. That's not why I'm going.'" [67399, 67400]

WashingtonExaminer.com reports, "In a sign that they expect heavy losses on election night, Democratic leaders have decided not to throw any big parties in D.C. to watch the returns come in. Instead, a few of the leaders will make themselves available to talk to reporters—and that appears to be it. Traditionally, the major national party organizations rent out space in downtown Washington for viewing parties—the Dems took a ballroom in November 2006 when polls, rightly, suggested they would ride a wave to power—though the biggest events are in presidential election years. In another sign of which party is optimistic this time around, the Republican National Committee said last week it had rented out the roof of the swanky W Hotel in downtown Washington to host its 2014 event. They will be able to watch the returns flow in while sipping cocktails on a terrace overlooking the White House itself, a clear signal they expect to have much to celebrate." [67401]

In a "NewsOne For Black America" interview, Michelle Obama tells Roland Martin, "And that's my message to voters. This isn't about Barack, it's not about the person on the ballot, it's about you. And for most of the people that [sic; who] we're talkin' [sic; talking] to [black listeners], a Democratic ticket is the clear ticket that we should be voting on, regardless of who said what or did this. That shouldn't even come into the equation. [What the candidates say or do is not relevant?] Voting is critical, not matter

who's on the ballot, and that's one of the things we have ta [sic; to] continually work on in our communities of new voters..." (In other words, "Black people should vote for the Democrats and not worry about why they are doing so.") Martin asks, "So can we, if we go out to the polls, can we, say, we have a 'souls to polls' ...can we do soul food after we vote?" Mrs. Obama replies, "Absolutely. I give everyone full permission to eat some fried chicken after they vote. Only after, if you haven't voted... You make a good point. Because I am, I do talk about health. But I think that a good victory for Democrats on Tuesday, you know, should be rewarded with some fried chicken." [67401, 67402, 67419, 67440, 67520, 67543]

HotAir.com reports on the disclosure of emails that show the White House pressured the Inspector General Richard Griffin to change his report on the Veterans Administration scandal. [67429]

Algemeiner.com reports, "In a dramatic development, Israeli cabinet members are warning that ...Obama threatened Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu that the US may opt not to oppose future hostile UN Security Council votes [against Israel], unless Israel accedes to American policy demands, Israel's NRG News reported on Sunday. 'The prime minister told colleagues in recent days ...that his office's understanding of the issue and the government's take on it is that the Americans will not cast a veto against a resolution that reaches the Security Council,' Ariel Kahana, diplomatic correspondent for the Makor Rishon and NRG dailies, told The Algemeiner on Monday, quoting ministerial-level sources. ...The threat, at least as leaked, implies that the United States is prepared to abandon Israel in the dock of the world body, a step that could further destabilize relations between the two allies to an unprecedented degree, Kahana said." (There are 15 members of the U.N. Security Council. Any of the five permanent members—China, France, Russia, the United Kingdom, and the United States—can block a resolution passed by the full council.) Pamela Geller writes, "Obama took his jihad against the Jews to the next level. ...The worst is yet to come after the election." [67454, 67455]

ANSamed.info reports, "The Islamic State (ISIS) has issued a statement saying that an Islamic Caliphate will be established in the Sinai, calling it the "first step towards the invasion of Jerusalem.' The statement threatens Egyptian security forces, which... suffered [sic] an attack on October 24. ISIS urged jihadists in the region to 'destroy police checkpoints and stations, launch RPGs at their gatherings and show the world that the Rule of God must be imposed.'" (Pamela Geller observes, "This announcement from the Islamic State exposes the hypocrisy of the anti-Israel narrative that the UN and Barack Obama and John Kerry so energetically push. The war against Israel isn't about land or settlements or occupation. It is an Islamic jihad. No negotiations will end it. It is about destroying Israel totally and setting up an Islamic government on its land.") [67457, 67458]

On *Andrea Mitchell Reports*, the discussion of a possible GOP takeover of the Senate prompts Tom Brokaw to say, "The question then is, what are they [Republicans] prepared

to give to the Democrats to meet them in the middle ground? What are they going to do about immigration? What are they going to do about the minimum wage?” (The statement is remarkable. Since Obama entered the White House the Democrats in Congress have essentially refused to give *one inch* to the Republicans on almost every issue—and Brokaw expects the Republicans to “play nice” with their political enemies. Absurd as Brokaw’s comment is, it is not surprising, and it will no doubt be persistently repeated by the mainstream media.) [67422, 67433, 67535]

Obama’s National Security Advisor, Susan Rice, continues to display her dislike of Jews and Israel. FreeBeacon.com reports that Rice “rudely mocked Israel’s ambassador during a recent meeting with an American Jewish leader. Rice... was asked in a recent meeting with a top American Jewish leader why she had not taken meetings with Israeli Ambassador Ron Dermer. ‘Rice responded, with her characteristic sarcasm, ‘He never asked to meet me,’” Haaretz reported Rice as saying. [Rice] then mocked Dermer and conservative casino magnate Sheldon Adelson. ‘Besides, I understood that he’s too busy traveling to Sheldon Adelson’s events in Las Vegas,’ Rice reportedly said with contempt.” (In March, Dermer was guest of honor at a gathering of the Republican Jewish Coalition.) [67405, 67406]

MSNBC’s Ronan Farrow and former New Mexico Governor Bill Richardson wonder why Democrat candidates have not “tout[ed] foreign policy and this administration’s track record on it as a success on the campaign trail...” (It may be that the Democrat candidates could not think of any Obama foreign policy successes.) [67441]

On *The Kelly File*, Charles Krauthammer says, “This [election] is a referendum on Obama’s hyper-liberalism. ...And this isn’t only the Party *in* government, this is the party *of* government. This is liberalism on trial. I can assure you that if the Democrats pull off a miracle and do well tomorrow night, [White House press secretary] Josh Earnest is gonna [sic] be up there on the podium on Wednesday saying, ‘Of course this was a national referendum on Obama and Obamaism.’ You say it isn’t if you know you’re gonna [sic] lose. ...It is of course an election about Obama, his record and his performance, but also I think it shows you a couple of things. One is, I think Republicans have run a fairly gaffe-free campaign. The gaffes have been on the other side, particularly this sort of overreach on the ‘war on women’ which has become almost a joke in a place like Colorado where the [leftist] *Denver Post* endorsed the Democrat’s opponent, calling Mark Udall ‘Senator Uterus’ for going completely overboard with what they called an obnoxious one-issue campaign. You get Senator [Mary] Landrieu, a female Senator from Louisiana, reelected *three times* [sic; elected once and reelected twice], claiming a week ago that, you know, she’s not doing that well because of the sexism that exists in the South. It’s becoming sort of a joke.” Asked by Megyn Kelly why the Republicans are not even further ahead, Krauthammer observes that they are running against “pedigreed” Democrat candidates, whose family names “carry a lot of weight.” (While not approaching Kennedy stature, the political names Begich, Landrieu, Pryor, Begich, Nunn, and Carter have a long history, and Democrats with those names automatically gain some votes.) [67407]

The Department of Justice releases 64,280 documents related to Operation Fast and Furious, after a judge's order. (They include emails in which Attorney General Eric Holder says his critics could "kiss my ass.") The next day, Congressman Darrell Issa (R-CA), chairman of the House Oversight and Government Reform Committee, states, "When Eric Holder wants to know why he was the first Attorney General held in criminal contempt of Congress, he can read the judge's order that compelled the production of 64,280 pages that he and ...Obama illegitimately and illegally withheld from Congress. Since these pages still do not represent the entire universe of the documents the House of Representatives is seeking related to the Justice Department's cover-up of the botched gun-walking scandal that contributed to the death of a Border Patrol agent, our court case will continue. I am deeply concerned that some redactions to these documents may still be inappropriate and contrary to the judge's order in the case. This production is nonetheless a victory for the legislative branch, a victory for transparency, and a victory for efforts to check Executive Branch power. As the production is extensive and may contain sensitive information, our investigative staff will be carefully examining the documents turned over last night." The committee issues a statement: "...[Obama] and the Attorney General attempted to extend the scope of the Executive Privilege well beyond its historical boundaries to avoid disclosing documents that embarrass or otherwise implicate senior Obama Administration officials. In effect, last night's production is an admission that the Justice Department never had legitimate grounds to withhold these documents in the first place. Approximately two-thirds of the universe of documents that the Justice Department withheld from Congress has now been shown to be well outside the scope of Executive Privilege." (The Obama administration delayed the release of the documents as long as it could. By waiting until the evening before election day it is assured that Oversight committee investigators will not be able to review any controversial documents until well after the votes have been counted.) [67413, 67414, 67438, 67733, 67755, 67768]

On November 4, election day, some voters in Bexar County, Texas encounter voting machines that list Democrat Wendy Davis as candidate for governor but list GOP lieutenant governor candidate David Dewhurst as the GOP governor candidate in place of actual candidate Greg Abbott. (If Bexar County is the only county Davis wins, the reason will be obvious.) [67409, 67410, 67411]

Townhall.com's Katie Pavlich reports on voting irregularities in several areas of the country, notably with machines changing the voter's selection of the Republican candidate to the Democrat candidate. In Overland Park, Kansas, votes for Republican Pat Roberts are changed by the machines to opponent Greg Orman. In some congressional districts in Virginia, voters complain that the touch-screen sensors on the machines are not properly lined up with the text. In Connecticut, voter registration lists are not delivered to the polling places on time. [67412, 67421]

In Minneapolis, ballots show the name "Captain Jack Sparrow" as the name of a candidate for county commissioner. [67417]

On *Morning Joe*, Politico.com's Jim VandeHei says, "[E]ven if Republicans win, I think they're going to be in a hell of a jam. In that they're not going to be able to get anything done." Mika Brzezinski adds, "[I]f they win the Senate tonight and they have a really good night, the Republicans, it will only embolden their more self-destructive ways. ... I think if the Republicans have a really bad night, it might open the door for a reasonable Republican who can actually win the election, because they would really correct." (By "reasonable Republican" she means "Democrat-lite.") [67529]

Author and Fox News commentator Monica Crowley tweets, "So I just voted in NYC where it doesn't count, & I had 5 people each pull me aside & whisper 'we're voting Republican too!'" [67415]

The leftist magazine *The New Republic* tweets, "Joni Ernst is going to win because there was no local journalism to stop her." (The magazine apparently believes the job of journalists is not to report the news but to stop Republicans from getting elected.) [67416]

In an interview with WPLR, Vice President Joe Biden says U.S. Senate candidate Greg Orman will caucus with the Democrats if he wins his race against Senator Pat Roberts (R-KS). (The unprincipled Orman, who is unlikely to win, has stated that he will caucus with whichever party controls the Senate.) [67434]

Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell (R-KY) easily wins reelection—by 16 points. McConnell says, "Tomorrow, the papers will say I won this race, but the truth is... tonight we begin another one, one that's far more important than mine—and that's the race to turn this country around. ... It's time to go in a new direction. It's time to turn this country around. And I will not let you down. ... I work hard to bring your concerns to Washington and I will not let up. So tonight I pledge you this. Whether you're a coal miner in eastern Kentucky who can't find work, or a mom in Paducah who doesn't understand why the government just took away her family's health insurance—I've heard your concerns. I've made them my own. You will be heard in Washington. ... And look, when you got right down to it, that's what this campaign was really all about. It wasn't about me or my opponent. It was about a government that people no longer trust to carry out its most basic duties to keep them safe; to protect the border; to provide dignified and quality care for our veterans. A government that can't be trusted to do the basic things because it's too busy focusing on things it shouldn't be focused on at all. A government that's too busy imposing its view of the world on people who don't share that view. Too many in Washington have forgotten that their job is to serve. ... I don't expect [Obama] to wake up tomorrow and view the world any differently than he did when he woke up this morning. He knows I won't either. But look, we do have an obligation to work together on issues where we can agree. I think we have a duty to do that. Just because we have a two party system doesn't mean we have to be in perpetual conflict. I think I've shown that to be true at critical times in the past. I hope [Obama] gives me the chance to show it again." [67479, 67533, 67538, 67866]

Senator Lindsey Graham (R-SC) wins reelection.

Senator Tim Scott (R-SC) wins reelection, capturing 61 percent of the vote. [67627, 67984]

In South Carolina, Republican Governor Nikki Haley wins reelection.

Congresswoman Shelley Moore Capito (R-WV) wins the Senate race in West Virginia, defeating Democrat Natalie Tennant by a whopping 28 percentage points, for the first GOP Senate pickup. [67870]

In Ohio, Republican Governor John Kasich easily wins reelection, winning almost every voting group and even 60 percent of the female vote. Kasich wins 64 percent of the total vote, against his Democrat challenger Edward Fitzgerald's 33 percent. (Fitzgerald's running mate is Sharen Neuhardt, a former board member of Miami Valley's Planned Parenthood.) [67896]

Democrat Tom Wolf defeats Governor Tom Corbett in Pennsylvania. (Pennsylvania is the only state where an incumbent Republican governor loses, and Corbett was the only Republican governor to have raised gasoline taxes.) [68146]

U.S. Senate race victories go to Thad Cochran (R-MS), Lamar Alexander (R-TN), Susan Collins (R-ME), Jeff Sessions (R-AL), James Inhofe (R-OK), James Lankford (R-OK), Mike Enzi (R-WY), John Cornyn (R-TX), Dick Durbin (D-IL), Al Franken (D-MN), Cory Booker (D-NJ), Jack Reed (D-RI), Chris Coons (D-DE), and Ed Markey (D-MA).

Republican challenger Tom Cotton defeats Senator Mark Pryor (D-AR) by 17 points—despite Bill Clinton's many visits to Arkansas on behalf of Pryor—for the second GOP pickup of the night. [67483, 67866, 67936]

Republican candidate Asa Hutchinson wins the Arkansas governor race—as does every Republican candidate for Congress. (Democrat Bill Clinton's home state now has a Republican governor, two Republican Senators, and an all-GOP House delegation.)

Republican candidate Mike Rounds wins the U.S. Senate race in South Dakota, for a third GOP pick-up.

By a 20-point margin, Republican Gregg Abbott defeats Wendy “Abortion Barbie” Davis in the Texas gubernatorial race. Davis not only loses the male vote; she also loses the female vote—although she wins the black and Hispanic segments of the female vote. (On June 30, 2013, MSNBC's Ed Schultz said, “If I were Wendy Davis, I would not limit myself to think about just being the governor of Texas. I think that she is a star. I think she has the guts, the political moxie. She is exactly what women in this country have

been begging for.”) [67588, 67622, 67626, 67706, 67953]

Democrat Governor Andrew Cuomo wins reelection in New York.

Democrat candidate Gary Peters wins the U.S. Senate race in Michigan.

Republican Ben Sasse wins the open U.S. Senate race in Nebraska.

Republican Governor Rick Snyder wins reelection in Michigan. [67496]

Senator Jeanne Shaheen (D-NH) defeats Republican challenger Scott Brown. (More than a few observers believe Brown lost because he is far from conservative and was not supported by Tea Party voters. WND.com notes that Scott’s campaign platform was labeled “Democrat Lite.”) [67481, 67746, 67747]

The Louisiana Senate race heads to a runoff election on December 6 because neither Senator Mary Landrieu (D-LA) nor her two GOP challengers received at least 50 percent of the vote. (Republican Bill Cassidy, who came in second, is likely to win the runoff because he will gain most of the votes of the candidates who came behind him and Landrieu.) [67478]

Congressman Cory Gardner (R-CO) defeats Senator Mark Udall (D-CO), giving the GOP four Senate pickups. [67482, 67504]

New Mexico Governor Susana Martinez wins reelection.

Republican Steve Daines wins the U.S. Senate race in Montana, defeating socialist Amanda Curtis—and giving the GOP its fifth Senate pickup. [67486]

Republican Governor Terry Branstad wins reelection in Iowa.

Republican Evan Jenkins defeats longtime Congressman Nick Rahall (D-WV) in West Virginia’s 3rd District.

By 10 p.m., it is clear that the Republicans will not only retain control of the House of Representatives, they will pick up at least 10 seats. [68250]

Republican Governor Scott Walker (a possible 2016 presidential candidate) wins reelection in Wisconsin—despite visits to the state by Obama and his wife Michelle on behalf of Democrat candidate Mary Burke. (Despite the Democrats having spent a fortune in an unsuccessful effort to unseat Walker, TheDailyBeast.com’s Ana Marie Cox writes that he was “too boring to beat.”) [67477, 67500, 67935, 67954]

Maine's Republican Governor Paul LePage surprises many by winning reelection, partly on a platform of slashing funds for cities that give illegal immigrants welfare benefits. [68060, 68061]

In Iowa, Republican Joni Ernst defeats Congressman Bruce Braley (D-IA) by nine points to win the U.S. Senate seat of retiring Democrat Senator Tom Harkin. Ernst's victory gives the GOP its sixth Senate seat pickup—and control of the Senate. (Without even waiting for Ernst to be sworn in, CNN's Dana Bash says that because Ernst is conservative “she's going to be a one-term senator.” MSNBC's Luke Russert says Ernst has “rather extreme Tea Party views.”) [67586, 67866]

Doubling his share of the black vote since his last election with his school choice policies, Republican Governor Rick Scott wins reelection in Florida, defeating former governor, Republican-turned-Independent-turned-Democrat Charlie “opportunist” Crist. (Whether Crist will switch gender for a future election is not yet known.) [67484, 67503, 67800, 67815]

Senator Tom Udall (D-NM) wins reelection.

Republican candidate Doug Ducey wins the governor's office in Arizona. [67502]

In Georgia, Republican David Perdue wins the U.S. Senate seat by eight points, defeating Democrat Michelle Nunn—and getting past the 50 percent threshold to avoid a runoff election. (Nunn receives only 28 percent of the white vote. Georgia voters clearly believe the Democrat Party no longer resembles the party of her father, former four-term Senator Sam Nunn. Still, Nunn may run again in 2016, when Senator Johnny Isakson (R-GA) is up for reelection.) [67476, 67501, 67713, 67866]

Senator Pat Roberts (R-KS), with the help of a big shakeup of his campaign team in the final weeks, wins reelection by 11 points, defeating so-called “Independent” Greg Orman. [67462, 67487, 67494, 67866]

Georgia Governor Nathan Deal defeats Democrat challenger Jason Carter, the grandson of Jimmy Carter. [67498]

In Maryland, Republican Larry Hogan defeats Democrat Anthony Brown by five points to become the state's next governor. (Hogan's victory is a clear rejection by the voters of the policies of incumbent Governor Martin O'Malley, which further diminishes his chances of being a viable Democrat presidential candidate in 2016. Even though Hillary Clinton campaigned for Brown, she may be pleased that Hogan, who pledged to reverse O'Malley's tax increases, beat the Democrat.) [67601, 67866]

In Connecticut, Democrat Governor Dannel Malloy defeats GOP challenger Tom Foley.

In Illinois, Democrat-turned-Republican-in-Name-Only Bruce Rauner defeats Democrat Governor Pat Quinn by five points. (MSNBC's Chris Matthews reacts, "Unbelievable. This is amazing." Andrea Mitchell piled on, saying, "It's also, uh, a real blow to ...Obama. There's no way you can't call it a blow to ...Obama because he campaigned for him [Quinn]. That was one race that [Obama] really did want to win." (Why Matthews, or anyone else, should be surprised that Quinn lost is unclear. The debt-ridden state is a fiscal disaster and everyone knows it. Residents already saw their income taxes raised under Quinn and were not eager for him to do it again.) [67461, 67474, 67497, 67599, 67723, 67866, 67981]

Republican Thom Tillis defeats Senator Kay Hagan (D-NC), giving the GOP seven wins over Democrats. (Hagan won her seat in 2008 only because of the massive youth vote that turned out for Obama. Without the under-30 vote she would have lost. In 2014, Hagan won the age 25-29 vote by a 50-34 margin, but won the age 18-24 vote by only 47-44. Across the country, many of 2008's first-time voters have remained true to the Democrats, but the new, younger voters are less dedicated to the Democrats—perhaps because instead of "hope and change" placards they have mostly encountered "not hiring" signs. Nevertheless, no one should be surprised if Hagan runs again in 2016, challenging Senator Richard Burr (R-NC).) [67475, 67707]

Republican Charlie Baker defeats Democrat Martha Coakley to win the governor's race in Massachusetts. [67469, 67495]

Baker, like Republican Governor Sam Brownback of Kansas, Republican Governor Rick Snyder of Michigan, and winning Republican gubernatorial candidates Larry Hogan in Maryland, Charlie Baker in Massachusetts, Bruce Rauner in Illinois, all ran on conservative tax policies. That they all won victories may be a signal that the voters have had enough of the Democrats' tax-and-spend policies. [67951]

In Utah, Mia Love wins the Congressional race in the state's 4th district, becoming the first black Republican woman ever elected to Congress. (At HuffingtonPost.com Darron Smith claims she benefitted from "white privilege.") [67442, 67489, 67604, 67794]

Congressman Joe Garcia (D-FL) loses to Republican Carlos Curbelo.

Congressman Brad Schneider (D-IL) loses to Republican Robert Dold.

Congressman William Enyart (D-IL) loses to Republican Mike Bost.

Congresswoman Carol Shea-Porter (D-NH) loses to Republican Frank Guinta.

Congressman Timothy Bishop (D-NY) loses to Republican Lee Zeldin.

Republican Dave Brat, who defeated Congressman Eric Cantor (R-VA) in the GOP primary, defeats his Democrat opponent.

In New York's 21st district, Republican Elise Stefanik becomes the youngest woman (age 30) ever elected to Congress, defeating Democrat Aaron Woolf. [67532, 67604]

In West Virginia, 18-year-old Republican, college freshman, and NRA member Saira Blair wins a state senate race. [67532]

In California, Sandra "I demand free birth control" Fluke loses a state senate seat contest by 21 percent. [67488, 67600]

In Texas, George P. Bush, grandson of former President George H.W. Bush and son of former Florida Governor Jeb Bush, is elected state land commissioner. [67490]

On MSNBC, Chris Matthews asks, "How does [Obama] not read this as a rejection of his name, of his party, of his agenda? How does he not read that?" [67470]

At TheHill.com, Justin Sink writes, "Democrats dismayed with the loss of the Senate are pointing the finger squarely at ...Obama. In race after race across the country, vulnerable Democrats were unable to shed the shadow of a deeply unpopular White House. Voters appeared eager to punish Obama after two years defined by crisis and mismanagement, and Republicans saw consistent success by labeling their opponents as potential rubber stamps for [Obama]. Sen. Joe Manchin (D-WV) said [Obama's] energy policies 'absolutely' hurt Democratic chances among voters in coal country and that voters in his state had the 'perception of the government attacking them, which basically is what's happening.' 'It doesn't make sense that we have to fight so hard against our own government and our own administration and our president to try to find a balance,' Manchin told MSNBC. According to exit polls, two-thirds of voters believe the country is on the wrong track, and half disapprove of [Obama's] job performance. As the dust settled Tuesday night, top Democratic aides and strategists vented frustration with an administration they say could have done more to help the party out. 'It was ...Obama dragging candidates down across the country,' one Senate Democratic aide said. 'It was a tough map to start with, and his numbers were especially bad in these states, making it that much harder to overcome.' They lamented that [Obama] repeatedly nationalized the election, even though he knew he was unpopular in many 2014 battleground states. ... 'It's an inescapable fact that this election was more about Obama and frustration with his [administration] than any other factor,' said one prominent Democratic strategist. 'You can blame, in some cases, bad strategy, bad candidacy, bad ads—but the one ring that unites them all was anger and frustration toward Obama's policies.'" [67492]

In Oregon, voters overwhelmingly support "Measure 88," which would prohibit illegal

immigrants from being given driver's licenses—despite the fact that the pro-license advocates outspent their opponents by a 10-to-1 margin. The Center for Immigration Studies' Mark Krikorian observes, "Whenever the public gets that sort of clear-cut, black-and-white issue for tougher controls—even in Oregon, when they're legalizing dope—they support them. It really highlights how this issue is not a Republican-liberal issue like, say, taxes and abortion, but an up-down issue, elites versus the public." (In other words, Obama may be dead wrong if he believes the public will support his executive order giving illegal immigrants amnesty. Obama and his fellow Democrats want "comprehensive" legislation because that makes it easier to hide the details. But his amnesty order will be a blatant affront to every law-abiding American—and every law-abiding *legal* immigrant.) [67509, 68149]

A medical marijuana referendum fails in Florida, but voters approve the legalization of "recreational marijuana" in Oregon, Alaska, and Washington, D.C. (Under Florida law, state constitutional amendments require 60 percent of the vote to pass. The medical marijuana measure receives 57.6 percent.) Minimum wage increases are approved by the voters in Alaska, Arkansas, Nebraska, and South Dakota. [67548, 67712, 68131]

In Arizona, voters approve Proposition 122, which ConservativeTribune.com calls "an important amendment to the state constitution that enshrines nullification, or anti-commandeering. Specifically, it allows the state to "exercise its sovereign authority to restrict the actions of its personnel and the use of its financial resources to purposes that are consistent with the Constitution. This amendment, approved by a 2.8% margin, will make it easier for Arizonans to refuse to enforce federal laws, forcing Washington to do its own dirty work. Under the provision, voters could hold referendums on withholding state resources from enforcing Obamacare, federal impingement on American's Second Amendment rights, NSA spying programs, and other measures, according to the Tenth Amendment Center. Other states have considered nullification measures as a method of pushing back on the massive, unconstitutional expansion of federal government by unelected bureaucrats in federal agencies under ...Obama or any future White House occupant, but this is believed to be the first amendment to a state constitution with such a broad scope. Arizonans could have held such referendums at any time, but adding this language to the state's constitution means that such referendums will now be statutory, rather than constitutional, making it easier—and far less expensive—to get on the ballot for the people to decide." [67751]

In Alabama, voters pass a constitutional amendment prohibiting the use of foreign laws (and Islamic Shari'ah law) in state courts. The amendment bars state courts from applying "any law, rule or legal code system used outside of the United States or by any other people, group or culture different from the people of the United States or the States of Alabama." [67756]

Syndicated columnist Charles Krauthammer observes that the Republicans "are now in a position to seize the agenda. That's what was at stake with control of the Senate. Obama had control of the agenda; Harry Reid had control of the agenda, because he suppressed

everything that the Republicans in the House had proposed and passed. So now it's in the hands of Republicans. They have to demonstrate, and they have the opportunity now, that they have a mandate, that they have actually a program for the country. This election was not about Republican ideas. It was about opposition to Obama and it has been spoken. Right now Republicans have two years to show that they can govern. ...Republicans ought to have an agenda where they pass a bill a week. They can start small, Keystone, it could be trade authority which Obama is seeking, it can be destroying ObamaCare in blows, for example, the abolition of the medical device tax that Democrats support, but you go one by one by one, start small, start narrow, and then you go to the big things, like corporate and individual tax reform. On that agenda you can run and you can win in 2016." [67519]

NBC's Tom Brokaw comments, "I don't think that this was a big, ideological election as much as it was, 'We want to change the team. We want to find somebody who can get things done.' Will they [the voters] fall out of love with Republicans that they have elected to office? That all depends on how the Republicans take control of the Senate now and the Congress. They're going to be looking at 2016. No one wants to go into the presidential election with the attitude that the country had going into this election. And to change all of that, they're going to have to get some things done. They're going to have to reach across the [party] lines a little bit. When [Senator Rob] Portman [R-OH] and even [Senator Mitch] McConnell [R-KY] and others are talking about, 'Now we have a chance for tax reform' and so on, that means the Democrats are going to have a place at the table as well. So I think we've got a long way to go and it's very hard, at this point, to conjecture about how they may behave. Does McConnell back away from repealing, for example, [the] Affordable Care [Act]? Will we not hear about Benghazi again for a while and all the other issues that have been coming up? It was not so long ago a lot of Republicans said impeach [Obama]. Do they want to go there? That's not the message that the country has sent." (Brokaw was not calling for the GOP to be given "a place at the table" before the election. Suddenly, with the other party winning, Brokaw decides everyone should have a say. Further, there were never "a lot of Republicans" in Congress calling for Obama's impeachment. Brokaw's claim is absurd.) [67525]

NBC's Andrea Mitchell claims Republican candidates "tried to focus on ISIS and Ebola in the scariest, most non-factual ways to take the, the, you know, the eye off the real, the real issues, which were the economy. Because Democrats were dumb enough to not say, 'Let's talk about the economy. Let's talk about pocket book issues.'" (On CNN, Carol Costello makes the same claim about Republican focus on Ebola, apparently forgetting that the issue is only a few weeks old and could hardly have had much impact on the election.) [67526, 67527]

At 10:04 p.m., NBC's Chuck Todd says, "What I would say is that everybody is holding serve. Okay? It's a good Republican night, but it's not a wave." Then, notes MRC.org, "at 10:49 p.m., Todd said this about the current state of affairs of the midterm elections: 'I think we're bordering on calling this a wave election.'" [67528, 67535]

Laughably, outgoing Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid (D-MN) states, “I’d like to congratulate Senator [Mitch] McConnell [R-KY], who will be the new Senate majority leader. The message from voters is clear: They want us to work together. I look forward to working with Senator McConnell to get things done for the middle class.” (For six years Reid has chosen not to work with the Republicans. Now that he will be in the minority, cooperation is suddenly fashionable.) On Fox News, Democrat pollster Pat Caddell comments, “The man [Reid] is a disgrace to democracy. I want to say this as a Democrat: I think at some point you should stand up for your country as an American.” [67533, 67547, 67605]

Exit polls shows that Republicans received more support than usual from Jewish voters: about 33 percent. (It was only 11 percent in 1992.) [67567]

Exit polls also indicate that Republican candidates did better than expected among Hispanic voters. (Newsmax.com later reports, “In Texas... Republican Greg Abbott won 44 percent of the Hispanic vote while Democrat Wendy Davis took 55 percent... In 2010, Republican Gov. Rick Perry had just 38 percent of Latinos... In Georgia... Republican Gov. Nathan Deal snagged his re-election with 47 percent of Hispanic voters behind him; in the Senate race there, conservative GOP businessman David Perdue got 42 percent of the Latino votes while Democrat Michelle Nunn pulled in 57 percent, exit polls showed. Kansas GOP incumbent Gov. Sam Brownback netted 47 percent of the Latino vote, compared with Democratic challenger Paul Davis, who got 46 percent, exit polls showed. The gains are significant, The [New York] Times notes: in the 2012 presidential race, GOP nominee Mitt Romney won only 27 percent of the Hispanic vote while ...Obama was re-elected with 71 percent.”) [67578, 67622, 67706]

According to *The New York Times*, an unnamed White House aide says Obama “doesn’t feel repudiated” by the election results. [67536, 67537]

WashingtonExaminer.com quotes one senior House Republican: “Couldn’t [Obama] have visited just a few more states? Everything he touched turned to crap.” [67573]

On November 5 election results show the Republicans with 52 Senate seats, with three races undecided. Votes are still being counted in Alaska, where Republican Dan Sullivan leads incumbent Democrat Mark Begich by 8,000 votes with only absentee ballots left to be tallied. In Virginia (where voters in at least 11 precincts complained that machines switched their votes from the Republican to the Democrat), incumbent Democrat Mark Warner leads GOP challenger Ed Gillespie by a small margin with 95 percent of the vote counted. No candidate reached 50 percent in Louisiana. That forces a runoff election in early December—in which Republican Bill Cassidy is expected to defeat incumbent Democrat Mary Landrieu. (Most observers assume the GOP will win Alaska and Louisiana, giving the Republicans 54 Senate seats.) [67443, 67445, 67447, 67448, 67449, 67450, 67466, 67467, 67468, 67471, 67478, 67480, 67485, 67493, 67499, 67507, 67523, 67531, 67534, 67552, 67554]

Every Republican who won a Senate seat campaigned on a platform that included the repeal of ObamaCare. [67577]

In the House, Republicans win 243 seats to the Democrats' 175, with the remaining races still undecided. [67445, 67447, 67448, 67449, 67450, 67466, 67467, 67471, 67473, 67493, 67507, 67570]

In addition to gaining seats in the House and winning control of the Senate, Republicans scored major victories in state legislatures across the country and will control 69 out of 98 (House and Senate) chambers. Although Democrats lost control of some state houses, they gained none. [67564, 67580, 67786]

In West Virginia, Democrat State Senator Daniel Hall breaks an upper chamber tie by switching his allegiance to the Republican Party. In Missouri, Representative Linda Black switches from Democrat to Republican. [67666]

Since Obama entered the White House, Democrats have lost at least 69 House seats and at least 13 Senate seats—the worst record since Harry Truman was president. [67582]

Despite pushing a “Republican war on women” theme, many female Democrat candidates lose, while many Republican women win—much to the chagrin of many media leftists. [67507, 67585]

According to exit polls, nationwide, Republicans won 52 percent of the total vote, 56 percent of the male vote, 53 percent of the age 45-64 vote, 57 percent of the age 65+ vote, 60 percent of the white vote, and 58 percent of the married vote. Democrats won 52 percent of the female vote, 54 percent of the age 18-29 vote, 50 percent of the age 30-44 vote, 89 percent of the black vote, 63 percent of the Hispanic vote, 50 percent of the Asian vote, and 56 percent of the unmarried vote. [67674]

In Colorado, the age 18-29 vote falls to 14 percent, compared to 20 percent in 2012—when a referendum to legalize marijuana was on the ballot. [67590, 67591]

Voters in Berkeley, California approve a one cent-per-ounce tax on soft drinks. (Pushing the tax was former New York City mayor Michael “Nanny” Bloomberg, who spent \$650,000 on the campaign.) San Francisco voters reject a similar tax proposal. [67596]

On the *Today* show, leftist host Matt Lauer says to New Jersey Governor Chris Christie, “Republicans have control of the House and Senate for the first time in eight years... In January, voters are gonna [sic] say, ‘What are you going to do with the power?’ Opposing [Obama’s] policy is not a policy. Specifically, what can Republicans do with this power?” Christie replies, “...People want to get things done. That’s why Republican governors were elected last night—re-elected and new ones elected, Matt—because governors get things done. That’s what the country wants.” Lauer pushes again: “Tell me

specifically one area where you would like this new Republican majority to compromise, real compromise, with ...Obama.” Christie, refusing to accept the premise of the question, responds, “Listen, I think that what the Republican majority needs to do first is to grow jobs in this country and then have prosperity. And I think the two things they need to do is tax reform and a national energy policy. And [Obama] needs to sit down and get that done with Republicans in Congress. And it should be able to get done.” (In other words, “It’s now time for Obama to learn how to compromise.”) [67545]

Matthews asks colleague Joy Reid, “What do you think is the good news that might come tonight for people that [sic; who] want to have good news tonight?” (That is, “Is there any good election news for Democrats?”) Reid replies, “Oh, that’s a good question, Chris, yeah, I know, right. Good news?” Reid responded. “Well, you know what? I... I... I don’t know what the good news would be. I think that if, for Democrats, the best news that could come out of it if Democrats were to lose the Senate, I guess, if you’re a Democrat and looking toward the future, would be that if the Senate is more like the House, maybe the overreach would make it easier to rebound two years later, ’cause I see nothing but gridlock ahead either way ’cause it’s gonna be such a closely-held Senate, either way it’s gonna be very close.” [67472, 67535]

At WGBHnews.com, PBS’ Dan Kennedy warns that the election of Republicans means Americans have “turned their backs on the planet. By handing over the Senate to [Senate Minority Leader] Mitch McConnell and his merry band of Republicans, voters all but ensured that no progress will be made on climate change during the next two years—and that even some tenuous steps in the right direction may be reversed.” [67583, 67584]

With Obama becoming the lamest of lame ducks, he prepares to deliver an afternoon address to comment on the election results.

On Facebook, Sarah Palin writes, “The Democrats got mauled today, deservedly so. To prohibit that from happening to the GOP in 2016, it must learn the lesson from the last time Republicans held the Senate majority. This time they must not retreat, and it’s our responsibility to hold them accountable. ...Now, new Republican Congressional majority in the House and Senate, please realize that Americans were not necessarily voting FOR any party; they were voting AGAINST the continued dysfunction and corruption in D.C. We the People were saying ‘enough is enough’ to the scandals, crony capitalism, and utter lack of leadership in Washington.” [67446]

Soon-to-be-Senate Majority Leader Mitch McConnell (R-KY) states, “The Senate in the last few years basically didn’t do anything. The first thing I need to do is get the Senate back to normal.” (Current Majority Leader Harry Reid (D-NV) will likely not be challenged if he elects to run for Senate Minority Leader.) [67464, 67465]

Senator Mitch McConnell (R-KY) is asked if the new GOP-controlled Senate will have hearings on the IRS/Lois Lerner scandal. He replies, “Oh, you can bet on that.” [67517,

67518]

House Majority Leader John Boehner (R-OH) states, “It’s time for government to start getting results and implementing solutions to the challenges facing our country, starting with our still-struggling economy. Americans can expect the new Congress to debate and vote soon on the many common-sense jobs and energy bills that passed the Republican-led House in recent years with bipartisan support but were never even brought to a vote by the outgoing Senate majority, as well as solutions offered by Senate Republicans that were denied consideration. I’ve also put forth a five-point roadmap for harnessing the emerging energy boom in America, resetting our economy and restoring the American Dream for our children and grandchildren. It calls for fixing our tax code, solving our spending problem, reforming our legal system, reforming our regulatory system, and improving our education system. ...This is a time for solutions to get our economy moving again, and we’re eager to get to work.” [67539]

WISTV.com reports, “Just over 12 hours after the Republican Party captured control of the Senate from the Democrats, South Carolina Sen. Lindsey Graham [R-SC] says he’s already been in touch with ...Obama on how to move forward. ‘[Obama] called last night,’ Graham said. ‘We had a rather lengthy discussion. I think [Obama] was very sincere in wanting to find common ground. Only time will tell.’ Graham says he and [Obama] discussed the country’s infrastructure needs and spoke ‘a bit’ about immigration.’ ...Graham says he continues to believe there is bipartisan action on immigration reform. Just last year, Graham was part of a bipartisan group of senators who drafted and ultimately passed a comprehensive immigration reform bill through the Senate. The House of Representatives, however, never took up the bill.” (That Obama telephoned Graham is revealing. He chose to speak with a weak-kneed “Republican In Name Only” who had already signed onto a terrible immigration bill.) [67770]

The humility-challenged Obama holds a press conference, in which he refuses to accept any responsibility for the disaster the Democrats had in the just-held mid-term elections. He again calls for infrastructure spending, an increase in the minimum wage, amnesty for illegal immigrants, and subsidized child care, and suggests he would work with the Republicans to get things done. But Obama’s underlying message is clear: he will “cooperate” with the GOP only if it caves in to his demands. Some will argue that he “used the right words,” but others will comment that there is not a “spirit of compromise” bone in his body. Obama says, “Obviously Republicans had a good night and deserve credit for running good campaigns, [but] we are simply more than a collection of blue and red states.” (Of course, for six years Obama and his fellow Democrats have done their best to pay as little attention as possible to the wishes of Republicans.) “Congress will pass some bills that I cannot sign and I will take some actions that Congress will not like.” (That is, “Be prepared for quite a few vetoes.”) [67464, 67508, 67511, 67512, 67513, 67514, 67515, 67546, 67551, 67559, 67560, 67562, 67569, 67571, 67581, 67589, 67597]

On the issue of a possible illegal immigrant amnesty executive order, Obama says, “If

you send me a bill that I can sign, executive actions go away.” (In other words, “If I don’t get what I want, I will go around the Congress—legally or not.”) But Obama gives a year-end deadline for Congress, meaning he wants the lame-duck session to pass the immigration legislation, rather than the next Congress in January. That means he wants the current, Democrat-controlled Senate to get it done. House Republicans will, of course, never agree to that. Thus, Obama is giving himself an excuse to issue an executive order before January—and he will say he was forced to do it because of Republican “obstructionism.” Obama knows he will anger Congress and the nation, but he believes Republicans will be afraid to impeach him because it will damage them in the 2016 elections. Further, Obama may even *not* want Congress to pass immigration legislation—even if that legislation is to his liking—because all that would require is his signature. His ego is such that he wants to remain “relevant,” and the best way for him to do that is to issue an executive order. He wants to be able to say, “*I* did this,” not “I signed what *Congress* did.”) [67464, 67508, 67511, 67512, 67513, 67514, 67515, 67546, 67551, 67559, 67560, 67562, 67569, 67571, 67581, 67589, 67597]

Obama says, “To everyone who voted, I want you to know... I hear you. To the two-thirds of voters who chose not to participate... I hear you, too.” (In other words, “Don’t blame me for the Democrat losses last night, blame the voters who stayed home,” and, “The Republicans didn’t really win, the Democrats just didn’t vote.”) Obama is not happy with Fox News’ Ed Henry, who asks if he will take a page from the playbook of Bill Clinton—who chose to cooperate with the GOP after massive mid-term losses in 1994 rather than be confrontational. Without saying so directly, Obama implies he will indeed be confrontational. Nor is Obama thrilled by CNN’s Jim Acosta, who says, “Your party rejected you this election, they didn’t even want you around.” (*The Obama Timeline* waits in vain for a reporter to ask Obama, “How does it feel to be rejected by an entire nation, like you were rejected by your own mother, father, and stepfather?”) ABC’s Jonathan Karl asks whether Obama thought it was a mistake to “do so little to develop relationships with Republicans in Congress.” Obama dances around that, responding, “I think that every day I’m asking myself, ‘Are there some things I can do better? I’m going to keep asking that every single day. ...The fact is that most of my interactions with members of Congress have been cordial, and they’ve been constructive.” (Since entering the White House, Obama has had only two private meetings with Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell.) [67464, 67508, 67511, 67512, 67513, 67514, 67515, 67546, 67551, 67559, 67560, 67562, 67569, 67571, 67581, 67589, 67597]

On the issue of the fight against ISIS, Obama says, “And what we’re doing in Syria is, first and foremost, in service of reducing ISIL’s capacity to resupply and send troops and then run back in over the Syrian border, to eventually re-establish a border between Iraq and Syria so that, slowly, Iraq regains control of its security and its territory. That is our number one mission. That is our number one focus.” (BizPacReview.com comments, “In other words, controlling national borders is important to Iraq’s security and territorial integrity, but the same strategy isn’t necessary to protect America’s interests? Maybe when they’re done over there, Iraq could come help us with our borders.”) [67769]

According to Politico, billionaire hedge fund manager Tom Steyer and other environmentalists spent \$85 million trying to elect Democrats: “The billionaire’s super PAC and other green groups saw the vast majority of their favored candidates in the battleground states go down to defeat, despite spending an unprecedented amount of money to help climate-friendly Democrats in the midterm elections. Just two of the six vulnerable Democratic Senate candidates backed by various green groups—New Hampshire Sen. Jeanne Shaheen and Michigan Rep. Gary Peters—prevailed Tuesday... Of the environmentalists’ preferred gubernatorial candidates in the high-profile races, just one—Pennsylvania Democrat Tom Wolf—won on Tuesday. Florida’s Charlie Crist, Wisconsin’s Mary Burke, Michigan’s Mark Schauer and Maine’s Michael Michaud all failed to unseat GOP incumbents.” According to Politifact.com, Steyer alone spent \$73 million supporting Democrat candidates, while casino owner Adelson gave about \$5 million to Republican candidates. According to Newsweek.com, “Republican candidates and right-leaning outside groups will have spent more money than Democrats and liberal-leaning groups, at \$1.92 billion for the GOP compared to the Democrats’ \$1.76 billion, CRP [Center for Responsive Politics] predicts.” A reported \$110 million was spent in the North Carolina Senate race; \$69 million was spent in Colorado; \$61 million was spent in Iowa; \$40.6 million was spent in Alaska; and \$39.9 million was spent in Arkansas. In each of those five states the Democrat Senate candidate lost. According to FreeBeacon.com, the National Education Association and the American Federation of Teachers spent about \$60 million in union dues supporting the campaigns of many losing Democrat candidates. [67491, 67653, 67654, 67655, 67691]

The Washington Post reports, “At a March 4 Oval Office meeting, Senate Majority Leader Harry M. Reid (D-NV) and other Senate leaders pleaded with Obama to transfer millions in party funds and to also help raise money for an outside group. ‘We were never going to get on the same page,’ said David Krone, Reid’s chief of staff. ‘We were beating our heads against the wall.’ The tension represented something more fundamental than money—it was indicative of a wider resentment among Democrats in the Capitol of how [Obama] was approaching the election and how, they felt, he was dragging them down. All year on the trail, Democratic incumbents would be pounded for administration blunders beyond their control—the disastrous rollout of the health-care law, problems at the Department of Veterans Affairs, undocumented children flooding across the border, Islamic State terrorism and fears about Ebola.” [67462, 67505, 67508, 67521]

The *New York Post* cover shows a nude Obama wearing a crown and wearing a barrel, with the headline “Stripped! Emperor has no clothes.” [67506]

Chelsea Natividad, an organizer for failed Texas gubernatorial candidate Wendy Davis, tweets, “I blame [Davis’] losses on Obama and the weak policies he’s set forth from Obamacare to how we handle foreign powers.” (Apparently Natividad cannot comprehend that Davis lost because she was a terrible candidate whose major issue—support of late-term abortions—might not have gone over well in Texas.) Natividad also tweets, “If you’re a woman and you voted Republican, fall off of the face of the earth.” “If you’re a student and you voted Republican, slap yourself eight times.” “If you’re

Hispanic and you voted Republican in this election, I strongly suggest you reevaluate your life.” “You don’t truly know the meaning of exhaustion until you work on a campaign.” “I look so disgusting the reflection of myself in my laptop frightened me hahaha.” “I have officially lost it.” [67516, 67603]

The leftist, pro-abortion site DailyKos.com writes that “One bright spot from last night’s elections” is the voter rejection of “personhood measures” in Colorado and North Dakota. [67522]

The Dow Jones Industrial Average closes up 100 points. (Some analysts believe investors are optimistic that a GOP-controlled Senate may mean a lessening of regulations that inhibit job creation).

On CNN, newly-elected Utah Congresswoman Mia Love is asked how it feels to be the first female black elected to the House of Representatives. Love responds, “Well, first of all, I think what we need to mention here is, this had nothing to do with race. Understand that Utahans have made a statement that they’re not interested in dividing Americans based on race or gender, that they want to make sure that they are electing people who are honest and who have integrity, who can be able to go out and actually make sure that we represent the values that they hold dear, and that’s really what made history here. ...Race, gender had nothing to do with it. Principles had everything to do with it, and Utah values had everything to do with it. ...I wasn’t elected because of the color of my skin, I wasn’t elected because of my gender. I was elected because of the solutions I put at the table, because I promised I would run a positive, issues-oriented campaign, and that’s exactly what resonated.” The CNN host then asks, “What’s the first area where you think you can work with Democrats to get something done?”—as if every elected Republican’s first task is to cave in to the minority Democrats. [67524, 67555, 67579, 67607]

Also on CNN, Democratic strategist Cornell Belcher, who worked on Obama’s 2012 campaign, says, “One of the things that’s been difficult I know for the White House is quite frankly that they—you all did a very good job of nationalizing the election, which is what we would have done in the same position. The problem for the White House has been this: arguably the best campaigner our party has was basically locked away in the White House and, in fact, when they were leading attacks against [Obama], [he] was never able to really come out of the White House and defend himself...” [67530, 67553]

Also on CNN, Congressman Charlie Rangel (D-NY) blames the Democrat losses on racism. On MSNBC, Ron Reagan, Jr. argues that Democrats lost because “they ran away from Obama and they ran away from ObamaCare.” [67553]

On MSNBC’s *Now*, Chris Matthews comments that Obama “keeps talking about ‘common ground.’ Damn it, there’s very little common ground between [the political] left and right. But what there is is compromise. ‘You do something for me on minimum wage, I’ll do something for you on corporate tax reform.’ ...He never mentions trading

and compromise. [Obama] always talks about common ground. Damn it, you cannot run a government on common ground. He misses the main point about politics, which is to be a politician and to trade. ...But he won't play the compromise. There's something in this guy that just plays to his constituency and acts like there's no other world out there. And that's going to be a collision at the end of this year like you haven't seen. I do believe it [an amnesty executive order] will be waving red flag in front of the bull [the Republicans]. ...The fact that [Obama] is getting advice from people that [sic; who] say, 'You're always right' is the problem. He's got too many sycophants around him telling him, 'All you have to keep doing is what you're doing.' What I heard him to do right now is say, 'I was right, we had the wrong electorate last night. I'd prefer a different electorate, I'd like the two-thirds of the people who didn't vote to go vote.' Well they didn't vote, that's the problem. They didn't show up... Why don't we elect the voters? Why don't we pick the voters and have them vote for us, that's a great system! It's sycophancy." [67587, 67595]

D. W. Ulsterman's "D. C. insider" writes, "What I did call right on was the mess in North Carolina. That huge jump in absentee ballots had a lot of us very concerned. We knew there was a good chance ten percent or more of those ballots were fraudulent and favoring the [Senator Kay] Hagan vote. They [Democrat operatives] knew that too. They're not so cocky around here this morning though! They all arrived late, and since then the door has been closed. Unhappy campers down the hall today! I am so proud of the late in the game work that was done to counter the attempt to steal it from us, and even more proud of all the North Carolina voters who came out and made that theft impossible. There were just too many honest votes to be overcome this time. Awesome job NC voters! Besides Hagan's office, there are a surprising number of Democrats around here who actually seem relieved about how the election turned out. Apparently they have not been satisfied with their own leadership and how brutally it has forced them to comply with orders from the top. I've been so busy with my own battles with Republican leaders I didn't realize my counterparts actually had it worse than I do. Now they get the chance for their own reset button over the next couple years. Another interesting thing that happened shortly after I arrived today was a small entourage coming back from the [Congressman Steny] Hoyer wing. I didn't recognize any of them and asked who they were and was told it was 'some Clinton people.' I just thought about it and realized there have been no 'Obama people' I've seen up here yet. Not one. Also wonder if that group might mean Hoyer is making a move against Pelosi [in a challenge to win the House Minority Leader position]? He's not a spring chicken and not the kind of reset button I would be supporting if I were a Democrat. Or maybe he's tight with the Clintons and helping to push out whatever little Obama influence remains around here? Things are going to be very interesting, that's for sure!" [67612]

The D. C. insider continues, "Speaking of Obama and influence, you would not believe how bitter the Democrats are against the White House. Some of it is being reported in the news but those reports are a lot more tame than the reality around here. I've overheard some normally very low key staff spitting mad about what happened. The name 'Obama' is a curse word up here right now. Every time it's spoken it's through a pair of gritted teeth! Democrats feel like they were left to die by the White House, [and] That Obama is

already counting his post-presidency dollars and stopped caring a long time ago. I'm not sure about that. [Obama's] ego and Valerie Jarrett's desire for power are still considerable obstacles to doing the right thing for America. Guess we'll have to wait and see but something tells me we won't be waiting too long. Have you seen the Illinois governor race map? The entire state [except for Chicago] is covered in red! Don't forget that Barack Obama, the First Lady, the entire Obama machine put themselves front and center in support of the Democratic governor and lost and lost big! [Illinois Governor Pat] Quinn was up plus four a couple weeks ago and ended up losing by over 4%. Everyone was saying if late polls showed it close Quinn would end up winning easy. The opposite happened. And all of those other governor races that went Republican. People don't realize how important that is for the 2016 political landscape. Governors can have a huge influence over how the state by state races play out leading up to a presidential election. We won Illinois. I still can't believe it even while I'm saying it!" [67612]

"If I had to choose one word to describe the mood up here today it would be optimistic. Maybe I should allow myself two words and say cautiously optimistic. There seems to be a toughness coming from the [Senator Mitch] McConnell office that I've never seen before. I know he's disappointed many of us before with his senatorial wishy-washy ways but I'm hopeful that he's gonna come out swinging after this. He just won what is likely going to be his last campaign, and I'm hearing there's an urgency in him to battle back against the damage the current administration has done to the country. He got an earful from Kentucky voters on the campaign trail, and he ran a very good campaign by the way, and I think the anger and concern of those voters might have really gotten to him. I sure hope so. There's also a great story going around about how McConnell made a personal call to his old friend Pat Roberts (Kansas Senator) and lit into him for several minutes. This took place late last summer. McConnell was very upset with how Roberts seemed to be taking his re-election chances for granted and the two went at it over the phone and in the end, Roberts fired his campaign staff and started to actually put up a real fight to win. I love those kinds of stories because its stuff like that that shows a political party ready to really fight for a change. I just hope we don't lose that fight after getting comfortable in our new offices like we've done too many times before. That doesn't mean we don't work with Democrats it just means we don't compromise everything in the name of compromising anything. We need bipartisan bills to now come out of this Congress and land on the president's desk so Barack Obama can have a taste of real political pressure the likes of which he's never seen since being elected." [67612]

"Right now there's a lot of smiles around here and even more work to do. For the first time in a long time I feel we have a Republican Party willing to go out and kick some butt. I'm looking down at the county by county results in Illinois and smiling ear to ear right now. Do you know that Barack Obama won 21 of those counties in 2012? Want to know how many Governor Pat Quinn won last night? ONE. Cook County, the Democratic stronghold. That was it. If you go directly north of Cook there's Lake County. In 2012 Barack Obama won Lake County by over 8 points. In 2014 Quinn lost Lake County to the Republican Bruce Rauner by almost 20 points!!!! Are you kidding me? Enjoy this moment. It won't last. The fight has just begun but at least we're finally throwing some real punches these days, huh?" [67612]

At WashingtonTimes.com Charles Hurt warns, “America now enters the two most dangerous years of her existence—or certainly the most dangerous since the Great Depression and possibly going all the way back to the Civil War. ...The silver lining for Democrats today is now they now have the perfect excuse to bounce both of them [House Minority Leader Nancy Pelosi (D-CA) and Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid (D-NV)] out of leadership forever. And this is where things get very, very dangerous for America. ...Obama still has two more years left in his final term. Already, he has demonstrated again and again that he has no regard for the constitution or the legitimacy of laws when they do not suit his agenda. He flaunts his disregard for the constitutional process, dismisses laws he doesn’t like and rewrites others. He mocks the powers of Congress. The Supreme Court has slapped him down more than [anyone] in recent times. All of this as he tells us he is an expert on constitutional law. Now come his very explicit threats to pass more illegal and unconstitutional... edicts to grant amnesty to illegal aliens already in the United States. This, in turn, will issue invitations for millions more illegals to come streaming across the border. It will not end at immigration. Unchecked power is addictive. Disowned by Democrats and made to feel irrelevant in this election, ...Obama’s enormous and unjustified ego is deeply wounded. He is frustrated and feels caged, cornered. This is when people like him are most dangerous. Buoyant Republicans will make an effort to engage him. But ...Obama is not a listener. He is not a negotiator. He is not a learner. He will just take what he wants. It is easier that way.” [67696]

HotAir.com observes, “[T]he polls were off. And they weren’t off by a little. They were heavily biased in favor of the Democrats this time. Races we were supposed to lose came in with slim victories. Races which were supposed to be razor thin came in with a wide margin. Kansas might have been the biggest shocker. The RCP [Real Clear Politics] average was showing [Greg] Orman with an almost one point margin of victory yesterday, but [Senator] Pat Roberts [R-KS] wound up winning by more than ten points. [Iowa GOP Senate candidate] Joni Ernst was up by two in the polls and ended up winning by 9. How did they wind up getting all of this so wrong? But the real question now shifts to what the GOP will do with their newly restored power. ...[Senate Majority Leader-to-be Mitch] McConnell [R-KY] is claiming that he’s ready to work with the White House to get something done. I’m not sure if that happens, but even if it doesn’t, the narrative shifts. If Republicans can assemble some popular legislation on things like [the] Keystone [pipeline], tightening the borders and tax reform, those bills will now make it to the White House having been crafted by the legislators the people chose. If Barack Obama just shoots them all down, nobody with an ounce of credibility will be saying that it’s the Republicans who are the obstructionists. And that may just wash over into 2016.” [67533, 67598, 67866]

Meanwhile, Larry Sabato, a political scientist at the University of Virginia, calls for “an investigation of the polls in Virginia. They were completely wrong, just as they were in Georgia. They were also way off in Illinois, and I could go on and on. Boy, is that an industry that needs some housecleaning.” (DailyCaller.com later reports that a Hampton University poll conducted in Virginia was, according to the school, “held for further review.” If the poll showed Republican candidate Ed Gillespie gaining ground on Senator

Mark Warner (D-VA), that might have shifted even more momentum to Gillespie—who had been written off as a certain loser. In fact, Warner won by less than a percentage point. Some might suspect that the poll was withheld in order to keep voters from knowing how close the race had become.) [67549, 67628, 68227]

CNSNews.com reports, “Republican House candidates bested Democratic House candidates 58 percent to 40 percent among voters who are married and have children, according to the national exit poll published by CNN. Similarly, Republican House candidates bested Democratic House candidates 58 percent to 41 percent among all married voters, according to the exit poll. The exit poll indicated that Democratic candidates had a stronger appeal to voters who are not married—particularly unmarried women. Among unmarried men, Democrat House candidates bested Republican candidates 50 percent to 47 percent; and among unmarried women, Democrat House candidates bested Republican candidates 60 percent to 38 percent. Among married men, Republican House candidates bested Democratic House candidates 61 percent to 37 percent. Among married women, Republican candidates bested Democratic House candidates 54 percent to 44 percent.” [67540]

Breitbart.com reminds readers that in June, Obama told ABC’s Barbara Walters, “I don’t really care to be president without the Senate.” (It can be assumed he will not now resign.) [67541, 67542]

Rush Limbaugh tells his radio listeners, “The Republican Party was not elected to compromise. The Republican Party was not elected to sit down and work together with the Democrats. The Republican Party was not elected to slow down the speed the country is headed to the cliff and go over it slowly. The Republican Party was elected to stop before we get to the cliff. ...As I listen to the wizards of smart—all the analysts of both parties, all movements on TV last night and today—the thing I’m hearing from everybody is that what the voters want is for Washington to compromise and people to work together. If voters wanted Republicans to work with Democrats, they wouldn’t have seen to it that so many Democrats got creamed last night. The country’s depressed because of Democrats. The country is out of work because of Democrats. ...There is no way the vote yesterday was a signal to work with them. They have had six years of unstoppable destruction, and the American people—and I, by the way—want it stopped.” [67544]

In *The Wall Street Journal*, Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell (R-KY) and House Speaker John Boehner (R-OH) write, “Americans have entrusted Republicans with control of both the House and Senate. We are humbled by this opportunity to help struggling middle-class Americans who are clearly frustrated by an increasing lack of opportunity, the stagnation of wages, and a government that seems incapable of performing even basic tasks. Looking ahead to the next Congress, we will honor the voters’ trust by focusing, first, on jobs and the economy. Among other things, that means a renewed effort to debate and vote on the many bills that passed the Republican-led House in recent years with bipartisan support, but were never even brought to a vote by

the Democratic Senate majority. It also means renewing our commitment to repeal ObamaCare, which is hurting the job market along with Americans' health care. ...Our priorities in the 114th Congress will be your priorities. That means addressing head-on many of the most pressing challenges facing the country, including:

- The insanely complex tax code that is driving American jobs overseas;
- Health costs that continue to rise under a hopelessly flawed law that Americans have never supported;
- A savage global terrorist threat that seeks to wage war on every American;
- An education system that denies choice to parents and denies a good education to too many children;
- Excessive regulations and frivolous lawsuits that are driving up costs for families and preventing the economy from growing;
- An antiquated government bureaucracy ill-equipped to serve a citizenry facing 21st-century challenges, from disease control to caring for veterans;
- A national debt that has Americans stealing from their children and grandchildren, robbing them of benefits that they will never see and leaving them with burdens that will be nearly impossible to repay.

January will bring the opportunity to begin anew. Republicans will return the focus to the issues at the top of your priority list. Your concerns will be our concerns. That's our pledge. The skeptics say nothing will be accomplished in the next two years. As elected servants of the people, we will make it our job to prove the skeptics wrong." [67576, 67606]

In a letter to Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid (D-NV), Senators Ted Cruz (R-TX), Mike Lee (R-UT), Jeff Sessions (R-AL), Pat Roberts (R-KS), Mike Crapo (R-ID), and David Vitter (R-LA) state, "We write to express our alarm with ...Obama's announced intention to take unilateral executive action by the end of this year to lawlessly grant amnesty to immigrants who have entered the country illegally. The Supreme Court has recognized that 'over no conceivable subject is the power of Congress more complete' than its power over immigration. Therefore, ...Obama will be exercising powers properly belonging to Congress if he makes good his threat. This will create a constitutional crisis that demands action by Congress to restore the separation of powers. As majority leader of the Senate, you have the responsibility of not only representing the citizens of your state, but also of protecting the Constitution through vigilant exercise of the checks and balances provided under the Constitution. Therefore, we write to offer our full assistance

in ensuring expeditious Senate debate and passage for a measure that preserves the power of Congress by blocking any action the president may take to violate the Constitution and unilaterally grant amnesty. ...[H]owever, should you decline to defend the Senate and the Constitution from executive overreach, the undersigned senators will use all procedural means necessary to return the Senate's focus during the lame duck session to resolving the constitutional crisis created by ...Obama's lawless amnesty." (Whether an amnesty executive order from Obama is constitutional is irrelevant to the fact that it would only be temporary. If Obama can grant amnesty, a successor in the White House can issue an executive order that reverses the amnesty. If immigration policy should be changed, it should be done through legitimate legislation.) [67575]

Chicago Mayor Rahm Emanuel, Obama's former White House chief of staff, calls on Obama to issue an executive order granting amnesty to illegal immigrants to "finally bring those who live in the shadows of society into the daylight." Emanuel says, "There are some who believe they follow a political process of obstruction. But I don't believe the public voted for obstruction [in the mid-term elections], and I don't think they voted for just criticizing for the sake of criticism. They want ideas and solutions. And part of the ideas and solutions necessary to move not just the country forward, but most importantly the city, is immigration. We need a resolution. If Congress won't work with [Obama], I believe [he] will then move forward because it's essential for the city of Chicago. Yes, a city of immigrants. But I remind you almost half of the small businesses were started by recent immigrants. ...About a third to 40 percent of the new patents [are filed by] immigrants. This is in our economic interest and well being that we have immigration reform." (Like many leftists, Emanuel is unwilling to distinguish between legal immigrants and illegal immigrants. Those who "live in the shadows" are there because of their own illegal actions. Emanuel may as well say, "Let's make child molestation legal so that the child molesters can move into the daylight.") [67635]

DailyCaller.com reports, "The Internal Revenue Service admitted in court Wednesday that the agency has not searched any of its standard computer systems for Lois Lerner's missing emails. According to a new IRS legal brief in the agency's court battle with the nonprofit group Judicial Watch, IRS lawyers said that IRS officials did not search for Lerner's emails. Here are the reasons given: Why the IRS didn't search computer servers: 'the servers would not result in the recovery of any information.' Why the IRS didn't look at backup tapes: 'no reason to believe that the tapes are a potential source of recovering' the missing emails. The IRS did not 'submit declarations about any of the foregoing items because it had no reason to believe that they were sources from which to recover information lost as a result of Lerner's hard drive failure,' the agency admitted." [67550, 67572]

Terrorist Fawzi al-Odah is released from the detainee facility at Guantanamo and sent to Kuwait. Senator Kelly Ayotte (R-NH) calls the release "yet another dangerous example of the Obama administration's misguided motivation to empty and then close Guantanamo rather than protect the national security interests of the United States." [67658, 67659]

Reuters reports, “The U.S. Mint said on Wednesday it has temporarily sold out of its American Eagle silver bullion coins following ‘tremendous’ demand in the past several weeks. ...The Mint will advise when additional inventory will become available for sale without providing further details. The announcement has not been made available to the public, but a U.S. Mint spokesman confirmed that it has sent the statement to its authorized participants. A sharp break in gold prices to their lowest in more than four years last week has unleashed a surge in demand for silver and gold coins in North America and Europe.” (*The Obama Timeline* believes the price of gold and silver is being manipulated and kept far below its market value. That, in turn, is prompting investors to buy gold and silver—on the assumption that it is only a matter of time before the prices shoot back up. No artificial manipulation of prices can last forever.) [67637, 67638]

Examiner.com points out that 28 senators who voted for ObamaCare won’t be in the Senate in January 2015, either because they lost their reelection races, retired, or died. (The number will be 29 if Louisiana’s Mary Landrieu loses the runoff election in December.) [67556]

A leftist take on the election results is found at SFGate.com, where Mark Morford writes, “Not that anyone cares, what with all the Democratic moaning and the Republican leering, liberals across American once again licking their wounds in a sort of dumbfounded, how-could-this-happen disbelief, as Republicans grab gobs of dumb power on waves of nothing but contempt, hostility and a derisive lack of a single fresh idea. ...[Obama] certainly didn’t help, with his weird tone of detached apathy, his failure to grow some serious backbone to push back against GOP obstructionism and trumpet the party’s successes from day one, all combined with a sort of pathetic lack of follow-through on maintaining the wild, youth-led enthusiasm he so rightfully earned in the beginning, and again in 2012. And Republicans? Simple. They won (again) because of their utter mastery at hurling empty propaganda, and their utter hatred of ...Obama. Let us emphasize this point fully and clear: Hate won. Ideas lost. ...In nearly every race in the country, Republicans ran on one campaign slogan and one slogan only: Obama is horrible. And it worked. It worked shockingly well. As with every mid-term, turnout was abysmal, young (liberal) voters stayed away, and those who did turn out were the Republican’s most favorite chattel of all: older, fear-addled white conservatives who lack much in the way of critical thinking skills. Bingo!” [67557]

“... [T]he [Democrat] party’s most fatal flaw,” continues Morford, “is also its most appealing trait: It lacks the murderous cruelty and savage bloodlust of the Republicans. Whereas the GOP has zero qualms about flinging outright lies (birthers, science deniers, creationists, et al) to get what it wants, not to mention an ever-present air of racism, sexism and a dark mistrust/hatred of everyone from Muslims to the entire African continent, Dems have no such arsenal, and no skill to use it if they did. Republicans will say and do anything to win, and are utterly ruthless about how they go about it; enacting a smart, fair policy agenda is almost nowhere on their priority list. Dems are the exact opposite: terrific agenda, lots of policy, but morally unwilling to play dirty, to murder

their own grandmother in cold blood and blame it on the GOP, to make it go.” (Morford goes on to explain why California is the model of good government. He is apparently unaware that the state has massive numbers of people on welfare and food stamps, is deep in debt, has huge annual deficits, and is driving individuals and businesses away with its high taxes and brutal regulations.) [67557]

Political analyst Dick Morris writes, “The Republican Party now has a once-in-a-generation opportunity to define its brand by passing legislation through both houses of Congress. Even if ...Obama vetoes the bills—as he will—they will answer the nagging question among the voters: What does the Republican Party stand for? Conventional political consultants will be content to luxuriate in the negative image Obama has created for himself and for his party. But the wiser leaders of the GOP will realize that it is only by articulating a programmatic alternative that Republicans can really seal the deal with the majority of Americans. Nobody pays attention to political platforms or candidate speeches. White papers from campaigns are best for lining wastebaskets. The media won’t cover one-house bills passed by Republicans knowing that the Senate will never assent. But if the Republicans pass serious legislation through both houses of Congress, the media has to take it seriously. And if these bills are in sync with the concerns of most Americans, it will only be to the advantage of the GOP if Obama vetoes them. Republicans in the House have amassed a considerable body of good proposals that passed the House but Harry Reid has refused to bring up in the Senate. More are lying on desks in committee, ready to be reported out.” [67614]

DailyCaller.com notes “The Three Most Laugh-Out Loud Explanations For Dems; Midterm Defeat.” NationalJournal.com’s James Oliphant claims Obama is simply not a good politician, he “isn’t one suited to hot-blooded rhetoric and emotional appeals,” and “prefers, instead, deliberation, nuance, reason—and incrementalism above narrative.” Obama, writes Oliphant, is “more technician than tactician, and a man who, perhaps, had more faith in the American public’s ability to discern substance from style than was warranted.” (In other words, “The voters are simply too stupid to appreciate Obama’s brilliance and wonderfulness and are unable to comprehend how much better off they all are because he is in the White House.”) The second laughable excuse for the Republican sweep comes from David Krone, chief of staff for Senator Majority Leader Harry Reid (D-NV), who claims Obama did not help the Senate Majority Fund raise enough money—even though “Reid’s super PAC aired 45,000 advertisements—more than any other PAC, committee or candidate.” (Many of the losing Democrat candidates spent far more on their campaigns than did their Republican victors.) Lastly, of course, are claims of racism—ludicrous examples of which are not worth repeating here. [67565, 67566]

Blogger Ace of Spades comments on “liberals’ favorite complaint about Obama. It’s their favorite complaint, because it’s so minor. Whenever they need to complain about this failure, they will only do so on two grounds. The first ground, which we saw in that Politico piece the other day, the big one about Obama’s ‘detachment’ and ‘depression,’ is that Obama, nobly, despises the ‘Theatrical’ aspects of his job. That is, he won’t play the Actor, oozing false sentiment. This is as complimentary a ‘criticism’ as one could hope to

bestow—he's too honest to be a great leader!!! The second ground... is that Obama doesn't care to 'schmooze' with his allies in Congress. Again, this 'criticism' is pretty much a compliment. Again, the criticism directed at Obama is that he is too honest and can't abide the bullshit. The actual truth is that Obama simply doesn't do his job, because he is lazy, and he refuses to do the non-glamorous, non-'fun' parts of his job such as compromising, horse-trading, or working out the details, because he is a committed die-hard ideologue who also suffers from an intense Messianic complex in which he can only be the conquering hero. And also, he seems to be lethargic because he is psychologically a depressive, whose mood is only elevated by hero worship—something he hasn't gotten in a while, because he's a miserable failure. These are the real truths of the matter, but of course the New York Times and Politico can only bring themselves to criticize Obama for disdaining phony theatrics or phony 'schmoozing' with the horrible phonies that make up the Democratic congressional caucus." [67592]

On *Special Report*, Charles Krauthammer observes, "I think [Obama is] threatening this [an executive order on illegal immigrant amnesty] because he wants to do it. I think he's all the more anxious to go ahead and do this because it makes him relevant, it makes him the center of the universe again. He is not a happy man that he was asked for a year by his own Democrats to stay away and be invisible. This is a guy who doesn't enjoy being invisible and, look, what are we talking about tonight? A little bit on the election itself, and now about what *he's* going to do. He's back in the game, he's relevant now. This is exactly why he wants immigration. Republicans have to resist the temptation, this is impeachment bait, or all kinds of nonsense bait. Do what you can, suspend the financing of this [amnesty action] because you have the power of the purse. But create your own agenda and don't allow Obama to suck you into a one-issue fall." (Obama is practically begging to be impeached because it keeps him at the center of attention. He knows that if the House impeaches him the Senate will not convict him—because it requires a two-thirds vote, and the Republicans would never be able to round up more than a dozen Democrat votes to remove Obama from office. Rather than fall for the impeachment bait, the Republicans should simply pass the legislation it believes is necessary to reinvigorate the economy, create jobs, and repeal part or all of ObamaCare, and let those bills pile up on Obama's desk. He can become veto-happy at his own risk.) [67589]

Whether the next two years under Obama will help or hurt Hillary Clinton's chances in 2016 remains to be seen. But Obama will have only two options when Congress sends him a bill: sign it or veto it. If the economy improves as a result of Republican legislation that Obama signs into law, Clinton can hardly help her campaign by saying, "I would have vetoed those bills." If Obama issues veto after veto and the economy remains in a slump, Clinton cannot say, "I would have signed those bills," because that would be an admission that she supports Republican proposals. Strangely, Clinton's best hope may be that Republican legislation is signed by Obama and the economy does *not* improve. She can then say, "We tried it the Republican way and it failed." That means she essentially has to root for America to fail.

D. W. Ulsterman writes, "This bit of information came in this afternoon. Apparently a

series of conference calls took place today during the late morning hours between representatives of [Senate Minority Leader] Mitch McConnell, [Senate Majority Leader] Harry Reid, [House Speaker] John Boehner, and [Congressman] Steny Hoyer. (Not sure why [House Minority Leader Nancy] Pelosi's office wasn't mentioned/included.) One of the main subjects that all four offices agreed upon was the removal of Valerie Jarrett's direct influence within the Obama White House if any real collaborative legislative progress was to be accomplished during the next two years. Democrats are scrambling to remain relevant and feel Jarrett is the one responsible for much of the incompetence surrounding the Obama White House, a White House notorious for ignoring the suggestions of Democratic legislators in recent years. On this subject, it seems the newly emboldened Republican leadership is only too happy to assist. The effort to remove Valerie Jarrett from the White House is definitely bi-partisan. So says a Capitol Hill source. The upcoming Attorney General selection has a lot to do with both Democrats and Republicans weary of a White House being run out of a senior adviser's office instead of the Oval Office. Republicans want an AG who will for the first time in six years doesn't see their first job being protecting [Obama] and his agenda 24/7 while Democrats don't want another divisive and partisan battle that will only further harm their brand name going into 2016. Holder answered to Jarrett. Leaders of both parties want to remove that link with the next AG and feel that can't happen if Jarrett remains in her current position inside the White House. [I] Wouldn't be surprised if the Clintons have a hand in this too, but they weren't mentioned directly. The effort to remove Valerie Jarrett from the White House is definitely bi-partisan. Ok then readers, let's keep an eye out for any Jarrett related news items. Might be quite a battle brewing if Valerie Jarrett decides she's not going anywhere..." [67608]

At USNews.com Mark W. Davis writes, "Here's the only tea leaf you need to read: You can tell [Obama's] intentions, stance and strategy by whether or not he shakes up his White House staff, beginning with Valerie Jarrett, a staffer who has accumulated the power, resources and the formal trappings of a prime minister. ...Of course, the United States Constitution does not describe the office of prime minister—but many in Washington believe that Obama has, in fact, devolved that level of power and responsibility on Jarrett's shoulders. Jarrett is often described as [Obama's] Rasputin, but Nicholas and the czarina never afforded Rasputin the official respect lavished on this White House senior adviser. She has roughly three dozen White House staffers who work directly under her. When Jarrett goes to lunch at one tony Washington restaurant or another, she travels in a motorcade surrounded by Secret Service agents and police motorcycles who cordon off intersections. Beyond the unseemliness of an aide moving about with the pomp of a constitutional officer, there is the greater issue of Jarrett's enabling of Obama's narcissism and lazy approach to governing. ...Jarrett is the White House 'mirror, mirror on the wall' who has cultivated the psychological dependency of [Obama]. If he continues to allow her to sweat the details (translation: run the government in his name), while bathing in her adulation, Obama will be remembered for being disconnected, disinterested and ultimately delusional." [67611]

CNN's Erin Burnett badgers Republican National Committee chairman Reince Priebus about Republicans needing to compromise with Obama. Priebus responds, "I don't

believe a thing [Obama] says... He's been talking about immigration reform for seven years, so... you're using his words as if they actually mean something... and asking me to respond to it. [He was] talking about this when he had 60 votes in the Senate and Nancy Pelosi in the House and they didn't do a darn thing, and all he's been doing for the last year is lying to Hispanic voters across the country, saying, 'I'm gonna sign an executive order amnesty before the end of summer,' and then people went crazy, and then he said, 'Well, no, I'm not gonna do it' because he didn't want to upset the mid-terms, and then the people that wanted him to do it went crazy, so then he said, 'Well, I'm gonna do it after the mid-terms'—it's ridiculous. ...He's not trustworthy on this issue, and the only thing he *has* done, is he's unified the country against his immigration policies." Burnett criticizes Priebus for his "tone" and for saying Obama was lying. Priebus notes that Obama "has screwed up even his own policies on this issue by mishandling the politics on this from the very beginning. So, now to come back and say, after the American people repudiated the policies of Barack Obama, and everyone that was connected to him, to now say, 'Well, what are you guys going to do to compromise with the person that the American people have just repudiated?' I think it's a little bizarre." [67646]

On *The O'Reilly Factor*, Krauthammer comments again on Obama's press conference, calling him "a strange combination of obliviousness and recklessness. ...This is time for Republicans to be very disciplined. They won the election because they were disciplined. They stayed on message. They made it a referendum on Obama. And they won. What they have to do now is to go from being the party of no to the party with an agenda." Krauthammer warns against impeachment talk: "The prize here is not the impeachment of Obama and the curtailing of his term by three months. The prize is winning the White House in 2016 and changing the country." On the issue of an amnesty executive order, the syndicated columnist says, "The way he spoke today at the press conference, he looked absolutely determined to do it. This is a man seething with anger over what's happened. This is a man who thinks he's been betrayed by the country." (*The Obama Timeline* agrees with Krauthammer, but also believes Obama is especially dangerous because he is psychologically disturbed. He is a psychopath. He was abandoned by his mother several times, to be raised by his white grandparents. He was abandoned by his biological father and by his stepfather. He was kicked in the shins by the voters in the 2010 mid-term elections. In the 2014 mid-term elections he was repudiated by the electorate and even by his fellow Democrats, who did not want him campaigning beside them. Obama is seething with anger and resentment, piled on top of feelings of rejection. To expect him to act rationally is unreasonable, as was proven at his press conference. Obama's mental state has always made him dangerous, and he has become more dangerous because of the election results. He will react by clinging even more closely to the sycophants who choose not to deliver to him the unvarnished truth, and by listening even more intently to those few people in his inner circle—like Valerie Jarrett—who are even more dangerous than he is. Leaders in Congress should be *very* wary of Obama's actions, which may become quite unpredictable and irrational.) [67640, 67680]

On *The Kelly File*, former Obama deputy press secretary Bill Burton tells Megyn Kelly, "...Democrats are never going to be able to win in midterms if we don't figure out how

to talk to white voters. ...I don't think that the message that we have has been able to really translate to the coalition of voters that helped bring Republicans into even more power." (In other words, "We have to figure out how to convince the people whose pockets we are picking that picking their pockets is a good thing.") [67661]

At the Country Music Awards, hosts Carrie Underwood and Brad Paisley joke about the election results. Underwood says, "As we stand here and celebrate and have a good time, we recognize that people around the world are worried." Paisley: "Yeah, you can't turn on the TV or open up a newspaper or click on a web site without being reminded of the epidemic we're all facing. And I don't think I'm out of line in saying that this condition has hit Nashville the hardest." Underwood: "That's right, Brad. And, of course, we're talking about... Postpartum Taylor Swift Disorder. Or, as it's more commonly known, P.P.T.S.D." (Singer Swift recently pulled all her albums from the streaming service Spotify.com because of music piracy issues.) Paisley: "Why isn't our government doing something about this? I'll be the first one to say that ...Obama does not care about Postpartum Taylor Swift Disorder." Underwood: "I'm pretty sure that's why the Democrats lost the Senate." [67621, 67623, 67650]

On November 6 NBC White House correspondent Chris Jansing says on the *Today* program, "Well, what looked to be at least a temporary truce between ...Obama and Congress lasted less than 24 hours. Republican leaders now say the focus of the new Congress will be to repeal [Obama's] signature accomplishment, ObamaCare. That after [Obama] struck an optimistic tone in his post-election press conference." (Why efforts by the Republicans to repeal ObamaCare should surprise Jansing is not clear. What she thought there was a truce is also not clear. As far as her portraying Obama as having an "optimistic tone" during his press conference, one can only suggest that she was not paying attention to what he said and how he said it.) [67652]

Sports coach Dave Daubenmire writes at NewsWithViews.com, "I am not asking this with my tongue in my cheek. I am as serious as a judge. As I sit here and write, I am listening to Mr. Obama's press conference. Something is very wrong with this guy. He is either mentally ill or demon possessed. Either choice is a possibility. But something is definitely wrong with him. He seems somehow inhuman. ...Obama is a hollow man. He has no feelings. He feels no emotions. The human drama of competition seems to have no outward effect on him. Can I be blunt? He got his butt kicked. Every talking head on the tube is pointing the finger at his unpopularity. 'The bloom is off of the rose. It is a direct repudiation of his policies. The era of Obama is over.' It is as if everyone knows it but him. Politics is nothing more than a beauty contest, and Obama has been voted off of the island. But he acts as if he still owns the island. There seems to be no agony in his defeat. It is not normal. His emotions do not line up with reality. He is either sick or he is possessed. I'm not laughing. I am serious. ...No emotions. Cold. Calculating. He doesn't even know that he lost. He is unaware that he has been rejected. He acts as if it is business as usual while the entire Democratic Party is wishing for a moving van out in front of the White House. In my coaching career I lost a lot of games. I know how it feels. I know how it makes you react. He has destroyed his party. His friends are running

for cover. But he acts as if he has just won.” [67561]

FreeBeacon.com reports, “Iranian leaders are quietly expressing fear about the Republican takeover of Congress Tuesday night, with many conveying concerns that Tehran has lost a key bloc of U.S. Democrats who wanted to roll back economic sanctions and hand Iran a favorable nuclear deal, according to an internal CIA analysis and Farsi language reports. ...The eventual outcome of Tuesday’s elections prompted many Iranian commenters and officials to express concern that years of U.S. capitulation to Iranian demands might soon come to an end. Republican gains in Congress appear to have motivated Iran to work harder toward inking a nuclear deal with the Obama administration before the lame duck legislative session concludes, according to an official analysis by the CIA’s Open Source Center authored ahead of the midterm elections. Some Iranians are now betting that the White House will fully lift sanctions before the new Congress assembles and that it will also sign a deal that permits Tehran to continue enriching uranium, the key component in a nuclear weapon.” [67574]

D. W. Ulsterman writes, “Hours after his own Democratic Party was dealt a debilitating rebuke by American voters across the nation, ...Obama stepped to the podium [sic; lectern] to take questions and ramble on for well over an hour all the while seemingly unrepentant for his own fault in politically dividing a nation against itself for the last six years—a division that has left Democrats scrambling to remain relevant at a time when everything Obama is seen as toxic, disruptive, and incompetent. Yesterday it was reported here how Democratic Party leaders were willing to work with Republicans to try and convince the White House to push out longtime White House Senior Adviser and de facto President Valerie Jarrett to better ensure Barack Obama might have an opportunity to listen to reason instead of constantly clinging to the hyper-partisan socialist ideals that have long marked the Jarrett-Obama administration. ...And while some among the Mainstream Media are once again attempting to prop up the Obama legacy, those efforts are doing little to soothe the legitimate concerns of Democrats who see a party in disarray and a future dependent upon the equally tired legacy of Hillary Clinton who herself is attached to some of the Obama administration’s greatest scandals. For too long the face of the Democratic Party has been the multi headed hydra of Barack Obama, Harry Reid, Nancy Pelosi and Debbie Wasserman Schultz. These four represent a shrill and divisive far left ideology that was thoroughly refused by voters earlier this week throughout all levels of government. After six years of their wailing incompetence, an increasing number of voters regardless of party affiliation began asking themselves, ‘What is wrong with these people?’ They witnessed time and again Democratic leaders who lied, and then lied about those lies, one layer of deception stacked upon the other. There appeared to be no accountability, no considerate and mature stewardship of the government. It was all media created image, petulant complaints, superficial platitudes, and one failure after the next. While Republicans were capable of being bad, this version of Democrats were clearly worse—much worse. ...And then this headline from U.S. News and World Report that came the same time our D.C. Whispers report on the very same subject: ‘Time for a Shake-Up; Obama needs to clean house, starting with Valerie Jarrett.’ Indeed...” [67609, 67610]

House Speaker John Boehner (R-OH) says Obama will “poison” any relationship with Congress if he uses an executive order to grant amnesty to illegal immigrants. “When you play with matches, you take the risk of burning yourself, and [Obama is] going to burn himself if he goes down this path.” Boehner also says Congress will repeal ObamaCare, as well as legislation repealing parts of ObamaCare (like the job-killing medical device tax). “We need to put them on [Obama’s] desk and let him choose. We can pass Keystone, restore the 40 hour work week (which was gutted by Obamacare), and pass the Hire Our Heroes Act. ... Yesterday we heard [Obama] say that he will double down on his go-it-alone approach. I told him he needs to put politics aside and rebuild trust. ... Our immigration system is broken and needs to be fixed, but I made it clear to [Obama] if he acts unilaterally [he] will poison the well and there will be no chance for immigration reform. It’s as simple as that.” (The Republican agenda is clear: Congress will pass a mountain of legislation and dare Obama to veto what the voters have demanded. Republicans may not be able to prevent Obama from issuing an amnesty executive order, but it can block the approval of funds for the implementation of such an order. For example, Congress could authorize no funds for the printing and distribution of identification or job-permission cards for illegal immigrants.) [67613, 67615, 67619, 67642, 67645, 67682]

Smug CBS reporter Nancy Cordes asks Boehner, “Mr. Speaker, you have a new crop of conservatives coming into the House who have suggested, among other things, that women need to submit to the authority of their husbands, that Hillary Clinton is the Anti-Christ, and that the families of Sandy Hook victims should just ‘get over it.’ So the ‘Hell No Caucus,’ as you’ve put it, is getting bigger. But some of them don’t think you’re conservative enough—” Boehner interrupts, “No, no, no, no, no, no, now listen... I think, the premise of your question, I would take exception to. Yes, we have some new members who’ve made some statements, I’ll give you that. But when you look at the vast majority of the new members that [sic; who] are coming in here, uh, they’re really, solid members...” Cordes interrupts, “But on immigration, for example, you tried to act in the last Congress and your conservative members yanked you back. How can you work with [Obama] on an issue like this?” Boehner responds, “No, no, no, no, no. Again, I would argue with the premise of the question. Uh, what held us back last year was a flood of kids coming to the border because of the actions that [Obama] had already taken. And let me tell you, the American people from the right to the left started to look at this issue in a very different way.” [67730]

Senator Jeff Session (R-AL) states, “The American people rebelled against [Obama’s] executive amnesty and rallied behind GOP candidates who promised to put the needs of the American people first. It is shocking then that [Obama] would declare that the only way ‘those executive actions go away,’ is to ‘send me a bill that I can sign.’ Otherwise, [Obama] warned, he would ‘act in the absence of action by Congress.’ Of course, Congress has acted, and so have the American people. Republicans, and the voters who sent us here, rejected the Obama-Democrat legislation to give work permits to illegal immigrants and to surge already-record immigration rates. [Obama] cannot, having had his policies defeated at the ballot box, impose them through executive decree. A Republican Congress will defend itself and our citizens from these lawless actions.

Surrendering to illegality is not an option. Democrats will have to choose sides: protect [Obama's] agenda, or protect your constituents. Americans do not want their borders erased. What they have asked for is an agenda that promotes higher wages, reforms government, eliminates failed programs, balances the budget, increases energy production, and protects their sovereignty.” (After Obama illegally grants work permits to several million illegal immigrants, the official unemployment rate should skyrocket—if Obama is honest enough to count them in the monthly statistics.) [67620]

Politico reports, “The Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee [DSCC] has canceled its advertising reservations for Sen. Mary Landrieu ahead of the December runoff in Louisiana. The committee canceled all broadcast buys planned from Monday through Dec. 6 in the state’s five major media markets... That’s about \$1.6 million worth of time. The DSCC is in the process of canceling an additional \$275,000 in cable placements, according to buyer sources.” (In other words, everyone knows Landrieu will lose to Republican Bill Cassidy.) HotAir.com notes, “The DSCC took out a loan for \$10 million two weeks ago to try to prop up people like [Senators] Kay Hagan [D-NC] and Mark Udall [D-CO]. Given the return they got on their investment on Tuesday night, go figure that they’re not going to go further into hock to try to prop up the last red-state Democrat standing.” [67616, 67617, 67667, 67736]

On Bloomberg television, *Time* magazine’s Mark Halperin says Hillary Clinton was the “loser” in the midterm elections. “The [Democrat] party is now in disarray. Hillary Clinton and her team are so cautious—they over-think, they over-analyze everything—this gives them a lot of new complexity to deal with. I just think whatever plan they had, about how to proceed after the midterms—in terms of potential announcement, considering even whether to run—it’s all thrown up in the air because no one expected the result they got [from the elections].” [67624]

On MSNBC, White House communications director Jennifer Palmieri is asked by Alex Wagner, “In terms of the results on Tuesday night, as [Obama] was watching what happened, was he surprised by how badly the Democrats did?” Palmieri replies, “I’m not going to characterize [Obama’s] personal reaction.” Wagner: “Was the White House surprised?” Palmieri: “Yes we were. We were braced for a bad night and the outcomes were worse than we expected and a lot of good Democrats who are currently in the Senate and have served the country and their states really well, Kay Hagan and Mark Pryor and Mark Udall lost their seats. It’s a big disappointment and loss, and then a lot of great gubernatorial candidates like Mary Burke in Wisconsin didn’t win, and it was a very tough night for us.” (If Wagner wants to know how Obama reacted, she could perhaps ask her husband: White House chef Sam Kass.) [67625]

At Breitbart.com author Pamela Geller, president of the American Freedom Defense Initiative, writes, “People all over the world look to America as the moral force for good in the world. And that hope had been dashed... until [Tuesday] night. The lights on the ‘the shining city on the hill’ shone brightly. We won and we won big. Huge. And it is even *bigger than that* knowing what we know about the leftwing election fraud on voter

rolls and the ghost vote. Last night, the American people sent a very clear, very loud message to ...Obama. Stop. The American people said STOP, and if you don't, our elected officials will do everything we empower them to do to stop you from further destroying this country. Knowing the contempt Obama has for us, he has no intention of heeding our warnings and will continue on his jihad against freedom, the individual, American hegemony, and our allies in the world. But America has withdrawn our sanction. ...The left's 'war on women' myth epically failed, especially in light of the real war on women—in the Muslim world. The slave markets, the buying and selling of non-Muslim women—the misogyny inherent in the sharia. Their immigration rout failed. Particularly now, when national security has become the top issue and terrorists are easily penetrating our porous borders. Moms and dads have finally woken up to the jihad threat, and they got out the vote. The jobless millennials, as brainwashed as they are, can't pay the rent with hope and change. The millennials didn't get out the vote for Obama. Millions of Americans, like me, who had their health insurance cancelled and now live uninsured got out the vote. Obama hoped to get out the anti-semitic vote. Obama and his administration made vicious, repeated attacks on Israel just days before the election. American support for Israel has never been so high. Friends of Israel got out the vote. Republicans didn't vote last night. Americans voted for America.” [67639]

“...The Democrats will use these two years to get ready for 2016. They will spend the next two years blaming the Republicans for what's here and what's coming—the poison fruit of Obama's catastrophic domestic and foreign policies. But we can out-manuever them. We have to. This is the beginning of a very great fight. We can and must seize the day. We must take a deep breath, take the long view, have a plan and stick to it—as one. ...The Republicans must work together to defeat the single greatest threat to our nation's security and well being: Obama and his quisling administration. It will be a brutal two years. Obama will continue to pursue the disastrous plans for us—Iranian nukes, immigration, Obamacare, etc. But we have turned the corner. The fight is on. The Republicans cannot squander this opportunity. We must be unified and resolute—not 'inherently resolute' (the ridiculous moniker of Obama's incoherent policy in Iraq), but consciously and deliberately resolute. It. is. on. E Pluribus Unum.” [67639]

The Wall Street Journal reports that Obama “secretly wrote to Iran's Supreme Leader Ayatollah Ali Khamenei in the middle of last month and described a shared interest in fighting Islamic State militants in Iraq and Syria, according to people briefed on the correspondence. The letter appeared aimed both at buttressing the campaign against Islamic State and nudging Iran's religious leader closer to a nuclear deal. Mr. Obama stressed to Mr. Khamenei that any cooperation on Islamic State was largely contingent on Iran reaching a comprehensive agreement with global powers on the future of Tehran's nuclear program by a Nov. 24 diplomatic deadline, the same people say. The October letter marked at least the fourth time Mr. Obama has written Iran's most powerful political and religious leader since taking office in 2009 and pledging to engage with Tehran's Islamist government.” FoxNews.com reports, “[A] congressional source told Fox News that the letter would upset the inroads they've tried to make with 'the Sunni league,' noting that the president should have informed Congress of this back-channel if it was in fact going on. 'This f***s up everything,' the source said. ...Iran's government

is Shiite-led, while the Islamic State is a Sunni terror group. The source was apparently referring to efforts to rally support among Sunni-led Arab states to confront ISIS. Republican Senators John McCain of Arizona and Lindsey Graham of South Carolina issued a joint statement Thursday night saying it was ‘outrageous that, while the cries of moderate Syrian forces for greater U.S. assistance fall on deaf ears in the White House, ...Obama is apparently urging Ayatollah Khamenei to join the fight against ISIS.’” (Israel may be even more outraged than McCain and Graham, as it has more to lose if Obama’s backdoor dealings allow Iran to develop nuclear weapons.) [67629, 67630, 67668, 67705]

At PJMedia.com Roger L. Simon writes, “I admit I didn’t much care for Barack Obama before the revelation that he had secretly written Khamenei to induce the Iranian supreme leader to sign a nuclear deal in return for U.S. help battling ISIS. Now I despise our president. He is contemptible. Ayatollah Khamenei is a man who has been leading the massive chants of ‘Death to Israel’ (and the Jews) literally every day since 1979. Only a true anti-Semite could attempt to make a secret deal with such a person. Indeed, someone who would want to make a deal with Khamenei has about as much respect for human rights in general as Torquemada. That person would have to be an unmitigated liar and sociopath. And such a person is [Obama], so desperate for an Iran deal he will literally do or say anything, so desperate to find some salvation for his failing [administration] he will put not only Israel but the whole world at risk. It’s almost like a re-upped version of *Dr. Strangelove* with Peter Sellers as the ayatollah—he would have been great—and Obama himself riding the bomb at the end like Slim Pickens. Bon voyage, Mitch McConnell... Arrivederci, John Boehner... Hasta la vista, Tea Party. ...It’s hard to know what motivates [Obama], but it’s not so hard to know what motivates the gaggle of Jewish Democratic politicians—you know who you are... Chuck Schumer, Barbara Boxer, Dianne Feinstein, Richard Blumenthal, Al Franken, Jerrold Nadler, Adam Schiff, etc., etc., who let him get away with that behavior and make a deal with a country that wants to eradicate Israel and then move on from there to whatever else is in sight (Yemen, these days). They are pathetic lackeys and careerists of the most slimey [sic; slimy] sort who would fit in well, as I said elsewhere, in Berlin, 1937. Not a single one of them, as far as I know, said word one when the White House branded the prime minister of Israel a ‘chickenshit.’ That was okay with them, I guess, as long as they could keep their offices on the right floors of the Senate and House office buildings.” [67671]

The Washington Post reports, “A veteran State Department diplomat and longtime Pakistan expert is under federal investigation as part of a counterintelligence probe and has had her security clearances withdrawn, according to U.S. officials. The FBI searched the Northwest Washington home of Robin L. Raphel last month, and her State Department office was also examined and sealed, officials said. Raphel, a fixture in Washington’s diplomatic and think-tank circles, was placed on administrative leave last month, and her contract with the State Department was allowed to expire this week. Two U.S. officials described the investigation as a counterintelligence matter, which typically involves allegations of spying on behalf of foreign governments. The exact nature of the investigation involving Raphel remains unclear.” State Department spokeswoman Jen Psaki says, “She has not been charged. We are aware of this law enforcement matter. The

State Department has been cooperating with our law enforcement colleagues. She is no longer employed by the State Department.” Pamela Geller adds, “American investigators intercepted a conversation this year in which a Pakistani official said that his government was receiving American secrets from a prominent former State Department diplomat, officials said, setting off an espionage investigation. ...[T]he Indian media has been reporting on it closely. Raphel alienated our ally India and damaged our close relationship with that key ally when she recognized Pakistan’s jihad claims to Kashmir, changing longtime American policy. ...Another reason why Hillary Clinton should never be President. Between Huma Abedin and Robin Raphel, Clinton is a one-woman American wrecking ball.” (Raphel, a former CIA analyst, is also a longtime ally of Bill and Hilary Clinton. Until November 2, she was the coordinator of non-military assistance to Pakistan. In her position she certainly dealt with the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID), which has been used as a front agency for the CIA. Obama’s mother, Stanley Ann Dunham, once worked for USAID.) [607, 608, 609, 610, 611, 612, 613, 614, 615, 933, 68409, 68410, 68411, 68417]

Senator Joe Manchin (D-WV) tells *Time* magazine, “There’s an old saying my grandmother would say, ‘people don’t care how much you know, until they know how much you care.’ And [Obama] is bright and very articulate and speaks very well. [But] People just don’t believe he cares. That’s the disconnect that I’m seeing.” [67687, 67688]

WashingtonTimes.com reports that Congressman Duncan Hunter (R-CA) “wrote a letter to the Pentagon alleging that U.S. authorities tried to pay cash to win the release of Sgt. Bowe Bergdahl, who was held captive for nearly five years by the terrorist Haqqani Network in Pakistan. Mr. Duncan requested in his letter that Defense Secretary Chuck Hagel look into the matter and ask the Joint Special Operations Command for further information, the Wall Street Journal reported. The California Republican, who’s a member of the House Armed Services Committee, alleges in his letter that the U.S. military tried to make the payment to an Afghan intermediary. But the Pentagon has denied making any such attempt, the Wall Street Journal reported.” Hunter states, “It has been brought to my attention that a payment was made to an Afghan intermediary who ‘disappeared’ with the money and failed to facilitate Bergdahl’s release in return. The payment was made in January-February 2014, according to sources.” [68318]

LifeSiteNews.com reports, “Kenya’s Catholic bishops are charging two United Nations organizations with sterilizing millions of girls and women under cover of an anti-tetanus inoculation program sponsored by the Kenyan government. According to a statement released Tuesday by the Kenya Catholic Doctors Association, the organization has found an antigen that causes miscarriages in a vaccine being administered to 2.3 million girls and women by the World Health Organization [WHO] and UNICEF. Priests throughout Kenya reportedly are advising their congregations to refuse the vaccine. ‘We sent six samples from around Kenya to laboratories in South Africa. They tested positive for the HCG antigen,’ Dr. Muhame Ngare of the Mercy Medical Centre in Nairobi told LifeSiteNews. ‘They were all laced with HCG.’ Dr. Ngare, spokesman for the Kenya Catholic Doctors Association, stated in a bulletin released November 4, ‘This proved

right our worst fears; that this WHO campaign is not about eradicating neonatal tetanus but a well-coordinated forceful population control mass sterilization exercise using a proven fertility regulating vaccine. This evidence was presented to the Ministry of Health before the third round of immunization but was ignored.” DCClothesline.com notes a 2010 speech by billionaire Microsoft founder Bill Gates, in which he stated, “The world today has 6.8 billion people. That’s headed up to about 9 billion. Now if we do a REALLY great job on new vaccines, health care, reproductive health service, we could lower that by perhaps 10 to 15 percent.” [67738, 67739]

The *Chicago Sun-Times* reports, “Dr. Eric E. Whitaker, one of ...Obama’s closest friends, has refused to answer federal prosecutors’ questions about whether he had a ‘sexual relationship’ with a former aide who pleaded guilty to stealing \$400,000 in taxpayers’ money in a scheme that began when Whitaker was her boss at the Illinois Department of Public Health, court records show. ...Whitaker and his family have continued to vacation with [Obama] and his family amid the federal probe. Whitaker is a frequent companion of Obama on the basketball court and golf course.” (As noted previously in this *Timeline*, in 2006 then-Senator Obama pushed for a \$1 million earmark for the University of Chicago Hospitals. His wife, Michelle, was then promoted to Vice-President of Community and External Affairs for the hospitals, and her salary jumped from \$121,900 to \$316,962. Her main responsibilities, in promoting an Urban Health Initiative, were to act as a “bouncer”—to encourage the poor, uninsured area residents to go to neighborhood clinics rather than diminish hospital profits by using the hospital emergency rooms. Assisting her with the public relations of the policy was David Axelrod—Obama’s campaign strategist. Whitaker was an executive vice-president of the University of Chicago Hospitals. Obama had previously arranged for Whitaker to be hired as the head of the Illinois Department of Public Health, at a salary of \$150,000. Whitaker later ran the Illinois Department of Public Health, where he approved funds for a non-profit organization called “Let’s Talk, Let’s Test” (LTLT), which has been investigated by the U.S. attorney’s office for misuse of Illinois taxpayer funds. The organization was founded to fight the spread of AIDS in the black community. It purportedly spent more than \$500,000 of the \$1.2 million it received from the state on ghost-payrollers, Soldier Field skybox tickets, and five-figure bonuses to staffers. Whitaker said, “Did I have concerns about giving money to a new organization? Sure. If you look over the landscape of black-directed HIV organizations, there was no obvious alternative.”) [110, 111, 112, 664, 1945, 4310, 5056, 11060, 11505, 67631, 67914]

A federal appeals court upholds bans on same-sex marriage in four states. WashingtonPost.com reports, “A panel of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the 6th Circuit in Cincinnati ruled 2 to 1 that although same-sex marriage across the nation is practically inevitable, in the words of U.S. Circuit Judge Jeffrey S. Sutton, it should be settled through the democratic process and not the judicial one. The decision overturned lower-court rulings in Michigan, Ohio, Tennessee and Kentucky and makes the 6th Circuit the first appeals court to uphold state bans since the Supreme Court struck down part of the federal Defense of Marriage Act in 2013. The Supreme Court began its term last month by declining to hear appeals of decisions that had gone the other way, and that move to let the rulings stand greatly expanded the number of states in which same-sex couples

may marry.” [67663, 67664]

In an interview with the Lexington Herald-Leader, soon-to-be-Senate Majority Leader Mitch McConnell (R-KY) says his top priority is “to try to do whatever I can to get the EPA [Environmental Protection Agency] reined in. It will be hard because the only good tool to do that ...is through the spending process, and if [Obama]feels strongly enough about it, he can veto the bill. But I view it as a complete outrage that he could not get cap-and-trade through the Congress when he owned the place—owned the place—and decided to do it anyway.” (That is, after the Democrat-controlled Senate and House refused to pass the cap-and-trade legislation he wanted, Obama simply ordered the EPA to start imposing strict, job-killing regulations on the coal industry.) “I’m absolutely convinced from the people I talk to around the country, not just here but around the country, that coal has a future. The question is whether or not coal is going to have a future here. It’s got a future in Europe. It’s got a future in China, India, Australia. But not here? It makes me very angry, and I’m going to do everything I can to try to stop them.” McConnell also says Senator Rand Paul (R-KY) will be “able to count on me” if he runs for president in 2016. [67643, 67644]

An unnamed senior Democrat aide tells Politico, “As a party, we need to change. [Voters] like our policies. All this leftie [talk], the country likes, but somehow the message about us as individual members of the conference isn’t breaking through. There is great unrest.” (Why, after being trounced in an election, Democrats would believe the voters like their policies is unclear.) Incoming Congresswoman Gwen Graham (D-FL) says, “I am not Nancy Pelosi. Neither am I Barack Obama or Harry Reid. I am Gwen Graham. And I am going to go to Washington and represent this district so incredibly well, and represent all of the counties of this district.” Politico writes, “No Democrat is gearing up to challenge [House Minority Leader] Nancy Pelosi in public, but behind the scenes some Democrats are saying it’s time for new blood at the leadership table ahead of 2016. Senior aides said they hope the party’s big losses Tuesday would encourage the minority leader to expand her network of allies and advisers to include a broader set of voices for crafting election messaging and congressional agendas.” [67647]

On November 7 Republican Ed Gillespie concedes to Senator Mark Warner (D-V). (Warner, who most expected to run away with the race, won by fewer than 20,000 votes, out of more than two million cast. Had Libertarian candidate Robert Jarvis not been in the race and had most of his votes gone to Gillespie, Warner would have lost.) [67632, 67672]

Senator Mark Begich (D-AK) refuses to concede the race in Alaska, despite being 8,000 votes behind GOP Republican challenger Dan Sullivan. DailyCaller.com reports, “An independent newspaper analysis found that after the 22,000 reportedly uncounted absentee and early votes are counted, Sullivan would add approximately another 1,100 to his lead. Of the 13,804 alleged early ballots requested by voters that have not been turned in yet, the numbers appear to favor Sullivan taking most of them.” [67641]

At NationalReview.com Jim Geraghty points out that “Maine and Nebraska do not allocate their electoral votes in the presidential election by ‘winner take all.’” (They allow two electoral votes to the presidential candidate who wins the most votes in the state, but then allocate the remaining electoral votes base on the candidate who wins the most in each Congressional district.) “Starting in January, Republicans will hold state legislative majorities and the governor’s mansions in Michigan, Ohio, Wisconsin, Florida, and Nevada. If some or all of those states passed laws allocating their electoral votes by districts [as do Maine and Nebraska], all of these purple-to-blue states would allocate their electoral votes in a way that would make it extremely likely for Republicans to win at least half of them. And without half the electoral votes in those states, it would [be] nearly impossible for the Democratic nominee to win [the presidential election]. For example, Barack Obama won Ohio twice, and because he won the popular vote in 2012, won all of the state’s 18 electoral votes. Under the district system, if the Republican presidential nominee wins all of the U.S. House districts in Ohio currently held by the GOP, he would get twelve electoral votes and the Democrat would get only six. In Michigan, Obama won all 16 of the state’s electoral votes; if the Republican 2016 nominee won all the currently GOP-held House districts, he would get nine and the Democrat would get seven. ...Any state’s change to this more proportional system would be entirely constitutional. When Barack Obama won one of Nebraska’s electoral votes in 2008, no one on the Democratic side complained. So... should Republicans pursue this course?” [68174, 68175, 68176]

Geraghty’s proposal would likely make sense to many voters, who believe it unfair that a candidate should be given *all* of a state’s electoral votes even though he or she may have *lost* in *most* of the state’s counties and Congressional districts. The Democrat candidates focus on the big cities, where large percentages of residents collect federal welfare benefits, and can ignore the rest of a state’s citizens. The Republican candidates campaign in the small towns and suburbs, hoping to offset the massive advantage the Democrats have in the welfare districts. Assigning electoral votes by Congressional district arguably evens out the playing field, forcing the Democrats to advocate policies that apply to *all* Americans, rather than just government-dependent Americans. The change would also offset some of the Democrat advantage Obama will give them if he grants amnesty to millions of illegal immigrants and puts them on a “pathway to citizenship”—perhaps more properly called a “pathway to Democrat voter registration.”

AngryWhiteDude.com posts “A Tea Party Member’s Open Letter To Republicans.” It reads in part, “Congratulations on your recent win over your ‘good friends on the other side of the aisle’ last Tuesday. You ran a very wise and crafty campaign. Basically, you said that you weren’t Obama. There was no talk of repealing ObamaCare, securing the borders, banning travel from Ebola-spawning nations in Africa, reducing the national debt, cutting spending, or anything else those of us in the Tea Party movement would like to see. You won because America finally realized Obama and the Democrats are an existential threat to America. We hope you don’t overlook the fact that millions of Tea Party conservatives held our nose to reelect the same lifelong congressional Republicans who have done nothing to solve any of our problems or fight to stop Obama’s destruction of our nation. ...In [the] Mississippi [primary], your actions were nothing less than

despicable. To save the geriatric hide of lifelong politician Thad Cochran, you ran ads on black radio stations telling gullible black voters that those who supported Chris McDaniel were ‘Nazis, KKK members, and racists.’ ... You despise the Tea Party because we dare demand Congress exercises fiscal responsibility. You see yourselves as kings and our ruling elite who cannot be bothered by the unwashed hoi polloi. You only want our votes every two years. We know that. But the times they are a changing. The Tea Party has a difficult time distinguishing Republicans from Democrats these days in Washington. And when a true conservative like Ted Cruz has the cojones to do something to stop the legislative madness you and your friends on the other side of the aisle have created, you do everything possible to stop him!” [67750]

“The Tea Party is tired of voting for the less worse candidate. You have received the Tea Party vote in the past because you were marginally less evil than Democrats. Now we can’t say if that is true after watching you use the same despicable tactics to defeat Tea Party conservatives in the primaries. That is coming to an end. So are our loyal votes. Many Tea Party conservatives voted Libertarian in the general election. Many have publicly declared, [this web site] included, that we will no longer support big-government, moderate Republican puppet candidates. I will not vote for Jeb Bush, Mitt Romney, Chris Christie, or any of the other Democrat-lites you wish to serve up as the latest cannon-fodder for the Democrats in 2016. You won big last Tuesday. It could be your last victory ever. We are closely watching every move you make to take down Obama and his minions who have run roughshod over our Constitution and YOU! We do not seek bi-partisanship. We do not want you to compromise with the Democrats or Obama. The only reason we want you to reach across the aisle is to grab Harry Reid, Nancy Pelosi, or any of the other socialist by the throat and squeeze. If you ‘go along to get along,’ the Tea Party will not support the Republican Party any further. You have counted on our vote in the past because we had no other options. That is changing. ... If there was ever a time to eat your Wheaties, now is the time, Republicans. We expect you to be bold and uncompromising. How can you negotiate with communists? How do you negotiate with a murderer? Negotiate that he will only make you a paraplegic but spare your life? The Democrats are murderers. Killers of individual freedoms, national wealth, military strength, and fiscal sanity! You must kill them before they kill all of us!” [67750]

“Quite bluntly, Republican Establishment, I despise you. I have had to count on you. And you have failed in nearly every instance. You have no more chances to make it right with the conservative base of your Party. It’s show time. Do something big and dramatic. Grow a pair and do something good for those who pay the bills in America. The moochers have had their time. It’s OUR time now. You were not elected last Tuesday because we like you. You were elected because we fully realize the danger to our existence Obama presents. We are not prepared to stand idly by any longer while he ‘fundamentally changes’ America into a third-world hellhole as you have done. We are patriotic, determined, and many. And we will fight and, if necessary, die to protect the Constitution. And you [had] better believe we fully understand why the Founders gave us the Second Amendment. Republican Establishment, you are on notice. Do the right thing or be gone. Our patience is up. We cannot wait any longer. We will not believe your

promises or contracts with us. We will monitor your actions and act accordingly. ... We are watching! You are officially on notice.” [67750]

At Politico.com Carol Felsenthal writes, “Almost since the start” of the Obama administration, “people who have actual, real duties in the West Wing of the White House—the working, executive part of the government, that is—have been urging him to do something about Valerie Jarrett. Push her into the East Wing, where she can hang out with Michelle Obama and the White House social secretary, or give her an ambassadorship—or something—but for Pete’s sake get her out of the way of the hard work of governing that needs to be done. Now it’s really time to do it. ... In the days before anyone knew how brutally the Democrats would get beaten, politicians and staffers and pundits were urging a shakeup of the White House staff. ... Jarrett is more than a mere senior staffer to [Obama], and of course she is not going to be fired outright. Not ever. If her role in this administration reflected reality, Jarrett would be called ‘First Big Sister’ to both Michelle and Barack. And who would fire the kind of big sister who ‘really dedicated her entire life to the Obamas,’ as *New York Times* reporter Jodi Kantor told me when I interviewed her about her intimate look at the first family, *The Obamas*? ‘She has thrown her entire life into their cause, and she’s made it very clear that she would happily run in front of a speeding truck for them.’ Very moving. But the fact is, on balance it appears that Jarrett has been more an obstructer than a facilitator over the past six years when it comes to governing, and it’s probably long past time for [Obama] to move her gently into another role.” [67648, 67737, 67853]

“... West Wing staffers in general believed that Jarrett didn’t handle power well. Mark Halperin and John Heilemann report in their book *Double Down* that West Wing staffers ‘were scared to death’ of her. Fear can be productive if the person wielding the power is accomplishing great things, but Jarrett was not. Her undefined role combined with what by all accounts has been almost unlimited proximity to the Obamas has proved a bad mix. She seems to isolate [Obama] from people who might help him or teach him something—and if there’s one thing that has become clear about Obama, it’s that he doesn’t get to hear enough outside voices. ... Last month, none other than Mitt Romney was quoted in a *New York Times Magazine* article reflecting on the well-established insularity of the Obama White House: ‘I won’t mention who it was, but I met with one of the nation’s top Republican leaders, and he said, ‘You know, the strange thing is that [Obama] seems to answer to only two people—Valerie Jarrett and Michelle Obama.’ Jarrett wields real power on personnel matters, but her choices often seem based on whom she particularly likes rather than who might be best suited for the job. ... She is also supposed to be [Obama’s] liaison to business, which was ‘an effort that many in the West Wing believe she failed at,’ writes [NBC’s Chuck] Todd. ‘And yet they didn’t get why she didn’t pay a price.’ ... Chicago business people who knew Jarrett have told me over the years that she was not respected for her business skills.” [67648, 67737, 67853]

“... Many Wall Streeters, meanwhile, considered her ‘a political hack, ineffectual and entitled,’ [Mark] Halperin and [John] Heilemann write. And economists who talk to her about policy are sometimes astonished at the things that come out of her mouth, reflecting very little understanding of economic solutions. ... From foreign trips to White

House policy meetings, [Jarrett] is occupying a critical space that ought to belong to an operator focused on governing and government, someone experienced in the levers of the bureaucracy and playing on the world stage. Now in his sixth year, humbled by the midterms, [Obama] badly needs the best people around him, people who can provide real advice and build a lasting legacy. Instead, he's got the palace guard watching his back—and judging from Obama's poll numbers, they haven't done it well. ...[I]f Obama is considering a shakeup, why not finally add Jarrett—the lady of the lofty titles, enormous influence on her boss and few actual accomplishments that have helped the shaker-in-chief—to the mix? Well, we know it's not going to be a traditional firing, and it's probably too late to give her an ambassadorship. But if Jarrett's not going anywhere, how to safely occupy her—and keep her out of the way—until she turns off the lights in the White House on January 20, 2017?" [67648, 67737, 67853]

At WashingtonPost.com, Jonathan Capeheart later unconvincingly whines that the criticism of Jarrett is due to her gender. (This is the same Capeheart who, in July 2011, ridiculed Sarah Palin for a *Newsweek* cover photo, writing that she “looks young and vibrant... But when Palin's cover shot is viewed through the prism of presidential politics, it's a dud. Folks want to be able to envision someone sitting in the Oval Office. They don't necessarily want to envision them in the pages of *Esquire* magazine's ‘Sexiest Woman Alive 2011’ or *Maxim*. She can't possibly be taken seriously as a presidential contender dressed like that...”) MSNBC's Mika Brzezinski—who, it should be noted, is a friend of Jarrett—asks, “So why is Valerie the focus of these ridiculous attacks?” and suggests, “Perhaps it is because she is a woman.” (Brzezinski might want to consider that she has an on-air position at MSNBC only because her father is former Jimmy Carter advisor Zbigniew Brzezinski. Apparently she believes one can use name and gender both to get a job and to refute criticism.) Noah Rothman writes at HotAir.com, “If Jarrett were to be somehow subordinated to the position of presidential librarian tomorrow, there is no evidence to suggest that Obama would become the master of his own destiny, deftly moving to the center while ensuring his left flank remained intact. Those searching for scapegoats in Jarrett are really performing mental gymnastics to avoid acknowledging the obvious: Obama is the problem.” [67834, 67853, 67854, 67871, 67932, 67933, 67934]

Obama selects New York prosecutor Loretta Lynch to succeed Eric Holder as Attorney General. (Leftist racists and sexists quickly brag that Lynch will be the nation's first black female Attorney General—which should not, of course, be relevant if the nation is serious about trying to eliminate racism and sexism.) White House press secretary Josh Earnest says, “Ms. Lynch is a strong, independent prosecutor who has twice led one of the most important U.S. Attorney's Offices in the country.” According to DailyCaller.com, “Lynch is known to be close to Holder due to her membership in the Attorney General's Advisory Committee,” and Obama selected Lynch “just two days after Obama's [November 5] post-election meeting with Al Sharpton and weeks after Lynch's own [August 21] meeting with Sharpton.” Holder visited Lynch in her New York office on Oct. 30. (One assumption is that race-hustler Sharpton persuaded Obama to nominate Lynch to replace Holder, rather than Labor Secretary Tom Perez.) [67649, 67670, 67683, 67694, 67709, 67724, 67725]

It is worth noting that Lynch was, with Attorney General Eric Holder's wife Sharon Malone, among the first members of the African American Delta Sigma Theta sorority at Harvard. Additionally, PunditPress.com reports, "In a speech given at Long Beach earlier this year... Lynch specifically called out voter ID laws as racist and schools [for] disproportionately using zero tolerance policies against minorities." She stated, "I'm proud to tell you that the Department of Justice has looked at these [voter photo ID] laws and looked at what's happening in the Deep South, and in my home state of North Carolina has brought lawsuits against those voting rights changes that seek to limit our [black people's] ability to stand up and exercise our rights as citizens. And those lawsuits will continue." (In other words, Lynch will likely not be doing anything any differently than Eric Holder at the Department of Justice. In fact, Lynch will do her best to defend Holder from prosecution after he leaves office—which is why he supports her nomination.) [67775, 67776, 67795, 67929, 68325]

At IndyStar.com Jeffrey M. McCall, professor of communication at DePauw University and author of *Viewer Discretion Advised: Taking Control of Mass Media Influences*, writes, "Former CBS correspondent Sharyl Attkisson is either a paranoid kook or victim of one of the most heinous government abuses of a reporter in American history. Either way, the rest of the journalism community should be jumping into action to determine the truth. Sadly, it is not. Attkisson claims in her new book that the federal government hacked into her computer to track and disrupt her investigative reporting of the Benghazi attacks and the Fast and Furious gun transactions. Both of these matters linger with unanswered questions. Attkisson has been one of the few reporters digging into these important stories, while many news organizations find no room for such news. ...America needs to have Attkisson's allegations carefully scrutinized. Citizens need to know if our government has made an assault on the free press. Inasmuch as the press is a surrogate for the public, this kind of media abuse would, in essence, be an attack on the American people. ...Press attention to the Attkisson situation has been sparse to the point of irresponsibility. Readers and viewers of many traditional media outlets would never know of Attkisson's allegations. Perhaps the editors and producers of those outlets just don't believe Attkisson. Or maybe they fear reprisals from an Obama administration that makes little secret of its disdain for the press. If journalists' failure to fully look into the abuse of Attkisson is based on fear, then shame on them. ...First Amendment protections mean nothing if the free press doesn't actively pursue the prospect of the government hacking the computer of a prominent reporter. If it did happen, the citizens need to know why, by whom and at whose direction. This story should lead every network newscast and front every newspaper until it is determined either that Attkisson's charges are accurate or that she is a fraud. If it is the latter, then Attkisson's journalism career will be declared over. If it is the former, then the media must commit to seeing the responsible government officials punished." [67785]

The BBC reports, "A column of 32 tanks and 30 trucks has crossed into eastern Ukraine from Russia, the Ukrainian government says. The trucks were carrying ammunition and fighters, said a military spokesman, but the BBC cannot confirm his report." HotAir.com's Ed Morrissey writes, "This move is directly out of the Crimea playbook. In that seizure, Russian troops infiltrated the peninsula in uniforms without insignia, seized

control of the region, and then held a plebescite [sic; plebiscite] on annexation to the country that had occupied their land. Immediately afterward, Russia invested Crimea militarily, this time openly, and secured its new possession. This is exactly what has unfolded in Donetsk and Luhansk, just over a longer period of time.” [67651, 67665]

According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the economy created only 214,000 jobs in October. The unemployment rate is 5.8 percent. (Once again, the rate declines *not* because people have found jobs, but because people have dropped out of the workforce entirely and are no longer even being counted as unemployed.) The unemployment rate is much higher than 5.8 percent in more than a few states: New York (6.2 percent), New Jersey (6.5 percent), Illinois (6.6 percent), Michigan (7.2 percent), and California (7.3 percent). CNSNews.com notes, “The number of African Americans who were employed in the United States in October dropped by 41,000; and the number of African-Americans not participating in the labor force increased by 114,000.” Meanwhile, the number of first-time home buyers is at a 30-year low, even though the population is much greater. [67656, 67662, 67669, 67697, 67698, 67708, 67898, 67939]

At the White House, Obama has a lunch meeting with key Republican and Democrat leaders of the House and the Senate. WashingtonTimes.com reports that House Speaker John Boehner’s office, “said the speaker pointed to dozens of bills that have already cleared the House to boost U.S. energy production and cut some of [Obama’s] new regulations, saying those are a starting point for trying to boost the economy. And Mr. Boehner urged [Obama] to back off his intent to claim unilateral powers to grant legal status to illegal immigrants. ‘The speaker warned that unilateral action by [Obama] on executive amnesty will erase any chances of doing immigration reform and will also make it harder for Congress and the White House to work together successfully on other areas where there might otherwise be common ground,’ Mr. Boehner’s office said in a statement. In its own readout of the meeting the White House said [Obama] rejected that entreaty and ‘reiterated his commitment to taking action’ on immigration on his own.” (Obama refuses to accept that his amnesty executive order was on the ballot November 4 and it lost.) [67657, 67675, 67686, 67732, 67777]

At the State Department, spokesperson Jennifer Psaki is acted to comment on Joint Chiefs of Staff Chairman General Martin Dempsey’s praise of Israel for going to “extraordinary lengths” to avoid civilian casualties when retaliating against Hamas terrorist attacks. At PJMedia.com Bryan Preston writes, “Psaki had the choice of agreeing with Gen. Dempsey, refusing to offer an opinion, or disagreeing with him—the latter, carrying the possibility of opening up another argument with Israel. Psaki chose the latter. Psaki says, “It remains the broad view of the entire [Obama] administration that they could’ve done more, uh, and they should’ve taken, uh, more, all, feasible precautions to prevent more civilian casualties.” (Psaki offers no examples of what additional steps the Israeli Defense Forces could have taken.) [67757, 67758]

CNN runs a chyron (a bottom of the screen banner) that reads, “SEAL WHO CLAIMS HE KILLED OBAMA UNDER ATTACK.” (The text’s “OBAMA” should, of course, be “OSAMA,” to refer to Osama bin Laden.) [67727]

Mitt Romney responds to the news of Obama's secret letter to Iran, saying, "I was frankly stunned that [Obama] would write a letter of that nature and in effect, legitimize a nation and a leadership which is violating international norms and is threatening the world, and I found it astounding. To suggest that we might somehow work together is something which is so far beyond the pale, I was speechless as I heard about it. I simply can't understand it. I think as well that the right kind of approach in dealing with Iran is to recognize Iran as we thought about South Africa during apartheid and that was we consider them a pariah. Their leaders were shunned. They were not invited to international bodies and we exerted that kind of moral suasion on that. To somehow have a communication with Iran's supreme leader is in my view an enormous error. ... This is the fourth time [Obama] has reached out an open hand to Iran. It continues to diminish himself and America, these acts of his that unfortunately lead bad people to assume that American can be pushed around and I find it very unfortunate." Romney warns that Russia and China are not worried about a U.S. response to any of their actions because of Obama's weak foreign policy: "Does that make us stronger in negotiations on the nuclear issue? Does it make us stronger on the world stage or does it make us diminished? He [Obama] continues to diminish himself and America in these acts of his that unfortunately lead bad people to assume America can be pushed around, and I found it very unfortunate." [67759, 67760, 67865]

U.S. District Judge Susan Bolton, a Bill Clinton appointee, strikes down Arizona's 2005 immigrant smuggling law on the grounds that it is trumped by federal statutes. KSWT.com writes, "Bolton ruled the state law deprives federal authorities of their exclusive right to prosecute smuggling crimes. Arizona's smuggling law was passed as lawmakers responded to voter frustration over the state's position as the nation's then-busiest immigrant smuggling hub. The smuggling law had been used frequently in Maricopa County Sheriff Joe Arpaio's trademark immigration efforts, though the courts have curbed his immigration powers over the 17 last months." (In July 2010 Bolton issued a temporary injunction to block Arizona's immigration law, SB 1070, which gave police officers the power to ask about the immigration status of anyone stopped or arrested. Former federal prosecutor Andrew C. McCarthy wrote at the time, "In effect, the court is saying that if the feds refuse to enforce the law the states can't do it either because doing so would transgress the federal policy of non-enforcement ... which is nuts.") [10784, 13238, 13240, 13243, 13257, 13268, 13309, 13312, 13320, 13321, 13333, 13397, 13413, 13468, 13504, 31383, 37325, 67735]

Tom Moran, editorial board member of New Jersey's *Star-Ledger*, whines that that the Republican control of the Senate is the fault of Founding Father James Madison, who saw to it that the U.S. Constitution gave two senators to even the sparsely populated states. Moran writes, "The problem is that all states, big or small, get the same two seats in the Senate. That gives a nearly vacant state like Wyoming the same heft as California or New York." (Moran may want to read a few history books, from which he could learn that the provision in the Constitution was intentional, and meant to ensure that states with more residents could not abuse their power to take advantage of states with fewer

residents. Perhaps Moran also believes that every white American should get to vote more than once because they outnumber black Americans.) [67660]

The Supreme Court agrees to hear the ObamaCare case *Halbig v. Burwell*. D. W. Ulsterman writes, “Just days after American voters delivered a powerful push back against the policies of Democrats across the nation, the Supreme Court has just announced its intention to take on the case of whether or not the subsidies that make up the heart of the increasingly divisive and burdensome Obamacare healthcare law are in fact legal. Opponents of those subsidies insist they are not legal, and without those subsidies, the law itself would break apart. In addition to the election results, the Supreme Court will be hearing the legal challenge at the same time as developing reports are coming out indicating Obamacare costs are skyrocketing, as are people’s premium rates—rate increases the Obama administration are accused of hiding from the public until after the 2014 Midterm Election. With that election now over, and Republicans poised to take full control of Congress for the first time in eight years, the slightly conservative-leaning Supreme Court will find itself in a position to make a ruling which could decimate the unpopular healthcare law. If so, the winds of political change currently blowing through Washington D.C. could quickly turn into a tsunami the likes of which we have not seen in generations.” [67673, 67676, 67677, 67678, 67685, 67692, 67748, 67752, 67753, 67804, 67959, 67982, 68408, 68442]

The court case centers around the fact that the Affordable Care Act calls for federal subsidies for consumers who purchase ObamaCare insurance through the state exchanges. Technically, therefore, the subsidies are *not* available to consumers in the many states that did *not* set up exchanges. The law also states that employer mandates apply only where there are state exchanges. ObamaCare supporters claim the *intention* of the law was for subsidies to be available for all, but the court should only rule on the language of the law, not intentions. But even if the court does consider intentions, there is a mountain of evidence demonstrating that the law’s wording was specifically *intended* to encourage (blackmail) states into establishing exchanges. (In fact, the linking of subsidies to state exchanges appears *nine times* in the legislation.) The “no exchange, no money” language was the carrot and stick in the legislation. If the Supreme Court rules against the Obama administration, ObamaCare essentially collapses—because it is the taxpayer subsidies that was what prompted consumers to go to Healthcare.gov in the first place. [67673, 67676, 67677, 67678, 67685, 67692, 67748, 67752, 67753, 67804, 67959, 67982, 68408]

The evidence in favor of the plaintiff includes a 2012 statement in a lecture by one of the chief architects of ObamaCare, MIT’s Jonathan Gruber: “I think what’s important to remember politically about this is, if you’re a state and you don’t set up an exchange, that means your citizens don’t get their tax credits [subsidies]. But your citizens still pay the taxes that support this bill. So you’re essentially saying to your citizens, you’re going to pay all the taxes to help all the other states in the country. I hope that’s a blatant enough political reality that states will get their act together and realize there are billions of dollars at stake here in setting up these exchanges, and that they’ll do it.” On November 11, Gruber contradicts his own 2012 statement, telling WGBH-TV the claim that “states

that don't run their own exchanges shouldn't deliver subsidies to people... is patently at odds with what the law is trying to do. If you ask the people that [sic; who] wrote the law, this is not what they intended. ... Any sensible reading of this law shows the intention." (In other words, when the truth caught up with him he had to lie.) [67959]

Michael Rosman, General Counsel at the Center for Individual Rights, writes, "The government and supporters of the [Affordable Care Act] seem to argue that [the bill's] history [the Democrats having to rush through approval of what had already been written while they still had the votes to do so, because the election of Scott Brown to replace the late Senator Edward Kennedy cost them a filibuster-proof Senate] is a reason to reject the plain meaning of the statute. [In other words, the Democrats' argument is, "We would have cleaned up the bill's language if we had time, but we could not because we no longer had Kennedy's vote to stop a filibuster.""] Everyone knows what we really wanted, they suggest, and it certainly was not to undermine the ACA by limiting subsidies. My organization, along with our co-counsel (Cooper & Kirk and The Judicial Education Project), representing various U.S. senators and representatives, took a different approach in the amicus brief that we filed. Our clients believe that the unusual nature of the history of the bill makes it all the more important to apply the plain meaning rule. Trying to figure out what supporters of the law might have done *if they had had the votes to do it is a fool's game. The plain words of the statute are the only things that members of the two Houses of Congress voted on, and it's all that can govern an agency's interpretation of the statute.*" [68006]

House Oversight and Government Reform Committee Chairman Darrell Issa (R-CA) issues a statement: "...Obama's health law was pushed on the American people through a highly partisan effort that never did an adequate analysis of the government's authority to provide premium subsidies through exchanges established by the federal government. The sloppy and rushed nature of the process that created the health law is rightly catching up to it. The statute provides no authority for subsidies through the federal exchange, and proponents of the law cannot cover-up their regrets by ignoring the plain text of the law when it proves inconvenient." [67681]

Paul R. Hollrah writes, "Now, as we enter the 2016 campaign season, with Senator Ted Cruz (R-TX), Governor Bobby Jindal (R-LA), Senator Marco Rubio (R-FL) and Senator Rick Santorum (R-PA), mentioned as potential presidential candidates, a great many Americans remain confused about the definition of the term 'natural born Citizen.' Although each of these men are eligible to serve as governors, as U.S. Senators, as members of the U.S. House of Representatives, or even justices of the U.S. Supreme Court, none are eligible to serve as president or vice president because they are not 'natural born Citizens,' as required by Article II, Section 1 of the U.S. Constitution. Cruz was born in Canada to an American mother and a Cuban father; Jindal was born in the U.S. to a father and mother, both of whom were citizens of India; Rubio was born in the U.S. to parents, both of whom were citizens of Cuba; and Santorum was born in the U.S. to an American mother and an Italian father. Under provisions of the 14th Amendment, all are 'citizens at birth,' but none are 'natural born' citizens because of their non-citizen

parentage.” (Historically, the term natural born citizen means born on U.S. soil to two U.S.-citizen parents.) [67745]

Hollrah notes that some supporters of Cruz (and Obama, et al) point to “8 USC §1401 to support the contention that Cruz is a ‘natural born’ citizen. That statutory language defines a ‘citizen at birth’ as ‘a person born outside of the United States and its outlying possessions of parents one of whom is a citizen of the United States who has been physically present in the United States or one of its outlying possessions for a continuous period of one year prior to the birth of such person, and the other of whom is... not a citizen of the United States.’ [But] At no point does the statute mention the term ‘natural born Citizen,’ nor does it attempt to show that the terms ‘natural born Citizen’ and ‘citizen at birth’ are synonymous. To the contrary, when the Founders inserted the words ‘natural born Citizen’ in Article II, Section 1 of the Constitution, as a principal qualification for those who wished to serve as president of the United States, it was their intention that all those born with any taint of foreign allegiance should be barred from the presidency and the vice presidency. Hence, the term ‘natural born Citizen.’ ...What many who support the eligibility of Cruz, Jindal, Rubio, and Santorum refuse to consider is that there are only two jobs in all of America that require the incumbents to be ‘natural born’ citizens. Those jobs are president and vice president of the United States. Every other job in America, in government or in the private sector, can be filled by natural born citizens, by citizens at birth, by naturalized citizens, or, in some cases, by non-citizens with work visas. Those who agree that there are several categories of citizenship, but then argue that the Constitution puts no unique requirements on candidates for president and vice president, have an obligation to explain what they see as the difference between a ‘natural born’ citizen and any other kind of citizen.” [67745]

“[A]ll 535 members of Congress, Republicans and Democrats alike, purposely violated their oath of office by failing to demand an examination of Obama’s qualifications. Why did they do so? Although we can’t read the minds of 535 members of Congress, we can ‘bet the farm’ that most failed to question Obama’s eligibility because they were terrified at [sic; by] what would happen in the streets of America if the first black man ever elected by the Electoral College was turned away at the last moment on a constitutional ‘technicality.’ ...But now, with the potential candidacies of Ted Cruz, Bobby Jindal, Marco Rubio, or Rick Santorum, Republican principles will soon be put to the test. We will see whether Republicans, who, unlike Democrats, believe in the strict construction of the Constitution and the rule of law, will have sufficient reverence for the words of the Constitution to deny the nomination to a candidate who does not meet the necessary qualifications. Knowing Republicans as I do, I feel certain that they will distinguish themselves by refusing to nominate an unqualified candidate.” [67745]

The White House announces that as many as 1,500 more U.S. troops will be sent to Iraq to “train, advise, and assist Iraqi security forces, including Kurdish forces.” The White House also insists that the announcement was made after the November 4 elections had nothing to do with politics. (That claim is, of course, preposterous. It is obvious that many Democrats would have been less inclined to vote if they knew Obama would be

sending more troops to Iraq; Obama delayed the announcement accordingly. The Pentagon had asked for the troops in September.) [67679, 67693, 67695, 67703, 67704]

At the daily press briefing, ABC's Jonathan Karl asks White House press secretary Josh Earnest, "Just to be clear... you're saying that [Obama], even before he's had a chance to have his first meeting with the new Republican leadership... even before he's had the chance to sit down and talk to them about it, he's completely closed to the idea of delaying this [amnesty] executive action? Not even willing to talk to them about delaying this?" Earnest replies, "He's going to take that executive action before the end of the year, but there is—Speaker Boehner and the other members of the House leadership will be arriving at the White House with a trump card up their sleeve. There is one thing they can do to prevent [Obama] from taking executive action. The thing they can do is allow that common sense, bipartisan bill passed by the Senate to come to the floor of the House of Representatives. And if the House passes that Senate bill, [Obama] won't take executive action. ...Certainly, the United States of America would benefit significantly from them taking that step... Even if they decide not to take those steps that are in the best interest in the country, [Obama's] not going to miss that opportunity." (Earnest's audacity is astounding: the "trump card" the Republicans hold is to cave in to Obama's demands. That is tantamount to a man saying to his wife: "Honey, don't you realize that *you* hold the trump card? If you just let me play golf every weekend without complaint, then I won't give you a hard time about it!") [67684]

Meanwhile, White House chief of staff Denis McDonough is asked by MSNBC's Chris Jansing, "Is there one thing you can say to American voters they're going to see that's different, given the message they sent on Tuesday?" McDonough replies, "They're going to see Washington working better if [Obama] has his way, and that's what he's going to do." (Like Obama, McDonough may not realize that the Democrats lost the Senate on November 4.) [67689, 67690]

On November 8 newly-elected Senator Joni Ernst (R-IA) reports for two days of military duty. WesternJournalism.com notes, "Ernst is a lieutenant colonel in the logistics branch and currently commands the 185th Combat Sustainment Support Battalion at Camp Dodge, the largest battalion in the Iowa Army National Guard. As of 2014, Ernst had served 21 years between the Army Reserve and the National Guard. She spent 14 months in Kuwait in 2003-2004 as a company commander during Operation Iraqi Freedom." [67742, 67743]

VoltaireNet.org reports, "On 10 April 2014, the USS Donald Cook entered the waters of the Black Sea and on 12 April a Russian Su-24 tactical bomber flew over the vessel triggering an incident that, according to several media reports, completely demoralized its crew... As the Russian jet approached the US vessel, the electronic device disabled all radars, control circuits, systems, information transmission, etc. on board the US destroyer. In other words, the all-powerful *Aegis* system, now hooked up—or about to be—with the defense systems installed on NATO's most modern ships was shut down, as turning off the TV set with the remote control. The Russian Su-24 then simulated a missile attack against the USS Donald Cook, which was left literally deaf and blind. As if

carrying out a training exercise, the Russian aircraft—unarmed—repeated the same maneuver 12 times before flying away.” Gary North later writes at LewRockwell.com, “This story got no play in American media. ... The Pentagon’s strategy is to play dumb. ‘Incident? What incident?’ Congressional hearings? Don’t hold your breath. Now Russia’s defense minister says that Russian bombers will soon start patrolling the Gulf of Mexico.” [67991, 67992]

On *Cashin’ In*, host Eric Bolling says, “It’s time to wake up America. Time for painting in big, bold conservative colors; no more squishy Republican pastels. The left and the Obama administration have had a sudden, dramatic change of heart. Apparently it’s time to compromise. Compromise? Did they compromise on ObamaCare? We didn’t want it. [Obama] and his majority forced that monster upon us. No compromise there. Did [Obama] compromise when he opened the border for hundreds of thousands of illegal children, Central American kids, to make themselves home here in America? Nope. It was his way or the highway. So let me get this straight: for six years, America has had the progressive agenda crammed down our throats, and now that the GOP has control of both houses of Congress, ... Obama, Val Jarrett and their minions want to play ball with the right? Sorry, Democrats, you fumbled and the GOP picked up the football. Get the Keystone pipeline legislation in [Obama’s] desk. Dare him to veto a bill that would create tens of thousands of jobs, reduce our energy costs, and create economic activity. Get a bill on his desk that allows corporations to repatriate two trillion dollars in profits sitting in foreign bank accounts; profits that were already taxed over there, let them bring it back to spend and hire American workers and American technology. It’s a two trillion stimulus package that costs the taxpayer zero. ... Dare [Obama] to veto that one. And put up a legal immigration reform package that conservatives want—emphasis on legal immigration. Veto that... and good luck to your 2016 Democrat pals. This is not a time for compromise. Conservatives have the ball. Time to run up the score—don’t spike the football, but damn, don’t waste this majority.” [67799]

At NationalReview.com John Yoo writes that he believes the Obama administration will lose when the Supreme Court rules on the ObamaCare case *Halbig v. Burwell* because: “1. The plain text of the statute denies subsidies to people who live in states without an exchange. This reading is not absurd, because it creates a powerful incentive for states to create an exchange in the first place. The obvious meaning of the text should only be discarded if it created absurd or ridiculous results... 2. There was no split in the circuits—the lower courts actually seemed to accept the Obama administration’s misreading of its own law. If the Court agreed with the lower courts, or wasn’t sure about it, they could have just allowed the issue to further percolate (as the Justices themselves will often say when they pass on the opportunity to take a case). The grant of certiorari (which takes four Justices) only makes sense if a majority wants to overrule the lower courts quickly. 3. I assume Chief Justice Roberts is with the original four dissenters from *Sebelius* two years ago in opposing the administration. This gives him the chance to atone for his error in upholding Obamacare as a valid use of the taxing clause in that case. His decision in *Sebelius* did great violence to the Constitution’s protections for federalism—it will be the mission of his Chief Justiceship to repair the damage. Plus, the insincere misreading of the statute will grate especially hard on Roberts’s professionalism—he

seems to take seriously getting the right lawyerly answer to technical statutory questions. Justice Kennedy, who is usually the swing vote, was strongly in the dissent against Obamacare two years ago, and I cannot see him engaging in legal gymnastics to save a law he thinks is already unconstitutional. 4. The Court will be acting in agreement with, rather than against, majority wishes. The last election gives the court political cover to cut back on Obamacare. Given the election results, a majority of Americans support repeal or radical restructuring of Obamacare. If the Court rules against Obama here, it will be acting with the support of a majority of Congress. What judge can resist the chance to reach the right legal result, fix mistakes from the past, and act with popular support? It's a Supreme Court trifecta." [67753]

The Associated Press reports, "Four young Islamic terrorists planned to assassinate Queen Elizabeth by stabbing her at the Royal British Legion Festival, a military party held in Royal Albert Hall. The event is scheduled on Saturday, Nov 8. ...The Sun reports that the four extremists, aged 19 to 27, were arrested by British police on Thursday night. Besides a knife, the police found in their possession firearms. They were arrested on suspicions of committing, preparing or instigating acts of terrorism, according to the Metropolitan police. Authorities informed the 88-year-old Queen about the assassination plot, but despite the threat to her life, she and Prime Minister David Cameron would still attend to her royal duties this weekend such as wreath-laying rites at the Sunday Remembrance celebration to mark the end of World War I in 1918. Besides the Queen, other members of the British royal family would attend the events as well as political and military leaders. The event's finale would be a two-minute silence while poppy petals fall from the roof to represent Britons who died in World War I. Britain raised in August the national terror threat to 'severe' from 'substantial' because of the 'highly likely' chances of a terrorist attack." [67702]

While Fox News prepare to air an interview with Rob O'Neill, the Navy SEAL who allegedly killed Osama bin Laden, Paul Craig Roberts writes at LewRockwell.com, "Osama bin Laden died in December 2001 of renal failure and other health problems... Bin Laden's obituary appeared in numerous foreign and Arabic press, and also on Fox News. No one can survive renal failure for a decade, and no dialysis machine was found in the alleged Abbotabad compound of bin Laden, who allegedly was murdered by SEALs a decade after his obituary notices. Additionally, no one among the crew of the ship from which the White House reported bin Laden was buried at sea saw any such burial, and the sailors sent messages home to that effect. Somehow a burial was held onboard a ship on which there are constant watches and crew on alert at all hours, and no one witnessed it. ...To date there is no evidence whatsoever in behalf of the Obama regime's claim. Not one tiny scrap. Just unsubstantiated self-serving claims. Additionally, ...witnesses interviewed by Pakistan TV reported that only one helicopter landed in Abbotabad and that when the occupants of the helicopter returned from the alleged bin Laden compound, the helicopter exploded on takeoff and there were no survivors. In other words, there was no bin Laden corpse to deliver to the ship that did not witness a burial and no SEAL hero to return who allegedly murdered an unarmed bin Laden. Moreover, the BBC interviewed residents in Abbotabad, including those next door to the alleged 'bin Laden compound,' and all say that they knew the person who lived there and

it was not bin Laden. ...So what is this claim by Rob O'Neill about? He is presented as a 'motivational speaker' in search of clients. What better ploy among gullible Americans than to claim 'I am the one who shot bin Laden.'" [67699, 67734]

"...What better way to give Rob O'Neill's claim validity than for the Pentagon to denounce his revelation for breaking obligation to remain silent. The Pentagon claims that O'Neill by claiming credit has painted a big target sign on our door asking ISIS to come get us. What unbelievable nonsense. ISIS and anyone who believed Obama's claim to have done in bin Laden already knew, if they believed the lie, that the Obama regime claimed responsibility for murdering an unarmed bin Laden. The reason the SEAL team was prevented from talking is that no member of the team was on the alleged mission. Just as the ship from which bin Laden was allegedly buried has no witnesses to the deed, the SEAL unit, whose members formed the team that allegedly dispatched an unarmed Terrorist Mastermind rather than to take him into custody for questioning, mysteriously died in a helicopter crash when they were loaded in violation of procedures in an unprotected 1960s vintage helicopter and sent into a combat zone in Afghanistan shortly after the alleged raid on 'bin Laden's compound.' For a while there were news reports that the families of these dead SEALs do not believe one word of the government's account. Moreover, the families reported receiving messages from the SEALs that suddenly they felt threatened and did not know why. The SEALs had been asking one another: "Were you on the bin Laden mission?" Apparently, none were. And to keep this a secret, the SEALs were sent to their deaths. Anyone who believes anything the US government says is gullible beyond the meaning of the word." (It is worth reminding readers that on November 2, 2007 former Prime Minister of Pakistan Benazir Bhutto told journalist David Frost that Osama bin Laden was already dead; she herself was assassinated a short time later. On January 28, 2002 CBS reported that Osama bin Laden was likely on dialysis for failing kidneys. If that story was correct, it is almost impossible to believe that that he could have lived another 9 years.) [20257, 20258, 20259, 20269, 20273, 20274, 20275, 20290, 20325, 24122, 24495, 32480, 67699, 67700, 67701]

Obama officially announces Loretta Lynch as his pick to follow Eric Holder as the nation's Attorney General, saying, "I couldn't be more proud to nominate Loretta Lynch as our next attorney general. ...It's pretty hard to be more qualified for the job than Loretta." Senators Ted Cruz (R-TX) and Mike Lee (R-UT) issue a statement: "...Obama's Attorney General nominee deserves fair and full consideration of the United States Senate, which is precisely why she should not be confirmed in the lame duck session of Congress by senators who just lost their seats and are no longer accountable to the voters. The Attorney General is the [nation's] chief law enforcement officer. As such, the nominee must demonstrate full and complete commitment to the law. Loretta Lynch deserves the opportunity to demonstrate those qualities, beginning with a statement whether or not she believes [Obama's] executive amnesty plans are constitutional and legal." HotAir.com observes that Obama "is preparing to use Loretta Lynch as a pawn in a larger political game. By picking someone with her professional history and then calling for a 'quick timeline for her confirmation' [Obama] is setting up the Republicans for a fight. When they insist that a thorough vetting and debate is called for and should be done by the new Congress selected by the voters, Obama will once again unleash the

tired canard about how all the GOP leadership can do is obstruct. This is not a bug in the system, it's a feature. He's spoiling for that fight, and from the look of things he will absolutely get it. Nothing has changed since Tuesday. Nothing." [67709, 67710, 67711, 67716, 67718, 67720, 67726, 67740]

At LibertyUnyielding.com Howard Portnoy wonders where Lynch stands on the issue of Islamic jihad. He writes, "So what is Lynch's position on jihad and its religious underpinnings? In the 2012 terror plot to bomb New York's JFK Airport, Lynch, as U.S. Attorney for the Eastern District, weighed in on the sentencing of 66-year-old co-conspirator Kareem Ibrahim, who was given a life sentence. According to the Associated Press (via the Seattle Times): 'Lynch said in a statement that [Ibrahim], a Shiite imam from Trinidad, 'abandoned the true tenants [sic; tenets] of his religion' by participating in the plot.' As Robert Spencer grimly quips at Jihad Watch: 'Yes, I am sure that Loretta Lynch knows so much more about the true 'tenants' of Islam than does a 66-year-old Shi'ite imam.' Lynch's presumptions about Islam's true nature are compatible with those of [Obama] and members of his administration... Lynch seems to be a perfect fit—which makes her a less than perfect fit for the role of the nation's top cop.'" [67826]

At Townhall.com D. W. Wilber reports that activists in Ferguson, Missouri, "are trying to arrange 'rules of engagement' with the police in anticipation of civil unrest following the Grand Jury decision being released, which it's anticipated will be a 'no true bill' clearing Officer Darren Wilson. This should happen fairly soon. Good thinking on their part to plan ahead like this. The activists want the police to NOT use armored vehicles, presumably so that the officers cannot take cover behind them when the shooting starts. They also don't want any officers mounted atop armored vehicles since that allows a better field of vision for the officer to communicate threats to other police. They want the police to recognize 'free zones,' where the rioters can run to for safety after shooting at the police. These 'free zones' will prevent the police from entering and arresting the rioters who just shot at them, since they are now in a 'free zone.' Sounds entirely reasonable I'm sure. The activists have also sought an agreement that the police will NOT use police batons or TASERS on them, or engage them with police dogs while they are rioting. Activists have sought an agreement that the police will NOT use tear gas or other chemical agents, and will also NOT fire rubber bullets at the rioters. (Considering what the police have endured over the last couple of months following Michael Brown's death, I suspect most of the police would be happy to oblige the activists in this regard and only use REAL bullets.)" [67714, 67728, 67729, 67741, 67816, 67817, 68018]

"Interestingly the activists have made no assurances to the police that they won't be shot at, assaulted, buildings set afire, or that looting, pillaging, and plundering will not occur. There are a number of other demands the rioters have made public, but they sounded rather foolish and silly (unlike these), so I don't list them here. One might consider all of this drama playing out to be tailor-made for a Hollywood movie, or perhaps even a mini-series. 'The Ferguson Insurgency!' Or 'Idiocy,' whichever is more appropriate. But it's more likely that this drama will just continue to play out on the streets of Ferguson in the coming days and weeks, and it will most assuredly have a sad ending. Michael Brown will still be dead because he grew up in a dysfunctional urban environment. Police

officers will be injured (hopefully nothing serious), and the news media will have several hours of film footage to use to fill in broadcast hours during those slow news days when they do ‘retrospectives.’” [67714, 67728, 67729, 67741]

Also at Townhall.com, political editor Guy Benson writes, “Based on national exit polls, here’s how the 2014 midterm electorate shaped up, underpinning Republicans’ historic landslide victory: (1) There was a gender gap, and it favored the GOP. Democrats carried women by just four points, while men flocked to Republicans (57/41). Republicans won white women and married women by double-digits. (2) Three-quarters of the electorate was white, with Republicans carrying the white vote by 22 points. Black voters split (89/10) for Democrats, while Republicans closed the Latino gap a bit, winning 36 percent of that demographic (including 41 percent of Hispanic men). After getting trounced among Asians in 2012, the GOP won a narrow majority of Asian voters this year. (3) The youth vote went Democratic, but by a relatively thin margin (54/43). (4) In addition to closing the ‘ground game’ gap, Republicans won the ‘persuadables,’ carrying independents by 12 points (54/42). (5) Democrats won low-income voters handily, barely carried the working class, and got crushed among all other income groups, including the middle class. (6) Catholics are a critical swing demographic. Unsurprisingly, they swung to Republicans in 2014, by ten points. Fully one-third of Jewish voters cast ballots for the GOP this year, up from 12 percent in 2006... (7) Two-thirds of voters said the country is on the wrong track. Republicans won nearly 70 percent of this group. A majority also agreed that government is ‘doing too much,’ almost 80 percent of whom voted red. Fifty-nine percent described themselves as angry or dissatisfied with the Obama administration. (8) Views on the two major parties ran roughly even, erasing a recent Democratic advantage. Dems’ favorable/unfavorable among 2014 voters was (43/55); for Republicans, it was (42/54). (9) Current members of the military and veterans broke for Republicans by 20 points. (10) One in four LGBT voters went for the GOP.” [67715]

North Korea releases two Americans it had been holding captive, Kenneth Bae and Matthew Todd Miller. Obama says, “It’s a wonderful day for them and their families. We’re grateful for their safe return.” (*The Obama Timeline* believes the release is a goodwill gesture as winter approaches: the impoverished dictatorship needs food to keep tens of thousands of people from starving.) [67717, 67710, 67731, 67809, 67812]

FoxNews.com reports, “After already receiving a controversial \$1.6 billion construction loan from U.S. taxpayers, the wealthy investors of a California solar power plant now want a \$539 million federal grant to pay off their federal loan. ‘This is an attempt by very large cash generating companies that have billions on their balance sheet to get a federal bailout, i.e. a bailout from us—the taxpayer for their pet project,’ said Reason Foundation VP of Research Julian Morris. ‘It’s actually rather obscene.’ The Ivanpah solar electric generating plant is owned by Google and renewable energy giant NRG, which are responsible for paying off their federal loan. If approved by the U.S. Treasury, the two corporations will not use their own money, but taxpayer cash to pay off 30 percent of the cost of their plant, but taxpayers will receive none of the millions in revenues the plant

will generate over the next 30 years.” (According to Forbes.com, Google was worth \$382.47 billion as of May 2014.) [67721, 67722]

At NationalReview.com Jonah Goldberg reminds readers of “that great episode of the *Brady Bunch* ‘Adios, Johnny Bravo.’ ...I will summarize. Greg Brady, scion of House Brady, is offered a contract from a record label. At first he is reluctant to sign on because he’s a loyal member of his family band. But the record producers convince him that he owes it to himself to be all he can be. They want him to become the new smash-hit sensation ‘Johnny Bravo.’ ...After much soul-searching, Greg agrees to become Johnny Bravo. That is, until he finds out that the producers don’t much care about his musical talent. Through the wizardry of music production—long before the advent of AutoTune—they twist his vocal stylings to what the market wants, not what Greg’s muse has on offer. ‘That’s not the way I sound!’ Greg protests. The producer retorts, ‘You? Now c’mon baby, don’t get caught up on an ego trip. I mean who cares how you sound? We’re after the sound.’ ‘If you don’t care about my sound, what do you need me for?’ Greg asks. ‘Because you fit the suit,’ another producer responds. Forgive me for committing the error of defining my meaning. But Barack Obama fits the suit. ...Barack Obama is indisputably good at one thing: Getting elected president of the United States. That’s it. He’s not good at *being* president of the United States. He’s not good at being the head of his party. He’s not good at diplomacy or public policy or managing large bureaucracies. He has no new ideas. But man did he fit the suit, metaphorically speaking.” [67744]

“...I have no doubt that Obama’s more left-wing in his heart than he is in his speeches and public priorities. But my basic point is that Obama doesn’t realize that his electoral success was a function of the media age we are in. He fit the part. He said the right words. He was an anti-George W. Bush when lots of people desperately wanted an anti-George W. Bush. He was black, cool, and eggheady in just the right way. Voting for Obama made lots of people feel good about themselves—which is a terrible reason to vote for anybody. Media elites and average Americans alike were seduced because they wanted to be seduced. They—starting with Obama himself—believed the hype. And he still does. He’s like modern-day Johnny Bravo lip-synching an auto-tuned song about ‘keeping it real’ and he thinks *he’s actually keeping it real*. He goes around talking about how much he hates talking points and sound-bites, how much he loathes cynicism and ideology. And yet, he does all this in talking points and sound-bites packed like verbal clown cars with ideology and cynicism.” [67744]

With only two months of power left, Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid (D-NV) plans to use it to “push the Senate to confirm 50 of ...Obama’s nominees as well as push through a huge, pork-laden spending bill before the end of 2014,” according to Examiner.com. ...[M]any believe Reid’s main focus will be passage of a new Democrat-sponsored bill to fund the government. The hope is to get a bill passed for a huge spending package that would run the government through September 2015, well beyond the start of a Republican-run Senate. According to [political consultant Tom] McCullough, Reid doesn’t want to debate moving a short-term bill that allows the Senate GOP majority in January to renegotiate spending levels at the start of the new year. ‘Reid wants to be able

to blame the Republicans for not funding the government and he knows that's how the news media—who for some unexplained reason love that guy—will slant their stories: GOP defunds government programs,' warned McCullough." [67754]

ISIS leader Abu Bakr al-Baghdadi is reportedly "critically injured" in a U.S.-led air strike on the Iraqi border town of al-Qaim. [67761, 67762, 67771, 67810]

On November 9 the White House commemorates the 25th anniversary of the fall of the Berlin Wall by saying nothing about it... or about Ronald Reagan. [67796]

Obama appears on *Face the Nation* (in an interview recorded on November 7) and says, "I still consider this the best job on earth" and will "try to squeeze [out] every last ounce of possibility" in the final two years." He also makes it clear he will issue an illegal immigrant amnesty executive order: "I'm going to do what I need to do." (The U.S. Constitution gives Congress the power to "establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization..." Obama has no legal authority to grant amnesty to anyone, although he has the power, on an *individual* basis, to grant reprieves and pardons for criminals. He cannot pardon or grant citizenship or any other privileges to 10-20 million people en masse.) Sympathetic interviewer Bob Schieffer asks Obama, "Let me ask you this, uh, you had a tough summer. We saw the rise of ISIS, the outbreak of Ebola, trouble in the Ukraine, illegal immigrants coming across the border, did you ever go back to the residence at night and say, 'Are we ever gonna [sic] get a break here?'" Obama replies, "We've had a busy six years." Schieffer also asks, "What criticisms of your administration do you think are valid?" Not surprisingly, Obama lists none and blames Republicans: "I think that what is also true is that no matter how frustrating it can sometimes be... to deal with an opposition that is pretty stubborn, and where there are really strong differences, you've just got to keep on trying." Obama refuses to concede that the election results had anything at all to do with his policies. Instead, he says, "The message that I took from this election, and we've seen this in a number of elections, successive elections, is people want to see this city work. ...And I think there are times, there's no doubt about it, where, you know, I think we have not been successful in going out there and letting people know what it is that we're trying to do and why this is the right direction. So there is a failure of politics there that we've got to improve on." (In other words, "I am always right, but the Democrat candidates did not defend me properly.") [67766, 67780, 67781, 67782, 67788, 67802]

Also on *Face the Nation*, CNN analyst David Gergen says Obama 'is the one that [sic; who] lost the elections. ...He's 20 points back and he's acting like he's ahead." Panel moderator Bob Schieffer says, "I'm wondering about the talk after this election, I think [Obama's] relations with the Democrats in the Senate may be as bad as his relations with the Republicans." Journalist Bob Woodward replies, "That's absolutely true. You get the Democrats in private, and they are on fire, because [Obama] won't spend the time, because he won't listen. [Fellow panelist] Peggy [Noonan] said yesterday in her column, and I think there is real truth here: humility is power. And after you lose, you have to come out and kind of face up to that. And there's a whole undercurrent in [Obama's] approach that, well, you know, it was bad but, you know, that was worse than bad. And I

think, optimistically, I think he's capable... he's capable of changing and engaging in that outreach, and he just needs to do it and kind of get out of this bubble that he seems to be living in." With regard to Obama's general tone during his interview with Schieffer, Woodward comments, "Obama is selling what happened in the midterm election and trying to put the best spin on it. I found the interview with Obama very revealing because he said, reach out to the other side, to persuade and sell it. [If] You're going to reach out to the other side on something one of the things you want to do is listen. But we didn't hear that. And what we heard is the continuous Obama line, 'I'm heading in the right direction, this is right.' No one knows better than Obama that all these powers are shared with Congress, and 'go it alone' approach is just not going to work." [67763, 67763, 67765, 67788, 67856]

Former President George W. Bush is also interviewed by *Face the Nation's* Bob Schieffer. TPNN.com notes, "Speaking about Saddam Hussein, Bush claimed that when [Iraqi dictator Saddam] Hussein was captured, he revealed to an FBI agent that he didn't believe President Bush was serious when he issued an ultimatum to the Iraqi dictator to relinquish power or else face the U.S. military. 'It's hard for me to believe he didn't believe me,' Bush stated. 'We'd given an ultimatum to the Taliban and delivered.' 'I went in there as a result of a very changed environment because of September the 11th,' Bush said. 'The danger we were concerned about was that the weapons ... would be put into the hands of terrorist groups that would come and make the attacks of 9/11 pale in comparison. ... When you say something as president, you [had] better mean it. Words mean something.'" (Obama's reaction to Bush's statement is not known.) [67791]

On *State of the Union*, Senator Chris Murphy (D-CT) says Obama cannot legally send 1,500 more U.S. troops to Iraq: "I would argue the 60-day War Powers Act clock expires. Tomorrow is 60 days since [Obama] announced his initial strategy. Congress has a constitutional responsibility to authorize this. I do not think [Obama] has the ability under current authority to authorize 1,500 troops without Congress acting. So my hope is that when we get back, we're going to have a full debate on this, and I think a lot of us are going to be very reluctant to support this kind of infusion of ground troops absent some suggestion, some evidence that the Iraqis are doing what's necessary politically to compliment this major infusion of American military resources." [67772, 67779]

On ABC's *This Week*, *Time* magazine's Mark Halperin says November 4 "was a horrible day for the Democrats: the governor's races, the Senate races, the state legislators. And I think right now it's a snapshot; the Republicans have problems too but as a snapshot for Tuesday, ... Obama was a spent political force and the Democratic Party either needs to be a liberal party and have the faith in their convictions and what [Obama's] accomplished, or they need to find another way. White men, older voters, Southern voters: this is a party right now that doesn't have a 50-state strategy for winning midterm elections." Halperin also says the Republicans in Congress are "going to have to take some risks. Risk of dealing with [Obama], risk of being the party who are [sic; that is] for fundamental restructuring of entitlement programs, the risk of trying to pass immigration reform for the good of their 2016 nominee. The risks of standing up to the Tea Party caucus and talk radio. There's [sic; there are] tons of things they can do. They are unified.

These are not guys known as bold risk takers who go out in public and throw down the gauntlet. They're going to have to if they want to do what's good for their politics and good for the country." (By "standing up to the Tea Party caucus and talk radio," Halperin of course means he wants members of the GOP establishment to legislate as though they are Democrats.) [67773, 67807]

On *Fox News Sunday*, Senator John Barrasso says, "I believe [an Obama executive order granting amnesty to illegal immigrants] will hurt cooperation on every issue... What [Obama] does over the next two months will set the tone for the next two years in Washington. You know, nobody ran for office and won a Senate race based on [Obama] having more executive authority to take executive actions on amnesty or healthcare or on any of those other issues. The American people want us to work together to find solutions. I think it would be like [Obama] pulling the pin out of the hand grenade as we're trying to work together. I hope cooler heads in the White House can prevail on [Obama] to say, 'Look, if you want a good constructive final two years, don't do this now...'" [67774]

Newsmax.com reports, "As many as 214,500 doctors will not participate in any Affordable Care Act exchange plans in the coming year, according to a medical practice trade group. Physicians are opting out for two main reasons: concern over low reimbursement rates, and worries that in a significant number of cases they won't be paid for their services, a new survey by the Medical Group Management Association reveals. ...In the private healthcare market, an individual loses coverage after failing to pay a premium. But [ObamaCare] exchange plans must provide their members with a 90-day 'grace period' to pay their premiums... The insurer is required to continue coverage for 30 days. After that, any medical care given a patient will be covered by the insurer if the overdue premium is paid by the end of the 90-day period. If the patient does not pay up, the healthcare provider will have to recover any charges incurred between the 31st and 90th day of the grace period directly from the patient. If the patient doesn't pay, the provider won't be compensated. A patient could conceivably join an exchange plan, stop paying the premium, receive extensive medical care, and escape paying completely. ...The other major reason for doctors opting out of the exchanges is their low reimbursement rates. Compared to each dollar a private plan pays providers for a service, it's estimated that Medicare pays \$0.80 and Obamacare exchanges pay about \$0.60." [67767]

At *WeeklyStandard.com* Daniel Halper writes, "...Obama and Vice President Biden might not see eye-to-eye on immigration strategy. A hint of an apparent disagreement was on display during Obama's lunch with congressional leaders on Friday at the White House. 'The meeting was tense at times, according to a senior House Republican aide. The aide was not authorized to describe the back-and-forth publicly by name and spoke only on condition of anonymity,' the Associated Press reports. 'Senate Democratic leader Harry Reid, about to lose his grip on the upper chamber, barely said a word. The aide said at one point as House Speaker John Boehner was making an argument on immigration, Obama responded that his patience was running out and Vice President Joe Biden

interrupted to ask how long Republicans needed [to pass an immigration bill in the House]. Obama angrily cut Biden off, the aide said.” [67778, 67803]

D. W. Ulsterman writes, “Outgoing Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid was reportedly reluctant to attend the White House meeting this week of party leaders called by ...Obama on the night the senator saw his domination over the senate wash away following a wave of anti-Obama and anti-Democrat sentiment during last week’s Midterm Election. Soon after that same meeting, his staff were given an earful regarding just how frustrated the longtime senator has become with a completely self-important and insulated Barack Obama. It was Senator Reid’s staff who then shared their boss’s dissatisfaction with others, including members of both [House Speaker] John Boehner and [Senate Minority Leader] Mitch McConnell’s offices. Some of these staff will likely be out of a job in 2015 as Reid’s office goes through the necessary downsizing expected of one having recently been bounced from the considerable power of Senate Majority Leader. Here is a Capitol Hill source’s accounting of just how angry Harry Reid is: ‘The senator was apparently complaining loudly and often hours before heading to the White House. ‘Why are we bothering with this garbage? A ridiculous waste of time. Nothing will happen. [Obama] just wants to look relevant. It’s always about him. Every time, it’s always him. I’d like to take their d*mn optics and shove it up their *ss. He’s too stupid to realize this is his fault!’ By the time Senator Reid arrived at the White House his mood was said to be no better. He was openly gracious to Senator McConnell but had nothing to say directly to [Obama]. He exchanged a few very brief pleasantries with the vice president but was glaring over at Obama the whole time. The report about tension between [Obama] and vice president was overstated by media reports. The real tension was between Reid and Obama. Apparently if Harry Reid could wipe somebody off the face of the earth with a look, he would have at that meeting. He’s that upset. He might actually hate the Obama White House more than the Republicans right now!’” [67783]

“Rumors are that after the White House meeting McConnell’s office touched base with Reid’s office regarding the pending AG hearing [the confirmation hearing for Obama’s Attorney General nominee Loretta Lynch]. We [Republicans] want that pushed back to January after the new Congress is seated. I have to wonder if Reid is willing to play that card against [Obama]. You won’t hear much about it but up here that would be an epic move that would send a clear signal to the White House that they are done. Then again, Reid being Reid [he] could do a 180 and go tell us to pound sand. He’s about as volatile a character as you’ll ever see in the senate. Definitely walks to his own beat.” Ulsterman adds more information from his Republican insider: “Another bit of Reid-related news. There’s something brewing between him and [Nevada’s Republican Governor Brian] Sandoval. Sandoval just won re-election by a mandate landslide. He’s the former Nevada AG [attorney general]. Reid’s power is in serious decline. Some think it has to do with an investigation. If that is true, Reid would need the Obama DOJ [Department of Justice] to protect him from that. That’s total speculation at this point on my part but it just seems too crazy for the senator to burn a bridge he might still need very soon. Keep your eyes open for any investigation type news coming out of Nevada. The senator has managed to duck and cover his way out of some rumors before but that was with control of the Senate and the influence that went with it. He’s a lot more vulnerable now.” (No one should be

surprised if Sandoval runs against Reid in 2018 and takes his Senate seat from him. Reid, of course, resents Sandoval for defeating his son Rory Reid in his gubernatorial run.) [67783]

At AmericanThinker.com M. Catherine Evans writes, “If confirmed, it looks as if Barack Obama’s nominee for Attorney General, Loretta Lynch, will be carrying out Eric Holder’s politics of racial vengeance. Based on her family history, social justice statements and close ties to black activists, Lynch will deploy law enforcement resources based on race and political ideology, not on the rule of law. ...From 1994 to 1998, Lynch was a partner in Connecticut-based Ujamaa Investment Group. According to David Horowitz’s Discover the Networks site, ‘Ujamaa’ is a Swahili term signifying a commitment to the practice of ‘shared wealth and a repudiation of economic inequality.’ ...Lynch has a close relationship with Eric Holder and in a speech at the Martin Luther King Center in Long Beach, New York last year she vowed to continue his work at the Department of Justice and fight those in the ‘deep south’ who want to take away blacks’ voting rights and reverse the progress of the last 50 years. Then she ask[ed] the young people in the audience, ‘What is it that makes you feel oppressed?’ ‘Is it the prison of racism?’” (Lynch opposes photo ID for voting, believing it discriminates against minorities; she opposes the death penalty, for the same reason.) [67784, 67784, 67795, 68013, 68138]

At NewRepublic.com Noam Scheiber writes that Democrat Party operatives and Obama administration officials “are shocked” by Obama advisor Valerie Jarrett’s “longevity and marvel at her influence. When I asked a longtime source who left the Obama White House years ago for his impressions of Jarrett, he confessed that he was too fearful to speak with me, even off the record. ...[Jarrett] has placed friends and former employees in important positions across the administration—‘you can be my person over there,’ is a common refrain. ... When administration aides plan ‘bilats,’ the term of art for meetings of two countries’ top officials, they realize that whatever size meeting they negotiate—nine by nine, eight by eight, etc.—our side will typically include one less foreign policy hand, because Jarrett has a standing seat at any table that includes [Obama]. Not surprisingly, all this influence has won Jarrett legions of detractors. They complain that she has too much control over who sees [Obama]. That she skews his decision-making with her after-hours visits. That she is an incorrigible yes-woman. That she has, in effect, become the chief architect of his very prominent and occasionally suffocating bubble. There is an element of truth to this critique. While aboard Air Force One at the end of the 2012 campaign, Jarrett turned to Obama and told him, ‘...I don’t understand how you’re not getting eighty-five percent of the vote.’ The other Obama aides in the cabin looked around in disbelief before concluding that she’d been earnest. ...So adept is Jarrett at catering to [Obama’s] needs that Michelle Obama has, at least on one occasion, chafed at the portrayal of their relationship. Late in the 2008 campaign, *Vogue* published a long profile of Jarrett titled ‘Barack’s Rock.’ According to a senior campaign aide, Michelle sniffed about the magazine bestowing a title that she considered hers.” [67789, 67790, 67805, 67835]

DailyCaller.com posts an October 2013 video (uncovered by investment advisor Rich Weinstein) of Obama architect Jonathan Gruber telling an audience at the University of Pennsylvania's 24th Annual Health Economics Conference, "This bill [ObamaCare] was written in a tortured way to make sure CBO [Congressional Budget Office] did not score the [individual] mandate [penalties] as taxes. If CBO scored the mandate as taxes, the bill dies. Okay, so it's written to do that. In terms of risk-rated subsidies, if you had a law which said that healthy people are gonna [sic] pay in—you made [it] explicit healthy people pay in [more than they need to] and sick people get [the] money, it would not have passed... [A] lack of transparency is a huge political advantage. And basically, call it the stupidity of the American voter or whatever, but basically that was really, really critical to get the thing to pass... Look, I wish [others were] right that we could make it all transparent, but I'd rather have this law than not." (In other words, the Obama administration viewed the American people as stupid and, in a typical socialist "ends justifies the means" tactic, lied about ObamaCare in order to get it passed. Some might argue that Gruber—who was paid about \$400,000 for his ObamaCare consulting work—was actually calling Democrats stupid inasmuch as most Republicans opposed the legislation.) Sitting next to Gruber on the panel is Mark V. Pauly, Professor of Health Care Management at the University of Pennsylvania. Pauly voices no objection to Gruber's "stupid" statement. [67793, 67797, 67806, 67814, 67821, 67829, 67846, 67867, 67877, 67885, 67886, 67887, 67918, 67938, 68023, 68039, 68066, 68278]

Despite the significance of Gruber's remarks, ABC, CBS, NBC, Univision, and Telemundo neglect to air the story, although Fox News and CNN do. (Arguably, the fact that the major networks are ignoring the story is proof that it is significant. HotAir.com's Noah Rothman writes that the media is "circling the wagons around Gruber" to protect Obama and ObamaCare. On MSNBC, *The New York Times*' Josh Barros provides Gruber with the excuse that "Public opinion on health care policy is just completely incoherent: and "puts politicians in a position where the only thing they can do to make the public happy is lie and so, people lied." A Washington Post story's headline is not, "ObamaCare architect lied about the law," but, "GOP's anti-Obamacare push gains new momentum in wake of Gruber video.") [67852, 67962]

Protesters in Ferguson, Missouri announce a \$5,000 "bounty" for anyone who can locate police officer Darren Wilson—whose shooting of convenience store robber Michael Brown sparked riots. (Obama and Attorney General Eric "my people" Holder have no comment.) [67798]

Newsmax.com reports, "Former CBS News investigative reporter Sharyl Attkisson says CBS News executives kept a clip of ...Obama refusing to call the Benghazi attacks terrorism secret until after the election in order to help Obama's re-election. Obama was interviewed by Steve Kroft for '60 Minutes' the Sunday following the attack and said, 'Well, it's too early to know exactly how this came about, what group was involved. But, obviously, it was an attack on Americans.' That clip did not air as part of the original interview, but the full transcript was sent to the 'CBS Evening News' staff. Mitt Romney brought up during one of their 2012 presidential debates Obama's failure for 14 days to label the attack terrorism. Attkisson said that would have been the perfect time to have

brought out the clip. Appearing Sunday on Fox News Channel's 'MediaBuzz,' Attkisson said, 'That exchange, I believe, should have been pulled out immediately after the debate, which would have been very newsy at the time, It was exclusive to CBS. It would have, it appears to me, proven Romney's point against Obama. But that clip was kept secret.' Attkisson said she was covering Benghazi, yet no one told her about the clip, instead directing her to another clip from the same interview that made Obama sound like he had labeled the act terrorism from the beginning. 'And it was only right before the election that somebody kind of leaked out the transcript to others of us at CBS and we were really shocked. We felt that there had been something very unethical had been done to have kept that up,' Attkisson said." [67801]

Breitbart.com reports, "The Minneapolis public school [MPS] system announced a major new district-wide policy for disciplining students: any suspension of a non-white student requires the district superintendent's approval. The MPS has been stung by reports that students of color are 10 times more likely to receive a suspension than white students. The Minneapolis school system has an enrollment of over 32,000 students. Seventy percent are non-white. School superintendent Bernadeia Johnson, a black woman, maintains that she wants to 'disrupt' the current suspension trends. Superintendent Johnson says that her new policy is aimed at forcing local school administrators to deeply 'probe' the reasons for issuing a suspension before that punishment is handed out." (The suspensions for white students apparently do not need "probing." Obama and Secretary of Education Arne Duncan have no comment.) [67808]

At PJMedia.com Roger L. Simon suggests that Hispanics will be the Democrats' next victims: "And now come the Latinos. After they have decimated black culture, our progressive friends are going after the Hispanics. I say 'going after' because the obvious unspoken goal of Obama's executive amnesty plan is the creation of a yet greater class of dependent voters. It's actually quite insulting to Latinos in the long term, just as it was to African Americans. One of the most effective ways to ruin someone's life is to make him or her dependent. Dependency on the state is not all that different from dependency on drugs or alcohol. Sooner or later it dominates who you are and will most likely ruin your life. You will never be free, unless you are that rare strong individual who is able to overcome it. That is what is being done by the Democratic Party in the name of executive amnesty. What an atrocious, immoral thing to do. We should all be equal under the law in this republic. The idea that the chief executive of our country would want to give special privileges to Latinos above and beyond the wishes of their future fellow citizens is not only morally repugnant, it is highly socially damaging. It drives us apart—and apparently deliberately. Latinos know that too and a surprising percentage seem to have seen that in last week's election, not voting, as predicted, for the Democrats. They don't want 'brown skin privilege' any more than I want 'white skin privilege' or Al Sharpton should have 'black skin privilege.' This positive turn of events should give us courage to call out the Democratic Party for its racism. It's our civic duty." [67811]

Addressing a conference of the Israeli American Council, billionaire Democrat donor Haim Saban says if he were Israeli Prime Minister Binyamin Netanyahu and Obama negotiates a weak deal with Iran that could be a threat to Israel, "I would bomb the living

daylights out of these sons of bitches. ...At the moment we could have increased the sanctions, we [the Obama administration] decreased them, and that was a mistake in my view.” [67859, 67860]

On November 10 *The Obama Timeline* received its health insurance premium notice for 2015. The rate increase is an astounding 291.8 percent.

Obama issues a statement urging the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) to classify the Internet as a telecommunications service that can be regulated by the federal government: “The time has come for the FCC to recognize that broadband service is of the same importance and must carry the same obligations as so many of the other vital services do. To do that, I believe the FCC should reclassify consumer broadband service under Title II of the Telecommunications Act—while at the same time forbearing from rate regulation and other provisions less relevant to broadband services. This is a basic acknowledgment of the services ISPs provide to American homes and businesses, and the straightforward obligations necessary to ensure the network works for everyone—not just one or two companies.” (Shortly after Obama’s statement, stock prices of Internet service providers fall.) [67820, 67837, 67842, 67843, 67867, 67868, 67941, 68054, 68055, 68106, 68145]

The Wall Street Journal notes that, as a prosecutor, Obama’s Attorney General nominee Loretta Lynch has “been aggressive in pursuing civil asset forfeiture, which has become a form of policing for profit. She recently announced that her office had collected more than \$904 million in criminal and civil actions in fiscal 2013, according to the Brooklyn Daily Eagle. Liberals and conservatives have begun to question forfeiture as an abuse of due process that can punish the innocent.” (Civil asset forfeiture laws allow law enforcement to confiscate the property of suspected criminals. For example, a drug dealer may have his automobile confiscated by the police. Unfortunately, the law is often abused as the burden of proof is shifted to the person whose property is taken. Even if the accused did not commit a crime, he may find it extraordinarily difficult to retrieve his property.) [67874, 67875, 67876, 67926]

The Republican governor-elect of Massachusetts, Charlie Baker, announces he will scuttle Democrat Governor Deval Patrick’s plans to issue driver’s licenses to illegal immigrants. Baker says, “I don’t support issuing driver’s licenses to people who are undocumented.” (TopRightNews.com notes that “Obama handed his pal Deval Patrick a ‘waiver’ to skirt the rules on secure IDs to benefit illegals. That is not what the Congress intended in the wake of the 9/11 attacks and 9/11 Commission recommendations.” [67792]

Obama arrives in Beijing, China for the 22nd Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) meeting. Obama says the United States “welcomes the rise of a prosperous, peaceful and stable China.” USA Today.com reports, “Obama emerged from his [limousine] chewing gum; he’s a well-known user of Nicorette, the smoking-cessation gum. But Chinese Internet users, accustomed to the highly formal standards of their stiff party leadership, quickly characterized the leader of the world’s most powerful nation as

an impolite ‘idler,’ or careless ‘rapper.’ ‘We made this meeting so luxurious, with singing and dancing, but see Obama, stepping out of his car chewing gum like an idler,’ wrote Yin Hong, a professor of journalism at Beijing’s Tsinghua University, on the Twitter-like Sina Weibo micro-blog service. Twitter, like Facebook, YouTube and Instagram, is banned in China, whose censors fear such services could aid political protest.” (Whether Obama is served Peking Lane Duck during his visit is not reported.) [67818, 67819, 67825, 67845, 67848, 67910, 67977]

At the APEC event, Obama and other attendees don “traditional” shirts for a group photo—a photo that results in Obama being mocked for looking like a character from *Star Trek*. [67838, 67839]

On Newsmax TV, actor, commentator, and former presidential speechwriter Ben Stein says, “You would think, if you read the liberal mainstream media, that the main problem with race in America was poor innocent black people being set upon and mistreated by the police. That’s just nonsense. I mean, the real problem with race in America is a very, very beaten-down, pathetic, self-defeating black underclass that... just can’t seem to get its way going in the way that blacks were able to before the scourge of drugs and the scourge of gangs. I mean, it’s an amazing thing—blacks were on their way in this country, even after the horrors of slavery, and then drugs came in, the destruction of families came in, and the crisis in the black community is just absolutely unbelievable, and that, it seems to me, is something that Mr. Obama could have addressed, and he has ignored it completely.” [67861]

After media leftists excoriate Stein for his comments, author Mark Steyn comes to his defense, also on Newsmax TV: “...The reaction of CNN to what Ben Stein said... is fascinating, because [those are] the characteristically stupid parameters in which we are allowed to talk about race. Eric Holder and everyone [are] always pawing for national conversations on race, by which they mean people like [CNN host] Erin Burnett get to beat up on anyone who actually says anything honest or truthful or refreshing or anything that does not prostrate itself before the pack of the usual grievance-mongers like the disgusting Al Sharpton and the disgusting Jesse Jackson. We have a stupid political discourse in this country. And one of the reasons it’s stupid is because we spend so much time on these phony racism conversations such as that held on CNN. If you take all the space on CNN or MSNBC that is devoted to racism and you just go to the other side of the world and switch on the television there, all that space that they spend talking, essentially prostrating themselves, kissing Al Sharpton’s ring, other countries spend talking about other [more important] things... Ben Stein is absolutely right. The collapse of the American family, the black American family, basically at the hands of the ‘Great Society’ is one of the great tragedies of all time. And this idea that somehow you’re not allowed to talk about it, you’re not allowed to mention that, you’re not allowed to go on about black kids being raised in fatherless homes that severely impact their opportunities in life, because it’s somehow offensive to the official version peddled by the NAACP or whatever, enough [of] that!” [67893]

The Obama administration predicts that between 9 and 9.9 million additional Americans will enroll in ObamaCare by the end of 2015—fewer than the 13 million the Congressional Budget Office suggests are needed to keep the system solvent. Dan Mendelson, CEO of the consulting firm Avalere Health, comments, “If you set low expectations, you’re not going to disappoint. It makes a lot of sense for them to put a stake in the ground.” Congressman Darrell Issa (R-CA) states, “Despite the administration’s habit of moving the goal posts, the fact is Obamacare is simply not delivering the results Americans were originally promised.” (In its first year, ObamaCare had 7.1 million enrollees.) [67850, 67851, 67857, 67863]

According to TalkingPointsMemo.com, “A delayed Senate report released Wednesday on the 2012 Benghazi attacks argued an FBI investigation has been weakened by the deaths of a number of cooperating Libyan sources. The Washington Post highlighted the report’s finding that 15 individuals who were ‘supporting the investigation or otherwise helpful to the United States’ have been killed since the attacks. It’s unclear if those killings were in any way related to the U.S. investigation, according to the report.” [67822, 67823]

Bridget Johnson reports at PJMedia.com, “The State Department called upon Israel and the Palestinian Authority to ‘de-escalate tensions’ after two Israelis were killed in separate stabbings by terrorists Monday.” Spokesperson Jennifer Psaki says, “[W]e urge all parties to exercise restraint.” A reporter then asks Psaki, “If you’re standing at a bus stop or something and someone runs a car into you or comes up and stabs you, I don’t know how—I mean, those people aren’t—don’t need to exercise restraint, do they?” (One of the victims was simply waiting for a bus when an Islamic jihadist stabbed her in the neck. How the Obama administration would have expected her to “exercise restraint” is not clear.) [67864]

Texas Governor-elect Gregg Abbott warns the White House not to issue an amnesty order: “We’re expecting the White House will not cross the line. If [Obama] crosses the line, he’s going to see an overwhelming rejection of what he’s trying to do. ...The first step is to secure the border. As long as [Obama] is inviting people to come here illegally, we will never see a secure border.” [67840]

Meanwhile, the fact that Obama is even threatening to declare amnesty has resulted in an upsurge in illegal border crossings. The National Border Patrol Council’s Shawn Moran tells WOAI, “We definitely see increases in illegal aliens coming across the border when there is national talk of an amnesty. ...Under President Bush there was talk of immigration reform, and they [border crossers] would say, ‘We’re coming here for the amnesty.’” [67841]

According to the Department of Agriculture, there have been more than 46 million beneficiaries in the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance [food stamp] Program for 36 months in a row. [67862]

DCClothesline.com suggests, “There are overwhelming suspicions that an African Ebola patient landed at 11:59 PM Sunday Night near Atlanta. This might signal the start of

things to come with Barack Hussein Obama making Ebola patients one of our chief imports. ...Last week a bizarre story surfaced from the Canary Islands. A group of 19 refugees from Sierra Leone and Guinea landed on a nudist beach. Local Health officials made a statement confirming that none of these individuals were found to be infected with Ebola. However, four were admittedly taken to local hospitals with serious health issues and some (as noted below) believe that Ebola symptoms were part of the story. We have to remember that Ebola has an incubation period that is now known to be up to 42 days [rather than 21]. So even if these 19 refugees were truly 'all clear' when they landed, it does not mean that one of them did not develop symptoms later. Yesterday it was discovered that there was an incoming flight from the Canary Islands to the U.S. ...This morning I checked the flight records and found that [aircraft] N173PA landed at Andrews Joint Base at 9:13 PM Eastern. The flight then took off again and headed for Cartersville, GA where it landed at 11:59 PM Eastern. Cartersville is 42 miles Northwest of Downtown Atlanta. Atlanta is, of course, home of the CDC and Emory Hospital (one of only four level-4 biocontainment hospitals in the U.S.)." [67827, 67828]

DailyCaller.com reports, "A career attorney with top ratings at Immigration and Customs Enforcement says that she faced retaliation from superiors for refusing to drop cases pending against illegal aliens guilty of DUI, identity theft and other crimes. Patricia Vroom, 59, made the claims in a lawsuit filed last week in U.S. District Court of Appeals in Arizona against Department of Homeland Security Secretary Jeh Johnson." [67836, 67912, 68091]

Bristol County, Massachusetts Sheriff Thomas Hodgson plans a December 10 protest in Washington, D.C. to protest Obama's planned executive order on amnesty and his failure to enforce existing immigration laws. Hodgson tells Fox News' Greta Van Susteren, "Sheriffs across the country have reached a point where we're tired of being marginalized for protecting the citizens of our communities by [Obama,] who's saying 'Look, I don't respect the immigration laws, I think people ought to be able to come here in violation of the laws and expecting law enforcement to look the other way.' This just can't be. I think everyone in this country understands, legal residents as well as American citizens, that democracy exists only because we have a framework of laws." [67832, 67858, 68289]

Radio talk show host Rush Limbaugh demands a public apology from the Democrat Congressional Campaign Committee for a malicious attack that intentionally misstated his comments about colleges implementing rules to combat "date rape." (On the air, Limbaugh had said, "How many of you guys, in your own experience with women, have learned that 'no' means 'yes' if you know how to spot it? ...In this modern [age]—that's not tolerated." The DCCC conveniently ignored the latter part of the statement in its attack on Limbaugh, and in a September fundraising email suggested he was encouraging rape, writing, "Let's be clear: Rush Limbaugh is advocating for the tolerance of rape.") On *Hannity*, Limbaugh attorney Patty Glaser says, "It's unforgivable. It's black and white. There needs to be no hyperbole. There needs to be no stretching. Rush's comments were deliberately taken out of context for apparently political reasons by people who should know better. This was not an irresponsible blogger, this was a Democratic

Congressional Campaign Committee made up of people we have elected to Congress. Shame on them.” [67831, 67847, 68097]

On November 11 Obama commemorates Veterans Day by tweeting a photo of himself greeting veterans. The caption reads, “We’ll have your backs—just like you had ours.” Meanwhile, critics complain that new Veterans Administration head Robert McDonald has done little in his first three months at the agency to solve its problems. [67833, 67849]

Former President George W. Bush tears up in his Veterans Day message. [67879, 67880]

At a Veterans Day ceremony at Arlington National Cemetery, Vice President Joe Biden says, “Every day for the last six years, I ask my staff early in the morning to contact the Department of Defense to get a detailed report of the number of troops deployed, the number wounded, and the number killed. Not a general number; the exact number every day. Because for every one of those warriors there's an entire family, extended family, back in America that has bled or is bleeding. As of this morning, U.S. troops died in Iraq and Afghanistan: 6,703; troops wounded in Iraq or Afghanistan: 5,168.” (The wounded count is actually 52,168. Breitbart.com notes, “Nearly 90 percent (17,339) of the wounded troops received their injuries after Obama was inaugurated for his first term on January 20, 2009. Pamela Geller observes, “This is why military families live in fear. Obama’s crippling rules of engagement are making our troops sitting ducks. These casualty numbers are mind-blowing, and yet the enemedia never mentions them.”) [67878, 67883, 67884]

Health and Human Services Secretary Sylvia Burwell calls on Congress to extend ObamaCare benefits to illegal immigrants to whom Obama granted amnesty under his “DREAM” policies. (NationalReview.com’s Jim Geraghty reminds readers that when Obama said in January 2009, “There are also those who claim that our reform effort will insure illegal immigrants. This, too, is false—the reforms I’m proposing would not apply to those who are here illegally,” Congressman Joe Wilson (R-SC) yelled out, “You lie!” “Fast-forward to 2014,” writes Geraghty, “and lo and behold, the Secretary of Health and Human Services Sylvia Burwell ‘called for extending Obamacare benefits to DREAM-eligible illegal immigrants. ...Wilson wasn’t wrong. He was *prescient*.” Roughly 42 percent of all new Medicaid enrollees are immigrants—both legal and illegal. Many of them enrolled via ObamaCare exchanges.) [67915, 68042, 68150]

Katie Pavlich writes at Townhall.com, “The battle on Capitol Hill over when nominations for ...Obama’s pick to replace outgoing Attorney General Eric Holder will begin is still brewing, but lawmakers are already getting their questions for the new nominee ready to go with ...Obama’s political agenda leading the way. Republican Senators Ted Cruz [R-TX] and Mike Lee [R-UT] both sit on the Senate Judiciary Committee, where Loretta Lynch will face tough questions about why she's fit to be the nation's top law enforcement officer. As ...Obama continues to threaten executive action on illegal immigration, Cruz and Lee want answers about how Lynch views the unilateral granting of amnesty. ...Finding out where Lynch stands on this issue, before she is confirmed as

Attorney General, is essential to upholding the rule of law in the United States. Let's hope our Senators can get some direct answers when her nomination hearing finally comes along." (Republicans warn that if Lynch's confirmation hearing is scheduled before the GOP takes over the Senate in January, the Democrat-controlled Judiciary Committee will prevent them from asking all the tough questions they have. According to TheHil.com, however, "A packed schedule after the election is almost certain to push the vetting process for Loretta Lynch into January, when Republicans are set to take power in the upper chamber. 'It seems likely [the Lynch vote] would be in the next Congress. It's difficult to process an [attorney general] that quickly,' said a Democratic aide." [67830, 67844, 67855]

According to BuzzFeed.com, Democrat candidates paid more than \$700,000 for private charter flights for Bill and Hillary Clinton to campaign for them. [67869]

SovereignMan.com reports, "This past week Brazil announced that it will be building a 3,500-mile fiber-optic cable to Portugal in order to avoid the grip of the NSA. What's more, they announced that not a penny of the \$185 million expected to be spent on the project will go to American firms, simply because they don't want to take any chances that the US government will tap the system. ...[T]he government of Brazil has banned the use of Microsoft technologies in all government offices, something that was also done in China earlier this year. The Red, White, and Blue Scare has now replaced the Red Scare of the Cold War era. And it comes at serious cost. From Brazil's rejection of American IT products alone, it is estimated that American firms will lose out on over \$35 billion in revenue over the next two years." [67888]

Buzzfeed.com reports, "Extremist fighters have been brought into mainland Europe, hidden amid boatloads of Syrian refugees, according to a veteran smuggler who claims to have done so himself. The smuggler, who has been given the pseudonym Hassan here, said in an interview with BuzzFeed News that since the summer he has sent more than 10 Islamic State of Iraq and Syria (ISIS) fighters into Europe. Hassan's claim was impossible to verify—and Western officials said they'd seen no evidence that such a scenario was taking place. His testimony, plus that of a second human trafficker who offered a similar account, marked the first time someone claiming direct involvement has said publicly that such a plan is underway. ...Hassan said the fighters were all Syrian or Iraqis posing as refugees. He believed they remained loyal to ISIS and were prepared to launch terrorist attacks in Europe. 'They are waiting for their orders,' Hassan said. 'Just wait. You will see.'" [68077]

Townhall.com's Katie Pavlich obtains a letter to Obama from Ronald T. Hosko, president of the Law Enforcement Legal Defense Fund and former Assistant Director of the FBI. Hosko writes, in part, "The hyper-politicization of justice issues has made it immeasurably more difficult for police officers to simply do their jobs. The growing divide between the police and the people—perhaps best characterized by protesters in Ferguson, Mo., who angrily chanted, 'It's not black or white. It's blue!'—only benefits... members of a political class seeking to vilify law enforcement for other societal failures. This puts our communities at greater risk, especially the most vulnerable among us. Your

attorney general, Eric Holder, is chief among the antagonists. During his tenure as the head of the Department of Justice, Mr. Holder claims to have investigated twice as many police and police departments as any of his predecessors. Of course, this includes his ill-timed decision to launch a full investigation into the Ferguson Police Department at the height of racial tensions in that community, throwing gasoline on a fire that was already burning. Many officers were disgusted by such a transparent political maneuver at a time when presidential and attorney general leadership could have calmed a truly chaotic situation. It won't be long before the American people turn their attention to other matters. Long after Ferguson is forgotten, police officers across America will still remember the way their senior federal executives turned their back on them with oft-repeated suggestions that race-based policing drives a biased, broken law enforcement agenda." [68019, 68020, 68070]

According to a Gallup poll, 53 percent of surveyed Americans want the Republican Congress "to have more influence over the direction the nation takes in the next year," while 36 percent want Obama to have the influence, and 8 percent want equal influence. In the poll, the Republican Party has a 42 percent favorability rating to the Democrat Party's 36 percent. [67895, 67917, 67923, 67928, 67942]

On MSNBC's little-watched *Ronan Farrow Daily*, Obama architect Jonathan Gruber responds to the outrage over his statement in which he referred to "the stupidity of the American voter." Gruber—who *The New York Times* points out has eight parrots—tells Farrow, "The comments in the video were made at an academic conference. I was speaking off the cuff. I basically spoke inappropriately. I regret having made those comments." (Gruber does not explain why insulting the American people is any more acceptable at an academic conference than elsewhere. In his "apology" he does not say he does not believe the American people are stupid; he only regrets having said it publicly.) Townhall.com's Katie Pavlich later comments, "Gruber's comments about stupid Americans aren't 'off the cuff,' they're based on the liberal philosophy that humans, especially Americans, are too stupid to make their own decisions and therefore the government must do things for them. Further, if Americans are too stupid to understand Obamacare, then why did the Obama administration go to great lengths to hide exactly what Obamacare really is? If Obamacare is so hard to understand, then why the need to cover-up what's in the bill in order to ensure Americans don't understand it? Seems to me they were worried those 'stupid' Americans would understand perfectly what Obamacare is and what its negative implications for the economy and the country would be moving forward. In the first video from earlier this week, Gruber admits that they had to hide a redistribution of wealth from healthy to sick and the fact that Obamacare is a tax from the American people before it passed because if they knew about those things, the bill would have died. The American people aren't stupid, Gruber just wants them to be." [67881, 67882, 67903, 67927, 67937, 67972]

House Minority Leader Nancy Pelosi (D-CA) tells reporters, "I don't know who [Jonathan Gruber] is. He didn't help write our bill. So, with all due respect to your question, you have a person who wasn't writing our bill, commenting on what was going on when we were writing the bill, who has withdrawn some of the statements that he

made. So let's put him aside." WashingtonPost.com then posts a video of Pelosi telling reporters in November 2009, "[O]ur bill [the Affordable Care Act] brings down rates. I don't know if you have seen Jonathan Gruber of MIT's analysis of what the comparison is to the status quo versus what will happen in our bill for those who seek insurance within the exchange. And our bill takes down those costs, even some now, and much less preventing the upward spiral." [67960, 67966]

On *The O'Reilly Factor*, Charles Krauthammer says, "This is exactly what conservatives have been saying for four years. What we're hearing now is the true voice of liberal arrogance. They believe this. They believe that the voters are stupid, as [Gruber] said, and they believe that they know the right way, they have to lead the masses to the 'Promised Land,' and they can only do it by deception. And that's what he said openly: 'We wanted to get the bill, we didn't care about how we did it, so we lied about everything. We lied about if you can keep the plan, knowing that you can't keep your plan. We lied about the fact this would be a transfer of wealth, a massive transfer of wealth.' Because, as Gruber said, had they known that, it would never have passed. They lied about every aspect of this, and I think that is what has been charged all along. And it is a scandal of the media that this has to be discovered in the sixth year of the [Obama administration] rather than talked about at the time, when it was obvious they were lying about all this. The idea of it being a transfer of wealth was known from the beginning. But they got away with it." (A lengthy list of Obama lies can be found at <http://obamalies.net/list-of-lies>.) [67892, 68221]

The Kelly File posts a video of Jonathan Gruber at a *second* event in which he calls the American people stupid. In discussing the various ways to tax the public to pay for ObamaCare that had been proposed, Gruber explains that the more convoluted "Cadillac tax" path for high-cost plans was favored over a direct tax because "...the American people are too stupid to understand the difference." (ObamaCare's Cadillac tax generally applies to labor union members who are fortunate enough to have employer-paid health insurance that is much better than that of the average American. Gruber is essentially arguing that union members are stupid. Gruber made the remarks at a "Cost of Health Care" meeting at Washington University in St. Louis. The clearly sympathetic audience laughs at his remark.) [67889, 67890, 67891, 67911, 67985, 67986]

It is worth noting that Obama was well aware of the deception of the Cadillac tax. Gruber himself has stated in a June 2012 interview on PBS' *Frontline* that Obama was in the room, seeking an alternative to direct taxation of the employee benefit of health insurance. Gruber told *Frontline*, "Now, the problem is, it's a political nightmare ... and people say, 'No, you can't tax my benefits.' So what we did a lot in that room was talk about, well, how could we make this work? And Obama was like [sic], 'Well, you know'—I mean, he is really a realistic guy. He is like [sic], 'Look, I can't just do this.' He said: 'It is just not going to happen politically. The bill will not pass. How do we manage to get there through phases and other things?' And we talked about it. And he was just very interested in that topic." TheGatewayPundit.com writes, "Obama was at the center of this deception. He specifically ordered Gruber and other 'healthcare experts' to find ways to game the CBO numbers so that the bill would pass. In his gleeful

showboating over passing the bill, Jonathan Gruber has clearly identified ...Obama as the source of the lie behind the Cadillac Tax. The story is no longer about Jonathan Gruber. It's about the deliberate lie [Obama] used to pass this monstrosity of a healthcare law." [67985, 67986, 68028, 68095, 68163, 68164, 68166]

In another video, from an address at the Pioneer Institute for public policy research in Boston, Gruber said, "Economists have called for 40 years to get rid of the regressive, inefficient and expensive tax subsidy provided for employer provider health insurance. It turns out politically it's really hard to get rid of, and the only way we could get rid of it was first by mislabeling it, calling it a tax on insurance plans rather than a tax on people when we all know it's a tax on people who hold those insurance plans." The "Cadillac tax" is not scheduled to start until 2018 but is indexed to the Consumer Price Index. Every year, therefore, it will snare increasing numbers of Americans. Gruber said, "What that means is the tax that starts out hitting only 8% of the insurance plans essentially amounts over the next 20 years essentially getting rid of the exclusion for employer sponsored plans. This was the only political way we were ever going to take on one of the worst public policies in America." (In other words, after 20 years virtually *all* employer-provided health insurance would be subject to the tax. That would essentially mean the elimination of the group employer plans, and all employees would be forced to buy insurance from an ObamaCare exchange.) [68011]

Also on *The Kelly File*, Congressman Trey Gowdy (R-SC) says, "I can't get past the irony to even get to the arrogance. The most transparent administration since the continent shifted had to rely on artifice and deception to pass its signature piece of legislation. You can't make that up. He had to lie to people and then he justified it, so I can't even get past the irony of that to get to the arrogance of him calling our fellow citizens stupid. ...It's really serious, in a participatory democracy, when you tell people, your fellow citizens, either you're not smart enough to understand the truth or we can't tell you the truth because you wouldn't go along with it. Well if they wouldn't go along with it maybe you shouldn't pass the law. ...I would say this to the professor [Gruber]: put down the cognac and the lost writings of J. D. Salinger, if you want to see how stupid our fellow citizens are, are take a look at last Tuesday night because they rejected you, this bill and this administration. ...I would hope my fellow citizens would keep this in mind the next time anybody tries to sell them a quote 'comprehensive' piece of legislation, whether it's Dodd/Frank or whether it's the immigration bill [Obama] so desperately wants. 'Comprehensive' is Latin for 'there's lots of bad stuff in here.' And he just proved that he is willing to lie. He's willing to lie because he has the arrogance of thinking that he knows what is best for this country and the citizens and voters do not. So, keep that in mind the next time anybody tries to sell you on a big piece of legislation by calling it comprehensive." [67904, 67905, 67931, 67940]

Meanwhile, Gruber shifts into attack mode, telling PBS station WGBH that the ObamaCare lawsuit *Halbig v. Burwell* "comes to the master strategy of the Republican Party, which is to confuse people enough about the law so that they don't understand the subsidies they're getting are because of the law." (Gruber's comment makes no sense. Republicans are not trying to claim the subsidies are not part of the Affordable Care Act.

They are merely arguing what the law itself states, that the subsidies apply only to taxpayers who enroll via state exchanges. They are trying to confuse no one. They are trying to emphasize that the law is being intentionally misinterpreted by the IRS for political purposes.) [67894]

On November 12 former Vermont Governor Howard Dean appears on *Morning Joe* and comments on Jonathan Gruber's statement that the American people are stupid: "The problem is not that he said it. The problem is that he thinks it. ...The core problem under the damn law is it was put together by a bunch of elitists two don't really fundamentally understand the American people. That's what the problem is." [67899, 67900, 67921, 67965]

Congressman Jim Jordan (R-OH) suggests, "We may want to have hearings on this [Jonathan Gruber's comments and the fact that the Obama administration intentionally misled the American people on ObamaCare]. We shouldn't be surprised they were misleading us." [67920, 67921, 67956, 67957, 67961, 67976]

A third Jonathan Gruber video surfaces. During a November 2012 speech at the University of Rhode Island, Gruber said of ObamaCare's "Cadillac tax," "It's a very clever, you know, basic exploitation of the lack of economic understanding of the American voter." [67912]

Via Twitter, CNN's Jim Sciutto reports that "ISIS is spreading beyond Syria and Iraq to Egypt and Lybia [sic; Libya], fed by returning foreign fighters." [67967]

The Associated Press declares Republican Dan Sullivan the winner of the U.S. Senate race in Alaska. Democrat Senator Mark Begich, who trails by about 8,000 votes, refuses to concede. (It is worth noting the Begich was elected in 2008 only because of trumped-up charges and prosecutorial misconduct against Republican Senator Ted Stevens. Conveniently for Begich, Stevens was not vindicated until *after* the election.) The Sullivan victory gives the GOP 53 Senate seats. That will likely become 54, as Republican Bill Cassidy is expected to defeat Democrat Senator Mary Landrieu in Louisiana's December 6 runoff election. Some suspect that Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid (D-NV) will allow a Keystone pipeline vote before December 6 for the main purpose of allowing Landrieu to brag to the voters that she supported it. [34025, 60974, 60975, 60976, 67872, 67873, 67897, 67919, 67924]

USAToday.com reports, "Since the beginning of 2010, 43 rural hospitals—with a total of more than 1,500 beds—have closed, according to data from the North Carolina Rural Health Research Program. The pace of closures has quickened: from 3 in 2010 to 13 in 2013, and 12 already this year. Georgia alone has lost five rural hospitals since 2012, and at least six more are teetering on the brink of collapse. Each of the state's closed hospitals served about 10,000 people—a lot for remaining area hospitals to absorb. The Affordable Care Act was designed to improve access to health care for all Americans and will give them another chance at getting health insurance during open enrollment starting this Saturday. But critics say the ACA is also accelerating the demise of rural outposts that

cater to many of society's most vulnerable. These hospitals treat some of the sickest and poorest patients—those least aware of how to stay healthy. Hospital officials contend that the law's penalties for having to re-admit patients soon after they're released are impossible to avoid and create a crushing burden." [68016, 68017]

On the floor of the Senate, Mary Landrieu (D-LA) asks for unanimous consent to vote on approval of the Keystone XL Pipeline. (Landrieu has been head of the Senate Energy Committee for six years—and waited until she faced a certain loss in a runoff election to demand a vote.) [67906, 67943, 67944, 67955]

House Minority Leader Nancy Pelosi (D-CA) tells Politico, "I do not believe what happened the other night is a wave. There was no wave of approval for the Republicans. I wish them congratulations, they won the election, but there was no wave of approval for anybody. There was an ebbing, an ebb tide, for us." (In other words, "The voters don't love the Republicans, they just hate the Democrats.") [67978, 67979]

MSNBC.com reports, "The U.S. and China announced late Tuesday that the two nations—which together account for over one third of all greenhouse gas pollution—have reached a groundbreaking deal to reduce carbon emissions and tackle the growing crisis of global climate change. The sweeping agreement, achieved after months of secret negotiations, includes a first-ever [non-binding] commitment by China to stop its emissions from growing entirely after 2030. The U.S. would double its pace of carbon reduction from 1.2% a year through 2020 to 2.3-2.8% a year afterward, ultimately cutting its total greenhouse gas emissions by 26% to 28% from 2005 levels by 2025. 'This is a major milestone,' ...Obama said at a joint press conference with Chinese President Xi Jinping. 'This is an ambitious goal, but this is an achievable goal.' 'We have a special responsibility to lead the world effort to combat global climate change,' Obama added. 'We hope to encourage all major economies to be ambitious.'" [67901, 67902, 67913, 67816, 67925, 67930, 67975]

Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell (R-KY) reacts with a statement: "Our economy can't take [Obama's] ideological war on coal. This unrealistic plan, that [Obama] would dump on his successor, would ensure higher utility rates and far fewer jobs. [Obama] said his policies were on the ballot, and the American people spoke up against them." At Townhall.com Katie Pavlich comments, "I'm not convinced this 'deal' is going [to] end well and doubt that trusting China to hold up their end of the deal is a wise move. ...Obama's war on coal and drastic EPA regulations in the United States have had a devastating effect on job growth and the economy with little results to show for actually reducing so-called 'climate change.' Republicans who will take control of the Senate in January are skeptical of the deal and are worried about the negative impact a one-way deal with China will have on Americans working in the energy industry here at home." The agreement is largely meaningless, although the media will play it up as a huge Obama success. The document uses a substantial amount of "best efforts," "intends," and "target" language. It will change nothing; it is not binding on either party, and the Senate would not approve it if it were. (All treaties require the approval of two-thirds of the Senate.) [67901, 67902, 67913, 67816, 67925]

HotAir.com notes that the agreement is “largely symbolic,” and that Obama “doesn’t actually have the authority to agree to anything binding on his own. The problem is, Obama probably means it, while China is almost certainly just yanking the world’s collective chain yet again with a bit of lip service as they seek better trade arrangements. Reuters also goes out of their way to describe China and the United States as *the world’s two biggest carbon polluters*. You might be able to make that argument, depending upon how you stretch your definitions, but there is no real comparison here. China is so vastly far ahead of anyone else in pollution that it makes the entire conversation laughable. It’s first worth noting that Barack Obama is already facing a huge backlash in Congress over the strangling regulations which the energy industry already faces. Trying to craft a way to make another huge emissions cut in the short term (they’re talking as much as 26%) would essentially see us moving back into caves. And the idea that our feet should be held to the figurative fire when we’re talking about China should render any discussion of this ‘agreement’ entirely moot. ...If China wants to cut a deal on this subject, they need to at least catch up to us first.” [67925]

In China, Obama throws Tibet under the bus, saying, “We recognize Tibet as part of the People’s Republic of China. We are not in favor of independence.” (Whether China demanded that statement from Obama in exchange for its agreement on the carbon emissions agreement is not known.) [67909]

At DailyCaller.com, managing editor Christopher Bedford comments on the Obama administration’s misdirected priorities when dealing with China. Bedford writes that Obama, “his top diplomat and his cheerleaders in the media could barely contain their excitement—this, they loudly proclaimed, had been the No. 1 goal of their China diplomacy. ...[T]his means [Obama] thinks a global warming treaty is more important than Americans’ ability to do business in China, caused by Beijing’s hostility toward foreign investment, strict command over the country’s economy, and artificial currency manipulation—leading to a massive trade deficit. ...[T]his means the leader of the free world thinks a global warming treaty is more important than two months of Hong Kong’s peaceful, democratic protests. ...[T]his means the commander in chief thinks a global warming treaty is more important than years of Chinese interests mining Africa of its fossil fuels and absolutely essential rare earth minerals under the protection of a U.S. security umbrella, all while American interests—private, federal and military—have been penetrated and compromised by Chinese hackers determined to steal the economic and military advantages produced by our free society. ...[T]his means the United States’ top man thinks a global warming treaty is more important than decades of allied, democratic governments being bullied and intimidated as Beijing grows increasingly belligerent... [T]his means the most powerful man in the West thinks a global warming treaty is more important than the communist government in Beijing, which over the past 70 years has murdered tens of millions of its own citizens... Indeed, the White House thought so little about that, they decided that China was a good place to announce that the administration was pushing for increased government control over the Internet.” [67950]

State Department spokeswoman Jen Psaki tells reporters the Obama administration is “deeply concerned” by Israeli plans to build 200 homes in Jerusalem, “particularly given the tense situation... Most importantly they are contrary to Israel’s own stated goal of achieving a two-state solution because they make it more difficult to do that.” TimesofIsrael.com reports, “Although located in northwest Jerusalem, the Ramot neighborhood straddles the Green Line that marked Israel’s pre-1967 boundaries, which means some of its area is on land that the Palestinians want as the capital of a future state. ... Israel captured East Jerusalem in 1967 and maintains that it is now part of the unified capital of Israel, a move that is not internationally recognized. The Palestinians claim East Jerusalem as their capital. The international community does not recognize Israeli sovereignty in the area and opposes settlement construction.” (The Palestinians claim East Jerusalem as their capital just as Mexicans claim Texas, California, Arizona, and New Mexico are not a legitimate part of the United States. Israel captured East Jerusalem in the Six-Day War. Had Israel’s enemies not wanted to lose the territory they should not have risked it by engaging in a war. Pamela Geller writes, “Imagine. The Obama White House is ‘deeply concerned’ about Jews building homes on Jewish land. Are they ‘deeply concerned’ about the recent ‘Palestinian’ car jihad attacks in Jerusalem? Apparently not. Are they ‘deeply concerned’ about ‘Palestinians’ passing out candies to celebrate the murders of an Israeli family in their beds at night? They never said they were. Hamas TV saying ‘Killing Jews is worship that brings us close to Allah’ — are they ‘deeply concerned’ about that? No. The Jew-hater in the White House is only ever ‘deeply concerned’ about [actions by] Israel.”) [68003, 68004]

The Washington Post whines that the Democrats suffered big losses on November 4 because of “Republican vote-suppression efforts” and because voters couldn’t get time off from work to go to the polls. (The *Post* may not be aware that one can vote before work or after work.) [67907]

Ann Coulter writes, “...Republicans’ sole objective for the next two years is to keep sending Obama bills that 80 percent of Americans will support. They can pass some great legislation—and they’ll also force Democrats into votes that won’t be easy to explain to their constituents. Republicans might start by dusting off that bill requiring Congress to live under Obamacare. Sen. Minority Leader Mitch McConnell [R-KY] has played a lousy hand well, and now, for the first time, he’ll have a majority. Even in the minority, McConnell got every single Republican to vote against Obamacare and tricked [Obama] into automatic spending cuts with the sequester—an amazing triumph later blown by idiots like [Congressman] Paul Ryan [R-WI]. There’s enormous potential. As McConnell’s speech the day after the election reminded me: Isn’t it great to have someone who can talk? I can barely remember the last time Republicans had a leader who spoke in sentences that scan in English. Do not blow this, Republicans. ...[A] majority of voters are giving you one more chance.” [67954]

The European Space Agency successfully lands a spacecraft on a comet. (To the amazement of everyone, Obama neither takes credit for the mission nor tweets a photo of himself.) [67908]

In Istanbul, Turkey, three off-duty sailors from the USS Ross are assaulted up by a group of men from the Turkiye Genclik Birligi (Turkish Youth Union/TGB) who shout, “Yankee, go home!” and “We want you out of our land!” Twelve of the attackers are briefly taken into custody, and then released without questioning. [67946, 67947, 67949, 68043, 68044]

AlArabiya.net reports, “The Islamic State of Iraq and Syria (ISIS) is now looking to introduce its own currency in an effort of solidifying its control over areas where it proclaimed a ‘caliphate.’ The militant group is reportedly looking to reinstate the Dinar as a means of exchange. Militant leaders announced in mosques in the Iraqi cities of Mosul and Nineveh that it has returned. ...Reports surfaced in October indicating that ISIS makes a daily revenue of \$1 million from black market oil sales alone. The group also receives several millions a month from wealthy supporters in addition to criminal activities such as robbing the banks in the cities they have taken over, U.S. Treasury Department anti-terrorism finance chief David Cohen has said.” (Pamela Geller quips, “Bet they’ll be worth more than the Obama USD after he is finished with us.”) [67886, 67997, 67998]

Breitbart.com reports, “A grieving father is asking ...Obama to bring his son, who was killed by an illegal alien, back to life with an executive order on immigration. ‘While your Executive Order pad is out, can you write one to bring my son and the tens of thousands (actually over 100,000) killed by illegal aliens back to life and to bring our destroyed families back together?’ asks Don Rosenberg in a letter to Obama. His son Drew was killed by an illegal alien who ran over him in 2010. In the letter, Rosenberg notes that ...Obama’s administration refused to deport the illegal alien who killed his son. ‘I know that shortly you will be issuing some sort of Executive Order protecting millions of lawbreakers, many of whom have killed people but all of whom share some responsibility for those killed,’ Rosenberg wrote. ‘I know that you want to prevent their families from being separated. By the way, your administration refused to deport the man who killed my son. I was told, ‘He’s only committed one crime of moral turpitude.’” In a previous letter to Obama, Rosenberg wrote, “Before you illegally say, ‘Welcome to America’ to those who have caused so much pain and suffering, on your next trip to California let me take you to Drew’s grave, and you tell him this is the right thing to do. My son and all of the others are considered collateral damage in the quest for votes and campaign contributions. Illegal immigration is not a victimless crime.” [67974]

Fox News obtains “new documents from a government agency which contain detailed proposals for [Obama] action that could lead to legalization for undocumented immigrants. ...Executive action could be announced as early as next week. As part of the 10-point plan, up to 4.5 million illegal immigrants living with their American born kids would be allowed to stay in the U.S., an expansion of deferred action. The plan would also expand deferred action for DACA children. There is also a proposal to raise pay for ICE officers to boost morale. [That is, a bribe to get them to keep their mouths shut about the lack of enforcement of immigration laws.] The plan would also allow family members of illegal immigrants another avenue for citizenship through the military’s delayed entry program. Sources say this avenue will likely be exploited, with people

joining the military, then not showing up for boot camp. Other proposals include a 50-percent discount to the first 10,000 naturalization applicants, 500,000 technology jobs through the State Department visa program, and increased border security.” [67942, 67973]

On *Special Report*, Charles Krauthammer comments, “The reason Obama has waited [to issue an amnesty order], is because according to his own words, which he has said repeatedly for six years, he is not allowed under the Constitution to do what he’s now proposing to do. He has said this over and over again, in public, where he’s said, ‘I’d like to do all these things but under the Constitution I do not write the laws.’ This, if any of this is true, is a wholesale canceling of a law [existing immigration law] passed by Congress. If it is to be canceled, if it is to be reformed, it has to be done [by Congress]. This is a constitutionally odious proposal. He knows it and he admitted it himself. As a matter of policy, I think it’s a terrible idea. I’m not against legalization [of immigrants], but I am against legalization before you’ve done anything serious about controlling the border. Otherwise, this is an advertisement to the whole world, particularly Latin America, where it’s easy to get across the border, you come into America, illegally, it’s up to you, we do not control our borders, and then if you wait long enough and you make a strong enough case and there’s enough pressure, we will legalize you. ...If a Republican in the White House said, ‘I waited and waited and I demanded abolition of the capital gains tax and the Congress wouldn’t do it, so I am now ordering the IRS, ‘No collection of capital gains’ ... [the Democrats] would say it’s unconstitutional, it is an impeachable offense. That is what [Obama is] doing.” [67942, 67952, 68011, 68026]

Fox News later provides additional information about Obama’s planned illegal immigrant action: “The plan contains 10 initiatives than span everything from boosting border security to improving pay for immigration officers. But the most controversial pertain to the millions who could get a deportation reprieve under what is known as ‘deferred action.’ The plan calls for expanding deferred action for illegal immigrants who came to the U.S. as children—but also for the parents of U.S. citizens and legal permanent residents. The latter could allow upwards of 4.5 million illegal immigrant adults with U.S.-born children to stay, according to estimates. ...Another portion that is sure to cause consternation among anti-‘amnesty’ lawmakers is a plan to expand deferred action for young people. In June 2012, Obama created such a program for illegal immigrants who came to the U.S. as children, entered before June 2007 and were under 31 as of June 2012. The change would expand that to cover anyone who entered before they were 16, and change the cut-off from June 2007 to Jan. 1, 2010. This is estimated to make nearly 300,000 illegal immigrants eligible.” [67945]

On November 13 Judge Andrew Napolitano, writing at LewRockwell.com, offers some suggested questions for the confirmation hearing of Obama’s Attorney General nominee Loretta Lynch: “Will you advise [Obama], as Holder did, that his careful, secret, conscientious deliberations about the legal guilt of some Americans are a constitutionally adequate substitute for due process, such that he can kill [via drone attacks] uncharged, untried, unsentenced Americans?” “Will you advise [Obama] that he can use his prosecutorial discretion in such a manner that American borders become open as they did

for Central American children last summer, and that foreign nationals who are here illegally can legally remain here without complying with the laws Congress has written?” “Can [Obama] decline to enforce laws with which he disagrees without violating his oath to enforce federal laws faithfully?” “Will you advise [Obama] that he can subpoena the home telephone records and the personal email accounts of Associated Press and Fox News reporters, as Holder did?” “Will you permit state and local police and the IRS to seize the property of known innocents who have not been charged with criminal behavior, much less convicted of it, and then retain much of the seized property even if the persons from whom it was seized are acquitted?” “Will you condone law enforcement using tanks and battering rams to deliver subpoenas?” “Do you accept the presumption of liberty, which means that the government must respect individual choices unless and until it can prove violations of the law to a judge or jury?” [67948]

Vice President Joe Biden calls for a hospital equipped to treat Ebola patients in “every state of the Union.” [68148]

In Ypsilanti, Michigan, the South Arbor Charter Academy replaces murals of Albert Einstein, Gandhi, Mother Teresa, and others with paintings of Obama, Oprah Winfrey, leftist poet Maya Angelou, Walt Disney, and *Harry Potter* author J.K. Rowling. Parent Craig Bergman tells Fox News, “This is no longer a hall of heroes. Now we have a hall of celebrities. The mere fact that you have talent doesn’t mean you are a hero. I want someone who made a life investment—perhaps they even sacrificed their life—so that our society and so our world could be a better place.” Parent Todd Holliday says, “My biggest concern is my kid seeing these murals for the next four years—thinking they represent what a hero is. They might be successful business people but they aren’t really heroes.” [68211, 68212]

The House Republican Conferences votes to retain Congressman John Boehner (R-OH) as Speaker of the House for the next session of Congress. Senator Mitch McConnell (R-KY) is elected Senate majority leader and Senator Harry Reid (D-NV) are elected Senate minority leader for the next Congress. Senator Jon Tester (D-MT) is elected the chairman of the Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee. Additionally, Politico reports that Reid “is engaged in private talks with the Massachusetts freshman [Senator Elizabeth Warren (D-MA)] to create a special leadership post for the former Harvard professor... In the new position, Warren is expected to serve as a go-between to liberal groups to ensure their voice is part of the leadership’s private deliberations, a source said. ... The move would likely be viewed favorably by an increasingly liberal caucus. But elevating Warren could also be seen as an indication that the new Senate Democratic minority is less interested in bipartisan compromises, even as the White House and Senate Republicans are signaling they want to cut deals in the new Congress.” (The creation of a new position for Warren keeps her in the spotlight for 2016 without the need for any existing party leader to step aside. HotAir.com observes that Clinton is “already feeling the pressure of Warren coming up behind her on the Left with plenty of support from the hard core liberal base. For her part, Warren is in the catbird’s seat here, since she can keep smiling and talking about how much she respects and supports Clinton (who is then forced to treat her just as nicely) while an unpaid army of cheerleaders keep showing up on

television pushing her to run for the Democrat nomination. Now, if she is hoisted up into a serious upper chamber leadership role, (for no apparent reason, since she's a freshman with virtually zero experience) it swings the camera lens on her all the more and keeps people asking if Hillary isn't yesterday's news while Warren is the fresh face of the party.") [67958, 67964, 67968, 68007, 68036, 68037]

Reacting to the new Warren position, Senator Tom Harkin (D-IA) says, "A liaison to liberals? I've never heard of such a thing. I asked her about it and she said she was some kind of adviser. I don't know what it is. I don't know what that all means." Senator Joe Manchin (D-WV) says, "I didn't even know this was happening. I never knew it. I mean, they can pick whoever they want to." (Reid apparently invented the position for Warren and did not ask for many opinions, let alone a vote.) Senator Dianne Feinstein (D-CA) says, "That wasn't really discussed. It's a fait accompli. ... That subject never came up." Senator Tom Carper (D-DE) says, "I don't know. I have no comment. I have no comment. It was not a debatable issue." [68037]

Meanwhile, Warren addresses the annual winter meeting of the Democracy Alliance, a group of wealthy Democrat donors. Although Warren and Vice President Joe Biden appear at the event, Hillary Clinton does not. Politico reports, "[Guy] Saperstein, a San Francisco lawyer who has been critical of Clinton, [wrote] in an email, 'I think there would be a stampede away from Hillary if Elizabeth Warren became a serious candidate with a serious campaign infrastructure and, polling match-ups of Hillary v. Republicans continued to show her weakness.'" (Warren is arguably further to the political left than Obama, which will help her in the 2016 Democrat primaries if she decides to run for president. Her ideology, however, will hurt her in the general election against the Republican candidate if she wins the nomination from Clinton.) Former Obama campaign guru David Axelrod tells an audience, "I think the danger for Secretary Clinton is that, as was the case in 2007, her candidacy is out in front of the rationale for it. She should not rely too much on [the fact that] that we [Democrats] do have an electoral vote advantage and demographic advantages." [67980, 67983, 68027]

Fox News' Ed Henry asks White House press secretary Josh Earnest, "Didn't [Obama] promise unprecedented transparency? Why would one of the architects of the law [ObamaCare] suggest that you were misleading people?" Earnest replies, "Well, I'm not sure, frankly, Ed. The fact of the matter is the process associated with writing and passing and implementing the Affordable Care Act has been extraordinarily transparent. ... I think the fact of the matter is this was a very difficult undertaking, but ultimately this is a law that has had significant benefits for millions of people that have been able to sign up through the marketplaces established by the Affordable Care Act." [68012]

HotAir.com suggests that the GOP "threaten publicly to use Obama's amnesty precedent once they're back in the White House. ... So here's an idea. [John] Boehner and [Mitch] McConnell call a press conference flanked by Marco Rubio, Rand Paul, Ted Cruz, and Paul Ryan. If any Republican governors eyeing 2016 want to attend too, they're invited—[Chris] Christie, [Scott] Walker, [Bobby] Jindal, Jeb Bush, whoever. At the presser, B&M [Boehner and McConnell] make a short statement: The GOP intends to

challenge Obama's amnesty in court as an unconstitutional infringement on separation of powers. If, however, they lose that suit, they'll encourage any Republican successor to O to use the amnesty precedent in other areas of policy, starting with tax reform. Specifically, they'll advise the [next GOP] president to issue an executive order barring the IRS from collecting more than 10 percent of adjusted gross income from American taxpayers, a de facto flat tax. Like Obama's amnesty, that order will be temporary; a Democratic successor could rescind it with one stroke. Like Obama's amnesty, that order will be aimed at a highly contentious issue on which Congress is currently deadlocked. If the opposition party doesn't like the order, they can simply join the majority party in Congress in passing a compromise bill that supersedes it, just as Obama always says about the GOP and immigration. The point, obviously, is that the practice of dubious executive power grabs at Congress's expense can work for both parties. And will. Smarter liberals digested that point months ago, which is why they're leery of O's amnesty. Dumber liberals will need it explained to them, verrrrry sloooooowly. Once it is, if they're still gung ho about [Obama] appointing himself national lawgiver, well, okay. I guess that's America now. At least they won't act surprised when President [Ted] Cruz starts doing this stuff." [67969]

Obama czar Ron Klain states, "We are not at the beginning of the end or even the end of the beginning" of Ebola outbreak in West Africa. (Klain is likely trying to channel British Prime Minister Winston Churchill, who said on November 9, 1942, "Now this is not the end. It is not even the beginning of the end. But it is, perhaps, the end of the beginning." Klain did not succeed.) [67970, 67971]

In a Magellan Strategies poll, Congressman Bill Cassidy (R-LA) leads Senator Mary Landrieu (D-LA) by 16 points as they head toward a December 6 run-off election. [67987, 68025]

During a two-month period, 13 9-1-1 calls were received from the Sycamore Canyon Academy near Oracle, Arizona. The facility houses about 40 illegal immigrant youths from Central America who illegally crossed the border. WND.com reports, "Eight of the 13 calls 'were directly connected to acts of violence,' [Pinal County Sheriff Paul] Babeu said, including five assaults on staff members and students. The sheriff's records also show one report of a missing person and one incidence of marijuana possession at the facility since the young Central Americans showed up as wards of the federal government. In one case, a 74-year-old night watchman at the facility was beaten on Oct. 8 by a 13-year-old boy from Colombia. The boy created a weapon by placing three bars of soap into a tube sock and then used it to strike the man in the back of the head. ... The boy, Cristian Dakin, was taken to the Pinal County Sheriff's Oracle Substation for questioning. But Dakin, just 13, was savvy enough to refuse to answer any questions or make any statements without a lawyer present. He was charged with aggravated assault and transferred to a juvenile detention center. ... In another incident, a teacher at the facility had reportedly been attacked by three boys trying to steal her car keys. She has since quit her job at the academy..." [67990]

Ron Thompson, a retired law enforcement officer, tells WND.com, “Back when they were bringing the illegal Central Americans to Murrieta, [California] we organized a protest just like they did and got 200 to 300 people to block the buses and they never showed up here. The word we were hearing was they weren’t bringing the buses because they didn’t want a confrontation. That went on for about a week or so and we finally gave up because we thought they gave up, but then they snuck them in about three weeks later in the dead of night when everybody had gone home and nobody was watching.” Of Obama’s expected amnesty order, Thompson says, “I feel like it’s an illegal act... All it’s going to do is cause more chaos and anarchy on our borders because, from what I’m hearing with parents and kids being automatically accepted, all that’s going to do is cause more of a rush on our borders. It’s been kind of quiet in the Tucson sector lately, but they’re going to start coming back [into] Arizona and New Mexico if [Obama] declares amnesty. All it’s going to do is create more problems, more havoc for the residents, if they continue coming through. It’s just not the way to handle this issue. Yes we do need reform, whatever, but we need to find a way to do that through legal channels.” [67990]

Jessica M. Vaughan, director of policy studies for the Center for Immigration Studies, writes, “Amnesty for five million illegal aliens will impose an enormous fiscal burden on American communities, and close off job opportunities for Americans and legal immigrants—even as more than four million people who have been legally sponsored by U.S. citizens and employers and are waiting their turn will be relegated to the back of the processing line. This amnesty will cost taxpayers literally billions of dollars a year in additional outlays for services. Judging by the way the last executive amnesty, the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals for the so-called ‘Dreamers,’ was carried out, we can expect that almost no illegal alien who applies will be disqualified, and that criminal records, fraud, gang associations, and dependence on social services will be excused or ignored in favor of rubber-stamping approvals. In addition, the president is proposing to admit 500,000 technology workers and their families, despite a shortage of jobs and wage stagnation in this sector. This move is a gift to greedy tech companies who want to bypass American workers in favor of cheaper and more exploitable (not better educated, more skilled, or more creative) workers from abroad.” [68031]

Vaughan also writes, “[Obama’s] gradual, calculated dismantling of our immigration system has caused morale to plummet in the agencies of the Department of Homeland Security. Career immigration officials have courageously objected in public, and sometimes resorted to lawsuits to draw attention to the administration’s subversion of the law. In denial about their principled objections to his scheme, now [Obama] is hoping to stifle their voices by offering them a pay increase as part of this outrageous plan. His assumption that they are motivated by money shows just how little respect he has for the men and women who have devoted their careers to public service in immigration. ...Clearly the administration is trying to triangulate at best, or more likely thinks that it can just dangle the prospects of a pay raise if they would stop objecting to administration non-enforcement policies. I sincerely doubt anyone will fall for it, but it does reveal what he thinks of them.” Vaughan tells WashingtonExaminer.com, “Some have told me that illegal alien criminals they have arrested have even taunted them, saying they know the

ICE officers can't do anything to them because of Obama administration policies.” [68796]

Not only is [Obama] rewarding a huge share of those who have taken advantage of our unsecured borders over the years, he is also planning to gut enforcement even further by canceling Secure Communities, one of the most successful enforcement programs ever, whose purpose was to identify illegal aliens who have been arrested for committing crimes—a group that everyone agrees should be a priority for enforcement. [Obama's] gradual, calculated dismantling of our immigration system has caused morale to plummet in the agencies of the Department of Homeland Security. Career immigration officials have courageously objected in public, and sometimes resorted to lawsuits to draw attention to the administration's subversion of the law. In denial about their principled objections to his scheme, now [Obama] is hoping to stifle their voices by offering them a pay increase as part of this outrageous plan. His assumption that they are motivated by money shows just how little respect he has for the men and women who have devoted their careers to public service in immigration. Congress should waste no time drawing up legislation to withhold funding from the administration to carry out any of these actions, and prepare to impose strict constraints on further abuse of... authority.” [68031, 68032]

The Associated Press reports that the Obama administration has asked Congress again for a waiver that would allow it to bypass 1997 legislation that “bars the U.S. from funding military units suspected of ‘gross human rights violations,’ which include murder, torture and extrajudicial imprisonment.” (Without a waiver, Obama is technically prohibited from assisting some of the groups that are fighting ISIS because those groups themselves are guilty of violating human rights.) General Martin Dempsey, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, states, “We think that a national security waiver in the hands of the secretary of defense allows us to move with the pace we believe we need to move.” Retired Lieutenant General Michael D. Barbero observes, “There aren't a whole lot of Mother Teresas running around Iraq. But we know who some of the most serious perpetrators are, and we can go to the Iraqi government and demand that they be removed.” Pamela Geller comments, “The arms and the aid Obama has been sending to Syria have been captured, sold, or given to the Islamic State for well over a year now. Hell, I wouldn't be surprised if the weapons transferred to Syria in the gun-running operation that Ambassador Stevens was overseeing didn't fall into their hands as well. Now Obama wants Congress to sign off on aid to the beheaders, torturers, rapists and enslavers. American taxpayer dollars to these savages. This cannot stand. There are people we should stand with, aid and arm—the religious minorities, the victims of jihad. And we should ally with Israel—but Obama appears to share more common ground with the killers. Muslim Brotherhood in Egypt, Libya, Gaza, Syria... If the Obama administration can't or won't identify the ideology behind the jihadists' bloody war, how could he possibly know whom to arm?” [67999, 68000]

Although there were claims that ISIS leader Abu Bakr al-Baghdadi was gravely injured or even killed in a recent attack, the terrorist army releases an audio recording allegedly made by him. TimesofIsrael.com reports, “In the 17-minute message, the man who purported to be al-Baghdadi made no direct reference to the alleged strike against IS

leadership but mentioned developments that have occurred since. In the statement, released Thursday on social media networks, the man said his group would ‘never leave fighting, even if only one soldier remains.’ The man added that the US-led airstrike campaign against IS in Iraq and Syria had ‘mostly failed.’ He further contended that Israel ‘was a secret partner’ in the coalition established in order to combat the jihadi group. ...The purported extremist leader went on to urge Muslims to bring about an ‘eruption of jihad everywhere,’ and maintained that his group’s influence had spread across the Middle East, from Saudi Arabi and Yemen, to Egypt, Libya and Algeria. The recording appeared authentic, and the man’s voice appeared to correspond with previous recordings of al-Baghdadi released by the group.” (That the recording is audio only and not video suggests that al-Baghdadi may have been injured in the attack, and the nature and degree of the injuries were such that he wanted them left unknown.) [68001, 68002, 68005, 68015]

General Martin Dempsey, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, tells a Congressional committee he can envision sending additional U.S. troops to Iraq: “I’m not predicting at this point that I would recommend that those forces in Mosul and along the border would need to be accompanied by U.S. forces, but we’re certainly considering it.” [68045, 68046]

Rival jihadi groups ISIS and Al-Qaeda’s Syrian affiliate, Jabhat al-Nusra, agree to join forces. *The Independent* writes, “The accord set between the extremists groups in northern Syria last week could spell problems for the US-led coalition in its fight against Isis, as it complements its air strikes by arming “moderate” rebel factions to fight on the ground. Now, if the two terrorist groups fulfil their agreement and unite as one force, this would further weaken US-backed rebels - who are viewed as relatively disorganised.” [68072, 68073]

British Prime Minister David “half measures” Cameron announces a two-year ban on the return to Great Britain of any citizen who leaves to fight for ISIS in Syria or Iraq. (They will apparently be free to wage jihad on Brits after the two years are up.) [68050, 68051]

Meanwhile, according to Aljazeera.com, “China has imprisoned almost two dozen people—mostly Muslim religious leaders—in the western region of Xinjiang, in a stepped up crackdown on ‘illegal religious activities,’ Chinese media reported. The 22 suspects, including so-called ‘wild imams,’ were given prison terms ranging from five to 16 years at a mass public sentencing in Xinjiang on Monday, the state-run China News Service reported. ...China has vowed to crack down on religious extremism, which it blames for a string of violent attacks this year in Xinjiang and elsewhere.” [68053]

In *The Wall Street Journal*, Neera Tanden, president of the leftist Center for American Progress, delves into the “Grubergate” controversy and tries to throw the Obama administration a lifeline. She claims, “Mr. Gruber was not, as many claim, the architect of the health-care law. He is an MIT economist who, as a consultant to the Department of Health and Human Services, modeled the impact of various subsidy levels and rules. He did not make policy, nor did he work for the White House, HHS, or any congressional

committee. ...And Mr. Gruber's comments in 2013 that the law passed only because of 'the stupidity of the American voter' and a 'lack of transparency' by the Obama administration are simply incorrect." But DailyCaller.com notes that Tanden "indicated at an event held at the Center for American Progress on July 31, 2012 that the economist was essential to helping craft the law. 'I remember many a call to Jonathan Gruber about his expertise in Massachusetts as we were formulating the [Obama] plan. ... Not only did we call in Jon Gruber for his advise regularly, but we looked very much at the results [of the Massachusetts plan]." Additionally, "Princeton sociologist Paul Starr said that Gruber was attached to the [ObamaCare individual] mandate saying 'it's his baby.'" Harvard economist David Cutler has stated that Gruber "brought a level of science to an issue that would otherwise be just opinion. He's really the only person who has been doing all this careful modeling for so long. He's the only person you can go to for that kind of thing, which is why the White House reached out to him in the first place." (From 2009 to 2010 Tanden was senior adviser for health reform at the Department of Health and Human Services, and director of domestic policy for the 2008 Obama-Biden presidential campaign. If Tanden is arguing that Gruber's assistance was not very significant, she should explain to the taxpayers why he was paid about \$400,000.) [68009, 68010, 68023]

On *The O'Reilly Factor*, Bill O'Reilly says to Congressman Trey Gowdy (R-SC), "What about what Judge [Andrew] Napolitano raised, that this [a likely executive order granting amnesty to illegal immigrants] is an impeachable situation because it does go against Congress making the laws, because [Obama] is making a new law. And the new law says that if you have children who are American citizens even though you yourself are an illegal undocumented person, you can stay in this country. That supersedes the old law. Napolitano claims it's unconstitutional and impeachable. Do you see anybody going down that road in the House?" Gowdy responds, "Have you met Joe Biden?" (Of course, that Joe Biden is a buffoon is no reason not to impeach Obama. In fact, if Biden has knowledge that Obama's birth certificate was forged, Biden could be impeached for being part of a conspiracy. That would elevate House Speaker John Boehner (R-OH) to the presidency. The President pro tempore of the Senate—usually the Senator of the majority party with the most seniority—would be next in line in the order of presidential succession. Senator Orrin Hatch (R-UT) will likely be the President pro tempore of the Senate in January 2015.) [68008, 68057, 68058, 68059, 68319, 68320, 68321]

On *The Kelly File*, Charles Krauthammer responds to calls for Obama's impeachment if he grants amnesty to illegal immigrants: "I believe it is an impeachable offense. If the circumstances were different, if we were at the beginning of [Obama's first term], if we hadn't had years when the Congress has been supine and unresponsive at other grabs of their authority by the executive, like Obama unilaterally changing ObamaCare after it was passed, about 30 times, with no response from the Congress, the same as Obama essentially rewriting some of the drug laws. This idea of prosecutorial discretion is really a travesty. It is intended for extreme cases, for a case where you want to show mercy for an individual or two where it's an unusual incident, unusual circumstances, and you say, 'Okay, we're gonna give this person a pass.' It was never intended to abolish a whole class of people subject to a law, and to essentially abolish whole sections of a law, and that's exactly what's happening here. ...The whole American is system designed that it

has to be a collaboration between the Congress and the president, Congress has to pass it, he has to sign it. That's the way the damn things works. You can't say, 'I waited and waited'—and incidentally, the cynicism of Obama saying, 'I waited and waited,'—he was in control of the Congress, the Democrats had majorities for two years, in '09 and '10. He could have proposed and passed any immigration reform he wanted. He didn't propose it, he waited. And now he says, 'I waited for the Republicans.' Where were you when you had control of the Congress? And you can't just say, 'I waited,' you have to work with Republicans, and you cannot simply issue decrees. We don't rule by decree in this country. Obama says he's a constitutional scholar... and *he knows* that he shouldn't be doing this, but I think he's reached a point... he's not ever going to be on the ballot again, even indirectly, and he doesn't care." [68014]

On November 14, by a vote of 252-161, the House of Representatives passes legislation authorizing the construction of the Keystone XL pipeline. The Senate schedules a vote for November 18. Congressman Bill Cassidy (R-LA), who sponsored the bill, states, "We are going to make it as easy as possible for the Senate to finally get a bill to [Obama's] desk that approves this long-overdue Keystone XL pipeline." Reuters reports, "Speaking at a news conference in Myanmar on Friday, Obama said his position on the 800,000 barrels per day pipeline had not changed. Obama, who has raised doubts about how many jobs the pipeline would create and said he does not want to interfere with the State Department review of the issue, cited pending legal action in Nebraska and said it was hard to evaluate the pipeline proposal until the actual route was known." Obama says he doubts that the pipeline legislation would be a "massive jobs bill." (Obama and others claim that most of the Keystone jobs would be only temporary—as if that means no one wants them. But most construction jobs are temporary, including all the road-building and bridge-repairs jobs that would be result from any "infrastructure" legislation. In fact, Obama's *own* job is only temporary.) [67993, 67994, 67995, 68024, 68030, 68034]

Obama also repeats his amnesty threat, saying, "I gave the House over a year to go ahead and at least give a vote to the Senate bill. They failed to do so and I indicated to Speaker [John] Boehner [R-OH] several months ago that if, in fact, Congress failed to act, I would use all the lawful authority that I possess to try to make the system work better, and that's going to happen." (Under the Constitution, Obama does not have the authority to give the House or the Senate "a year" to do anything. Neither chamber nor its leaders report to Obama. Further, Obama has no "lawful authority" to act as he has proposed.) [67993, 67994, 67995, 68024, 68030, 68034]

On WMAL radio, Senator James Inhofe (R-K) suggests there may be enough votes in the Senate to override an expected Obama veto of the Keystone XL lifeline legislation: "After the beating the Democrats took, keep in mind we have another election coming up in 2016. There are a lot of Democrats who will not be real excited about Obama [vetoing the bill]. Just look at the last election—how few Democrats wanted Obama to come into their states to campaign for him." [68035]

In *The Wall Street Journal*, Peggy Noonan writes, "After a devastating election, [Obama] is presenting himself as if he won. The people were not saying no to his policies, he

explained, they would in fact like it if Republicans do what he tells them. You don't begin a new relationship with a threat, but that is what he gave Congress: Get me an immigration bill I like or I'll change U.S. immigration law on my own. Mr. Obama is doing what he knows how to do—stare them down and face them off. But his circumstances have changed. He used to be a conquering hero, now he's not. On the other hand he used to have to worry about public support. Now, with no more elections before him, he has the special power of the man who doesn't care. ...Mr. Obama is... essentially alone. He's got no one with him now. The Republicans don't like him, for reasons both usual and particular: They have had no good experiences with him. The Democrats don't like him, for their own reasons plus the election loss. Before his post-election lunch with congressional leaders, he told the press that he will judiciously consider any legislation, whoever sends it to him, Republicans or Democrats. His words implied that in this he was less partisan and more public-spirited than the hacks arrayed around him. It is for these grace notes that he is loved. No one at the table looked at him with colder, beadier eyes than outgoing Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid, who clearly doesn't like him at all. The press doesn't especially like [Obama]; in conversation they evince no residual warmth." [68098, 68099]

"This week at the Beijing summit there was no sign the leaders of the world had any particular regard for him. They can read election returns. They respect power and see it leaking out of him. If Mr. Obama had won the election they would have faked respect and affection. Vladimir Putin delivered the unkindest cut, patting Mr. Obama's shoulder reassuringly. Normally that's Mr. Obama's move, putting his hand on your back or shoulder as if to bestow gracious encouragement, needy little shrimp that you are. It's a dominance move. He's been doing it six years. This time it was Mr. Putin doing it to him. [Obama] didn't like it. ...[Obama] has taken to filibustering, to long, rambling answers in planned sit-down settings—no questions on the fly walking from here to there, as other presidents have always faced. The press generally allows him to ramble on, rarely fighting back as they did with Nixon. But I have noticed Mr. Obama uses a lot of words as padding. He always has, but now he does it more. There's a sense of indirection and obfuscation. ...It is possible [Obama] is responding to changed circumstances with a certain rigidity because no one ever stood in his way before. Most of his adult life has been a smooth glide. He had family challenges and an unusual childhood, but as an adult and a professional he never faced fierce, concentrated resistance. He was always magic. Life never came in and gave it to him hard on the jaw. So he really doesn't know how to get up from the mat. He doesn't know how to struggle to his feet and regain his balance. He only knows how to throw punches. But you can't punch from the mat. He only knows how to do what he's doing." [68098, 68099]

The National Cathedral in Washington, D.C. (an Episcopal church technically called the Cathedral Church of Saint Peter and Saint Paul in the City and Diocese of Washington) hosts a prayer service for Muslims. Before the prayers begin, a Christian woman named Christine Weick is removed from the church for declaring, "Jesus Christ died on that cross. He is the reason we are to worship only Him. Jesus Christ is our Lord and Savior. We have built enough of your mosques in this country. Why don't you worship in your mosques and leave our churches alone?" (The event was organized by South African

Ambassador Ebrahim Rasool, the All Dulles Area Muslim Society, Council on American-Islamic Relations, Islamic Society of North America, Muslim Public Affairs Council, and The Nation's Mosque. At JihadWatch.org, Robert Spencer notes "the Hamas and Muslim Brotherhood links of the sponsoring groups." Obama does not attend.) [68047, 68048, 68049, 68063, 68068, 68090, 68204, 68233]

WashingtonExaminer.com reports, "Nearly four in 10 Americans, or 92 million, are not in the labor force and now there's a reason why: They have simply given up and don't want to work. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the largest group of people not in the labor force are those who don't want a job, a remarkable statement on the nation's work ethic. The federal job counter said that 85.9 million adults last month didn't want a job, or 93 percent of all adults not in the labor force. A Pew Research Center analysis... dug a bit deeper to find out who those people are. Many are younger Americans who seem far less interested in landing a job than previous generations, possibly discouraged by the lack of good-paying jobs. Pew said that 39 percent of 16- to 24-year-olds don't want to work, up from 29 percent in 2000. Women especially don't want a job, but men have similar feelings. 'Women are more likely than men to say they don't want a job, although the gap has been narrowing—especially since the Great Recession. Last month, 28.5 percent of men said they didn't want a job, up from 23.9 percent in October 2000 and 25.2 percent in October 2008. For women, the share saying they didn't want a job hovered around 38 percent throughout the 2000s but began creeping up in 2010, reaching 40.2 percent last month,' said the Pew analysis." [68021, 68022]

The Obama administration announces a refugee program for children in El Salvador, Guatemala and Honduras whose parents are legal residents of the United States. According to the State Department, "This program will allow certain parents who are lawfully present in the United States to request access to the U.S. Refugee Admissions Program for their children still in one of these three countries. Children who are found ineligible for refugee admission but still at risk of harm may be considered for parole on a case-by-case basis." ("Case-by-case basis" means the children may be allowed into the United States even if their parents are not in the United States legally.) [68029]

Although Obama is eager to grant amnesty to millions of illegal immigrants, he has denied the renewal of an Israeli basketball player's visa. Breitbart.com reports, "The State Department's unexplained refusal to extend a valid P1 visa currently held by [Gal Mekel] has prevented the National Basketball Association's (NBA) Indiana Pacers from signing him. ...Mekel's waiver from the Dallas Mavericks was part of a deal to free up space on the Mavericks while helping the Pacers sign a desperately needed point guard for their injury-ravaged roster. ESPN.com reported that Mekel was flown to Boston to meet up with the Pacers last Wednesday, but Indiana was forced to back out of the deal after the State Department refused to renew his visa. ...The Pacers were desperate to sign the Israeli star because only one of their five guards was able to play. Four of the five are injured. Normally, visas for foreign-born players in the NBA are automatically transferable with the players to whom they are issued. More than 100 foreign-born players are currently in the NBA. This is the first instance many basketball analysts can recall where a foreign-born player was prevented from signing with a new NBA team

because a visa could not be transferred. ...Meanwhile, in Beijing on a state visit to China, President Obama announced Monday he was using his executive authority to unilaterally double the number of visas granted to Chinese students and would extend the duration of tourist visas to ten years.” (Some will assume Mekel was denied a visa renewal only because he is a Jew from Israel.) [68100, 68101]

At WND.com Jerome Corsi reports of an “abortion boast” by the now controversial MIT professor, Jonathan Gruber. A 2009 paper written by Gruber with co-authors Phillip Levine and Douglas Staiger published in the Review of Economics and Statistics “emphasized that by allowing a larger percentage of ‘non-marginal’ children, the future children of the nation would have improved odds of being raised in a two-parent family, an increased likelihood of college graduation and a greater chance of avoiding welfare.” They conclude that aborting “marginal children” would reduce future welfare costs if there are no restrictions to federally funded abortion at will. Gruber called it a “positive selection” effect, because “abortion is used by women to avoid bearing children who would grow up in adverse circumstances.” [68033]

The Fox Business Channel’s Melissa Francis tells her audience, “[W]hen I was at CNBC, I pointed out to my viewers that the math of ObamaCare simply didn’t work—not the politics, by the way, just the basic math. And when I did that, I was silenced. I said on the air that you couldn’t add millions of people to the system and force insurance companies to cover pre-existing conditions without raising the price on everyone else. I pointed out that it couldn’t possibly be true that if you like your plan you can keep it—that was a lie. And, in fact, millions of people had their insurance canceled. As a result of what I said at CNBC, I was called into management where I was told that I was ‘disrespecting [Obama],’ by telling what turned out to be the absolute truth. This Fox Business is the only network, and Fox News, not complicit in the campaign to keep you in the dark. Don’t trust the other guys. I can tell your firsthand, they are willing participants in the campaign to keep the economic truth from you. Don’t let them do it.” [68040, 68056, 68062, 68134]

Addressing the American Academy of Actuaries, former secretary of Health and Human Services Kathleen Sebelius refuses to answer a question about Jonathan “Americans are stupid” Gruber. She says, “You can talk to Dr. Gruber about what he said, but I don’t have a comment about his comments.” [68064]

At Townhall.com Kevin Glass writes, “...Obama’s public stance that the FCC should reclassify broadband internet services as a Title II ‘common carrier’ under the current Telecommunications Act carries many ramifications, but one is undeniable: there’s going to be a hidden tax hike, and it’s going to be paid for by consumers. Title II common carriers are required to ‘contribute’ to what’s called the Universal Service Fund—a government program to bring telecommunications services to underserved areas with the goal of universal coverage. Whether it’s called ‘contributions’ or fees or whatnot, the function of the program is a tax on corporate revenues in order to fund services for those who might not have them otherwise. It’s a redistributive corporate tax paid for by consumers. The USF tax amounts to more than a 16% charge on top of consumers’ bills.

As broadband service providers are not currently subject to the USF tax, a reclassification would mean that all consumers would see a jump around that size in their bill. Considering that in some locales, the cheapest broadband service runs upwards of \$50 per month, this will cost even the most price-conscious consumers an extra \$100 per year—and for those at higher tiers, much more than that. ...In a discussion at the National Press Club on Friday, current FCC commissioner Ajit Pai laid out exactly what consumers would be seeing on their bills. ‘Public utility regulation would mean higher broadband prices for consumers,’ Pai said. ‘Once broadband is classified as a telecommunications service, universal service charges would be assessed on carriers’ broadband services. Many state and local taxes would automatically kick in. The net result is that every single American broadband customer would have to pay a new tax—or taxes—to access the internet.’” (In other words, those who can afford Internet service would be taxed in order to provide subsidized service for those who cannot afford it. Some might argue that means, “Taxing productive people to give people on welfare free access to Internet pornography.”) [68054, 68106, 68145, 68207]

On *The Kelly File*, well-respected, liberal law professor Jonathan Turley comments on Obama’s planned amnesty executive order. He warns, “What I’m hearing certainly causes great concern that [Obama] will again violate the separation of powers. [He cannot] take on the power of all three branches and that’s what he seems to be doing. He certainly seems to be taking on legislative authority. He isn’t being particularly coy about this, you know he say, ‘This is what I wanted to get out of legislation and I’m going to do it on my own.’ and that does become a government of one. ...It’s a very sad moment but it’s becoming a particularly dangerous moment if [Obama] is going to go forward, particularly after this election, to defy the will of Congress yet again. I can understand the frustration, these are two political parties that cannot get along but... we have a Democratic process and a Congress that’s coming in with the full voice of the American people behind them. That’s what an election is, you may disagree with the outcome, but you have to respect the outcome. What [Obama] is suggesting is tearing at the very fabric of the constitution. We have a separation of powers that gives us balance and that doesn’t protect the branches. It’s not there to protect the executive branch or the legislative branch, it’s there to protect liberty. It’s there to keep any branch from assuming so much control that they become a threat to liberty. I always tell my friends on the Democratic side, we will rue the day when we helped create this uber presidency. What the Democrats are creating is something very, very dangerous. They’re creating a president who can go at it alone, and to go at it alone is something that is a very danger that the framers sought to avoid in our constitution.” [68122, 68230, 68355]

On November 15 the annual enrollment period for ObamaCare begins, with the HealthCare.gov Web site encountering scattered problems. According to Politico.com, “some searches for insurance policy details generat[ed] brief error messages. In a few instances, consumers received a notice that the annual enrollment period was closed, signaling that not all pages on the website had been successfully updated. Others reported having initial trouble logging into their accounts. More significant issues surfaced with the state exchange in Washington, which officials took down hours after it opened because of inaccurate subsidy calculations.” [68071, 68078]

Dr. Martin Salia, a surgeon who had been working in Sierra Leone, is brought to the United States to treat him for Ebola. According to FoxNews.com, Salia “is a Sierra Leone citizen and a permanent resident of the U.S., living in Maryland.” (That is, he has a “green card” but is not a U.S. citizen. Salia’s wife is a U.S. citizen.) [68065, 68103]

The *Daily Mail* reports that “Jihadi John, the Briton who beheaded two British and two American hostages held by Islamic State terrorists, has been injured in a US-led air strike, according to reports received by the Foreign Office. The masked ‘executioner’ with a London accent is believed to have narrowly escaped death when he attended a summit of the group’s leaders in an Iraqi town close to the Syrian border last Saturday. The meeting was targeted by American and Iraqi jets. ...The Foreign Office also issued an official statement saying: ‘We are aware of reports. We cannot confirm these reports.’ A spokesman for US Central Command said they were unable to confirm the details for security reasons.” [68067]

The United Arab Emirates includes the Council on American-Islamic Relation (CAIR) and the Muslim American Society in its list of designated terrorist organizations and groups. Jihad Watch’s Robert Spencer writes, “[T]he mainstream media has been going to Hamas-linked CAIR for years as if they were really what they claim to be, a civil rights organization. The fact that a government, any government, has branded it terrorist must be as embarrassing to the mainstream media as it is to Hamas-linked CAIR—that is, if either of them were capable of embarrassment.” (Obama’s State Department seeks “to gain more information” from the UAE as to why it is labeling CAIR a terrorist organization. Jihad Watch’s Robert Spencer explains, “CAIR is not, strictly speaking, a terrorist organization: it doesn’t blow things up or exhort others to do so. It is, however, an Islamic supremacist organization with the same goals as those of al-Qaeda and the Islamic State: the imposition of Islamic law wherever and whenever possible.” CAIR also raises funds for Hamas, and is essentially the propaganda arm of the Muslim Brotherhood in the United States. Senator Charles Schumer (D-NY) has stated that CAIR, which has encouraged Muslims in the United States not to cooperate with the FBI, “has ties to terrorism” and “intimate links with Hamas.”) [68074, 68075, 68132, 68186, 68248, 68249, 68298, 68455, 68685]

According to AGI, “U.S. and Turkish army officials have agreed that the training of around 2,000 moderate Syrian rebels, including Free Syrian Army (FSA) members and Syrian Turkmen, will take place at the military training centre in Hirfanli, Turkey. Officials from both countries met for the third time at the general headquarters in Ankara to discuss Turkey’s proposal to equip and train the rebels.” (The Obama administration continues to naively believe that there are “moderates” in the Free Syrian Army—which is not even an army but a collection of Syrians united mostly by their opposition to President Bashar al-Assad. The Free Syrian Army’s “moderates” are guilty of the same sort of atrocities as al-Qaeda and ISIS, such as persecuting Christians and other non-Muslims.) [68076]

A “Latin American Muslim Leaders Religious Summit” is held in Istanbul, Turkey. At the event, Turkish President Recep Tayyip Erdogan claims that Muslims discovered America: “Muslim sailors arrived in America in 1178.” (Readers may wish to refer to Frederick William Dame’s, *The Muslim Discovery of America*, which debunks the many absurd claims by Muslims about their influence in the world. Taking advantage of the average person’s ignorance of certain subjects, the Islamists seek to convince as many people as possible that Muslims, not Christopher Columbus, discovered the New World; that Muslims invented everything from mathematics to the alphabet to manned flight; and that Western civilization’s successes are due to Islam and that its failures are the result of not following Islam.) On November 28, Turkey’s Minister of Science, Industry and Technology claims it was Muslim scientists who first recognized that the earth was round—some 700-800 years before the time of Galileo. (He does not explain why Muslims kept all their miraculous discoveries and inventions secret for centuries. Nor does he recognize that the earth was considered by the Greeks to be spherical as early as the 3rd century BC.) [68111, 68112, 68113, 68114, 68116, 68682, 68974]

During a panel discussion at the Ronald Reagan Presidential Foundation in Simi Valley, California, Robert Gates (former Secretary of Defense) and Leon Panetta (former Secretary of Defense and CIA director) criticize Obama’s micromanagement of the U.S. military. Panetta states, “For the past 25 to 30 years, there has been a centralization of power in the White House. Because of that centralization of authority at the White House, there are too few voices that are being heard. ...[B]y the time you get to the White House, the staff has already decided.” Gates says, “My concern in terms of this relationship of the White House and the military is not on the big issues. It’s in the increasing desire of the White House to control and manage every aspect of military affairs. ...When [Obama] wants highly centralized control in the White House at the degree of micromanagement that I’m describing, that’s not bureaucratic, that’s political.” [68139, 68162]

On November 16, while attending the G-20 economic summit in Brisbane, Australia, Obama is asked by Fox News’ Ed Henry, “At your Burma town hall a couple days ago you tried to inspire young leaders by saying governments need to be held accountable and responsive to the people. Well, I wonder how you square that with your former advisor, Jonathan Gruber, claiming you were not transparent about the health care law because, in his words, the American people—the voters—are stupid, and you had to lie to them in order to get [ObamaCare] passed. Did you mislead Americans about the taxes, about keeping your plan in order to get the bill passed...?” Obama responds, “No. I, I did not. Uh, I just heard about this... I, I get well briefed before I come out here. Uh, th-th-the fact that some advisor who never worked on our staff, uh, expressed an opinion that, uh, I completely disagree with uh, uh, in terms of the voters, is no reflection on the actual process that was run. We had a yearlong debate, Ed. I mean, go back and look at your stories. The one thing we can’t say is that we did not have a lengthy debate about health care in the United States of America or that it was not adequately covered. I mean, I would just advise every press outlet here: Pull up every clip and every story. I think it’s fair to say there was not a, a provision in the health care law that was not extensively debated, uh, and was fully transparent. It was a tough debate.” (Many Americans might

argue that they were being misled when Obama promised if they liked their health plans they could keep them, that the average family would save \$2,500 per year on insurance premiums, that ObamaCare would reduce the budget, and that abortion would not be covered by ObamaCare. Obama's excuse that Gruber "was never on our staff" is irrelevant. He was paid \$400,000 to help design ObamaCare. The location of his desk is meaningless.) [68079, 68080, 68093, 68121, 68133, 68136, 68144, 68170, 68172, 68181]

On the issue of illegal immigrant amnesty, Obama says, "There is a very simple solution to this perception that somehow I'm exercising too much executive authority: pass a bill I can sign on this issue. Give me a bill that addresses those issues, I'll be the first one to sign it. And metaphorically, I'll crumple up whatever executive actions that we take and we'll toss them in the wastebasket because we will now have a law that addresses these issues." (In other words, "Just give me everything I am demanding and I will stop my temper tantrum!") Charles C. W. Cooke tweets, "This is among the most remarkable statements I have ever seen. It's almost self-parodic." (Some may imagine Adolph Hitler saying, "If only you Brits and Americans would round up the Jews and gas them, I wouldn't have to issue orders to do it.") Townhall.com reminds readers of a statement Obama made in Lancaster, Pennsylvania in 2008: "I taught constitutional law for 10 years. I take the Constitution very seriously. The biggest problems that we're facing right now have to do with George Bush trying to bring more and more power into the executive branch and not go through Congress at all, and that's what I intend to reverse when I'm President of the United States of America." [68153, 68154]

It is worth noting that while Obama, his fellow Democrats, and media leftists continue to whine that the Republican-controlled House has yet to act on the immigration bill, the 1,200-page bill has yet to be sent to the House by Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid (D-NV). [68205]

Obama is, of course, playing with constitutional fire. He believes he can do almost anything he wants via executive orders because he thinks he can never be removed from office. The truth, of course, is that the House of Representatives could easily muster the votes to impeach him. Granted, the Senate would be unlikely to convict, as that would require 67 votes, but the only thing holding the Senate back is *public sentiment*. If Obama angers and offends enough voters, and *if* those voters raise a big enough stink, even Senate Democrats will be forced to listen. On November 4 the Democrats lost eight Senate seats, and that will probably be nine after the December 6 runoff election in Louisiana. If enough Americans demand Obama's removal from office, even Senate Democrats will not stand in their way—not if it means protecting their own jobs in November 2016. They will not throw Obama under the bus now, but that does not mean there could never be circumstances that would cause them to change their minds.

Asked about sending ground troops to fight ISIS, Obama says, "There are always circumstances in which, uh, the United States might need to deploy, uh, U.S. ground troops. If we discovered that, uh, ISIL had gotten possession of a nuclear weapon, and we had to run an operation to get it out of their hands, uh, then yes, you can anticipate that

[chuckling] not only would Chairman Dempsey recommend me [sic; my] sending U.S. ground troops to get that weapon out of their hands, uh, but I would order it.” [68167]

Obama announces, “We are going to contribute \$3 billion to the Green Climate Fund so we can help developing nations deal with climate change. ... We cannot forget the need to lead on the global fight against climate change. Here in the Asia Pacific, nobody has more at stake when it comes to thinking about and then acting on climate change. Here, a climate that increases in temperature will mean more extreme and frequent storms, more flooding, rising seas that submerge Pacific islands. Here in Australia, it means longer droughts, more wildfires. The incredible natural glory of the Great Barrier Reef is threatened. Worldwide, this past summer was the hottest on record. No nation is immune, and every nation has a responsibility to do its part. ... But let me say, particularly again to the young people here: Combating climate change cannot be the work of governments alone. Citizens, especially the next generation, you have to keep raising your voices, because you deserve to live your lives in a world that is cleaner and that is healthier and that is sustainable. But that is not going to happen unless you are heard.” (Obama does not explain where the \$3 billion will come from, nor why it is the responsibility of U.S. taxpayers to fund “green” projects in other countries.) [68137]

Senator James Inhofe (R-OK) responds with a statement, “... Obama’s pledge to give unelected bureaucrats at the U.N. \$3 billion for climate change initiatives is an unfortunate decision to not listen to voters in this most recent election cycle. His climate change spending priorities, estimated to be \$120 billion since the beginning of his administration, were on the ballot, and Americans spoke. [Obama’s] climate change agenda has only siphoned precious taxpayer dollars away from the real problems facing the American people. In a new Congress, I will be working with my colleagues to reset the misguided priorities of Washington in the past six years. This includes getting our nation’s debt under control, securing proper equipment and training to protect our men and women in uniform, and repairing our nation’s crumbling roads and bridges. These are the realistic priorities of today.” [68137]

On *Meet the Press*, Health and Human Services Secretary Sylvia Burwell says of Jonathon Gruber’s comments about the stupidity of the American people and how ObamaCare was passed only because of a lack of transparency, “I have to start with how fundamentally I disagree with his comments about the bill and about the American people. Since I’ve been at the department, one of the things I focused on is transparency, making sure all our numbers come out whether good or bad. The other thing is the law is based on the issues of transparency and belief in the American people and choices in the marketplace.” Burwell also brags about the large number of Americans who are going to the ObamaCare exchanges to shop for insurance—as if they have any choice in the matter. (Consumers have no choice but to use the exchanges. If they do not, they will not receive the taxpayer subsidy. If the government were to hand out \$5,000 vouchers toward the purchase of a new car but the vouchers could only be used at one particular car dealer in each state, no one should be surprised when those dealers experience increased showroom traffic.) Asked by Chuck Todd if Gruber would “be welcomed back as a consultant?” Burwell replies, “Um, certainly right now in terms of the work we’re doing

at HHS we're doing our work and focusing on what we are doing and our modeling.” [68081, 68094, 68118]

Meet the Press host Chuck Todd asks Louisiana Governor Bobby Jindal, “If [Obama] goes through with his executive action [on amnesty], do you think Republicans and Capitol Hill ought to use even the power of shutting down the government to stop him from doing it?” Jindal refuses to take the bait, and responds, “Two things: I don’t think [Obama] should shut down the government to try to break the Constitution. The reality is this. I do think the—” Todd: “You think that [Obama] would be shutting down the government?” Jindal: “Oh, absolutely.” Todd: “And so, you do want Republicans to fight him on this, to the point that it could shut down the government?” Jindal: “I don’t think [Obama] should shut down the government.” Todd: “You’re twisting my question. That means you want that kind of showdown.” Jindal: “Let’s step back and understand what we’re talking about. So [Obama] said, ‘I want to break the law.’ He purposely said I’m going to wait till after the election, because I know it’s not going to be popular to grant amnesty to millions of folks... that are here illegally. We had an election. He said his policies were on the ballot. He lost in red states, purple states, blue states. The American people overwhelmingly ejected and rejected his policies. Now he’s saying, ‘I’m still going to break the law.’ Talk about arrogance. [Obama] used to say, ‘Elections have consequences.’ We’re talking about how can the Congress force [Obama] to follow the law. I would expect even Democrats who may agree with him on substance, to say the right way to do this is to follow the Constitution, follow the law. No, we shouldn’t shut down the government, but absolutely Republicans should do everything they can to force [Obama] to follow the law. Let’s secure the border. No, [Obama] shouldn’t shut down the government so that he can break the law.” [68147]

DailyCaller.com posts an October 1, 2009 video from a Senate Finance Committee hearing of then-Senator John Kerry (D-MA) saying, “According to [Jonathan] Gruber, who has been our guide on a lot of this, it’s somewhere in the vicinity of an \$8 billion cost...” (Whether Gruber was an ObamaCare “architect,” “advisor,” “consultant,” or “guide,” he was paid \$392,600 by the Obama administration for his advice.) [68120]

Former Obama campaign strategist David Axelrod tweets, “As one who worked hard to make ACA [the Affordable Care Act] and its benefits clear, let me say: if you looked up ‘stupid’ in [the] dictionary, you’d find [Jonathan] Gruber’s picture.” (Some might argue that paying \$400,000 for assistance from a stupid person is itself stupid.) [68085, 68129]

On *This Week*, ABC’s Martha Raddatz asks Senator Kirsten Gillibrand (D-NY), “Do you feel misled [about the Affordable Care Act] by Obama?” Gillibrand replies, “He should have just been more specific. Because the point is, if you’re being offered a terrible health care plan, [with coverage such] that the minute you get sick you’re going to have to go into bankruptcy, those plans should never be offered.” Raddatz: “So were you misled?” Gillibrand: “He should have just been specific. No, we all knew the whole point of the plan is to cover things people need like preventive care, birth control, pregnancy. How many women the minute they get pregnant might risk their coverage? How many

paid more because of their gender, because they might get pregnant? Those are the reforms we're talking about." [68105]

Gillibrand's ignorance is astounding. Many of the health plans she believes were "terrible" were precisely what their owners wanted. Many of them covered catastrophic events but not routine health care expenses. Those plans are less expensive than many other plans, but are adequate for millions of people. Gillibrand believes no American should have the freedom to buy such a plan. Her question, "How many women the minute they get pregnant might risk their coverage?" makes no sense. Getting pregnant does not result in insurance coverage being terminated. (If an insurer did that it would quickly find itself in trouble with state insurance regulators.) Her question, "How many paid more because of their gender, because they might get pregnant?" shows her ignorance of how insurance works. Because men do not get pregnant, they never incur maternity costs for insurance companies. Women, as a group, cost more to insure, as do smokers, diabetics, etc. (That is reality, not discrimination.) For Gillibrand to argue that women should not pay more for health insurance, despite the fact that they cost more to insure, is tantamount to arguing that teen-aged drivers should not pay more for car insurance than middle-age suburbanites, even though those higher premiums are more than justified by the higher accident rates of teen-aged drivers. Gillibrand's "solution" to what she sees as a discrimination against women problem was to vote for ObamaCare—which forces men and the elderly to pay for maternity coverage they will never use. (Her "solution" was to replace justifiable rate discrimination with unjustifiable rate discrimination.) [68105]

Also on *This Week*, Congressman Tom Cole (R-OK) says, "I think [Obama] wants a fight. [With his executive order threats] I think he's actually trying to bait us into doing some of these extreme things that have been suggested [such as impeachment and a government shutdown]. I don't think we will." [68135]

On *Fox News Sunday*, Senator John Thune (R-SD) agrees that a shutdown threat is ill-advised: "It doesn't solve the problem [of Obama's abuse of power]. But look, we're having those discussions... We're going to continue to meet about this. I know the House leaders are talking about, the Senate leaders are talking about it." [68135]

Columnist George Will observes, "The [immigration amnesty] policies that reportedly [Obama] is planning to implement are those about which people of intelligent people of good will can agree or disagree. It's going to shield from deportation millions of people who actually face no realistic process of deportation. He's going to give work permits to millions of people who are already working here. I'm not saying its trivial, but to put it in context here. And he's going to direct in the enforcement discretion the agents to concentrate on A, criminals, and B, people who arrived recently. Fine, the policies are defensible, [but] the process is execrable. The process is beyond the precedents, and beyond the constitutional questions there's a simple etiquette of democracy." [68141]

According to a national Rasmussen poll, "Thirty-two percent (32%) of Likely U.S. Voters agree that the American people are too stupid to understand the true costs

associated with Obamacare... Just 52% disagree and another 16% are not sure. ...Among voters who favor the health care law, only 18% think Americans are too stupid to understand the actual costs associated with the law. Those who oppose the law, however, by a 46% to 42% margin do think the American people are that stupid.” [68083]

On CNN’s *Inside Politics*, *The New York Times*’ Peter Baker comments on the likelihood that Obama will soon issue an executive order granting amnesty to millions of illegal immigrants: “Actually, the debate is between ...Obama and ...Obama. It was only a couple of years ago ...Obama tried to deflect pressure from immigration activists and, and from his left and say, look, I don’t have the power to do what you guys want me to do. And now he’s coming around, two or three years later, he’s got fresh legal opinions from the Justice Department saying, actually I do have the power to do it. And, uh, and they’re gonna [sic] go forward. I think at this point, within the White House, there is a consensus that he does have this power. ...And he’s gonna go ahead. Probably as early as this week.” HotAir.com notes several instances over the years where Obama said he did not have the power to grant amnesty, and writes, “That must have been one heck of a debate around the Oval Office desk, eh? He stuck to his guns consistently through his entire administration, right up to the spring of this year. But somehow over the course of the summer the debate took a turn and he’s now able to do pretty much whatever he likes.” (Inasmuch as the U.S. Constitution has not been amended since Obama entered the White House, neither has his ability to grant amnesty. He did not have it in 2009 and does not have it in 2014. What has changed is that he now cares even less than he did then about following the Constitution.) [68082, 68143]

DailyCaller.com notes that Obama may have forgotten what he wrote about immigration in his 2006 book, *The Audacity of Hope*: “[T]here’s no denying that many blacks share the same anxieties as many whites about the wave of illegal immigration flooding our Southern border—a sense that what’s happening now is fundamentally different from what has gone on before. Not all these fears are irrational. The number of immigrants added to the labor force every year is of a magnitude not seen in this country for over a century. If this huge influx of mostly low-skill workers provides some benefits to the economy as a whole—especially by keeping our workforce young, in contrast to an increasingly geriatric Europe and Japan—it also threatens to depress further the wages of blue-collar Americans and put strains on an already overburdened safety net.” (Obama now plans to open the floodgate of immigration even more. He should be made to explain why that will not now depress wages and strain the safety net.) [68119]

DefenseOne.com reports, “The State Department’s unclassified email system was compromised in recent weeks, at the same time as a White House network, and officials took the State system offline Friday, according to department officials. The maintenance has disrupted email traffic of State employees and the ability to access public websites, a senior department official told *Nextgov* on Sunday afternoon. State expects systems to be back up soon. It is believed hackers backed by a nation state, likely Russia or China, infiltrated the White House system in September or October. Officials were still working to suppress abnormal behavior on that network as recently as late October.” [68084, 68096]

ISIS beheads American aid worker Peter “Abdul Rahman” Kassig. (One of the ISIS fighters in the video appears to be “Jihadi John,” a British citizen who traveled to Syria to engage in jihad.) Obama states that Kassig “was taken from us in an act of pure evil by a terrorist group. ... Today we offer our prayers and condolences to the parents and family of Abdul-Rahman Kassig, also known to us as Peter.” Obama also claims, “ISIL’s actions represent no faith, least of all the Muslim faith which Abdul-Rahman adopted as his own. Today we grieve together, yet we also recall that the indomitable spirit of goodness and perseverance that burned so brightly in Abdul-Rahman Kassig, and which binds humanity together, ultimately is the light that will prevail over the darkness of ISIL.” (Once again, Obama pretends the Islamic State has nothing to do with Islam. His inclusion of “least of all” is absurd, as it means the terrorist army’s actions are more likely to represent any faith *other* than Islam, which he claims is the “least likely” religion to have been an influence. Kassig’s conversion to Islam, of course, did not save his head. Not only was he brainwashed, his parents have also fallen prey. The jihad-supporting, Anti-American Sheikh Muhammad Al-Yaquobi will preside over Kassig’s funeral in Indiana. Pamela Geller writes, “Peter Kassig’s parents have tragically betrayed their country, their culture and their civilization. They have become tools in the hands of the ideology that murdered their son.”) [68086, 68087, 68089, 68092, 68108, 68109, 68110, 68115, 68117, 68141, 68178, 68399, 68400]

Newsmax.com reports, “A source close to the Supreme Court tells Newsmax that White House efforts to get Ruth Bader Ginsburg to step down from the Supreme Court backfired while infuriating the liberal justice. To say that Ginsburg was unhappy about the call to resign would be a gross understatement. ... According to the source, the Obama administration saw the handwriting on the wall about the midterm elections, and anticipating a strong Republican showing, tried to get Ginsburg to step down before the balloting—to ensure that a Democratic Senate confirmed her replacement. Now a Republican-controlled Senate ensures that Obama will not be able to tap another far-left justice in his last two years. ... Even with Ginsburg on the job, the Obama administration has had a rocky relationship with the Supreme Court. The court historically has sided with the White House in a significant majority of cases it has heard. But the Obama administration has a losing record before the court, and has lost an unusually high number of cases in unanimous 9-0 decisions. Obama saw 20 unanimous defeats in the first 5-1/2 years of his administration, while his predecessor George W. Bush saw just 15 in his eight years in office. The court recently dealt a potential blow to Obama's signature effort, the Affordable Care Act, when it decided to hear a case challenging provisions of Obamacare. The bottom line, according to the source, is that the court just does not like the Obama administration and its continual disrespect of co-equal branches of the federal government.” [68088]

Near the end of a story about protester tactics being planned in Ferguson, Missouri after a grand jury announces its decision in the Michael Brown shooting case, *The New York Times* buries the statement, “Some of the national leaders met with ... Obama on Nov. 5 for a gathering that included a conversation about Ferguson. According to the Rev. Al Sharpton, who has appeared frequently in St. Louis with the Brown family and delivered

a speech at Mr. Brown's funeral, Mr. Obama 'was concerned about Ferguson staying on course in terms of pursuing what it was that he knew we were advocating. He said he hopes that we're doing all we can to keep peace.'" (The *Times* does not explain what Obama meant by "staying on course," or what course he expects police officer Darren Wilson and his family or apprehensive business owners in Ferguson to maintain. The meeting did not appear on Obama's daily schedule of events.) [68102, 68104, 68180, 68196]

At FrontPageMag.com Daniel Greenfield writes, "Even while the media is describing Peter Kassig, the ISIS hostage who apparently converted to Islam in captivity and was beheaded, by his American name, the Obama statement calls him by his Muslim name. ...The interesting media phenomenon is that Westerners who convert to Islam and become terrorists are almost never referred to by their Muslim names. Meanwhile Kassig who was killed by Muslims is. ...Too bad our government loves not only giving into [sic; in to] thugs, but glorifying their religion of thuggery." [68179]

The Independent reports, "The Islamic State (Isis) has recruited an army hundreds of thousands strong, far larger than previous estimates by the CIA, according to a senior Kurdish leader. He said the ability of Isis to attack on many widely separated fronts in Iraq and Syria at the same time shows that the number of militant fighters is at least 200,000, seven or eight times bigger than foreign intelligence estimates of up to 31,500 men." [68107]

Wisconsin Governor Scott Walker, who some consider a possible 2016 Republican presidential candidate, tells a local Fox News affiliate, "Whether it's two years, six years, 20 years from now, because at 47, I mean I think about Hillary Clinton, I could run 20 years from now for president and still be about the same age as the former secretary of State is right now. I say this only half-jokingly, that you have to be crazy to want to be president. Anyone who's seen the pictures of [Obama] or any of the former presidents can see the before and after, no matter how fit, no matter how young they are, they age pretty rapidly when you look at their hair and everything else involved with it. ...Right now, I still feel called to be governor of the state of Wisconsin, and I'm going to do the best job I can over the next four years." [68151]

On November 17 Ebola patient Dr. Martin Salia dies at the Nebraska Medical Center in Omaha. [68065, 68103, 68128, 68130, 68142]

The satirical Web site DailyCurreant.com "reports," "The state of North Dakota has named a new publicly-owned landfill after ...Obama. ...When completed, the Barack Obama Memorial Landfill will be the largest waste disposal site in North Dakota, and the 17th largest in the United States. It will be especially rich in toxic waste from the local petroleum and medical industries. 'We wanted to do something to honor [Obama],' says Republican State Senator Doug Perlman, who was the lead sponsor of the bill. 'And I think a pile of garbage is a fitting tribute...'" [68451]

Former Obama campaign guru David Axelrod tweets, “One additional note on Gruber: His contributions to the ACA, like Gov. Romney’s MA plan, were valuable. His throwaway quips were offensive.” (Translation: “It’s okay to deceive millions of Americans as long as you just don’t get caught bragging about it.”) [68123]

ObamaCare reaches a record low approval rating in a Gallup poll, with 37 percent approving of the law and 56 percent disapproving. [68124, 68184]

At IndyStar.com Gary Varval posts a Jonathon Gruber version of the Healthcare.gov home page. It treads: “The Health Insurance Marketplace is Open for Stupid American Voters.” [68125]

Opponents of the Keystone XL pipeline protest in front of Senator Mary Landrieu’s (D-LA) Washington, D.C. mansion. (Although Landrieu is likely to lose the December 6 runoff election, she may run for the Senate again in 2016 if Senator David Vitter (R-LA) runs for governor and his seat opens up as a result.) [68126, 68127, 68168]

The *Daily Mail* reports, “A jihadist serving life in prison on terror charges brought in the wake of 9/11 has claimed the Saudi Arabian royal family helped finance the plot. Zacarias Moussaoui, 46, says an unnamed Saudi Prince paid for flying lessons for him and the 19 terrorists who hijacked planes in the September 11 attacks in the run-up to the atrocities. The incredible claims were made in documents filed to a federal court in Oklahoma, in which Moussaoui says a prince ‘was assisting me in my Islamic terrorist activities... and was doing so knowingly for Osama bin Laden.’ He also said that bin Laden provided assistance from Saudi leaders in planning the attacks, and that he was involved in a plot to shoot down Air Force One with President Bill Clinton on board. The Saudi government has flatly denied any involvement in 9/11. Moussaoui’s own credibility is also suspect—as even Osama bin Laden has denied he had anything to do with his terrorist plots.” [68152]

An April 5, 2006 video of Obama speaking at The Brookings Institution is posted on YouTube. In the recording, Obama says, “Uh, you’ve already drawn some of the brightest minds from, uh, academia and policy circles, uh, many of them I have stolen ideas from liberally, uh, people ranging from Robert Gordon ta [sic; to] Austan Goolsbee, Jon Gruber, uh, my dear friend, Jim Wallis here, uh, who can talk, I think, who can inform, uh, what are sometimes dry policy debates with, uh, a prophetic voice.” (Jonathan Gruber, who Obama now calls “an adviser who was never on our staff,” was in 2006 one of the “brightest minds” from whom Obama had “stolen ideas from.”) [68155, 68156, 68157, 68160, 68183, 68203]

Although Democrats are now running away from Gruber and claiming he was not a significant player in health care reform, he has been paid close to \$6 million by the federal government and several states for his assistance. At NationalReview.com Deroy Murdock lists some of the payments Gruber received: “\$103,500 from the U.S. Department of State, \$392,000 from the state of Minnesota, \$392,600 from the U.S. Department of Health and Human Resources, \$400,000 from the state of Vermont,

\$400,000 from the state of Wisconsin, \$481,050 from the state of Michigan, \$1,730,000 from the U.S. Department of Justice (that medical hotbed), \$2,050,000 from the U.S. National Institutes of Health.” Murdock reports, “The stalwart pro-Obama group Organizing for Action boasted about Gruber’s key role, but then airbrushed him from its website after this controversy exploded last week. Fortunately, TeaParty.org has posted a cached version of that page in which these Obamites call Gruber someone ‘who helped write Obamacare.’” [68177]

Protesters in Ferguson, Missouri start blocking traffic to disrupt the city in anticipation of a decision by a grand jury not to indict police officer Darren Wilson for the shooting of convenience store robber Michael Brown. One riot advocate tweets, “March to white neighborhoods, obstruct their traffic, make their kids ask their parents why, tear up their neighborhoods not yours.” [68158]

Missouri Governor Jay Nixon declares a state of emergency and authorizes the deployment of the National Guard to deal with expected rioters in and around Ferguson. Meanwhile, according to BizPacReview.com, an employee of Drury Plaza Hotel in Chesterfield, Missouri, is fired for posting on Facebook video he recorded of a large number of Department of Homeland Security vehicles in the underground parking garage. The hotel is apparently “housing hundreds of DHS agents” about 25 miles from Ferguson. [68159, 68161, 68202, 68224]

HotAir.com notes a March 28, 2012 New York Times that praise M.I.T.’s now infamous Jonathan Gruber: “They all wanted Jonathan Gruber, a numbers wizard at M.I.T., to help them figure out how to fix their health care systems... Then came the call in 2008 from President-elect Obama’s transition team, the one that officially turned this stay-at-home economics professor into Mr. Mandate. Mr. Gruber has spent decades modeling the intricacies of the health care ecosystem, which involves making predictions about how new laws will play out based on past experience and economic theory. It is his research that convinced the Obama administration that health care reform could not work without requiring everyone to buy insurance. ...Gruber’s position as an adviser to the influential Congressional Budget Office also left him perfectly positioned to advise the White House on health reform. ‘The most important arbiter of everything was the C.B.O.,’ said Neera Tanden, who was a senior adviser for health reform at the Department of Health and Human Services. The C.B.O.’s assessment of a bill’s efficacy and costs strongly influences political debate, but the office does not publicly reveal how it calculates those numbers. ‘We knew the numbers he gave us would be close to where the C.B.O. was likely to come out,’ Ms. Tanden said. She was right. After Mr. Gruber helped the administration put together the basic principles of the proposal, the White House lent him to Capitol Hill to help Congressional staff members draft the specifics of the legislation. ...Even though he was brought in by the White House, Congressional staff members from both parties trusted him because he was seen as an econometric wonk, not a political agent. But soon his very involvement with the bill caused questions about his objectivity to be raised in the news media.” (The Obama administration is now denying that Gruber had much of a role in the drafting of ObamaCare, but in 2012 “the White

House lent him to Capitol Hill to help Congressional staff members draft the specifics of the legislation.”) [68164, 68165]

Even leftist MSNBC admits that Grubergate is a disaster for ObamaCare. Reporter Alex Seitz-Wald says on *The Cycle*, “Jonathan Gruber, I’m guessing his name I.D. is 0.00001 percent among most Americans. But it does confirm all the worst suspicions that Republicans had, everything that they’ve been saying about Obamacare, that it was passed on a platform of lies, that Democrats were not transparent in passing this bill. His words, his own words, kind of confirm all of that, so they’ll point to that, and it’s just yet another hurdle in trying to get the numbers back above water for Obamacare.” [68171]

DailyCaller.com reports that it was Gruber who convinced Obama “to create the individual and employer mandates in the health care law, which Obama originally opposed as a presidential candidate. During the 2008 presidential campaign, an obscure but influential left-wing group called the Herndon Alliance approached the campaigns of Obama and fellow Democratic candidates Hillary Clinton and John Edwards to get all three major Democrats on board with health care reform. ...After Obama won the presidential election in November 2008, he added Gruber to his transition team. The New York Times later reported that Gruber became ‘Mr. Mandate’ on the Obama health care reform team. Obama finally announced his support for the mandate in July 2009, the very same month that he met personally with Gruber in the Oval Office. Obama’s decision was made during a series of Obamacare-designing White House meetings, of which Gruber was present at five. ‘It is his research that convinced the Obama administration that health care reform could not work without requiring everyone to buy insurance,’ the Times reported in 2012, when Gruber was publicly hoping the Supreme Court would uphold the constitutionality of the individual mandate, which it eventually did.” [68197]

As noted previously in this *Timeline*, Herndon Alliance (which is partly funded by the leftist Media Matters for America) was the marketing firm that coordinated efforts to push the issue of contraceptives as a 2012 campaign issue. The issue of contraceptives was not on the political radar until ABC’s George Stephanopoulos strangely asked Mitt Romney in a GOP debate if states could ban birth control. The assumption is that Stephanopoulos coordinated his line of questioning with the White House. (Stephanopoulos reportedly maintained contact with the White House via daily strategy calls, along with James Carville and Paul Begala of CNN.) The contraceptives issue was raised because polling showed—not surprisingly—that women were in favor of requiring insurers to provide free birth control, abortifacients, and sterilization. The Obama campaign naturally seized on that, and laid out a strategy to buy the votes of women—votes that Obama has been losing because of the poor economy—and portray the Republicans as opposed to women’s rights and access to birth control. [989, 29412]

Aaron Klein reported at WND.com in November 2013 that the Herndon Alliance was “the driving force in branding Obamacare to the public. It was this group that advised ...Obama to say Americans can maintain their choice of doctors and insurers under his health-care plan... The Herndon Alliance is openly partnered with a number of radical groups, including MoveOn, the National Council of La Raza and a slew of George Soros-

funded activist organizations. It is also partnered with a ‘direct action’ group dedicated to the teachings of radical Saul Alinsky. The original research that informed Herndon’s blueprint for marketing Obamacare... was concocted by the imaging guru for the late Venezuelan dictator Hugo Chavez. Herndon’s campaign was also based on survey data from progressive pollster Celinda Lake, whose information was central in President Obama’s 2012 campaign decision to turn contraception for women into a key election issue. Lake and Herndon have been providing strategy to Enroll America, the main organization pushing for the uninsured to sign up for Obamacare. Enroll America’s executive director, Ron Pollack, was a founding member of Herndon. The Herndon Alliance has been behind the marketing campaign for Obamacare since the inception of the legislation. Herndon is ‘the most influential group in the health arena that the public has never heard of,’ reported Politico in 2009. Politico reported that when Obama repeatedly announced Americans can maintain their ‘choice’ of doctors and insurance plans, ‘he is using a Herndon strategy for wringing fear out of a system overhaul.’ ...Lake’s firm, together with Herndon, was one of the driving forces behind the progressive strategy to use contraception as an election issue in 2012.” [989, 29412, 51207]

According to WesternJournalism.com, the Herndon Alliance is linked to a socialist consulting firm run by Michael Shellenberger called the Environics Research Group, also known as American Environics. One of Shellenberger’s clients was the late Venezuelan dictator Hugo Chavez. Shellenberger, along with communist Van Jones (Obama’s former “green jobs czar”), is on the board of the George Soros-funded Apollo Alliance, a front group that uses environmental issues to promote socialism. Also on the board are former Weather Underground radicals and domestic terrorists Jeffrey Carl Jones and William Ayers. Joel Rogers, another leftist political activist, heads the New York branch of the Apollo Alliance. Rogers founded the socialist New Party, which Obama joined on January 11, 1996. The Herndon Alliance’s treasurer is Phillipe Villers, who is also co-founder of Families USA—which received a \$1 million grant from the Obama administration to push ObamaCare. Families USA is linked to Enroll America, supposedly “non-partisan,” federally funded organization whose job is to persuade Americans to enroll in ObamaCare. (Families USA and Enroll America list the same New York City address and suite number as their headquarters.) Heading up Enroll America is Anne Filipic, who previously worked for Health and Human Services Secretary Kathleen Sebelius. [52501, 52502, 52503, 52504]

According to DailyCaller.com, the AARP and the leftist Herndon Alliance “participated in weekly conference calls during the run-up to the passage of Obamacare” and were involved in the development of the administration’s “you can keep your plan and your doctor” messaging. (AARP benefits from ObamaCare by selling Medicare supplemental policies to senior citizens who, because of ObamaCare, will lose their Medicare Advantage plans. DailyCaller.com notes, “AARP saved \$1.8 billion by successfully pushing to keep Medigap reform out of the final draft of Obamacare.”) [52112]

Senator Mark Begich (D-AK) concedes to Republican Dan Sullivan. (Begich can be expected to challenge Senator Lisa Murkowski (R-AK) when she seeks reelection.) [68182]

In New York City, an Orthodox Jewish man is attacked by three people at a subway station. According to the *New York Daily News*, the attackers beat the man with his own umbrella while calling him a “dirty bloody Jew” and “a fucking Jew.” A bystander who tries to assist the man is also attacked. (Obama has no comment.) [68237, 68238]

Breitbart.com reports, “Illegal aliens who get ...Obama’s likely forthcoming executive amnesty will have immediate access to welfare and other public benefits, according to a new report from the Federation of American Immigration Reform (FAIR) exclusively provided to Breitbart News ahead of its public release shows. ‘Obama’s executive amnesty isn’t only unconstitutional but costly; from day one it opens up federal and state benefits to individuals who are still illegal aliens, regardless of the label [Obama] puts on them,’ FAIR executive director Julie Kirchner told Breitbart News. ‘Deferred action and parole-in-place don’t fit neatly into statutory definitions that prohibit access to benefits, mostly because deferred action and parole-in-place have no statutory basis themselves,’ FAIR communications director Bob Dane added. ‘Congress has never imagined a rouge [sic; rogue] [White House] pulling rabbits out of a hat to justify a broad, transformational makeover of the country by way of amnesty. There will always be thousands of loopholes in the law and backdoor methods to achieve a desired agenda, but ultimately the intent of Congress is preeminent. It may be that the courts will have to review that.’” (Many federal benefit programs require only that the applicant be “lawfully present” in the United States, rather than U.S. citizens or legal immigrants with permanent resident status.) [68209]

DailyCaller.com points out, “Embattled MIT economist Jonathan Gruber once disagreed with a bold claim made repeatedly by then-Sen. Barack Obama on the 2008 presidential campaign trail that the average American family would save \$2,500 on their premiums per year under his health-care plan. ‘We’ll work to lower your premiums by up to \$2,500 per family per year,’ Obama told an audience on Sept. 6, 2008. He made a similar claim at least 18 more times stump speeches during the campaign. ...But that was news at the time to Gruber, who later advised the Obama administration on the creation of Obamacare and is now at the center of a firestorm for candid remarks he made about how the administration duped the American public in order to get the health law passed. ‘I know zero credible evidence to support that conclusion,’ Gruber told the [so-called] non-partisan FactCheck.org in Feb. 2008 about proposals offered by Obama and his Democratic challenger at the time, Hillary Clinton. ...Gruber also offered his candid suggestion for how to actually control health-care costs. ‘At the end of the day, the only way to control health-care costs in America is to deny Americans health care they want,’ Gruber said.” [68169]

WhiteHouseDossier.com reports, “A new video featuring Obamacare architect Jonathan Gruber, uncovered by White House Dossier today, shows Gruber concurring that some states refusing to expand Medicaid as part of Obamacare do so out of racist motives and

asserting that the refusal is ‘almost awesome in its evilness’ and an effort to ‘punish poor people.’” (Some states chose not to expand Medicaid because the federal subsidies to reimburse them for the costs are gradually reduced, leaving the states no choice but to raise taxes to cover the funding shortage.) In the recording Gruber says, “There’s [sic; there are] larger principles at stake here, when these states are not just turning down covering the poor people, but turning down the federal stimulus that would come with that. They’re not just not interested in covering poor people, they’re willing to sacrifice billions of dollars in injections into their economy in order to punish poor people. I mean, it really is just almost awesome in its evilness. And I agree, you have to recognize there’s [sic] larger principles at stake here.” (Gruber is essentially arguing that it is racist to not expand Medicaid even if a state lacks the financial resources to do so.) [68206]

On *Special Report*, Charles Krauthammer comments on Obama’s November 16 claim that he “just heard about” the Gruber controversy: “I think [Obama] was not told about what’s going on. And the reason is that they [in the White House] have had six years experience of the press essentially conspiring with them... I think they calculated [that Obama] could go a week without talking about it and then pretend he never heard of it because you wouldn’t hear about it in the press. In fact, except for Fox [News], you look at all the networks and... it’s been a blackout. ... This is a scandal of the first order and they imagined they would actually get away with it. And when you see everybody pretending that they had never heard of this guy when you show the evidence—he was in the White House 19 times. So when they make the movie, it will be called ‘The Man Who Never Was.’” Krauthammer jokes, “And I think this is an extension of the Secret Service scandal. Gruber jumped the fence at the White House, he got through an open door, and he sat in the Oval Office and joined 19 meetings, and that’s exactly what happened.” [68200]

Also on *Special Report*, NationalReview.com’s Jonah Goldberg says, “In a lot of ways, this spectacle represents not just everything’s that’s wrong with the Obama administration, it’s everything wrong with liberalism and a lot that’s wrong with America itself. You’ve got this guy [Jonathan Gruber] who is pretending to be an objective independent analyst, who’s got huge amounts of skin in the game in terms of money he can make off of consulting fees, but also of the prestige being involved and the speeches he could do which haven’t been tallied into these numbers—anyway, it’s millions of dollars—being touted around through a transmission belt [conveyor belt] of liberal journalists, who all are all pretending to be objective analysts too, quoting each other, reaffirming each other, all with the help of the White House which went along with this soup to nuts—a process which this guy says was all about lies and misleading the American people. And then when caught about it, the same administration tries to dismiss him as if he was just some sort of random White House intruder. The whole thing stinks. It’s not just that’s he’s getting rich, it’s the hypocrisy that every time Republicans complain about ObamaCare, they say ‘Oh, it’s just because those evil, profit-hungry Koch brothers are trying to get rich,’ which was always a lie. It’s also that this law itself makes American life more complex and then there’s this leaching new class of people who profit from the complexity that they are imposing upon the society.” [68213]

National Journal's Ron Fournier says that Obama “has destroyed the credibility of his administration himself and government itself.” [68216]

MSNBC's Lawrence O'Donnell asks Congressman Peter Welch (D-VT), “No one at the White House has been able to give me the legal justification for the following component of [Obama's] plan which was leaked to *The New York Times*. the part where it says... that [Obama] will allow many parents of children who are American citizens or legal residents to obtain legal work documents. Can you tell me and has the White House told you, what is the legal justification for [Obama] to create a new category of beneficiaries for work documents? How can that be done without legislation?” Welch responds, “You know, Lawrence, I can't tell you, and I'm not the lawyer who's going to be litigating this case. So the answer to that would be decided by the courts as you and I know. But here's what I can tell you—” O'Donnell: “Congressman, so as far as you know, and I don't mean to badger about this but I've been on this for days now, I haven't heard from a single elected Democrat, not one Democrat in Washington who can answer the question that I just put to you. Have you heard it? Have you heard it answered by any Democrats?” Welch: “I haven't. I haven't.” (Welch readily acknowledges that Obama's amnesty action will be litigated, yet Democrat legislators are not lining up to warn Obama, “Don't do it.” Apparently they do not understand that Obama's actions will be a noose around their necks in the November 2016 elections.) [68251, 68252]

On *Hannity*, Senator Rand Paul observes, “There was the public deception by [Obama] and all of his henchmen and women, but also the deception of paid consultants. The one thing we can do is that this Mr. Gruber, this Jonathan Gruber—he was paid and now he's admitted he was deceptive and deceitful, I'm going to ask for an investigation from the investigator general and ask that he return his pay. Because how can you—how can we pay someone to be a consultant to government who's frankly admitting they were dishonest? So I think he should be made to return his pay. The other thing we ought to investigate is there's [sic; there are] about ten different states where [Gruber] got between \$200,000 and \$400,000 for specific reports. Who was... organizing this for him? Is this some sort of thing that happened within government? Was he just able to market himself everywhere? Or was this all coming as sort of an organized way to enrich Obama consultants? But this is a disgrace. Now totals are saying as much as \$6 million. I think we ought to talk about having him give it back to the taxpayer.” [68198, 68217]

On November 18, while yelling “Allahu Akbar,” Palestinian terrorists wielding axes and guns murder three Americans, one British citizen, and a police officer at a synagogue in Jerusalem. Nine others are wounded, and the attackers are shot and killed by armed citizens and police. One witness says, “There were people running from the synagogue, and a man sitting on the pavement covered in blood; it looked like he has been stabbed. Two people came out with their faces half missing, looking like they'd been attacked with knives.” One of the injured, a Canadian, requires surgery on his head, eyes, and arms, and has to be placed in a medically-induced coma; even if he survives, he reportedly will suffer from massive brain damage. [68185, 68187, 68188, 68194, 68201, 68215, 68225, 68235, 68240, 68241, 68242, 68243, 68244, 68245, 68246, 68247, 68293, 68294, 68297]

In Gaza, Palestinians celebrate the murders by passing out candy and food and setting off fireworks, and Hamas praises the attack. Hamas calls the murders “heroic.” On CNN, a “developing story” graphic incorrectly states, “Deadly Attack On Jerusalem Mosque.” (Upon further investigation of its “developing story,” perhaps CNN will learn that Jews worship in synagogues, not mosques.) A CNN.com headline reads, “4 Israelis, 2 Palestinians killed in synagogue attack, police say”—a headline that suggests the two Palestinians were victims, rather than the attackers. *The Guardian* changes a Reuters headline from, “Palestinians kill four in Jerusalem synagogue attack” to “Four worshippers killed in attack on Jerusalem synagogue,” and the lead sentence from, “Two Palestinians armed with a meat cleaver and a gun killed four people in a Jerusalem synagogue on Tuesday before being shot dead by police...” to “Two men armed with axes, knives and a pistol have killed four Israelis and wounded several others in a Jerusalem synagogue...” (Apparently *The Guardian* does not want its reader to know that the killers are Palestinians.) In an on-air report, a BBC interviewer asks Israeli Economy Minister Naftali Bennett to put down a photograph of one of the attack victims, saying, “We don’t want to actually see that picture, if you could take that down.” (This would be the same BBC that does not hesitate to broadcast images of slain Hamas terrorists in Gaza.) [68185, 68187, 68188, 68194, 68201, 68215, 68225, 68235, 68240, 68241, 68242, 68243, 68244, 68245, 68246, 68247, 68293, 68294, 68297]

On CBS, anchor Norah O’Donnell says, “The two Palestinian attackers died in a shootout with police. It happened at a contested religious site in Jerusalem.” (O’Donnell is either grossly uninformed and ignorant, or she is intentionally misleading viewers. The synagogue is *not* a “contested religious site.” It is a synagogue in a Jewish neighborhood in west Jerusalem, not the eastern part of the city which many Palestinians live. Pamela Geller writes, “These are not media gaffes as referred to below. These are devices to skew the news and subtly advance and impose the Jew-hatred agenda of many in the media. ...O’Donnell is a typical journalist, taking her talking points from Islamic supremacists and their leftist stooges. If O’Donnell is compelled to editorialize the news and refer to the capital of Israel as a ‘contested religious site,’ it is incumbent upon her to explain. Jerusalem is mentioned ZERO times in the Quran. Jerusalem is mentioned over 700 times in the Jewish Bible. ‘Contested’ becomes a news factoid when it serves this century’s nazi-esque objectives.”) [68295, 68296]

In response to the terrorist savagery, Obama calls for “Israeli and Palestinian leaders and ordinary citizens to work cooperatively together to lower tensions, reject violence, and seek a path towards peace.” (Once again, Obama responds to a one-sided massacre by blaming both sides, as if the victims at the synagogue had done anything to deserve being hacked to death. Obama displays absolutely no outrage in his perfunctory remarks, despite the fact that three innocent Americans were among the five people savagely murdered in the attack. Americans should be outraged by his lack of outrage. Israeli Prime Minister Binyamin Netanyahu has to *ask* world leaders to be outraged, knowing that most will probably not care that a few Jews have been killed.) [68190, 68239]

The Spanish parliament votes to symbolically recognize Palestine as a legitimate state—apparently believing that acting like cowards will somehow keep Spain safe from jihadist attacks. (Pamela Geller writes, “As jihadists massacred four Rabbis and wounded many others, Spain’s Parliament thought it a good idea to give these savages a state. Jihad groups have vowed to recapture Spain—Al-Andalus—and it looks as if Spain won’t put up much a fight. They have already surrendered of sorts. Just what is it that these countries hope to achieve by rewarding savagery? The Muslims in Gaza, Judea and Samaria have vowed to destroy Israel. They have no effort to come to accord. They wage war—that’s what they do and the international community gifts them billions. Billions... to wage more war against the Jews.”) [68236]

The U.S. military orders about 70,000 troops in Europe to avoid wearing uniforms when leaving their bases. [68299]

On *Morning Joe*, former Obama advisor and “car czar” Steven Rattner says, “Jonathan Gruber was, back in the day, in 2009, the guru on health care... He designed the Massachusetts plan for Romney. I think if you go back and look at *The Washington Post* or *The New York Times* or anything from that period, you will find Jonathan Gruber’s name all over it, as both someone who’s the leading expert on health care quoted by everybody, and as someone who the White House was using—I don’t think we knew the dollar numbers he was paid at the time—but I remember that when I was in the White House, he was certainly viewed as an important figure in helping to put ObamaCare together. ...The problem is not that Gruber helped them put ObamaCare together, because he was ‘the man.’ The problem is what he said in the last two weeks and how the White House has handled it.” [68274]

House Democrats reelect Nancy Pelosi to serve as their minority leader for another two years. [68173]

The U.S. dollar takes another step toward decline as Germany and China finalize plans to trade directly using euros and the yuan. Examiner.com observes, “The significance of this direct settlement process is that trade between China and Germany should begin to increase substantially, and without the need to use the dollar as a medium for swap functions between both currencies. This will also facilitate greater capital investment in Germany as recognition of the Yuan as a global primary currency will bring new investors and new joint investments between the largest economy in Europe and the largest economy in Asia. ...Just as important as increasing financial partnerships between the two economies, this new currency swap process will potentially allow Germany, and in particular the banking center of Frankfurt, to bypass the City of London as the primary financial hub for Europe since settlements will first and foremost go through the German banks and become the conduit for nearly all of Asia as the growing coalition of ASEAN economies follow China's lead in future trade between the Far East and Europe. ...2014 will go down in history as the year China made their move to usurp America in seeking to take dominion over the global financial system. In just the past 11 months, China has broken the 40 year old petro-dollar agreement through their partnership with Russia to buy and sell oil in either the Rouble or the Yuan, has established a global bank (AIIB) to

replace the IMF and World Bank in providing capital loans to sovereign states, and now they have established the Yuan in Europe as a viable trade currency that will only increase its growing use around the world as an alternative to the dollar, and as an accepted form of payment between nations.” (All else being equal, the change means the U.S. dollar will be worth less because demand for it will decrease. Meanwhile, various European nations are considering or working to repatriate all their gold. The value of the U.S. dollar would also decline if nations start removing their gold deposits from the United States and shipping them back home—especially if their gold turns out not to be there.) [68459, 68575, 68656, 68663, 68664]

In a stunning article at *TheAtlantic.com*, Garrett Epps, who allegedly teaches Constitutional law (less likely) and creative writing (more likely) at the University of Baltimore, comments on the coming clashes between Obama and a new Republican Congress. Epps writes, “What’s coming will be painful, frustrating, and dangerous—and it will illustrate a constitutional malfunction unforeseen in 1787. ...The problem of divided government is a bug, not a feature, and the Constitution itself provides no guidance on how to work around it. ...I’m not taking one side against the other; I’m trying to illustrate a dangerous weakness of our system, one that the Framers clearly did not foresee. ...I don’t think any of them anticipated that the two branches would ever clash over which represented ‘the will of the voters.’” (The open-minded may think that Epps is here using his “creative writing” talents, rather than his knowledge of the U.S. Constitution. The less charitable may call him a moron whose ignorance of the document is immeasurable.) [68189]

New York magazine’s Jonathan Chait, who on November 13 wrote that Jonathan Gruber “helped write the Affordable Care Act,” on November 18 claims Gruber played “no direct role in writing the law.” [68191, 68192, 68193]

Meanwhile, to protect the Obama administration from additional embarrassment, various universities and organizations have been quietly removing videos of Gruber speeches from their Web sites. (Whether the deletions are what Obama means by “net neutrality” is not known for certain.) [68195, 68199]

House Republicans select Congressman Jason Chaffetz (R-UT) to chair the House Oversight and Government Reform Committee in the next Congress, to replace the current term-limited chairman, Darrel Issa (R-CA). Congressman Paul Ryan (R-WI) will chair the House Ways and Means Committee. Ryan states, “We will work together to fix the tax code, hold the IRS accountable, strengthen Medicare and Social Security, repair the safety net, promote job-creating trade agreements, and determine how best to repeal and replace ObamaCare with patient-centered solutions.” [68266, 68275]

House Speaker John Boehner (R-OH) says, “Now let’s be clear about this. A Keystone pipeline veto would send the signal that [Obama] has no interest in listening to the American people. Vetoing an overwhelmingly popular bill would be a clear indication that he doesn’t care about the American people’s priorities. It would be the equivalent of calling the American people stupid.” [68220]

Although the House of Representatives passed Keystone XL pipeline legislation on November 14, enough Senate Democrats filibuster the measure to prevent supporters from gathering the 60 votes necessary to move it forward—at least for the time being. The first vote fails with 59 votes: 14 Democrats and all 45 Republicans. (Even if the bill passes, it is likely to be vetoed by Obama—who apparently believes the six year review process has not been long enough.) Obama has absurdly claimed that the pipeline will not create many jobs in the United States and “doesn’t have an impact on U.S. gas prices.” *The Wall Street Journal* writes, “Someone should tell [Obama] that oil markets are global and adding to global supply might well reduce U.S. gas prices, other things being equal. A tutor could add that Keystone XL will also carry U.S. light oil from North Dakota’s Bakken Shale. So even if he thinks that bilateral trade only helps Canada, he’s still wrong about Keystone.” Additionally, workers cannot build a 1,200-mile pipeline without workers across the country manufacturing the pipes, fittings, valves, pumps, and other items. (The 14 Democrats voting with the Republicans: Begich, Bennet, Carper, Casey, Donnelly, Hagan, Heitkamp, Landrieu, Manchin, McCaskill, Pryor, Tester, Walsh, and Warner.) [68208, 68210, 68214, 68218, 68219, 68226, 68272]

At the daily press briefing, ABC’s Jonathan Karl asks White House press secretary Josh Earnest, “Does [Obama] still stand by what he said last year when he said, ‘I am not the emperor of the United States. My job is to execute laws that are passed.’ Is that still operative?” Earnest replies, “Absolutely.” Karl: “Not a king, either?” Earnest: “That’s right.” [68222, 68276]

Neal Boortz, sitting in for Herman Cain on his radio program, tells a caller, “When I was actually doing a daily show, I wasn’t that interested in the questions about whether or not Barack Obama was an actual citizen, whether or not he enrolled at Occidental as a foreign student, whether or not he’s used several Social Security numbers.... I wasn’t that interested, but now that we have discovered, now that we know, [for a] fact, that Obama is a pathological liar, that Obama will do *anything* that he thinks he can get away with to obtain and preserve power, now that we know this, it does cause me to go back to *all* of these former questions and say, you know what? Maybe these people [‘birthers’] that I kinda wrote off as nut cases, maybe they had a point.” [68223]

DailyCaller.com reports that Speaker of the House John Boehner (R-OH) “has hired Jonathan Turley, a renowned liberal law professor, as his lead counsel in the House’s lawsuit against the Obama administration’s delay of Obamacare’s employer mandate. Turley is a law professor at the George Washington University, frequent legal commentator and self-avowed liberal. He may be the perfect pick for House Republicans—Turley is not only a liberal, but is friendly toward Obamacare itself, according to his writings. But he’s vociferously pushed back against ...Obama’s generous use of executive action in the past and has hit the administration for its implementation of the health-care law and he said he jumped at the chance to represent House Republicans.” Turley states, “It is a great honor to represent the institution in this historic lawsuit and to work with the talented staff of the House General Counsel’s Office. To quote the movie *Jerry Maguire*, the House ‘had me at hello’ in seeking a

ruling to reinforce the line of authority between the branches. The question presented by this lawsuit is whether we will live in a system of shared and equal powers, as required by our Constitution, or whether we will continue to see the rise of a dominant Executive with sweeping unilateral powers. That is a question worthy of review and resolution in our federal courts.” (Democrats, outraged that Turley would dare represent the Republican-controlled House and criticize Obama, demand that he be banned from speaking in public about the issue of Obama’s executive authority and its limits. That is, Democrats want Turley to be stripped of his First Amendment rights.) [68228, 68268, 68280, 68565]

On MSNBC’s *The Cycle*, co-host Ari Melber goes ballistic in a defense of Obama and ObamaCare, saying, “Nobody cares about Jonathan Gruber! ... Who cares! He did not work directly on it [ObamaCare], although he worked on the Massachusetts model. He wrote some policy. I hope this is what Republicans continue to do, because it’s pathetic. And the fact that they’re so excited about this, trying to go do oppo[sition] research on a dude that someone has not ever heard of. Oh my God, Barack Obama hasn’t heard of Jonathon Gruber? Neither has the American voter which doesn’t implicate their intelligence at all. No one cares about Jonathan Gruber! I swear to you! Now people have some concerns about Obamacare. Let’s talk about them. And by the way, if you want to legislate on any of them, please, you have Congress now; please bring us your amendments if you care about health care for the public. But for those of us that [sic; who] worked on the issues and followed them for years, this is a sad note...” (Obama has not only heard of Gruber, he has often met with him in the Oval Office.) [68229]

At TheFederalist.com, Sean Davis writes, “Jonathan Gruber was a key architect of Obamacare who was intimately involved in the drafting of the legislation. That is a fact. It is not arguable. It is not assailable. It is backed up by overwhelming contemporaneous evidence long before Gruber became a controversial figure whose loose lips threatened to sink the Obamacare ship. And the people who pimped Gruber as the all-knowing health care savior who single-handedly built the model that guaranteed a future of health care glory were not Obamacare’s critics. They were its most ardent proponents. ... Gruber doesn’t get to be an architect of Obamacare and Romneycare when you want to use his authority and credentials to bash Republicans or spin for the law, and then radically transform into one of three Jon Grubers who just happens to live in Obama’s neighborhood once Gruber becomes a massive liability for the Left. Gruber was one of the key architects of Obamacare. He didn’t just build econometric simulation models based on the law. He was also involved in drafting its key components. And he was paid enormous sums of money for his advice and counsel. These are facts. Accept them, learn to deal with them, and give the embarrassingly bad Gruber Truthing a rest. ... Gruber himself acknowledged in a 2012 presentation that he literally wrote, at a bare minimum, the portion of the law containing small business tax credits.” [68279]

According to a poll by Princeton Survey Research, 46 percent of Americans oppose an Obama executive order on illegal immigrant amnesty and want the new Congress to draft immigration after it is sworn in; 42 percent approve of Obama’s planned illegal action. [68231]

Pushing his book, *The Stranger: Barack Obama in White House*, in a Newsmax TV interview, NBC's Chuck Todd says, "The most familiar refrain is how many people feel as if six years in, they still don't know [Obama], they still don't quite know what makes him tick. I had one Democratic senator who was a big supporter of him in the primary against Hillary Clinton saying, '[I] backed the wrong horse, I didn't realize he hadn't climbed the greasy pole of politics.'" [68270]

TPNN.com posts an interview with a welfare recipient named Kiara, who says, "I'm 30 years old, I have four kids, and I've been on welfare for 12 years." Asked if she lives in government housing, Kiara says, "Yes, since I was 18, but they kicked me out because I didn't report [unintelligible]." Asked if she is employed, she says, "No. ...I'm comfortable with it, and I feel like I don't need to look for one [a job] because I get a check from the government every month. ...I get \$780 in food stamps, \$500 in [unintelligible], and I get Medicaid and WIC [Women, Infants, and Children program benefits]." (During the interview, the tattooed young woman fidgets with her smartphone.) [68232]

Outgoing Attorney General Eric Holder engages in some partial revenge against conservatives who have consistently opposed him, by removing the death penalty from consideration for the killers of police officer Kevin Quick. (Quick was kidnapped by four thugs, forced to withdraw money from cash machines at several banks, and then shot to death. The killers dumped his body in a wooded area in Virginia, where it was found six days later. Quick was white; his killers were black.) According to Fox News, Holder's Department of Justice has approved the death penalty in only 27 of the 1,236 death penalty cases it has reviewed. Investors.com writes, "Holder, who once called the United States a 'nation of cowards' regarding discussions of race, is the AG who failed to prosecute one of the clearest cases of voter intimidation in American history in Philadelphia by black militants, members of the New Black Panther Party. If they had been white supremacists in, say, Alabama, we suspect that he would not have been so reluctant.") [68234, 68256, 68311]

On *Special Report*, the *Weekly Standard's* Stephen Hayes says, "I'm troubled by the administration's attempt to distance itself from one of the architects of ObamaCare, but I guess I have come to expect that from [Obama], from his administration, this is what they do. They are not afraid to, I think, be dishonest if it furthers their interests. I'm equally troubled by the reporters who are refusing to cover this or, in some cases, actually pretending that he is not who they said he was just months ago. There was a Politico article in which the reporter wrote a lede and she said, you know, Jonathan Gruber, 'chief architect of ObamaCare,' et cetera, et cetera. The same reporter just wrote an article recently saying, 'Was Jonathan Gruber really an architect of ObamaCare?' This is hackery. This is just dishonest journalism. I think journalists have a lot to answer for in terms of being deceived or being enablers of the administration in the first place to pass Obamacare. But they have even more to answer for right now." [68267]

On *Hannity*, Congressman Jim Jordan (R-OH) says that Jonathan Gruber “used taxpayer money to lie to tax payers [about ObamaCare] and when it was all over he made fun of them. Of course he needs to come in front of a congressional committee and answer our tough questions about what he did, where all of the money went to. Lets hope that happens, there’s a timing to it, but let’s hope it happens and I think it will. He was the man, the American people know he’s the man. He lied to the American people using their tax dollars to do so, of course he needs to answer our questions.” [68253]

“Man-caused global warming” notwithstanding, all 50 states—including Hawaii and Florida—experience temperatures of 32 degrees or colder. (The temperature dips to 30 degrees on Hawaii’s dormant volcano, Mauna Kea. Jacksonville, Florida records 24 degrees, breaking a record set in 1873.) Bretibart.com notes, “According to the *Boston Globe*, 1,360 daily low records have been smashed across the country in a single week.” [68282, 68324]

On November 19 Politico reports that Obama “is expected to formally unveil his executive actions on immigration this week and will travel to Las Vegas for an event Friday...” (Obama’s announcement will come on Thursday evening, November 20—which is the day Mexico celebrates Día de la Revolución, the third Thursday in November. It is clear that Obama chose to announce his amnesty order on the 20th because of the significance of the day for Mexicans.) [68265, 68281]

CBS, NBC, ABC, and Fox will reportedly not air Obama’s 8 p.m. amnesty announcement live from the White House. (The Fox News Channel will, however, as will CNN and MSNBC.) Univision will interrupt the 15th annual Latin Grammy Awards program to broadcast Obama’s announcement. (Obama scheduled the speech so that he could have access to the large Hispanic audience watching the awards program. In fact, Obama did not formally request air time from the major networks—possibly because he knew the reaction from most *Americans* would be negative, while it would be positive from most *Mexicans*. It may also be possible that Obama has been informed that the Ferguson grand jury indictment decision might be announced on the 20th. He knows that the live television coverage of anticipated race riots—if there is no indictment of officer Darren Wilson—will take precedence over reports of criticism of the amnesty order. Obama may be planning to cover the outrage with a different outrage.) [68261, 68262, 68277, 68290, 68304, 68310, 68323, 68334]

According to House Speaker John Boehner (R-OH), on at least 22 occasions Obama has stated that he does not have the authority to issue an executive order granting amnesty to illegal immigrants. On March 31, 2008 Obama said, “I take the Constitution very seriously. The biggest problems that we’re facing right now have to do with [President Bush] trying to bring more and more power into the executive branch and not go through Congress at all. And that’s what I intend to reverse when I’m President of the United States of America.” On October 14, 2010 Obama said, “I do have an obligation to make sure that I am following some of the rules. I can’t simply ignore laws that are out there. I’ve got to work to make sure that they are changed.” On October 25, 2010 Obama said, “I am not king. I can’t do these things just by myself. We have a system of government

that requires the Congress to work with the Executive Branch to make it happen. ...I'm not king. If Congress has laws on the books that says that people [sic; say people] who are here who are not documented have to be deported, then I can exercise some flexibility in terms of where we deploy our resources, to focus on people who are really causing problems as opposed to families who are just trying to work and support themselves. But there's a limit to the discretion that I can show because I am obliged to execute the law. That's what the Executive Branch means. I can't just make the laws up by myself. So the most important thing that we can do is focus on changing the underlying laws." On April 29, 2011 Obama said, "I know some here wish that I could just bypass Congress and change the law myself. But that's not how democracy works. See, democracy is hard [sic; difficult]. But it's right. Changing our laws means doing the hard work of changing minds and changing votes, one by one." [68254, 68255, 68283, 68341]

According to an NBC/Wall Street Journal poll, only 43 percent of Hispanics in the United States support Obama's coming amnesty order, while 37 percent oppose it. In addition, "By a margin of 56 percent to 40 percent, Hispanic voters oppose allowing illegal immigrants to obtain federal benefits, including Obamacare benefits, 'while they are going through the legalization process...'" [68257, 68258]

At the daily press briefing, press secretary Josh Earnest is asked about criticism of Obama's lawlessness in issuing an amnesty order. Earnest replies, "Well, uh, I'll say a couple things about the quote, I happened to see that too, I, I mean the thing that, there are a couple things that stuck out to me, the first is, you know, again, we'll have an ample opportunity to discuss the legal basis for [Obama's] executive actions once he's announced them." (In other words, "He has to sign his executive order for you to know what's in it.") "Uh, you know, uh, we've heard, uh, this kind of rhetoric about lawlessness from the House Republicans for some time, I know that their most recent statement referred to 'Emperor Obama.' You know, the fact of the matter is, uh, you know, [Obama] is somebody who is willing to examine the law, review the law, and use every element of that law to make progress for the American people. And that is, uh, and if that is something that Republicans are critical of, that's, you know, maybe a criticism [Obama] wears with a, with a badge of honor I think." (Earnest may perhaps be subconsciously recalling that Bill Clinton once referred to his impeachment as a "badge of honor." Or Earnest may have used the reference on purpose, to remind Republicans that Clinton may have been impeached but he was not convicted. Earnest may have been instructed to make the "badge of honor" statement to taunt the GOP.) Earnest also says that Obama "is always willing to allow the Speaker to change his mind." (That is, "Emperor Obama will 'permit' House Speaker John Boehner (R-OH) to cave in on the amnesty issue.") [68259, 68260, 68263, 68284]

Michael Steel, spokesman for House Speaker John Boehner (R-OH), tweets, "I will wear this nonsensical WH response with a badge of honor." [68285]

Joseph Clancy, the acting director of the U.S. Secret Service, appears before the House Judiciary Committee. Congressman Louie Gohmert (R-TX) asks Clancy, "Has there been any thought to just eliminating the fence around the White House? Has [former

Department of Homeland Secretary Janet] Napolitano ever talked about that, maybe having a virtual fence, or electronic fences? Has that been discussed at all?” Clancy responds, “Sir, I’m not aware of any discussions in that regard.” Gohmert: “Would you be in favor of removing the fence around the White House and having a virtual or electronic fence around it?” Clancy: “Sir, my knee-jerk reaction that would be, no sir, partly because of the number of tourists that come on Pennsylvania Avenue and come right up to that area and, you know, take pictures and whatnot.” Gohmert: “Well you know the secretary has said a number of times, Secretary Napolitano, the [border] fence was worthless: ‘You put a 10 foot fence up, somebody’s going to build a 12 foot ladder.’ So I would think that if the administration is going to be consistent, it’s now time to remove the fence from around the White House. Because if it isn’t good enough for our border [with Mexico], it shouldn’t be good enough for the White House. So I would ask you to consider that consistency, and also consider the fact that maybe there really *is* some real virtue in having a fence that slows people down.” [68337]

DefenseNews.com reports, “A new congressional-funded report paints a dark picture of China’s nuclear weapons and missile modernization efforts. The report, issued Nov. 19, by the US China Economic and Security Review Commission, states China will pose a threat to all US military forces, bases and assets in the Western Pacific within the next 10 years. China will also be able to attack US national security satellites in a variety of ways—kinetic, laser, electronic jamming and seizing. According to the report, China’s capabilities will hold at risk all US national security satellites in every orbital regime in the next five-to-10 years. ‘In space, China in 2014 continued to pursue a broad counter-space program to challenge U.S. information superiority in a conflict and disrupt or destroy U.S. satellites if necessary.’ Beijing also calculates its space warfare capabilities will enhance its strategic deterrent as well as allow China to coerce the US and others ‘into not interfering with China militarily.’” [68975]

At OfTwoMinds.com, Charles Hugh Smith wonders, “What do we do when the bubble economy cannot be reflatd [sic; reinflatd]?” He notes, “It is generally conceded that the global economy is currently experiencing a third bubble. The first expanded in the 1990s and popped in 2000, the second one expanded in 2002 and burst in 2008, and the third one inflated in 2009 and has yet to implode. We can anticipate the popping of this third bubble, and this opens a line of inquiry few have taken: what if the popping of this third bubble breaks the bubble inflation machinery? In other words, what if there can be no fourth bubble to bail out the status quo, due to the systemic limitations of bubble-blowing as a solution to previous bubbles popping? Given that we’re still in Peak Central Bank Omnipotence [mode], it is widely believed central banks can continue inflating bubbles of confidence, assets, debt and consumption at will, essentially forever. But what if the fourth bubble can’t reach the heights of the third bubble? What if the debt and leverage required to inflate the fourth bubble breaks down before the fourth bubble can even reach the heights needed to make everyone who bet the farm on the status quo whole? Few dare ask these questions as they raise a terrifying follow-on question: what do we do when the bubble economy cannot be reflatd?” (In other words, the next time the donkey fazoo hits the fan, it may break the fan altogether.) [68340]

At HuffingtonPost.com Senator Elizabeth Warren (D-MA) slams Obama for selecting Antonio Weiss for the position of Under Secretary for Domestic Finance at the Treasury Department, partly because Weiss, “head of global investment banking for the financial giant Lazard... has spent the last 20 years of his career at Lazard—most of it advising on international mergers and acquisitions.” Weiss was involved with Burger King’s purchase of Canadian company Tim Hortons. Warren writes, “The over-representation of Wall Street banks in senior government positions sends a bad message. It tells people that one—and only one—point of view will dominate economic policymaking. It tells people that whatever goes wrong in this economy, the Wall Street banks will be protected first. That’s yet another advantage that Wall Street just doesn’t need. ...Enough is enough. It’s time for the Obama administration to loosen the hold that Wall Street banks have over economic policy making. Sure, big banks are important, but running this economy for American families is a lot more important.” [68453]

According to the Brookings Institution, ObamaCare will improve the incomes of the bottom 20 percent of Americans, while reducing the incomes of the top 80 percent. Middle-class Americans will be hurt the most. [68264]

BizPacReview.com writes, “The inmates will be running the asylum. Surrendering early to the inevitable protests that will greet the grand jury’s decision if it produces no indictment in the Michael Brown shooting case, St. Louis Mayor Francis Slay has agreed in advance to obey many of the pre-riot demands already presented to the city by people hellbent on violence, according to a report on Twitchy.com. ...The protestors call them ‘rules of engagement. ...With a spineless political structure already surrendering, officers will be unsure of the limits of their authority (possibly seeing themselves as the next Darren Wilson), demonstrators will be emboldened (fantasizing themselves as the next Michael Brown?), and the preening morally superior will get their self-validation—and TV face time—by providing ‘safe houses’ to criminals to rest between crimes. What could go wrong? As conservative commentator and author Dana Loesch put it, the abdication of responsibility is going to have consequences: ‘The storm that erupts is on the hands of STL city leadership. They’ve encouraged and cheered on Ferguson tactics towards others.’” [68269]

According to DCClothesline.com, “A woman who returned from Guinea 18 days ago and was on an Ebola monitoring list dropped dead in a Brooklyn hair salon yesterday after eyewitnesses said she began bleeding from the mouth and nose, but authorities later asserted the cause of death was an ‘apparent heart attack.’” [68309]

Judicial Watch announces that it “has obtained records from the United States Air Force revealing the flight cost for ...Obama’s Labor Day 2014 weekend trips for fundraising, personal business, and politicking came to a total of \$1,539,402.10 in taxpayer-paid transportation expenses. The documents regarding the transportation expenses came in response to a Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) request filed on September 2, 2014. ...Obama began his Labor Day weekend by taking off on yet another flurry of fundraisers in the Northeast. He began his money-raising venture by heading to Westchester, New York, on Friday, August 29. While in New York, Obama attended two fundraisers for the

Democratic National Committee, one of them a BBQ at the home of former UBS CEO Robert Wolf. Obama later that day took off for Providence, Rhode Island, for a fundraiser at the private residence of former Nortek CEO Richard Bready and Betty Easton, where tickets cost up to \$32,400. This event marked Obama's ninth fundraiser for the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee this year. Obama was originally scheduled to fly back to Westchester, New York, Friday night, spend the night there, then return to D.C. after attending the high-profile wedding of the White House chef Sam Kass to MSNBC host and liberal commentator, Alex Wagner on Saturday. However, he changed plans last minute and flew to D.C. for the night—and then flew back to New York. White House's Press Secretary Josh Earnest explained that this change allowed Obama to 'sleep in his own bed, do a little work tomorrow, spend some time with his family, and then travel back to New York...' The difference between flying to Washington, D.C., instead of New York created an additional 1.4 hours spent in Air Force One, which adds up to \$295,227.80 more in taxpayer dollars. Obama wrapped up his Labor Day travel by flying to Milwaukee, Wisconsin, on Monday, where he made a campaign speech at Laborfest 2014." [68271]

At RenewAmerica.com Gina Miller writes, "Powerlessly watching our nation fall in not-so-slow motion is a nightmare from which we cannot wake up. It's clear to all but the most obtuse and deceived among us that the United States of America has been taken over by Marxist enemies within. We have a completely lawless [Obama in the White House], a man who speaks only lies, who has shown himself to be an anti-American subversive, hell-bent on the destruction of our Constitution and representative Republic. Using extra-constitutional schemes, blatant fraud and federal bureaucratic dictates, he is destroying our economy, our energy sector, our healthcare system, our borders, our military and our freedoms. He is giving aid and comfort to our Muslim enemies. He is spitting on every constitutional provision designed to check his power. And, the Republicans refuse to stop him. Instead, they have shown themselves to be corrupt cowards." [68273]

"...Long ago, his blatantly unconstitutional behavior in office, his political 'high crimes and misdemeanors,' warranted his impeachment. Richard Nixon and Bill Clinton look like boy scouts compared to Obama, and impeachment proceedings were launched against them both. Yet, the Republicans seem scared to death of moving to impeach Obama. They have stopped no part of his agenda, and they have surrendered their power for no discernible reason. There is only one legal remedy for dealing with [Obama]: his impeachment and removal from office. I have no interest in hearing from the 'it'll never happen' crowd, because our nation is currently in critical condition, and something must be done to stop this evil, malicious man and his fellow travelers. We are standing on the brink of Obama's complete obliteration of our national borders by illegally granting 'amnesty' to the hordes of foreign invaders who have stolen into the United States. ... Whatever their reasons for behaving in such a cowardly manner for the past several years, the Republicans have a duty by the Constitution they swore to uphold to make their first order of business in January to impeach and remove Barack Obama... That's one thing Obama can't veto. The survival of our freedoms and constitutional, representative Republic depends on these people putting the United States of America above their

selfish political interests and their fears of the senseless bully hordes in the street.”
[68273]

At Politico.com, Senator Ted Cruz (R-TX) writes, “The Constitution designs a system of checks and balances for our nation, and executive amnesty for immigrants here illegally unilaterally decreed from the White House would seriously undermine the rule of law. Our founders repeatedly warned about the dangers of unlimited power within the executive branch; Congress should heed those words as [Obama] threatens to grant amnesty to millions of people who have come to our country illegally. To be clear, the dispute over executive amnesty is not between ...Obama and Republicans in Congress; it is a dispute between ...Obama and the American people. ...Obama was correct: His policies were on the ballot across the nation in 2014. The elections were a referendum on amnesty, and the voters soundly rejected it. There was no ambiguity. Undeterred, ...Obama appears to be going forward. It is lawless. It is unconstitutional. He is defiant and angry at the American people. If he acts by executive diktat, ...Obama will ...be acting as a monarch. ...When [Obama] embraces the tactics of a monarch, it becomes incumbent on Congress to wield the constitutional power it has to stop it. Congress, representing the voice of the people, should use every tool available to prevent [Obama] from subverting the rule of law.” [68291]

“...If [Obama] announces executive amnesty, the new Senate majority leader who takes over in January should announce that the 114th Congress will not confirm a single nominee—executive or judicial—outside of vital national security positions, so long as the illegal amnesty persists. ...Additionally, the new Congress should exercise the power of the purse by passing individual appropriations bills authorizing critical functions of government and attaching riders to strip [Obama’s ability]... to grant amnesty. ...Obama will no doubt threaten a shutdown—that seems to be the one card he repeatedly plays—but Congress can authorize funding for agencies of government one at a time. If [Obama] is unwilling to accept funding for, say, the Department of Homeland Security without his being able to unilaterally defy the law, he alone will be responsible for the consequences. A presidential temper tantrum is not an acceptable means of discourse. ...The American people, however, are not powerless. They have elected a new Congress full of members who have promised in their campaigns to stand up to [Obama] and stop the amnesty. We must honor our commitments. If [Obama] will not respect the people, Congress must.”
[68291]

At CommentaryMagaizne.com Peter Wehner writes that Obama “is now acting like, in his words, an ‘emperor.’ His hypocrisy is, even by his standards, staggering. But hypocrisy is not unusual in politicians and presidents; firing a missile aimed at our constitutional form of government is. And that is what Mr. Obama is about to do. As the liberal law professor Jonathan Turley put it last night, this is a ‘particularly dangerous moment’ for [Obama] to defy the will of Congress yet again, just 15 days after an election in which the American people registered their emphatic (anti-Obama) judgment. ‘What [Obama] is suggesting is tearing at the very fabric of the Constitution,’ according to Professor Turley. ‘We have a separation of powers that gives us balance. And that doesn’t protect the branches—it’s not there to protect the executive branch or legislative

branch—it's to protect liberty. It's to prevent any branch from assuming so much control that they become a threat to liberty.' What is about to happen may be the low point in [an administration] filled with them. Mr. Obama is acting in a way that he himself knows—that he himself has said—is unconstitutional and indefensible. No matter. In an act of unmatched narcissism and selfishness, [Obama] will create—he is thirsting to create—a constitutional crisis that is utterly unnecessary and will further polarize our political culture. Mr. Obama is about to commit an act of constitutional infamy. This is a stain that will stay with him." [68306, 68307]

Senator Tom Coburn (R-OK) comments, "The country's going to go nuts" after Obama issues his amnesty executive order, "because they're going to see it as a move outside [his] authority... and it's going to be a very serious situation. You're going to see—hopefully not—but you could see instances of anarchy. ... You could see violence. ... Instead of having the rule of law handling in our country today, now we're starting to have the rule of rulers, and that's the total antithesis of what this country was founded on. Here's how people think: 'Well, if the law doesn't apply to [Obama], then why should it apply to me?'" (Coburn's remark sparks outrage from some media leftists, who seem to think that protesting in Ferguson, Missouri is more than justified while protesting against an illegal action by Obama is not—and are fine with Obama telling the Ferguson crowd to "stay on course.") [68314, 68315]

DailyCaller.com reports, "The agency that represents MIT economist Jonathan Gruber on the lecture circuit will not allow the University of Rhode Island to repost a video of a speech he gave there in 2012 that was taken off of YouTube earlier this week... Gruber, who was paid \$392,600 by the Obama administration for consultation work on Obamacare, was also paid \$12,500 by the University of Rhode Island for a lecture he gave there on Oct. 30, 2012." Additionally, "Washington University paid out more than a semester's worth of tuition to host MIT economist Jonathan Gruber for an hour-long speech he gave there last year—[the] speech in which he said that Americans are 'too stupid' to understand Obamacare. It costs just under \$23,000 per semester to attend the private school in St. Louis. But the school spent \$26,000 to bring in Gruber, a key Obamacare adviser, to speak at a health forum there on Oct. 4, 2013..." [68286, 68287]

Meanwhile, "Grubergate" costs Gruber paychecks from the state of Vermont, which decides to stop paying him to do ObamaCare consulting work. (According to FoxNews.com, "Gruber's original contract with the state was worth more than \$400,000. He's already been paid \$160,000.") Gruber also loses a contract with the state of North Carolina. Bill Holmes, a spokesman for the North Carolina Auditor's office, tells WRAL, "Gruber's comment that it was all right to mislead people to get to a desired outcome that he favored led our auditors to determine he had at least the appearance of an independence impairment." Gruber not only lacks objectivity, he is not very good at what he does for a living. In November 2009 he told *The Washington Post*, "What we know for sure the bill [ObamaCare] will do is that it will lower the cost of buying non-group health insurance." Gruber also claimed that a family with income of \$38,000 "would save, on average, \$8,550," because of ObamaCare. Gruber was, of course, dead wrong. [68288, 68385, 68482]

Terrance Patrick Bean, one of Obama's top campaign contribution bundlers, is arrested in Portland, Oregon and charged with two felony counts of having sex with a minor. According to Oregonlive.com, "Bean has been one of the state's biggest Democratic donors and an influential figure in gay rights circles in the state. He helped found two major national political groups, the Human Rights Campaign and the Gay and Lesbian Victory Fund and has been a major contributor for several Democratic presidential candidates, including Barack Obama." USA Today.com adds, "A search of the Federal Election Commission's campaign-finance database turns up thousands in donations every cycle by Bean to the Democratic Party's most powerful leaders, including Hillary Clinton, Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid [D-NV], Sen. Dick Durbin [D-IL], and [former] Rep. Barney Frank [D-MA], among others. Photos of Bean posted online show him flying on Air Force One with Obama. The scandal is escalating. Earlier today, according to local media, Kiah Loy Lawson, allegedly [the] 66-year-old Bean's 25-year-old former boyfriend, was arrested by the Portland Sex Crimes Unit for sexually abusing the same boy. After the relationship between the two men ended, Lawson went public with claims that Bean had a practice of secretly videotaping himself having sex with others." ABC, CBS, and NBC ignore the story. (Whether Bean and Obama had sex on Air Force One is not reported.) [68328, 68329, 68333, 68358, 68544, 68799, 68810]

On *On the Record*, National Journal's Ron Fournier comments, "We're missing the big picture here. We're all assuming Hispanics are going to be for this [Obama executive order]. If, if right now we don't have a majority of Hispanics who want him to do this by fiat, we could very much have in the next election the same thing that happened in this election, which was, of course, Hispanics are not gonna [sic] vote for Republicans, but they could stay home. ...A lot of them already see this as pandering. ...Why, when he had of the control the Congress, why didn't he give them immigration reform that was durable? Or why not get bipartisan immigration? ...Hispanics know when they're being pandered to and they're being used politically, and they, they can see through this." [68301]

DailyCaller.com reports, "Statewide tea party protests are being planned in Nevada to greet ...Obama's announcement of executive action on amnesty. [Obama] will announce his executive amnesty plan Thursday night at 8 p.m. in a primetime address to the nation. Obama will then speak at Del Sol High School in Las Vegas Friday with Senate Minority Leader-elect Harry Reid. Las Vegas Tea Party organizer Karen Steelmon sent the message out to supporters that statewide protests are being planned. 'LOCATION TENTATIVELY AT DEL SOL HIGH SCHOOL ON E. PATRICK NOT VERIFIED.....KEEP FRIDAY OPEN TO PROTEST AT A MOMENTS NOTICE.....DETAILS WILL BE POSTED HERE AS SOON ARE THEY ARE RECEIVED.....WE WILL COORDINATE PROTESTS STATEWIDE....'" [68302]

Across the country, conservatives are in no mood to tolerate another cave-in to Obama by the Republican establishment. Matthew Boyle writes at Breitbart.com, "Conservatives say that Republican leaders, including House Speaker John Boehner [R-OH] and incoming Senate Majority Leader Mitch McConnell [R-KY], will be 'complicit' in

...Obama's planned executive amnesty if they don't pull out all the stops to block him. ... 'Fight or be complicit in lawlessness,' Judicial Watch president Tom Fitton told Breitbart News, is the message to congressional GOP leaders on Obama's amnesty. If Republicans move forward with the plan from House Appropriations Committee chairman [Congressman] Hal Rogers (R-KY) to fund the entire government—including Obama's executive amnesty, which [Obama] is set to announce on Thursday night—in an omnibus spending bill, a Senate GOP aide told Breitbart News conservatives will spread chaos across Washington. 'If Obama announces executive amnesty and the House passes an omnibus with no language blocking it, there will be no Senate vote, because conservatives will burn down the Capitol,' the aide said. When asked to clarify if he was serious they'd burn the building to the ground—or if he was speaking metaphorically—the aide said 'open rebellion.'" [68322]

Congressman Louie Gohmert (R-TX) states, "Perhaps 'Caesar's Palace' is an appropriate venue for the American Caesar's [Obama's] regal proclamation that gambles away jobs for Americans. As an equal branch of government where legislation must originate, Congress must either fight it or we will be complicit in this amnesty as royal subjects and the democratic republic will be gone. Now is the time that Republicans need to stand strong for the principles for which the majority of American voters sent them to Washington. Dissatisfaction with the White House and Senate over amnesty issues was a significant reason the American people added Republican seats in the House and Republican control of the Senate. Congress must protect the Constitution and the American public from such a decree from Mount Olympus that declares a state of lawlessness in America." [68322]

On November 20 a gunman at the Florida State University library in Tallahassee wounds three people and is then shot and killed by campus police. [68312]

WashingtonExaminer.com reports, "A new Purdue University report and survey of on global warming finds that just 50 percent of scientists blame human causes, not the NASA-endorsed and widely distributed claim of 97 percent." [68381]

On the *Today* program, NBC's Savannah Guthrie says Obama "will address the nation tonight on the hot-button issue of immigration reform, planning to make good on a progress—a promise to sidestep Congress and take executive action." (From Guthrie's perspective, Obama does not deserve criticism for breaking the law; he deserves credit for fulfilling a promise to break the law.) [68368]

Judge Andrew Napolitano writes at LewRockwell.com, "By conferring temporary legal status upon foreign nationals who have not achieved it under the law, providing they meet criteria that he will establish, [Obama] affects huge numbers of persons and produces a result that is the opposite of what the law requires. Can [Obama's] exercise of his prosecutorial discretion constitutionally nullify a federal statute? No. Can [Obama's] exercise of his prosecutorial discretion effectively rewrite a federal statute? No. It is unconstitutional for [Obama] to nullify federal law. It is unconstitutional for him to refuse to enforce laws that affect millions of persons and billions of dollars. It is

unconstitutional for him to refuse to enforce laws merely because he disagrees with them—particularly laws that pre-existed his [taking the oath of office]. And it is unconstitutional for him to rewrite laws, even if he is doing so to make them more just.” [68292]

“Every president since Dwight D. Eisenhower has deferred some deportations. President Reagan deferred deportations for about 100,000 families of foreign nationals in 1987 under his reading of the congressionally authorized 1986 amnesty law, and President George H.W. Bush did so in 1990 for about 350,000 foreign nationals under his reading of the same law. Each of these was based on a principled public presidential reading of the words and purposes of a federal statute. Obama does not purport to read and interpret the current immigration law; rather, he effectively rewrites it. What can Congress do? Congress can pass legislation to invalidate Obama’s executive actions. Yet even if it did so and overrode his certain veto, it has no assurances that Obama would be bound by the new legislation. He refuses to enforce the plain language of well-established and never judicially altered federal statutes. What assurances does Congress have that he would follow any new statutes that he has vetoed and that regulate his behavior? Is the blanket refusal to enforce federal laws that profoundly affect five million persons—and in the process severely straining the social services of all 50 states—an impeachable offense? [Obama] is playing with constitutional fire, and impeachment is the only constitutional remedy available, short of 25 months of a constitutional conflagration that he has ignited.” [68292]

Speaking at the Global Entrepreneurship Summit in Marrakech, Morocco, Vice President Joe Biden says, “Ladies and gentlemen, in 2017, the United States for the first time, Caucasians of European descent like me will be in an absolute minority in the United States of America. The secret that people don’t know is our diversity is the reason for our incredible strength because the brightest, the most innovative, the most adventuresome, the greatest risk takers, they’re the ones who leave when they cannot flourish and seek other places.” (Whether Biden is happy that whites of European ancestry will soon be in the minority is unclear. Although he is correct that America’s greatness comes partly from the foreign risk-takers it attracts, that is becoming less true as time passes. Before it became a welfare state, people emigrated to America because it guaranteed them the freedom to work, create, invent, and prosper. Increasingly, however, the United States is attracting undesirables along with the risk-takers. In addition to accepting immigrants who want to become Americans, the nation is also accepting immigrants who have no desire to assimilate but who are eager to accept welfare benefits. It was not immigration alone that helped America become great. It was immigration, freedom, and individual responsibility. Increasing the first while decreasing the other two factors will lead to America’s decline.) [69000, 69001]

In a Rasmussen poll, Congressman Bill Cassidy (R-LA) leads Senator Mary Landrieu (D-LA) 56-41 percent as they head to a December 6 run-off election. Townhall.com observes, “Democrats have abandoned Mary Landrieu. No unity rallies appear to be on her schedule, she’s received little to no help from the DSCC [Democrat Senatorial Campaign Committee] or outside groups, and she’s certainly getting no visit from Hillary

Clinton this time around. Her campaign headquarters may as well be a ghost town. Because of her support of Obamacare, Landrieu is also getting hit with a new attack ad linking her to Jonathan Gruber—you know, the Obamacare architect who thinks you're 'stupid.'") [68300, 68305, 68313]

Author Ann Coulter quips, "By now there are so many tapes of [Jonathan] Gruber explaining how Obamacare fooled stupid Americans that they're being released as a boxed set in time for Christmas," and "You don't pay a half-million dollars to someone who is only peripherally involved in making policy. (Unless we're talking about Obama himself.)" [68303]

TheHill.com reports, "The average price of the most popular ObamaCare health insurance plans rose 10 percent for 2015, according to a new study of premium figures published Friday by the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS). Consulting firm Avalere Health analyzed the monthly price of the lowest-cost silver plan in each region. Twenty-eight percent of all marketplace enrollees chose the lowest-cost silver plan available to them." [68518, 68519]

PowerLineBlog.com posts several emails obtained by Judicial Watch via the Freedom of Information Act that show the Department of Justice was worried about then-CBS reporter Sharyl Attkisson's investigation of Operation Fast and Furious. The October 4, 2011 emails, from and to Tracy Schmalzer, head of the department's Office of Public Affairs, and White House Deputy Press Secretary Eric Schultz, include these statements: "I'm also calling Sharryl's [sic] editor [at CBS] and reaching out to [Bob] Schieffer. She's out of control." (That is, "We need to stop Attkisson from investigating. I'll get the Obama-friendly Schieffer to stop her.") "Good. Her piece was really bad for AG [Attorney General Eric Holder]." ("How dare she report the truth!") "Why do you think no one else wrote? Were they not fed the documents?" ("Who is leaking Fast and Furious information?") "I sent [National Journal's] Susan Davis your way. She's writing on Issa/FandF and I said you could load her up on the leaks, etc." ("We'll get reporters who support Obama to write articles to protect Holder.") "Thanks. Any way we can fix Fox?" ("How do we stop Fox News from reporting on Operation Fast and Furious?") "Let me know who you hear from. I've talked to NYT, NBC, and NPR—gave them all this. NBC not likely to go. Still working on other two." (In other words, "I talked NBC into ignoring the Fast and Furious story, but I'm still pressuring *The New York Times* and NPR to keep quiet.") It is worth noting that, in 2011, the White House was claiming it knew nothing about Operation Fast and Furious—yet White House Deputy Press Secretary Eric Schultz was discussing it with the Department of Labor. [68336, 68351, 68374, 68376, 68380, 68395, 68396, 68406]

PowerLine writes, "It is obvious that the Department of Justice has withheld other emails that are relevant to the above exchange. Schmalzer's reference to 'Sharryl' is out of the blue. There must have been prior references to her, but they do not show up in a search of the documents that have been produced. That means that they have been either redacted or withheld. Still, what we have is bad enough: the Obama administration targeted the only reporter who was following up on Fast and Furious, and went to her editor and to

elder statesman Bob Schieffer to pull her off the case—to get her, as they said, under ‘control.’” Several of the documents have portions hidden with the letters “DP,” meaning “Deliberative Privilege”—a much-misused species of executive privilege. I think it is impossible that the deliberative privilege could apply, since the redacted material is what Tracy Schmalzer gave to various news organizations. But that is the Obama administration’s MO: assert countless frivolous claims of privilege, stonewall furiously, and by the time the snail’s pace of our judicial system requires documents to be produced, the administration will be out of office. The Obama administration is rotten to the core, and Eric Holder is among the rottenest of its rotten apples.” [68336, 68351, 68374, 68376, 68380, 68395, 68396]

As previously reported in this *Timeline*, The White House was clearly furious that the Operation Fast and Furious scandal was getting any coverage. In October 2011 Attkisson told radio talk show host Laura Ingraham, “The DOJ [Department of Justice] woman was just yelling at me. The guy from the White House on Friday night literally screamed at me and cussed at me. Eric Schultz—oh, the person screaming was Tracy Schmalzer. She was yelling, not screaming. And the [other] person who screamed at me was Eric Schultz at the White House. ...In between the yelling that I received from the Justice Department yesterday, the spokeswoman—who would not put anything in writing—I was asking for her explanation so there would be clarity and no confusion later over what had been said. She wouldn’t put anything in writing. So we talked on the phone and she said things such as ‘the question [Attorney General Eric] Holder answered was different than the one he asked.’ But the way he phrased it, he said very explicitly, ‘I probably heard about Fast and Furious for the first time over the last few weeks.’” (The DOJ “spin” was that when Holder told the House Judiciary Committee in May 2011 that he had “probably heard about Fast and Furious for the first time over the last few weeks” he “did not understand the question” and meant only that he had not heard of any “problems” with the program until just weeks earlier.) Attkisson told Ingraham the DOJ and the White House “...will tell you that I’m the only reporter, as they told me, [who] is not [being] reasonable. They say *The Washington Post* is reasonable, the *LA Times* is reasonable, *The New York Times* is reasonable—I’m the only one who thinks this is a story, and they think I’m unfair and biased by pursuing it.” (Obama and Holder believed those newspapers were being “reasonable” only because they were barely covering the story—and because they were portraying Operation Fast and Furious as a problem within the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives about which the “higher ups” were not aware. In the world of the political left, if *The New York Times* and *The Washington Post* do not believe it’s a story, then it’s not a story.) [25074, 25086, 25091]

In another incident involving Tracy Schmalzer, after Elena Kagan was nominated by Obama for the Supreme Court, she (Kagan) tried to cover up her involvement with ObamaCare decisions so she would not have to recuse herself from any Supreme Court decisions involving the legislation. One email from Kagan read, “This needs to be coordinated. Tracy [Schmalzer], you should not say anything about this before talking to me.” Former Department of Justice attorney J. Christian Adams has called Schmalzer “the truth-challenged head of the Office of Public Affairs who disassembles the truth to the public on so many issues I have lost count.” [20802, 20804, 27527, 37280, 37309, 37354]

Bloomberg.com reports, “The Obama administration said it erroneously calculated the number of people with health coverage under the Affordable Care Act, incorrectly adding 380,000 dental subscribers to raise the total above 7 million. The accurate number with full health-care plans is 6.7 million as of Oct. 15, a spokesman for the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services confirmed today, saying the U.S. won’t include dental plans in future reports.” (The administration had been inflating the figures and got caught by Republican investigators for the House Oversight and Government Reform Committee using data obtained from the U.S. Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services.) [68343, 68344, 68366, 68384]

Obama releases four al-Qaeda terrorists and one Tunisian extremist from Guantanamo. [68377]

Talk radio’s Hugh Hewitt writes, “The people in the country illegally will know shortly that this [Obama amnesty] stunt tonight does not help them and may in fact hurt them—badly. The collision of what is in essence a letter of recommendation [for illegal immigrants] from [Obama] to employers with their genuine worries about liabilities under state law and about their fiduciary duties to their customers is going to be instant, and not to the good of the illegal population. Employers are going to flee [Obama’s] testimonial that, if he were king of the forest, not queen, not duke, not earl, he’d let this person have a green card. Because he’s not king, he cannot bless this person’s employment in the real world of tort liability and state law. He cannot solve the issue of Social Security and unemployment insurance withholding. What he can—and will do tonight—is mark the illegal as someone not worth the trouble of hiring. [Obama] simply cannot bestow a green card. Just a blessing. An Obama blessing. The blessing of a cheater. [Obama’s] lawless act will have the apparently contradictory impact of both making life harder for ‘those in the shadows’ by increasing the reluctance of employers to hire the obviously illegal, while at the same time attracting millions more north across the fenceless border. Employers are simply going to be less willing to hire the obviously illegal because of a host of other laws [Obama] cannot change, but the underground and top line messaging of [Obama’s] act will be an amplified ‘Olly olly oxen free’ to the millions who wish they were in America and not living in their own country.” [68307]

Hewitt observes that Obama “couldn’t have a GOP Congress doing in a couple of months what he could not yammer his way to in six years, so he is preemptively attempting to destroy the common ground on which Republicans and Democrats could walk on this issue: fence/regularization/guest worker program. ... That’s where we are: A widespread recognition that [Obama] cheats, and that he dissembles. He may outright lie tonight—we will see. But no one not in love with him as family or a close friend knows other than the truth: He is about to do a very, very bad thing, a disfigurement of the Constitution which will lead to future disfigurements. Wait until the environmentalists learn that a GOP president can suspend enforcement of their beloved if crazy Endangered Species Act. Wait until all sorts of special interests realize that their special interest legislation can be suspended at a stroke of a pen. D.C.’s permanent class may feel an involuntary shudder tonight, when it realizes all that they sell—their access and their ability to deliver lines of

law in lengthy bills—is at best fragile. It is a big night for [Obama], and a disastrous one for the Constitution.” [68307]

Commenting on Obama’s coming executive order, the Iowa Hawk blog’s David Burge tweets, “American voters repudiated in historic landslide 1-0 vote.” [68308]

White House press secretary Josh Earnest is asked, “When we get briefed, or we get information [on Obama’s amnesty action], will there be budgetary numbers attached to it? Will we be able to understand more what the projected cost or what the budgetary effect will be?” Earnest replies, “Well, I don’t know if those numbers will be produced, but you are certainly welcome to ask about them. We’ll see if we can get you some answers.” [68387]

Barely one week after the mid-term elections, former Virginia Senator Jim Webb, a Democrat, announces an “an exploratory committee to examine whether I should run for President in 2016.” (Webb is arguably to the political left of Hillary Clinton but not as far toward the radical left as Senator Elizabeth Warren (D-MA). Webb, age 68, is slightly older than Clinton (67) and Warren (65). Webb’s 2006 campaign communications director was Kristian Denny Todd, wife of NBC’s Chuck Todd. She is reportedly working with Webb again, albeit in an unpaid capacity. [68316, 68317, 68514, 68711, 68787]

On *Special Report*, Charles Krauthammer is asked, “Will we see a new mass migration from Central America? Senator [Marco] Rubio [R-FL] said today that often times these are misinterpreted in Central America.” He responds, “You don’t have to misinterpret it, you just have to interpret it. This executive action is a gigantic neon sign on the Rio Grande saying to Central Americans and to other people around the world, if you wait in line and you apply for legal immigration, you’re a sap. You come here illegally, you have children, and eventually you will be legalized. This will cause a complete new cohort. We will have 11 million new illegal immigrants in 10 or 15 years. We will be through this again and again. I would not oppose this if we were going to be serious about shutting the border. There is no seriousness whatsoever coming out of the administration or the Democrats on that. This is an invitation to a mass migration.” [68326]

Even before Obama’s amnesty announcement, the National Immigrant Youth Alliance criticizes him for not going far enough. It states, “Ideally we would have respected an embargo [on all deportations], but after 2 million deportations [Obama] has lost a tad bit of respect from our organization. We don’t care to play on their terms. [There is] No anticipated language on individuals who have [already] been deported, or who were forced to leave due to attrition style policies.” (Apparently the organization wants Obama to make it possible for those who have already been deported to return to the United States without consequence.) [68327]

Sacramento County, California Sheriff Scott Jones delivers a video message to excoriate Obama’s amnesty scheme. Addressing Obama, Jones notes the recent murders of several law enforcement officers by an illegal immigrant who continually returned to the United

States after being deported. Jones says, “I am going to implore you to address an issue that only you can address: immigration reform. And while Congress as a body, both Democrats and certainly Republicans, share the blame for their failure in this part, only you are singularly responsible for the hands-off policy that exists in Homeland Security and its subsidiaries, including Customs and Border Protection. ...[T]hey don’t need a raise to improve morale in that organization, they need to be allowed to do their jobs, and carry out their mission to keep America safe. Likewise, you are the only person that [sic; who] can impress upon Congress the urgency of reform. Simply stated, you’re the only singular person in this entire country that can advance or adopt meaningful immigration reform. By that very definition then, it is your singular failure alone as to why we do not yet have reform, why America continues to be at risk, and new crimes and new victims are mounting each and every day in every single state.” [68361, 68379]

Maricopa County, Arizona Sheriff Joe Arpaio files a lawsuit against Obama, Secretary of Homeland Security Jeh Johnson, Director of U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services Leon Rodriguez, and Attorney General Eric Holder, calling the administration’s Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals actions and his November 2014 amnesty decree “unconstitutional abuses” of Obama’s power. Arpaio states, “This unconstitutional act by [Obama] will have a serious detrimental impact on my carrying out the duties and responsibilities for which I am encharged [sic; responsible] as Sheriff. Specifically, it will severely strain our resources, both in manpower and financially, necessary to protect the citizens I was elected to serve. For instance, among the many negative affects of this executive order, will be the increased release of criminal aliens back onto streets of Maricopa County, Arizona, and the rest of the nation. I am not seeking to myself enforce the immigration laws as this is the province of the federal government. Rather, I am seeking to have [Obama] and the other defendants obey the U.S. Constitution, which prevents this executive order from having been issued in the first place. This unconstitutional act must be enjoined by a court of law on behalf of not just myself, but all of the American people.” [68338, 68339, 68342, 68362]

Obama meets with a group of leftist leaders in the White House, including AFL-CIO president Richard Trumka, NAACP president Cornell Brooks, race-hustling tax cheat Al Sharpton, and Janet Murguía, the head of the racist National Council of La Raza. (It is assumed they discuss both his amnesty action and the expected riots in Ferguson, Missouri.) [68369]

Obama delivers his illegal immigrant policy announcement. He says, “My fellow Americans, tonight, I’d like to talk with you about immigration. For more than 200 years, our tradition of welcoming immigrants from around the world has given us a tremendous advantage over other nations. It’s kept us youthful, dynamic, and entrepreneurial. It has shaped our character as a people with limitless possibilities—people not trapped by our past, but able to remake ourselves as we choose. But today, our immigration system is broken, and everybody knows it. Families who enter our country the right way and play by the rules watch others flout the rules. [That, of course, would not be the case if Obama bothered to enforce *existing* immigration laws.] Business owners who offer their workers good wages and benefits see the competition exploit undocumented immigrants by

paying them far less. [Again, that is the result of existing laws not being enforced.] All of us take offense to anyone who reaps the rewards of living in America without taking on the responsibilities of living in America. And undocumented immigrants who desperately want to embrace those responsibilities see little option but to remain in the shadows, or risk their families being torn apart. [That was the chance they took when they entered the country illegally.] It's been this way for decades. And for decades, we haven't done much about it. When I took office, I committed to fixing this broken immigration system. [If he actually been committed to fixing it, he could have done that when the Democrats controlled both the House and the Senate during his first two years in office.] And I began by doing what I could to secure our borders. Today, we have more agents and technology deployed to secure our southern border than at any time in our history. And over the past six years, illegal border crossings have been cut by more than half. Although this summer, there was a brief spike in unaccompanied children being apprehended at our border, the number of such children is now actually lower than it's been in nearly two years. [Obama considers more than 60,000 children and teen-agers crossing the border a "brief spike." That brief spike has been increasing steadily since 2011.] Overall, the number of people trying to cross our border illegally is at its lowest level since the 1970s. Those are the facts." [68330, 68331, 68346, 68365, 68367, 68371]

"Meanwhile, I worked with Congress on a comprehensive fix, and last year, 68 Democrats, Republicans, and Independents came together to pass a bipartisan bill in the Senate. It wasn't perfect. It was a compromise, but it reflected common sense. It would have doubled the number of border patrol agents, while giving undocumented immigrants a pathway to citizenship if they paid a fine, started paying their taxes, and went to the back of the line. [A "pathway to citizenship" already exists: enter the country legally and follow the existing immigration rules.] And independent experts said that it would help grow our economy and shrink our deficits. Had the House of Representatives allowed that kind of a bill a simple yes-or-no vote, it would have passed with support from both parties, and today it would be the law. But for a year and a half now, Republican leaders in the House have refused to allow that simple vote. [The Senate has not even sent the legislation to the House for a vote.] Now, I continue to believe that the best way to solve this problem is by working together to pass that kind of common sense law. [If Obama believed that, he should give the new Congress a month or two after it is sworn in to pass legislation.] But until that happens, there are actions I have the legal authority to take [he does not]... the same kinds of actions taken by Democratic and Republican Presidents before me—that will help make our immigration system more fair and more just. [Obama is incorrect. Previous executive orders were consistent with existing immigration law.] Tonight, I am announcing those actions. First, we'll build on our progress at the border with additional resources for our law enforcement personnel so that they can stem the flow of illegal crossings, and speed the return of those who do cross over. Second, I will make it easier and faster for high-skilled immigrants, graduates, and entrepreneurs to stay and contribute to our economy, as so many business leaders have proposed. [In other words, he will approve more work visas for immigrants, who will take jobs sorely needed by Americans.] Third, we'll take steps to deal responsibly with the millions of undocumented immigrants who already live in our country." [68330, 68331]

“I want to say more about this third issue, because it generates the most passion and controversy. Even as we are a nation of immigrants, we are also a nation of laws. [Obama is breaking those laws with his action.] Undocumented workers broke our immigration laws, and I believe that they must be held accountable—especially those who may be dangerous. That’s why, over the past six years, deportations of criminals are up 80 percent. [That those deportations have increased proves that more criminals have been allowed into the country because of Obama’s failure to maintain border security. The criminals obviously have to enter before they can be deported.] And that’s why we’re going to keep focusing enforcement resources on actual threats to our security. Felons, not families. Criminals, not children. Gang members, not a mother who’s working hard to provide for her kids. [Why has Obama not done that prioritizing over the last six years? He does not need Congressional approval to enforce existing laws.] We’ll prioritize, just like law enforcement does every day. But even as we focus on deporting criminals, the fact is, millions of immigrants—in every state, of every race and nationality—will still live here illegally. And let’s be honest—tracking down, rounding up, and deporting millions of people isn’t realistic. [No one in Congress is suggesting that all 11-20 million immigrants be deported.] Anyone who suggests otherwise isn’t being straight with you. It’s also not who we are as Americans. After all, most of these immigrants have been here a long time. [That is irrelevant. There is no statute of limitations on illegal immigration.] They work hard, often in tough, low-paying jobs. They support their families. They worship at our churches. Many of their kids are American-born or spent most of their lives here, and their hopes, dreams, and patriotism are just like ours. As my predecessor, President Bush, once put it: ‘They are a part of American life.’” [That may be true, but that does not warrant rewarding them for their law-breaking.] [68330, 68331]

“Now, here’s the thing: we expect people who live in this country to play by the rules. We expect that those who cut the line will not be unfairly rewarded. So we’re going to offer the following deal: If you’ve been in America for more than five years; if you have children who are American citizens or legal residents; if you register, pass a criminal background check, and you’re willing to pay your fair share of taxes—you’ll be able to apply to stay in this country temporarily, without fear of deportation. You can come out of the shadows and get right with the law. [How do law-breakers who have been living “in the shadows” for five years prove they have been in the country for at least five years? Will federal bureaucrats take the word of the immigrant? Or is Obama increasing jobs in the illegal phony document industry? How do illegal immigrants pay “their fair share of taxes?” They have been working illegally for cash and not reporting income. No highly-paid illegal immigrant is going to come forward and admit how much he has been paid illegally. But most illegal immigrants have low incomes and children. Their income taxes would likely be zero, so they would have no back taxes or penalty to pay—and Obama knows it. In fact, a substantial percentage of illegal immigrants coming forward to “pay their taxes” would actually receive generous payments from the IRS because of the Earned Income Tax Credit.] That’s what this deal is.” [68330, 68331]

“Now let’s be clear about what it isn’t. This deal does not apply to anyone who has come to this country recently. [How will federal bureaucrats know how long an illegal immigrant has been in the country when they have not been paying taxes and have been

“living in the shadows?” Will they simply take their word for it?] It does not apply to anyone who might come to America illegally in the future. [What stops an illegal immigrant from entering the country in December 2014 and claiming he arrived five years earlier?] It does not grant citizenship, or the right to stay here permanently, or offer the same benefits that citizens receive—only Congress can do that. All we’re saying is we’re not going to deport you. [Obama is lying. His actions will do far more than prevent illegal immigrants from being deported. He will issue work permits so they can obtain jobs that might otherwise go to Americans. He will allow them to get Social Security numbers, which will probably enable many of them to get a drivers license and illegally register to vote. By forgiving their failure to report income to the IRS, he will encourage them to file and then collect refunds from the Earned Income Tax Credit. If all Obama were doing is prevent deportations he would not need an executive order, as few illegal immigrants are at risk of being deported anyway. If there were a risk of deportation there would not be 11-20 million of them in the country.] [68330, 68331]

I know some of the critics of this action call it amnesty. Well, it’s not. [It *is* amnesty: the pardon of someone who has committed a crime.] Amnesty is the immigration system we have today—millions of people who live here without paying their taxes or playing by the rules, while politicians use the issue to scare people and whip up votes at election time. That’s the real amnesty—leaving this broken system the way it is. Mass amnesty would be unfair. [Yet that is precisely what Obama is doing.] Mass deportation would be both impossible and contrary to our character. [No one is suggesting that 11-20 million people be deported.] What I’m describing is accountability—a commonsense, middle ground approach: If you meet the criteria, you can come out of the shadows and get right with the law. If you’re a criminal, you’ll be deported. [All 11-20 million illegal immigrants are criminals.] If you plan to enter the U.S. illegally, your chances of getting caught and sent back just went up.” [That is absurd. Obama’s action is a signal people all over the world: “Come on in!”] [68330, 68331]

“The actions I’m taking are not only lawful [they are not], they’re the kinds of actions taken by every single Republican President and every single Democratic President for the past half century. [That is not accurate.] And to those members of Congress who question my authority to make our immigration system work better, or question the wisdom of me acting where Congress has failed, I have one answer: Pass a bill. [“Give me exactly what I want and we’ll all get along just fine!” The reality is that after the new Congress passes an immigration bill, Obama will veto it because it will call for increased border security and a roll-back of some or all of his executive action. In fact, even before Obama began his address the White House promised a veto.] I want to work with both parties to pass a more permanent legislative solution. [Why did Obama not do that during his first two years in office?] And the day I sign that bill into law, the actions I take will no longer be necessary. [“I will break the law only until I think I no longer have to break the law.”] Meanwhile, don’t let a disagreement over a single issue be a deal breaker on every issue. [that is, of course, precisely how Obama has acted for six years.] That’s not how our democracy works, and Congress certainly shouldn’t shut down our government again just because we disagree on this. [Obama is here taunting the Republicans, and instructing the media: “Whatever happens, blame the GOP.”] Americans are tired of gridlock. What our

country needs from us right now is a common purpose—a higher purpose. Most Americans support the types of reforms I’ve talked about tonight. [Americans support reforms be done legally by Congress.]” [68330, 68331, 68370]

“But I understand the disagreements held by many of you at home. Millions of us, myself included, go back generations in this country [Obama’s father was never a U.S. citizen.], with ancestors who put in the painstaking work to become citizens. So we don’t like the notion that anyone might get a free pass to American citizenship. [Yet that is exactly what Obama is doing, granting free passes to illegal immigrants.] I know that some worry immigration will change the very fabric of who we are, or take our jobs, or stick it to middle-class families at a time when they already feel like they’ve gotten the raw end of the deal for over a decade. [Those fears are valid. Giving millions of illegal immigrants the freedom to work legally will lower wages for millions of Americans. The “very fabric” of the nation *will*, in fact, be changed if current policies continue. One need only consider how European nations are being negatively affected by the massive influx of Muslims who refuse to assimilate—but eagerly accept welfare checks.] I hear these concerns. But that’s not what these steps would do. Our history and the facts show that immigrants are a net plus for our economy and our society. [*Legal* immigrants are a net plus; *illegal* immigrants are not.] And I believe it’s important that all of us have this debate without impugning each other’s character. [Obama has been impugning the character of his political opponents on the issue for years.]” [68330, 68331, 68370]

“Because for all the back-and-forth of Washington, we have to remember that this debate is about something bigger. It’s about who we are as a country, and who we want to be for future generations. Are we a nation that tolerates the hypocrisy of a system where workers who pick our fruit and make our beds never have a chance to get right with the law? [This racist statement is remarkably condescending and insulting, as it suggests that immigrants do nothing more than work in the fields or as maids.] Or are we a nation that gives them a chance to make amends, take responsibility, and give their kids a better future? Are we a nation that accepts the cruelty of ripping children from their parents’ arms? [No one is suggesting that children be “ripped from their parents’ arms. This is Obama trying to portray Republicans as mean-spirited, if not downright evil.] Or are we a nation that values families, and works to keep them together? [Arguably, a person who “values families” would not desert his own family to enter the United States illegally.]” [68330, 68331, 68363]

“Are we a nation that educates the world’s best and brightest in our universities, only to send them home to create businesses in countries that compete against us? [This is another false argument. No one is suggesting that college students be deported the minute they graduate. Americans are arguing that illegal immigrants should not be allowed to pay lower tuition than their own children.] Or are we a nation that encourages them to stay and create jobs, businesses, and industries right here in America? That’s what this debate is all about. We need more than politics as usual when it comes to immigration; we need reasoned, thoughtful, compassionate debate that focuses on our hopes, not our fears. [Obama is rejecting debate. He is demanding that Republicans pass legislation that satisfies him, rather than the voters.] I know the politics of this issue are tough. But let me

tell you why I have come to feel so strongly about it. Over the past few years, I have seen the determination of immigrant fathers who worked two or three jobs, without taking a dime from the government, and at risk at any moment of losing it all, just to build a better life for their kids. I've seen the heartbreak and anxiety of children whose mothers might be taken away from them just because they didn't have the right papers. [This is fear-mongering at its worst. No one is ripping families apart, and those few illegal immigrants who are deported are not prohibited from taking their children with them.] I've seen the courage of students who, except for the circumstances of their birth, are as American as Malia or Sasha; students who bravely come out as undocumented in hopes they could make a difference in a country they love. [That is irrelevant. The issue is not whether many immigrants are admirable people; the issue is whether laws should be followed or can freely be ignored.] These people—our neighbors, our classmates, our friends—they did not come here in search of a free ride or an easy life. [Actually, many immigrants do enter the United States for welfare benefits and free health care.] They came to work, and study, and serve in our military, and above all, contribute to America's success." [68330, 68331]

"Tomorrow, I'll travel to Las Vegas and meet with some of these students, including a young woman named Astrid Silva. Astrid was brought to America [illegally] when she was four years old. Her only possessions were a cross, her doll, and the frilly dress she had on. [This is Obama's salesmanship at his best. He elicits sympathy for his actions by painting a picture of a sad little girl with a cross, rather than a teen-aged gang member with a tattoo-covered body.] When she started school, she didn't speak any English. She caught up to the other kids by reading newspapers and watching PBS, and became a good student. [f the "watching PBS" remark does not elicit laughter, it should. At least Obama does not claim she watched *Frontline*, C-SPAN, or MSNBC.] Her father worked in landscaping. Her mother cleaned other people's homes. [Again, Obama brings up a stereotype of illegal immigrant laborers who seem capable of nothing more than farm work, landscaping, and cleaning hotel rooms.] They wouldn't let Astrid apply to a technology magnet school for fear the paperwork would out her as an undocumented immigrant—so she applied behind their back and got in. Still, she mostly lived in the shadows—until her grandmother, who visited every year from Mexico, passed away, and she couldn't travel to the funeral without risk of being found out and deported. [The girls' story may be sad, but those experiences were the result of her parents having broken the law. No one *forced* them to enter the country illegally or 'live in the shadows.']" [68330, 68331, 68332, 38363]

"It was around that time she decided to begin advocating for herself and others like her, and today, Astrid Silva is a college student working on her third degree. Are we a nation that kicks out a striving, hopeful immigrant like Astrid—or are we a nation that finds a way to welcome her in? Scripture tells us that we shall not oppress a stranger, for we know the heart of a stranger—we were strangers once, too. [Here is more Obama salesmanship: a man who almost never attends Christian church services and was taught Islam as a child relies on the Bible to push his agenda.] My fellow Americans, we are and always will be a nation of immigrants. We were strangers once, too. And whether our forebears were strangers who crossed the Atlantic, or the Pacific, or the Rio Grande, we

are here only because this country welcomed them in, and taught them that to be an American is about something more than what we look like, or what our last names are, or how we worship. [Obama ignores the difference between *legal* and *illegal* immigration.] What makes us Americans is our shared commitment to an ideal—that all of us are created equal, and all of us have the chance to make of our lives what we will. That’s the country our parents and grandparents and generations before them built for us. That’s the tradition we must uphold. That’s the legacy we must leave for those who are yet to come. Thank you, God bless you, and God bless this country we love.” [68330, 68331, 68332]

Although he refers to himself 31 times in 15 minutes, Obama’s speech is well-delivered and arguably could have been used to persuade legislators to pass a “comprehensive immigration reform” bill—if Obama had not poisoned the well by choosing to act without Congress. By acting as he has, Congress will no longer trust anything Obama says. Although Congress will no doubt pass some form of immigration legislation, Obama’s arrogant attitude will probably result in it being nothing like what he wants. Congress may very well pass a border security bill first—and because Obama has shown that he cannot be trusted it will almost certainly be tougher than it would have been had he been civil about the legislative process. Subsequent immigration bills are also likely to be far less generous than what he would like to see, and if Obama dares to veto the legislation after demanding that Congress pass something, he will look more like a petulant child than he already does. [68392]

The legal memorandum released by the White House which claims Obama has the authority to act as he has announced argues that “although there are approximately 11.3 million undocumented aliens in the country,” it only “has the resources to remove [deport] fewer than 400,000 such aliens each year.” Even if those estimates are correct, however, the ability to deport only 400,000 individuals per year does *not* mean those who are not deported can legally be given work permits, Social Security numbers, or other benefits normally limited to citizens and legal immigrants. (The logic of Obama’s excuse is pathetic. If, for example, the FBI only has sufficient manpower and resources to apprehend 60 percent of all counterfeiters, that does *not* mean the phony currency printed by the other 40 percent should be considered legal tender.) [68347]

Even if one argues that Obama has the “prosecutorial discretion” to not deport any of the millions of illegal immigrants to whom he is giving a “free pass,” he has absolutely *no* legal authority to grant work permits to any of them. It is against federal law for illegal immigrants to work in the United States. To argue that Obama can issue work permits is tantamount to arguing that because the FBI may not have the manpower to find and arrest all of the nation’s counterfeiters, Obama can issue permits to selected individuals allowing them to print money. Prosecutorial discretion means only that limited manpower should be used wisely and efficiently to enforce existing laws; it does *not* mean ignoring or rescinding those laws. Former prosecutor Andrew C. McCarthy writes, “There are... many more fraud offenses committed in the U.S. than there are law-enforcement resources to prosecute them. So federal prosecutors, in an exercise of prosecutorial discretion, will often establish a fraud threshold amount—say, \$10,000—beneath which they will not open a case. *But that does not mean you now have a right to steal \$9,999.* If

police in a big city are overwhelmed with violent crime and focus their attention strictly on murder, maiming, and rape, *that does not mean it is now legal to go around punching people in the nose*. ...Prosecutorial discretion means you are not required to prosecute every crime—which, since doing so would be impossible, is just a nod to reality. It does *not mean that those crimes the executive chooses not to enforce are now no longer crimes*. ...Yet that is ...Obama's theory. He is claiming not only the power to determine what immigration laws get enforced and which illegal immigrants get prosecuted—power he unquestionably has. He also claims the power to declare (a) that criminal acts are somehow lawful—that illegal aliens now have a right to be here—just because Obama has chosen not to prosecute them; and (b) that those who engage in this unprosecuted activity *will be rewarded with benefits* (lawful presence, relief from deportation, work permits, etc.), as if their illegal acts were valuable community service. ...That is not prosecutorial discretion. It is a lawless betrayal of [Obama's] constitutional duty to execute the laws faithfully." [68394]

It is worth noting that although Obama eagerly blames Congress for failing to pass an immigration bill, he had a lot to do with an immigration bill's failure in mid-2007—when he introduced amendments to legislation that effectively made it unacceptable to many Senators. It is widely believed that Obama did not want the legislation to pass *because he wanted it to be one of his campaign issues in 2008*. He could not very well attract Hispanic votes by promising to pass legislation that had already been passed. He looked at the issue solely through a political lens. According to CNN.com, Obama voted for at least five amendments that harmed the chances of the bill being passed, while Senator Edward Kennedy (D-MA) voted against them. Kennedy reportedly scolded Obama, "You can't come in here and undo everything!" (Obama did not care. His thought was, "How can I make this issue work for *me*?" rather than, "What is good for the country and the immigrant community?") [68407]

DailyCaller.com points out that "Illegal immigrants will receive huge payments from American taxpayers" as a result of Obama's illegal amnesty order. "The illegals will get work-permits and Social Security cards [and numbers], and will be required to pay taxes, according to Cecilia Munoz, the former immigration lobbyist who is now a top Obama aide. That means they're part of the tax system, she said, when she was asked if the illegals would get annual payments under the Earned Income Tax Credit program. ...Most households of illegals have very low income, and pay little [if any] in taxes. For example, in 2011, roughly 22 percent of immigrant households—both legal and illegal—were classified as living in poverty. In contrast, only 13 percent of American households were in poverty. However, once illegal immigrants are enrolled in the tax system, they would be entitled to EITC payments. The payments may be huge, and will rise each year. According to the Internal Revenue Service, two parents with three or more children would receive up to \$6,143 in 2014 if they earn less than \$46,997. A family with two kids, and an income of \$20,000, would receive \$14,590 in taxpayer funds this year alone. Parents who earn less than the threshold would get \$3,305 if they have one child, and \$5,460 if they have two children. The EITC program is already poorly monitored and may be subject to large amounts of fraud, according to critics." [68357]

On CNN, former White House press secretary Jay Carney is asked about the many previous statements by Obama declaring that he could not unilaterally change immigration laws. Carney replies, “Well, I, here, here, here’s what I say. I think, uh, if he could have those words back, especially the first clip [played by CNN] where he specifically talked about suspending deportations, then, you know, that is literally what he is doing today. In, in, in later instances, including when I was there, he would speak very carefully about what he could not do...” [68345]

House Speaker John Boehner (R-OH) issues a statement: “The American people want both parties to focus on solving problems together; they don’t support unilateral action from [Obama,] who is more interested in partisan politics than working with the people’s elected representatives. That is not how American democracy works. Not long ago, ...Obama said the unilateral action he just announced was ‘not an option’ and claimed he’d already ‘done everything that I can on my own.’ He said it would lead to a ‘surge in more illegal immigration.’ He said he was ‘not a king’ and ‘not the emperor’ and that he was ‘bound by the Constitution.’ He said an action like this would exceed his authority and be ‘difficult to justify legally.’ He may have changed his position, but that doesn’t change the Constitution. By ignoring the will of the American people, ...Obama has cemented his legacy of lawlessness and squandered what little credibility he had left. His ‘my way or the highway’ approach makes it harder to build the trust with the American people that is necessary to get things done on behalf of the country. Republicans are left with the serious responsibility of upholding our oath of office. We will not shrink from this duty, because our allegiance lies with the American people. We will listen to them, work with our members, and protect the Constitution.” [68354]

On *Hannity*, Senator Jeff Sessions (R-AL) says, “Make no mistake, this is five million people being given amnesty that Congress rejected, that the American people have rejected, that will pull down the wages of working Americans, will make jobs harder for them to find, will create a system in the future that will invite more people to come unlawfully and really include, as one officer said, a tidal wave of new illegality in the future. It’s a dramatic unlawful act that will do great damage to America. ...[This is] so basic. We learned that in school. ...Congress makes the laws. What [Obama] did in this order is he said I am not enforcing the laws that you have passed and indeed I’m going further. I’m going to give work permits, Social Security numbers to millions of people who Congress said cannot work in America. It’s really a breathtaking overreach of monumental proportions. ...[Obama] himself said I’m not an emperor. I can’t do this a few months ago, and now he’s done it. So he’s acknowledged he did not have the power to do this.” [68359]

Congresswoman Michele Bachmann (R-MN) calls on Americans who are furious about Obama’s illegal action to rally in Washington, D.C. at noon on December 3. [68397]

Hillary Clinton issues a politically cautious statement: “I support [Obama’s] decision to begin fixing our broken immigration system and focus finite resources on deporting felons rather than families. I was hopeful that the bipartisan bill passed by the Senate in 2013 would spur the House of Representatives to act, but they refused even to advance an

alternative. Their abdication of responsibility paved the way for this executive action, which follows established precedent from Presidents of both parties going back many decades. But, only Congress can finish the job by passing permanent bipartisan reform that keeps families together, treats everyone with dignity and compassion, upholds the rule of law, protects our borders and national security, and brings millions of hard-working people out of the shadows and into the formal economy so they can pay taxes and contribute to our nation's prosperity. Our disagreements on this important issue may grow heated at times, but I am confident that people of good will and good faith can yet find common ground. We should never forget that we're not discussing abstract statistics—we're talking about real families with real experiences. We're talking about parents lying awake at night afraid of a knock on the door that could tear their families apart, people who love this country, work hard, and want nothing more than a chance to contribute to the community and build better lives for themselves and their children.” [68373]

On November 21 Conn Carroll writes at Townhall.com, “After Obama enacted DACA [Deferred Action for Children Arrivals], wait times for visas for legal immigrants tripled from 5 months to 15. Obama essentially allowed illegal immigrants to jump in line in front of law-abiding legal immigrants. Since Obama has requested no new funding from Congress to pay for his new amnesty, and since his new amnesty is three times larger than his last amnesty, legal immigrants should not only expect to head to the back of the line again, but they should also expect much longer delays.” Carroll also warns, “Background checks are expensive and time consuming and USCIS [United States Citizenship and Immigration Service] does not have the resources to process additional amnesty programs on top of their normal duties. Judicial Watch uncovered documents in June 2013 showing that instead of full background checks normally used by the agency, DACA recipients got cheaper and less comprehensive ‘lean and lite’ checks.” (In other words, many of the criminal aliens will slip through the cracks and not be deported.) [68348]

Also at Townhall.com, Leah Barkoukis reports, “[T]he administration [has been] gearing up for yet another surge of illegal immigrants coming this spring—more than 100,000 to be exact. And to do so, they’re getting a family detention center ready with 2,400 beds.” [68349]

Congressman Darrell Issa (R-CA), chairman of the House Oversight and Government Reform Committee, calls on Jonathan Gruber to testify on December 9. [68350]

On the issue of Obama’s amnesty, Issa states, “[Obama’s] unilateral actions on immigration are a violation of his responsibilities and the trust the American people have placed in him. ...Obama is playing a dangerous political game with lives and deepening the mistrust that the American people and Congress have in his ability to faithfully execute the law. [Obama] is not respecting our system of checks and balances—we cannot let this stand.” (*The Obama Timeline* believes the Republican establishment will, in fact, “let it stand.” Obama’s illegal action gives it what it wants: cheap immigrant labor to please the business community, which could not care less if the border is porous. The

more conservative members of the House and Senate will make strong statements in opposition to Obama, but no significant action will be taken. Obama has made it easy for the GOP establishment. He allowed the House to avoid a vote that would have placated businesses while angering conservative voters. Instead of being angry at House Republicans for caving in to Obama's demands and passing the Senate's legislation, they will be angry at Obama. Businesses get cheap labor; the GOP gets continued campaign donations from those businesses; Obama gets millions of Hispanics on a pathway to becoming Democrat voters—and the average law-abiding, rule-following American gets stuck paying the bills. Evidence of a deceptive Republican scheme is the suggestion by Congressman Hal Rogers (R-KY) that they pass a continuing resolution funding government operations and giving Obama the money he wants to implement his amnesty policy, and then pass “rescission” legislation to remove the funding for that policy. Establishment Republicans can then claim, “See, we stopped Obama in his tracks!”—after which Obama will simply veto the legislation and issue work permits to millions of illegal immigrants.) [68352, 68438, 68489]

Obama signs his illegal amnesty orders at Del Sol High School in Las Vegas, Nevada—a state that reportedly has the largest percentage of illegal immigrants. During his speech, Obama is interrupted by a heckler who thinks his amnesty orders did not go far enough. Outside the school, a few hundred protesters hold “No Amnesty” and “Impeach Obama” signs. (*Red Eye's* Andy Levy quips that Obama's order applies only to Las Vegas because “what happens in Vegas, stays in Vegas.”) [68353, 68372, 68391, 68405, 68666]

Conn Carroll later comments on the heckling at Townhall.com, “[D]idn't Obama just grant executive amnesty to 5 million illegal immigrants? Isn't that enough? No. Amnesties do not solve problems. They only create more amnesties. ... The problem with both DACA [Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals] and the latest amnesty is that they have no limiting principle. If Obama has the power to give work permits to illegal immigrants who were brought to this country as children, then he also has the power to give work permits to the parents who brought them here. There simply is no legal principle limiting Obama's power to one group. And that is why amnesty activists will continue to heckle Obama and will begin to heckle Hillary Clinton when she begins making public appearances too. ... Remember, when Obama first announced DACA in 2012, the cutoff date for entering the United States was 2007. Last week he upped that date to 2010. Will Hillary up it to 2014 if she is elected? Will she protect the parents of DREAMers where Obama didn't?” [68666]

The satire site WorldNewsBureau.com “reports,” “Thieves stole the wheels, tires, and radio from the presidential limousine outside of Las Vegas's Del Sol High School Friday, as ... Obama spoke inside about his amnesty program for illegal immigrants. ‘Eyewitnesses say the whole thing took just a few minutes. We're currently looking for six to ten individuals who possibly do not speak English,’ said Las Vegas Police spokesman Sgt. Steve Wyatt. The embarrassing theft comes in the wake of criticism concerning the Secret Service's recent failure to stop a White House intruder.” [68454]

The House of Representatives files a lawsuit, *United States House of Representatives v. Burwell*, charging eight counts of constitutional and statutory violations of law related to the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (ACA). House Minority Leader Nancy Pelosi (D-CA) slams the well-respected liberal attorney who is working with the House nothing more than “a TV lawyer,” and claims the lawsuit is “meritless.” [68355, 68356]

The *Indianapolis Star* publishes a cartoon at IndyStar.com showing a family sitting down for Thanksgiving dinner, several people entering the dining room through a window, and one family member saying, “Thanks to [Obama’s] immigration order, we’ll be having extra guests this Thanksgiving.” After some readers call the cartoon “racist,” the newspaper removes the cartoon and its executive editor, Jeff Taylor, issues an apology. Taylor writes, “This action is not a comment on the issue of illegal immigration or a statement about [cartoonist Gary Varvel’s] right to express his opinions strongly. We encourage and support diverse opinion.” (The newspaper’s cowardly action is, of course, a comment on the issue and a statement about the cartoonist’s right to express his opinion. The cartoon is not “racist.” It merely reflects reality.) [68443, 68444, 68445]

PatDollard.com provides a short version of Obama’s speech: “We Need Less [sic; fewer] Whites And More Brown Democrats, Period. Get The Fuck Over It. Good Night.” [68360]

On MSNBC, Andrea Mitchell insists Obama’s amnesty order is not amnesty because “People have to apply, the applications won’t be taken until the spring. There’s a window where Republicans could act. So it’s not what people are describing, the critics.” [68478]

Senator Bob Corker (R-TN) says Obama “is not acting in strength, he is acting in weakness. Unless lightning strikes, it will be the worst [administration] in modern history. There has to be a response [to Obama’s illegal action], no question. But it has to be a response that enables us to continue to move our nation ahead, remembering that [Obama] will be gone in two years. He’s incredibly weak and, candidly, he is doing these things because he doesn’t have the ability to lead and is not willing to put the effort out to do the work to actually cause things to pass in Congress.” [68375]

WND.com reports, “Phone lines are melting on Capitol Hill with outraged citizens calling their elected representatives to complain about [Obama’s] order effectively granting amnesty to illegal immigrants. A number of Capitol Hill offices closed today for the Thanksgiving recess, but aides report hearing from upset voters even at the offices in lawmakers’ home states. The offices of Senators Rand Paul (R-KY) and Ted Cruz (R-TX) confirmed a flood of complaints, and an aide to Senator Jeff Sessions (R-AL) told WND, ‘We are getting tons of phone calls to block executive amnesty.’ ‘I don’t think the American people are mad at immigrants. They fully understand that immigrants would like to come to America. They’re mad at their government and their politicians. That’s what the anger is about, because we refuse to do the right thing,’ Sessions said today in remarks made at the Heritage Foundation in Washington. Sessions said ‘the situation is worse than you know,’ noting an Obama administration official had told him the chances for a typical illegal immigrant being deported were now virtually nil.” Democrat Senators

who oppose Obama's unilateral action include Joe Manchin (D-WV), Claire McCaskill (D-MO), Heidi Heitkamp (D-ND), Jon Tester (D-MT), Tom Carper (D-DE), and Al Franken (D-MN)." [68378]

Leftist network MSNBC hires White House Associate Communications Director Rachel Racusen as its vice president of communication. (Ideologically, Racusen will likely fit right in. She joins the *many* Obama administration officials who have taken media jobs.) [68382, 68390]

WashingtonExaminer.com reports, "Up to 30,000 missing emails sent by former Internal Revenue Service official Lois Lerner have been recovered by the IRS inspector general, five months after they were deemed lost forever. The U.S. Treasury Inspector General for Tax Administration (TIGTA) informed congressional staffers from several committees on Friday that the emails were found among hundreds of 'disaster recovery tapes' that were used to back up the IRS email system. 'They just said it took them several weeks and some forensic effort to get these emails off these tapes,' a congressional aide told the Washington Examiner. The IRS, in a statement provided to the Examiner, said the agency and IRS Commissioner John Koskinen is fully cooperating with the investigation." (As of November 25, ABC and NBC had not yet reported the story. According to MRC.org, CBS manages 26 seconds of coverage on the morning of November 22.) [68383, 68398, 68403, 68543, 68603, 68824, 68847]

Michelle Malkin writes, "When it rains, it pours. Just before unveiling his colossal administrative amnesty for millions of 'undocumented' aliens and foreign tech workers on Thursday, ...Obama separately ordered up to 8,000 more executive pardons and special work passes for Liberians, Sierra Leoneans and Guineans illegally in this country. Strange, isn't it? The same administration that refused to enact travel bans from Ebola-plagued West African nations to protect Americans is now granting 'temporary protected status' (TPS) to West Africans on American soil so they don't have to go back. It's not really about public health, of course. It's about political pandering and electoral engineering. Here's the dirty open secret: There's nothing 'temporary' about TPS benefits. Under both Democratic and Republican administrations, the program has become an endless, interminable residency plan for unlawful border-crossers, visa overstayers and deportation evaders from around the world. TPS golden ticket holders live here, work here, travel freely and are immune from detention or deportation. They are eligible to apply for an 'adjustment of status,' which puts them on the path to green cards and eventual citizenship." [68386]

Congressman Ted Poe (R-TX) and Congresswoman Diane Black (R-TN) introduce legislation, "The Separation of Powers Act," prohibiting the use of federal funds to implement Obama's amnesty order. [68388, 68389]

ConservativeBlog.com posts a number of criticisms of Obama's amnesty action written by prominent blacks. Talk show host Stacy Washington states, "Well, black liberals, sorry—but I have to put you on blast. Every time this country has pardoned illegal immigrants, crime and black unemployment have gone through the roof. Don't believe

me? Check the statistics from Reagan's congressionally-approved amnesty package. Not only did three times as many illegal immigrants as were promised become legal through the undiscovered intricacies of chain immigration, but the crime rate soared and black unemployment went through the roof. Sorry again, black liberals. You just got dumped!" Attorney Shelby Emmett states, "I wish Obama would focus just ten percent of his time on Americans and not illegals. Since this [is] all about rewarding people who chose to put their kids in a position where they'd be 'ripped' from their arms, why hasn't Obama suspended the family law system as well? Plenty of American parents lose their kids on a daily basis over silly things like breaking the law." [68393]

At a New York Historical Society event held at the Mandarin Oriental Hotel, Hillary Clinton says of Obama's amnesty order, "I think [Obama] took an historic [sic; a historic] step and I support it. This is about people's lives, people, I would venture to guess, who served us tonight, who prepared our food tonight..." (Just one day after Obama refers to illegal immigrants as fruit-pickers and maids, Clinton essentially declares that when she see Hispanics waiting tables she naturally assumes they are illegal immigrants. BizPacReview.com quips, "[I]f she were a Republican, the Internet would have blown up bigger than Kim Kardashian's butt.") The hotel later issues a statement: "Mandarin Oriental, New York does not knowingly employ illegal and/or undocumented immigrants. We require all employees to provide proof of their eligibility to legally work in the U.S. All wait staff and catering staff are employed through our hotel and we do not use outside contractors for such services." [68401, 68404, 68560]

Obama sends an email to supporters that reads, "If you agree that we can't wait any longer for meaningful action on immigration, join Americans across the country, including supporters of OFA, who are standing up to fight for reform." (The email then directs readers to a page asking for contributions to Obama's propaganda arm, Organizing for Action.) [68402]

Naief al-Hattab, director of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency's Zaitoun Elementary Boys school, calls the jihadist attack on a Jerusalem synagogue that left three Americans dead "wonderful." (TomGrossMedia.com notes that the UNRWA "is largely funded by European and American taxpayers." Obama has no comment.) [68421]

NYTimes.com reports that Obama "decided in recent weeks to authorize a more expansive mission for the military in Afghanistan in 2015 than originally planned, a move that ensures American troops will have a direct role in fighting in the war-ravaged country for at least another year. ...Obama's order allows American forces to carry out missions against the Taliban and other militant groups threatening American troops or the Afghan government, a broader mission than [Obama] described to the public earlier this year, according to several administration, military and congressional officials with knowledge of the decision. The new authorization also allows American jets, bombers and drones to support Afghan troops on combat missions. ...The decision to change that mission was the result of a lengthy and heated debate that laid bare the tension inside the Obama administration between two often-competing imperatives: the promise ...Obama made to end the war in Afghanistan, versus the demands of the Pentagon that American

troops be able to successfully fulfill their remaining missions in the country. ...Mr. Obama's decision, made during a White House meeting in recent weeks with his senior national security advisers, came over the objection of some of his top civilian aides, who argued that American lives should not be put at risk next year in any operations against the Taliban—and that they should have only a narrow counterterrorism mission against Al Qaeda. But the military pushed back, and generals both at the Pentagon and in Afghanistan urged Mr. Obama to define the mission more broadly to allow American troops to attack the Taliban, the Haqqani network and other militants if intelligence revealed that the extremists were threatening American forces in the country.” (At JihadWatch.com Robert Spencer writes, “The Afghan fool’s errand continues with no end in sight. Crippled by Obama’s impossible Rules of Engagement, our troops are there with no goal, no purpose, and no outcome other than to serve as targets for the Taliban.”) [68418, 68419, 68420]

Former President George W. Bush and former Alaska Governor Sarah Palin make the *Smithsonian* magazine’s list of the “100 most significant Americans.” (Leftists express outrage that Obama did not make the list.) [68431, 68432]

The *St. Louis Post-Dispatch* reports, “Two men have been indicted on weapons charges in federal court here for allegedly making straw purchases of two handguns at the Cabela’s sporting goods store in Hazelwood. A police source says both men are affiliated with the New Black Panther Party and were taken into custody this morning. The indictment was handed up Wednesday and unsealed today accusing Brandon Orlando Baldwin and Olajuwon Davis of making false statements to obtain firearms. The defendants’ ages and addresses were not made public. According to the indictment, between Nov. 1 and 13, Baldwin, also known as Brandon Muhammad, and Olajuwon, also known as Olajuwon Ali and Brother Ali, acquired two Hi-Point .45 ACP pistols at the store, claiming that Baldwin was the buyer when, in fact, the weapons were intended for someone else.” [68413, 68414, 68415, 68416, 68691, 68692]

On November 22 the Jordanian parliament has a moment of silence to recognize the terrorists who murdered five people at a synagogue in Jerusalem. Jordan’s prime minister, Abdullah Ensour, sends letters of condolences to the families of the two murderous thugs, who were killed by police. In his letter, Ensour states, “I ask Allah to wrap them abundantly with mercy, and with his contentment, and that he will give all of you patience, recovery from the agony and good comfort.” (Obama, who was quick to suggest that Israel was to blame for the savage killings, does not bother to denounce Jordan’s honoring of the killers. Secretary of State John Kerry recently praised Jordan for its “enormously constructive role” in dealing with Israeli-Palestinian conflicts.) [68421, 68422, 68440]

Catherine Herridge reports at FoxNews.com that Senator Lindsey Graham (R-SC) “wants to expand the House investigation into the 2012 Benghazi terrorist attack by adding a Senate probe, as a new House Intelligence Committee report Friday concluded that the initial CIA assessment found no demonstrations prior to the assault and a primary purpose of the CIA operation in eastern Libya was to track the movement of weapons to

Syria. The report described the attack as ‘complex’ with the attackers affiliated with Al Qaeda. It also said the initial CIA assessment concluded there were no demonstrations outside the State Department Consulate in Eastern Libya. ... On Friday, with little fanfare, the House Intelligence Committee released the findings of its two year, bi-partisan investigation into the terrorist attack. The 37 page report found that the first, internal CIA assessment was accurate—that no protests were involved—but then-CIA Director David Petraeus, [former acting-CIA director Mike] Morell and the administration latched onto information that supported the flawed [anti-YouTube video] demonstration scenario.” AT JihadWatch.com, Robert Spencer writes, “The Obama Administration narrative is definitively torpedoed in this report—and yet the mainstream media, even more craven and dishonest than usual, is spinning the report as an exoneration of Obama.” [68412, 68423, 68425]

Investigative reporter Sharyl Attkisson reports on “how the administration attempts to manipulate the press and news coverage.” As an example, she posts an email recently obtained by Judicial Watch in which “communications advisor” Matthew Miller tells Attorney General Eric Holder how to cover up Operation Fast and Furious. Miller suggests, “Send a letter to the Hill explaining what happened. Put in context the amount of information you get every week, say that you don’t recall reading those bullets or being aware of Fast and Furious at any time before early this year, but in any event, you certainly weren’t aware of the gun walking aspect of it until the news broke earlier this year (at which point you took immediate steps to have the IG investigate, etc.)” “2. Find a way for you to get in front of a reporter or two about this. You don’t want to call a press conference on this because it will blow things out perspective, but if you have any events in the next few days (preferably tomorrow), you could find a way to take two or three questions on it afterwards. Or if that’s not easily doable, you could find a way to ‘run into’ a couple of reporters on your way to something. Maybe [NBC’s] Pete Williams, Carrie, [The AP’s] Pete Yost—that part can be managed. Most important is that you’re in front of a camera in a relaxed manner giving a response you have rehearsed... It would be ideal if those two things happened in the same day so you didn’t have two news cycles of responding—you want to do it all at once. There may be things you need to do to go on offense as well, but I think most important right now is that you answer the charge about covering this up. Then you can move to offense.” [68430, 68435]

Miller also tells Holder, “The more I think about the offense versus defense part, I do think you should go on offense, too. After explaining what happened, you could go back at them by saying something like: ‘But let’s be clear what this is all about. I’ve ordered an investigation into what happened. But there are people on the Hill who don’t care about what really happened. For them this has become about scoring political points and weakening an agency charged with cracking down on gun violence. There are a lot of powerful lobbyists and their allies on the hill who have wanted to cripple the ATF for a long time, and they’re using this as an opportunity to do so. I’m not going to let them. Its [sic; it’s] clear the ATF made mistakes here. We’ve cleaned house, and we’re going to fix the agency, but we’re not going to allow it to be put out of business by people carrying water for the gun lobby.’ This part has to be really carefully crafted and delivered, but I

think it could be effective as a one-two punch. (One, explain what happened with your testimony; two, punch back.)” [68430, 68435]

At BizPacReview.com political pundit Carmine Sabia, Jr. addresses Obama: “This week, you gave a beautiful speech to the American people. And let me be clear: When I say the American people, I mean all legal citizens of the United States, regardless of their birth country. The speech was full of love and emotion. It would have been brilliant if you hadn’t delivered it while holding a gun to the country’s head. What you actually said to the citizens of this great nation is that you are the imperial king, and you don’t care what we, the people, want. The action you are taking amounts to amnesty without the consent of our legally elected representatives in Congress, while claiming it’s for all the right reasons. After all, who would want to tear apart families? Unfortunately, ...I don’t believe your intentions are sincere. You have taken action prior to the new Congress being sworn in. You fail to mention that you had two years to get whatever you wanted from Congress, and you didn’t act. You waited until after the midterm elections because you knew how unpopular it would be.” [68433]

“...[Y]ou talk about the House not allowing a simple yes or no vote, but you say nary a word about your commandant, Harry Reid, who wouldn’t allow any votes in the Senate that would put you on the hot seat. Votes on important issues like the Keystone Pipeline, for instance. Your speech was disingenuous, but you know that the majority of Americans are unaware of the truth. Like your friend, Jonathan Gruber, you believe the American voter is stupid and that they won’t get it. However, there are those of us who will fight for this nation. There are citizens who will fight for our Constitution, those who won’t lie down any longer. This is where the line is drawn... You have usurped the law of the land too many times. You, in fact, have said many times that you could not legally act in this manner because you are not an emperor. So what changed? Are you the emperor now? Most disappointing is that you slapped legal immigrants in the face. You looked in the eyes of all those who followed the law and did things the right way, and you called them suckers. You sold out your nation for political gain and to provoke Republicans into committing hara-kiri. It was done for all the wrong reasons, and you sold it to the American people as a noble action. ...[Y]ou ought to be ashamed of yourself, but, unfortunately, you don’t have enough integrity to feel shame.” [68433]

In his weekly radio/Internet address, Obama says, “We are only here because this country welcomed our forebears, and taught them that being American is about more than what we look like or where we come from. What makes us Americans is our shared commitment to an ideal—that all of us are created equal, and all of us have the chance to make of our lives what we will.” White House chief of staff Denis McDonough delivers the same speech in Spanish. [68471]

The Jerusalem Post writes, “Historic negotiations with Iran will reach an inflection point on Monday [November 24], as world powers seek to clinch a comprehensive deal that will, to their satisfaction, end concerns over the nature of its vast, decade-old nuclear program. But reflecting on the deal under discussion with *The Jerusalem Post* on the eve of the deadline, Israel has issued a stark, public warning to its allies with a clear

argument: Current proposals guarantee the perpetuation of a crisis, backing Israel into a corner from which military force against Iran provides the only logical exit.

...[C]ompounding Israel's fears, the proposal Jerusalem has seen shows that mass dismantlement of Iran's nuclear infrastructure—including the destruction, and not the mere warehousing, of its parts—is no longer on the table in Vienna. 'Iran's not being asked to dismantle the nuclear infrastructure,' the Israeli official said, having seen the proposal before the weekend. 'Right now what they're talking about is something very different.'" [68512, 68513]

On November 23 Obama, Derek Jeter, campaign supporter Stephen Cloobek, and the owner of the *Las Vegas Sun*, Brian Greenspun, play 27 holes of golf in Henderson, Nevada. [68428, 68429, 68474]

On *State of the Union*, Senator Lindsey Graham (R-SC) says the just-released House report on Benghazi "is full of crap. ... The intel community ... lied. The House Intelligence Committee is doing a lousy job of policing their own." [68477]

Obama appears on ABC's *This Week* (in an interview taped two days earlier) and says voters will want a "new car smell" in 2016. Although he mentions Hillary Clinton as a possible successor and calls her a "formidable candidate," he also says, "They want to drive something off the lot that doesn't have as much mileage as me"—hardly a description that applies to her. On the issue of whether he will campaign for his successor or others in 2016, Obama says, "You know, they're probably not gonna [sic] be looking at me ta [sic; to] campaign too much... One of the things about, uh, our society which is great, um, is that we don't have real long memories. [That is, the voters are stupid.] And, you know, we get, uh, we get impatient for the next thing... it's has worked for me before..." [68424, 68441, 68564]

This Week host George Stephanopoulos asks Obama, "How do you respond to the argument, a future president comes in, wants lower taxes, doesn't happen, Congress won't do it, he says, 'I'm not gonna [sic] prosecute who don't pay capital gains taxes.?'?" Obama replies, "Well, uh, the truth of the matter is George that the reason that we have to do [sic; apply], uh, prosecutorial discretion in, uh, immigration is that we know we are not even close to being able to deal with the folks who've been here a long time. The vast majority of folks understand that they need to pay taxes, and when we conduct an audit, for example, uh, we are selecting those folks who are most likely to be cheating. We're not going after, uh, millions and millions of people who everybody knows are here and we're taking advantage of low wages as they're mowing lawns or cleaning out bedpans, and looking the other way, but, then, you've got politicians suddenly goin' [sic; going] out there saying, uh, suggesting somehow that, uh, you know, we should be deporting all of them. Every knows, including Republicans, that we're not gonna [sic] deport 11 million people." Stephanopoulos: "So you don't think it'd be legitimate for a future president to make that argument [that tax law should be selectively enforced]?" Obama: "With respect to taxes? Absolutely not." (In other words, "I get to stretch or break the laws, but my successor does not." Obama, of course, intentionally misrepresented the question. It is not a question of selectively enforcing the law, it is a matter of ignoring the

law—which Obama seems perfectly willing to do. Additionally, no members of Congress are calling for the deportation of 11-20 million illegal immigrants. That is another of Obama’s infamous straw man arguments, in which he deliberately misstates the position of his opposition and then “proves” they are wrong and he is right.) [68448, 68464, 68540]

Meanwhile, the Democrat Congressional Campaign Committee quickly capitalizes on the furor over Obama’s illegal action, sending an email to supporters warning that the Republicans are calling for “Impeachment? Prison???”— and asking for contributions. [68449, 68450, 68452]

Obama (falsely and absurdly) brags to Stephanopoulos, “If you ask historians, take a look at the track records of the modern presidency, I’ve actually been very restrained. And I’ve been very restrained with respect to immigration. I bent over backwards and will continue to do everything I can to get Congress to work.” Obama also says, “My own experience tells me race relations continue to improve. There’s no way to say race relations are worse than 20, 50 years ago.” (They may not be worse than they were 20 or 50 years ago, but they are arguably worse than they were six years ago.) Obama calls on residents of Ferguson, Missouri to “keep protests peaceful. This is a country that allows everybody to express their views, allows them to peacefully assemble, to protest actions that they think are unjust, but using any event as an excuse for violence is contrary to rule of law and contrary to who we are.” (Of course, the residents of Ferguson are far less a problem than the agitators descending on the St. Louis suburb from out of town.) [68472, 68473]

The obsequious *Washington Post* comes to Obama’s defense by “fact-checking” a *Saturday Night Live* skit that mocked his amnesty executive order. The *Post* writes, “This skit got a couple of things right, and a couple of things wrong. For starters, Obama didn’t sign an executive order. He is taking executive action, in particular by directing the Department of Homeland Security to expand programs that defer deportation for classes of undocumented immigrants—parents of U.S. citizens or permanent-resident children, as well as undocumented immigrants brought to the country as children. ...As to whether the executive action is unconstitutional? That’s a matter of debate, of course.” (The *Post* is apparently unaware that *Saturday Night Live* is a comedy program, not a documentary or a televised legal brief. Whether the *Post* is aware that actress Janet Leigh was not actually stabbed to death in *Psycho* is not known.) [68426, 68427, 68434, 68439, 68446, 68447, 68484]

Marion Barry, former mayor of Washington, D.C., dies at age 78. Obama praises the cocaine-abusing, tax-cheating lawbreaker, stating, “Marion was born a sharecropper’s son, came of age during the Civil Rights movement, and became a fixture in D.C. politics for decades. Through a storied, at times tumultuous life and career, he earned the love and respect of countless Washingtonians, and Michelle and I extend our deepest sympathies to Marion’s family, friends and constituents.” [68436, 68469]

Khalid Mahmood, a Muslim member of the British Parliament, states, “The authorities say there are 500 British jihadists [fighting in Syria and Iraq] but the likely figure is at least three to four times that. I think 2,000 is a better estimate. My experience in Birmingham is it is a huge, huge problem.” An estimated 550 Muslims have left Germany to fight with ISIS. [68457, 68458, 68507, 68508]

A Heritage Foundation study estimates that Obama’s amnesty decree will cost the federal government—that is, the taxpayers—about \$40 billion per year in increased support for poor people, primarily for public education, medical care, and Earned Income Tax Credit subsidies.” [68460]

On November 24 Iran and the United States fail to reach a nuclear weapons agreement by their deadline. The Obama administration extends the negotiating deadline to July 1, 2015, giving Iran more time to engage in additional stall tactics—while continuing its nuclear program. (Whether the July 1 deadline will then be extended remains to be seen.) [68470, 68481, 68485, 68510]

Major General Mohammad Ali Jafari, commander of the Iranian Revolution Guards Corps, responds to the announcement of the extension of the talks: “Americans have very clearly surrendered to Iran’s might, and this is obvious in their behavior in the region and in the negotiations, and the enemies’ reservations vis-à-vis Iran are completely felt.” Iranian President Hassan Rouhani says, “Today we have a victory much greater than what happened in the negotiation. This victory is that our circumstances are not like previous years. ...No one says to reach agreement we must increase pressure on Iran, but they say to reach an agreement more time and more discussion is needed. This is a great victory for what the Iranian nation started since last June 15. Today the world realizes that they can only deal with Iran with discussion, logic, and negotiation, and there exists no other way or means. ...Centrifuges have been running and I promise the Iranian nation that centrifuges will never stop.” [68577]

Iranian Foreign Minister Javad Zarif states, “The object of this discussion is to have an Iranian enrichment program and at the same time remove international restrictions and pressures. I’m confident that any final deal will have a serious and not a token Iranian enrichment program coupled with removal of sanctions. This is the objective that we’re working on and this is the objective we will achieve.” (Everyone but Obama and Secretary of State John Kerry seems to understand that Iran is playing the U.S. negotiators for fools.) [68577, 68578]

Greg Jones, a senior research and nuclear analyst at the Nonproliferation Policy Education Center, states, “The actual amount of less than 5 percent enriched uranium that [the Iranians are] producing per month has increased. The stockpile has continued to grow. Now with this new extension, it’s gonna [sic] grow and then based on the less than 5 percent stockpile, that then determines how much weapons-grade uranium they can produce. They have a stockpile now that’ll probably support the production of about four nuclear weapons, and that’s slowly increasing over the course. It’ll probably gain another

nuclear weapons [sic; weapon's] worth by the end of June 2015 when this agreement runs out. So certainly that's been continuing." [68577, 68578]

FreeBeacon.com reports, "Iran's foreign minister and lead negotiator in nuclear talks is known to frequently scream and shout at Western diplomats, including Secretary of State John Kerry, a practice that has caused alarm among bodyguards stationed outside the negotiating room, according to a member of the Iranian diplomatic team who spoke to the Farsi-language press. Iranian Foreign Minister Javad Zarif—who is scheduled to hold one-on-one talks with Kerry this evening in Vienna—'frequently shouts at Western diplomats' in such a forceful manner that bodyguards have hurriedly entered the negotiation room on occasion worried that an incident might occur, according to one Iranian diplomat involved in negotiations who spoke anonymously with the Iranian press earlier this week." (Secretary of State John Kerry apparently puts up with the abuse because he is desperate to get a deal—and Iran knows it.) [68456, 68578]

At PJMedia.com Roger L. Simon writes, "Among the many lies and failures of Barack Obama, ultimately the most dangerous, the most lethal for humanity, is his meretricious and pathetic pursuit of a nuclear deal with Iran. In negotiation, Obama and his minions have been treating the mullahs as if they were the leaders of Denmark, even to the point of sending fawning multiple mailings to Ayatollah Khamenei, as absurd an approach as it is asinine. If Obama *really* wanted a deal, he would have gone about it in a very different manner, strengthening sanctions rather than weakening them, treating the mullahs as the autocratic religious fanatics that they are. What Obama seems to want instead is the appearance that he seeks to deprive Iran of the bomb, not the actual result. (He may even want the reverse, unconsciously or even semi-consciously. That would be more in line with his anti-imperialist views.) ...It is clear the Iranian leadership is getting precisely what they wanted yet again—more time to build a bomb and improve their nuclear delivery capabilities, including ICBMs, which have no other use other than for nuclear attack. ...Didn't we learn from the nuclear negotiations with North Korea? Fool me once, shame on you. Fool me twice, shame on me. Fool me 38 times... I'm an imbecile." [68486]

Secretary of Defense Chuck Hagel is forced to resign. Obama states, "Chuck Hagel has been no ordinary Secretary of Defense. As the first combat veteran to serve in that position, he understands like no other. ...I am grateful Chuck has agreed to stay on until I [have a successor confirmed]. For now let me just say this: Chuck Hagel has devoted himself to our national security and our men and women for more than six decades. ...We come from different [political], but in accepting this position you sent a special message: we are all Americans first." Hagel says, "I want to thank the entire leadership team at the Pentagon. It's been the greatest privilege of my life [to] serve with the men and women of the Defense Department and support their families. We've launched important reforms, reforms that will repair this institution." A "senior official" tells NBC Hagel "wasn't up to the job"—which is what many Senate conservatives, and some Senate Democrats, argued when Obama selected him for the position. His confirmation vote was 58-41. (Whether Hagel's successor will be worse remains to be seen.) [68463, 68467, 68468, 68476, 68479, 68480, 68483, 68511, 68601]

HotAir.com's Ed Morrissey observes, "[T]his is what happens with Cabinet Secretaries when policies go bad. Presidents ditch them as a signal for a shift in direction. In this case, it's more than fitting, because Hagel was appointed by Obama as Republican cover for his unwillingness to maintain a forward strategy against radical Islamist terror networks. Hagel had long opposed the Iraq war from the ranks of the Senate Republican caucus, and lent Obama some cheap credit on bipartisanship without challenging him on policy in the least. Hagel had next to no qualifications to lead the massive Defense Department, and despite getting ISIS right has not exactly impressed as SecDef. Now Obama wants to shift back to some limited form of the forward strategy, with an extension in Afghanistan and likely some use of ground troops in Iraq and Syria to fight ISIS. Hagel's opposition to that kind of interventionism won't make him an asset in the new strategy, so out he goes. That's really not a great deal different than George W. Bush replacing Donald Rumsfeld after the 2006 midterms with Robert Gates. It's just that the problem in the Bush administration was how to fight the war, while in the Obama administration it's been the refusal to admit that there is a war going on." [68480]

At WeeklyStandard.com William Kristol writes, "So Chuck Hagel has been fired as defense secretary. We were critical of his appointment, and opposed his confirmation by the Senate. But let's be clear: Hagel has done what he was asked and what was expected of him at the Pentagon. To the degree he has deviated from the Obama White House line, he's been more right than wrong (e.g., on the threat the Islamic State poses). So why has he been fired? Because the Obama White House needs a scapegoat. President George W. Bush fired Don Rumsfeld in connection with a change in strategy (the surge) and to bring in someone of independent stature. That's not the case today. ...Obama continues to want a Pentagon with weak leadership and little independence. There's therefore no reason to expect the next two years of Obama foreign and defense policy to be any better than the past two." [68483]

The New York Times writes that Hagel "raised the ire of the White House in August as the administration was ramping up its strategy to fight the Islamic State, directly contradicting [Obama], who months before had likened the Sunni militant group to a junior varsity basketball squad. Mr. Hagel, facing reporters in his now-familiar role next to General [Martin] Dempsey, called the Islamic State an 'imminent threat to every interest we have,' adding, 'This is beyond anything that we've seen.' White House officials later said they viewed those comments as unhelpful, although the administration still appears to be struggling to define just how large is the threat posed by the Islamic State." [68487, 68488]

At CNN.com David Rothkopf, CEO and editor of the FP Group, publishers of Foreign Policy magazine, and a visiting scholar at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, writes, "[T]he real problem that brought down Hagel had little to do with Hagel at all. It had to do with the fact that since [Susan] Rice took over as national security adviser, the Obama administration has been buffeted by a stunning series of foreign policy missteps and challenges that have shaken confidence in [Obama] at home and abroad. These include growing chaos in the wake of the intervention in Libya, the

consequences of pulling out too quickly in Iraq, compounded by the consequences of failing to take effective action of any sort in Syria, the resultant rise of ISIS, the mishandling of the National Security Agency revelations in ways that alienated our allies, the weak response to the Crimean adventure of Vladimir Putin and a host of related problems. ...Removing [Hagel] will be unsettling to those in the Pentagon who realize he is being let go for advocating their views as well as to those throughout the administration who will worry whether getting rid of him will be seen as enough. The real changes needed are at a high level in the White House, in the team immediately around [Obama] advising him on national security. Unless those changes happen, view the Hagel move as a distraction, as an effort to create the illusion of change where a shake-up is needed.” [68601]

At the daily press White House briefing, Fox News’ Ed Henry asks press secretary Josh Earnest, “There was a rather long story in *The New York Times* last week about Al Sharpton having allegedly having back taxes up to \$4.5 million [due the IRS] between personally and his for-profit entity. He has said that he’s paid a bunch of it, there’s some dispute about how much has been paid or not. He’s here frequently at the White House as an advisor to [Obama], [and Obama] spoke to his organization a few months ago. Is the White House concerned he hasn’t paid his taxes?” Earnest plays dumb and replies, “Ed, I have to be honest with you I haven’t read those stories. I can tell you the question you are asking though does illustrate the kind of important and justified restrictions that there are on political interference with any sort of tax investigations or tax enforcement. I am confident that this administration is allowing whatever enforcement procedures are underway to be carried out.” Henry: “But an adviser to [Obama] should pay his or her taxes?” Earnest: “I think every American should pay his or her taxes.” [68461]

Earnest also tells reporters he “wouldn’t be surprised” if Secretary of Defense Chuck Hagel is not the only official to leave the administration. [68466]

ThePostEmail.com reports that Kansas Secretary of State Kris Kobach “is in the process of assembling legal action against Obama’s declared ‘executive actions’ on illegal aliens residing within the country.” [68547]

Americans search federal Web sites in vain for the text of Obama’s executive order on illegal immigrant amnesty, but J. B. Williams writes at ThePosteEmail.com that “no such Executive Order actually exists. The American people were given the false impression that Barack Obama was signing an Executive Order providing amnesty for an estimated 4 million illegal immigrants residing in the United States. ...Obama did NOT issue an Executive Order. Instead, he used what is called Executive Action, which has no force of law behind it whatsoever [because it conflicts with existing law]. In doing so, Obama acted under ‘the color of office’ to openly subvert and circumvent the law. ...The actions of Barack Hussein Obama in this Executive Action are both illegal and unconstitutional. As they directly threaten the national sovereignty and security, the act rises to the level of an impeachable offense, and may rise to the level of treason.” [68571, 68572]

The *Chicago Sun-Times*' Lynn Sweet reports, "In the months leading to ...Obama's decision to bypass Congress and issue immigration executive orders last week, at one point Obama honored a request from House Speaker John Boehner (R-OH), to hold off making a 'very public push' on immigration during the primary season, White House Senior Adviser Valerie Jarrett told me. Some of Boehner's GOP House members faced primaries with challenges from the right, and the protective speaker did not want to make things more difficult for his flock. In June, then-House Majority Leader Eric Cantor (R-VA), lost his primary, and Cantor blamed immigration in part for his undoing. While various staffers on the Obama team and Democrats on Capitol Hill were very skeptical Boehner would ever allow a vote on any significant immigration measure—Obama accommodated him, giving Boehner the benefit of the doubt. Jarrett told me in an interview on Friday, 'Initially (Boehner) encouraged [Obama] to hold off on a very public push until after the primary season of the midterms, and [Obama] did that. And after the primary season, [Obama] said, he called again on the House to pass legislation, and the Speaker didn't call it up, and [Obama] said he wanted it done by the end of the summer, and the Speaker did not call it up, and then [Obama] decided to wait until the end of the year, and after the election the Speaker made it clear he would not be calling it up.' (That is, Boehner conspired with Obama to stall his amnesty executive order in order to protect "establishment" Republicans from being successfully challenged by more conservative candidates in the GOP primaries. Although the story is quite believable, Jarrett may also have invented it in order to increase conflict between establishment and conservative Republicans.) [68499, 68500]

Breitbart.com posts an Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) checklist for its agents to use when determining whether illegal immigrants should be arrested or deported. "First, agents must ask detained aliens: did you have a U.S. citizen or lawful permanent resident child on Nov. 20, 2014? Have you resided in the U.S. since Jan. 1, 2010? Were you physically present in the U.S. on Nov. 20, 2014? And were you 'without lawful immigration status' on Nov. 20, 2014? If the alien answers 'yes' to these questions, and they have not been convicted of serious crimes, 'the individual should be released from custody or not removed, and referred to USCIS [U.S. Customs and Immigration Services] to seek deferred action,' the document instructs. As one might imagine, apprehended aliens theoretically facing deportation may not always provide truthful answers to these questions. So ICE has established the robust policy of taking people completely at their word and letting someone else check it out later, should the alien ever later apply for official amnesty from the Obama administration. 'It's not our job to make any kind of initial investigation or ask for anything... just take them at their word and release so they can apply in Jan[uary] and let CIS figure it out,' an angry ICE agent explained." (Of course, the vast majority of illegal immigrants, even if they answer the questions truthfully—which is unlikely—will never report to immigration officials or court.) [68570]

The grand jury in Ferguson, Missouri reaches a decision as to whether police officer Darren Wilson should be charged criminally for his shooting of convenience store robber Michael Brown. The announcement of the decision is delayed to allow time for schools to close and law enforcement to move into position in the event the announcement results

in rioting. Race hustler Al Sharpton, eager to remain in the national spotlight, announces “I will respond to the grand jury announcement—9:15 ET press conference, watch live.” [68462, 68475, 68491, 68492, 68493]

Both CNN and HuffingtonPost.com post a map showing the locations where people are gathering to protest the grand jury decision. (Some might argue that the actions can be considered an incitement to riot.) [68605, 68606, 68607, 68808]

Obama presents the Presidential Medal of Freedom to NBC’s Tom Brokaw, actress Meryl Streep, singer Stevie Wonder, and several other mostly leftist individuals. [68465]

Along with Senator John McCain (R-AZ), Obama makes *GQ* magazine’s list of the “30 Least Influential People of 2014.” [68490]

The Office of Management and Budget’s Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs posts a list of 3,415 new federal regulations for the fall of 2014. DailyCaller.com notes, “One of the most contentious rules is the Environmental Protection Agency rules to limit greenhouse gas emissions from new and existing power plants. According to the agenda, these rules will be finalized in 2015.” (HotAir.com comments, “These regulations are going to deliver a crippling economic blow in exchange for modest (at best) reductions in emissions, even as competitors in other nations continue to flood the zone while facing no such restrictions. The overall ‘benefit’ to the global environment will be too small to measure, but the hike in your heating bill will be a very easy calculation.”) [68494, 68495, 68496, 68667]

On *Special Report*, Charles Krauthammer comments on Obama’s firing of Defense Secretary Chuck Hagel: “Hagel’s problems were not institutional, he was [in] over his head from the beginning. Anybody who watched his [confirmation] hearings knew that, he knew that. He was sort of a non-presence for the first year or so. The irony is that he got tossed in the end, thrown under the bus because he actually sort of spoke up, spoke out and spoke the truth on the fact that the Syrian policy was entirely incoherent. He went against the White House and [National Security Advisor] Susan Rice and the NSC [National Security Council], who were trying to manage his department and manage the Department of Defense over his head. And when he said the truth, he criticized the administration. Obama can tolerate a lot—cluelessness, incompetence, laziness—but not criticism. He had to go.” [68530]

During a press conference held by Missouri Governor Jay Nixon, a reporter name Larry Evers from the newspaper *Revolution* rudely interrupts the proceedings and asks, “Excuse, me! Governor Nixon, wouldn’t the lack of an indictment be a justification of police violence and lead to more police violence... So wouldn’t a lack of indictment mean fear for black people all over this country and effectively a green light for police violence? And second, I would like to pose to you, how you would respond to the call by ...the Revolution Communist Party that if officer Darren Wilson is not indicted for murder the country be brought to a halt through energetic, civil disobedience by billions

[yes, billions] of people?” Nixon replies, “I do not now what the grand jury has ruled, nor do I know what the prosecutor’s going to announce at 8 o’clock tonight.” [68535]

St. Louis County prosecutor Bob McCullough announces that after meeting 25 days and hearing 70 hours of testimony, the grand jury voted not to indict Ferguson, Missouri police officer Darren Wilson. Rioting follows, with windows broken, stores looted, cars overturned and set on fire, and at least 25 businesses burned. (Most of the businesses that are destroyed are minority-owned.) At least 61 people are arrested in Ferguson, and 21 are arrested in nearby St. Louis. Fox News reports the announcement with the words, “BREAKING NEWS: Grand jury does not indict officer in Ferguson case.” CNN, apparently eager to stir up the emotions of its viewers, states, “No indictment for Darren Wilson, the white police officer who fatally shot Michael Brown, an unarmed black teen.” [68497, 68498, 68501, 68502, 68509, 68515, 68516, 68525, 68536, 68537, 68538, 68539, 68545, 68551, 68552, 68554, 68556, 68559, 68579, 68581, 68588]

Without bothering to listen to McCullough’s statement, Obama delivers his own statement, saying protesters must work with the community, not against the community,” but anger is “an understandable reaction.” (He does not explain why anger is an understandable reaction to the proper use of the judicial process.) Obama—who just days earlier showed no respect for the rule of law with amnesty order—says, “We are a nation built on the rule of law, so we need to accept that this decision was the grand jury’s to make,”—and then immediately implies the grand jury’s decision was wrong: “This is not just an issue for Ferguson, this is an issue for America. There are still problems and communities of color aren’t just making this up.” [68497, 68498, 68501, 68502, 68509, 68515, 68516, 68525, 68536, 68537, 68538, 68539, 68545, 68551, 68552, 68554, 68556, 68559, 68579, 68581, 68588]

Obama also calls for criminal laws to be rewritten: “We need to recognize that the situation in Ferguson speaks to the broader problems that we still face as a nation. There are good people on all sides of this debate... who are interested in working with this administration and local and state officials to start tackling much-needed criminal justice reform.” (Whether Obama wants robbing convenience stores to be made legal is not clear.) [68527]

HotAir.com translates Obama’s speech: “‘The normal investigative process was followed, but *you have a right to be angry*. We had a months-long investigation and mountains of evidence presented to a jury of your peers, *but this was clearly a bad decision caused by the country’s legacy of racism*. The evidence may have indicated that Officer Wilson acted within the framework of the law, *but this isn’t just about one cop in Ferguson. White cops all over the country are out to get the black man and I’m sending Eric Holder to find out about it.*’ This is not a message of healing, nor is it a statement of support for the rule of law. That speech was a thinly veiled call to action, not to improve the nation, but to reinforce the idea that the legal system is not to be trusted. Barack Obama was telling everyone that you can have your day in court (or in this case, before a Grand Jury to decide if it even goes to court) but there is no reason for you to either trust or accept the results. If things don’t go the way you want, then it’s the courts that are

wrong, not you. And when the legal dust settles, *of course we don't want any violence*, but it's *completely understandable why you are so angry.*" [68551]

"It sends a second message to Officer Darren Wilson and the rest of the first responders around the nation as well. If you are on the job in a community *where you don't belong because you don't look like everyone you are protecting*, you are a suspect by default in any controversial situation. And in a horrible case like this, even if a jury of your peers examines the evidence and finds that you were simply doing your job, *your government will go out with a wink and a nod and tell everyone that you are probably still guilty.* Also, your job will be forfeit and your life will be fundamentally changed because you will still *be guilty in the court of public opinion.* And nobody from the government is coming to your assistance. In fact, we're going to throw you under the bus. So why should you bother signing up to do this job in the first place? That's probably a question a lot of cops are asking themselves this morning." [68551]

It is worth noting that in March 2008 Obama commented on the 1995 acquittal of O. J. Simpson: "You remember when, during the O.J. trial ...black and white culture just had these completely opposite reactions and nobody understood it. I'm somebody who was pretty clear that O.J. was guilty, and I was ashamed for my own community to respond in that way, but I also understood what was taking place, which was that reaction had more to do with a sense that somehow the criminal justice system historically had been biased so profoundly that a defeat of that justice system was somehow a victory." [68505, 68506]

At Breitbart.com Ben Shapiro writes, "The media spent months portraying 18-year-old black man Michael Brown as a 'gentle giant' victimized by cruel white racist Wilson, and by extension, charging America's law enforcement establishment with the ultimate sin. Unwilling to let that narrative die, ...Obama stepped forward—and in doing so, fueled the flames for future racial conflagrations. Obama, of course, invested long ago in the notion that every incident involving a black victim and a white (or white Hispanic) shooter symbolizes America's greater racial ills. There is no individual justice; there is only social justice. Darren Wilson and Michael Brown were not individuals; they were merely stand-ins for racial conflict. That's why ...Obama said that Trayvon Martin was like his fictional son; it's why he told the United Nations that the situation in Ferguson demonstrated America's failures. Every story fits into a narrative for ...Obama. Sadly for ...Obama, the grand jury looked at the evidence—something Obama and his allies have never bothered to do—and decided that Obama would have to find a different symbol of racial injustice. But that didn't faze Obama a bit. Striding to the podium, speaking off-teleprompter—which is when Obama *truly* says what he thinks, in all of its incoherent but radical glory—Obama explained that Wilson wasn't *really* innocent, that America could never be absolved of its past racial sins, and that the only solution was for him to be given more power." [68632]

"...Only behavior can be cured. And unless ...Obama is willing to name specific cases of behavior, and recommend specific punishments, this is happy talk designed to win him raves in *The New York Times* and generate more federal government interventionism.

...Obama creates amorphous 'challenges' America must overcome, and which can only be solved by him and his minions: 'I've instructed Attorney General [Eric] Holder to work with cities across the country to help build better relations between communities and law enforcement. That means working with law enforcement officials to make sure their ranks are representative of the communities they serve. We know that makes a difference. It means working to train officials so that law enforcement conducts itself in a way that is fair to everybody. It means enlisting the community actively on what should be everybody's goal, and that is to prevent crime.' Only Obama doesn't want to prevent crime. If he did, he'd focus on the causes of crime, a list on which white racism does not even rank in the top 100. Obama prefers to focus on unsolvable problems, because unsolvable problems always carry the same solution: more power for the executive." [68632]

After the announcement of the grand jury Michael Brown's mother's boyfriend, Louis Head (with his pants almost falling down), is caught on camera yelling, "Burn this motherfucker down! Burn this bitch down!" Brown family attorney Benjamin Crump later tells reporters, "Don't condemn them for being human. They want people to behave in a responsible, peaceful manner." Why urging people to burn the city down fits that description is not clear. Arguably, Head could be indicted for inciting a riot. It is likely that he will not be. It is also likely that white people will not riot if Head is not indicted. (Head is or was reportedly a member of the Bloods gang. Whether Michael Brown was also a member is not clear. Photographs showing Brown displaying Bloods gang symbols have appeared on the Internet.) [68523, 68524, 68596, 68598, 68599, 68668, 68749]

During the rioting in Ferguson, a group of blacks attacks an elderly white man. WND.com reports, "In the [KMOV-TV] video, eyewitnesses can be heard telling the news crew the man was beaten with his oxygen tank, which was then used to smash the window of his car. The attackers fled the scene in the man's vehicle and ran over the victim in the process. ... Medics eventually showed up and transported the man to the hospital, according to the St. Louis Post-Dispatch. ...The victim's identity and condition are unknown." [68633]

Thousands of less-violent protesters demonstrate in New York City's Times Square, but do manage to spray fake blood on police commissioner William Bratton. [68509]

Congresswoman Marcia Fudge (D-OH), chair of the Congressional Black Caucus, fans the flames of violence, stating, "The Ferguson Grand Jury's decision not to indict Officer Darren Wilson in the death of Michael Brown is a miscarriage of justice. It is a slap in the face to [sic; of] Americans nationwide who continue to hope and believe that justice will prevail. This decision seems to underscore an unwritten rule that Black lives hold no value; that you may kill Black men in this country without consequences or repercussions. This is a frightening narrative for every parent and guardian of Black and brown children, and another setback for race relations in America. My heart goes out to Michael Brown's loved ones, and to the loved ones of all the Michael Browns we have buried in this country." [68528]

Attorney General Eric Holder issues a statement: “While the grand jury proceeding in St. Louis County has concluded, the Justice Department’s investigation into the shooting of Michael Brown remains ongoing. Though we have shared information with local prosecutors during the course of our investigation, the federal inquiry has been independent of the local one from the start, and remains so now. Even at this mature stage of the investigation, we have avoided prejudging any of the evidence. And although federal civil rights law imposes a high legal bar in these types of cases, we have resisted forming premature conclusions. Michael Brown’s death was a tragedy. This incident has sparked a national conversation about the need to ensure confidence between law enforcement and the communities they protect and serve. While constructive efforts are underway in Ferguson and communities nationwide, far more must be done to create enduring trust. The Department will continue to work with law enforcement, civil rights, faith and community leaders across the country to foster effective relationships between law enforcement and the communities they serve and to improve fairness in the criminal justice system overall. In addition, the Department continues to investigate allegations of unconstitutional policing patterns or practices by the Ferguson Police Department. Though there will be disagreement with the grand jury’s decision not to indict, this feeling should not lead to violence. Those who decide to participate in demonstrations should remember the wishes of Michael Brown’s parents, who have asked that remembrances of their son be conducted peacefully. It does not honor his memory to engage in violence or looting. In the coming days, it will likewise be important for local law enforcement authorities to respect the rights of demonstrators, and deescalate tensions by avoiding excessive displays—and uses—of force.” [68517, 68550]

Ferguson Mayor James Knowles states, “I know I’ve been on the phone in contact with the County Executive’s Office. I know he has requested. I am requesting. I’ve requested the National Guard troops to come out from their command post to help restore order along the business district. We have not seen that... Those calls have gone unheeded at this point. At this point, unless we can get the current situation stabilized, right now it doesn’t appear that there’s any end in sight. We need to have the governor step up and give us the resources that he’s promised from the beginning. He said he would have a strong response. The resources necessary would be provided. They have not been provided so far.” [68532, 68562]

A black, bisexual rap “singer” named Azealia Banks (who once referred to blogger Perez Hilton as “a messy faggot” and does not shy away from using the term “cunt” in her rap lyrics), tweets, “I know it’s so fucked up but these things just make me feel such a general hatred for all straight white men. It’s a burning anger.” “I just start thinking the worst most racist things about white people when these things happen and I can’t help it. I’m sorry.” “And what makes it even worse is the fact that I sleep with white men... LOL” “I might have to kill one of these crackers in their sleep!!” (The likelihood of Banks finding a white man to sleep with her has probably decreased dramatically.) [68533, 68563]

On CNN, Democrat party hack Donna Brazile says, “I’m also concerned that some of the messages that you’re hearing—these are peaceful protesters by and large. These are

members of the community. Something was clearly broken before Michael Brown was shot and murdered. And tonight, Wolf [Blitzer], this is a very tense moment. And I just thought, they're making a mess out of it once again." [68534]

While reporting from a demonstration in New York City, CNN reporter Miguel Marquez says, "This is a very peaceful protest, uh, people are extremely upset though, and as we have gone through the night, the anger, the level of, of, uh, of voices has only gotten louder..." As he speaks, protesters chant, "Fuck CNN!" (Marquez later appears onscreen with the CNN logo no longer on his microphone.) [68597, 68638]

On November 25 protesters continue to demonstrate against the grand jury's decision not to indict police officer Darren Wilson by blocking Interstates 44 and 70 in the St. Louis area and throwing objects at the police. [68503, 68504, 68525]

According to a Chicago-based Web site called HeyJackass.com, between the day Michael Brown died on August 9 and November 24, 855 people in Chicago have been shot; 130 died and 725 were wounded. [68619, 68620, 68621]

Attorney, author, and radio talk show host Mark Levin writes, "Ferguson burns and violence has been unleashed thanks to the reckless liberal media, the lawless administration (especially Eric Holder) exploiting the shooting to smear police departments across the nation, phony civil rights demagogues, race-baiting politicians, and radical hate groups. The lies about why and how Officer Darrin Wilson shot Michael Brown started on day one and never ended. The indisputable facts are that Brown was shot because he assaulted a police officer, attempted to take the officer's pistol resulting in two close range gun shots in the police cruiser, and then turned around and charged the officer as he was being pursued. The entire event was precipitated by Brown earlier stealing cigars from a local store and assaulting the owner. What we are witnessing now is the left's war on the civil society. It's time to speak out in defense of law enforcement and others trying to protect the community and uphold the rule law." [68553]

Obama's race advisor, race pimp Al Sharpton, heads to Missouri for more rabble-rousing. [68529]

Sharpton's main rival in the "where's the camera?" competition, Jesse Jackson, tweets, "The jury concluded that Darren Wilson was justified in killing Michael Brown. I disagree. [Obama] must convene a WH conf on urban policy." (Jackson no doubt wants to be part of any White House conference. Whether not getting high on marijuana, robbing convenience stores, and attacking police officers will be suggested remains to be seen.) [68531, 68558]

Sharpton, speaking at a news conference held in the Greater St. Mark Missionary Baptist Church in St. Louis, says, "Let the record be clear. You [prosecutor Bob McCullough] have broken our hearts, but you have not broken our backs. We are going to continue to pursue justice." The *Chicago Tribune's* John Kass writes, "Justice? What about justice

for Natalie Dubose, and other African-Americans who saw their businesses [in Ferguson] ruined? Where's their justice? I wish I could tell you we learned something from Ferguson, but I can't. All I've been hearing is the old tired politics, and the old tired excuses. What did America learn from Ferguson? Not much." (Generous Americans, encouraged by Rush Limbaugh and various Tea Party groups, contribute to a fund for Dubose on the "crowdsourcing" Web site GoFundMe.com. By November 27, \$221,889 had been donated.) [68574, 68625, 68626, 68637, 68639]

On *Your World with Neil Cavuto*, Milwaukee County Sheriff David Clarke (who happens to be black) tells Cavuto, "Any time Al Sharpton shows up on the scene, nothing good's going to come out of that. ...[Obama] said that what we need to do is try to understand them [the rioters] and he said that the anger was an 'understandable reaction' and I was just floored by that because it's *not* an understandable reaction. People have to come up with a more socially acceptable way to deal with anger and frustration. This is totally and unequivocally intolerable. ...[W]hen I heard [Obama] call for calm *after* the rioting started I questioned his sincerity because some of his political strategy of divide and conquer fuels this ...racial animosity between people. And so I think when he called for clam after the rioting started, I believe it was done with a wink and a nod." [68569]

Clarke also addresses the Constitutional Sheriffs and Peace Officers Association at the National Press Club, stating, "I'm known for... not sugar-coating things. This [Attorney General Eric Holder's actions with regard to the events in Ferguson, Missouri] pissed me off. I sat up and watched as events unfolded in Ferguson, Missouri. [It was an] unfortunate situation obviously. Anytime a law enforcement officer uses force that takes a life, it deserves a thorough, transparent vetting, investigation—we all... agree with that. But then some groups started to converge on the small town of Ferguson, Missouri, like vultures on a roadside carcass. Groups like the New Black Panther Party, people like Al Sharpton, to come and exploit that situation and instead of coming in to help and try to restore calm, poured gas on that fire with some of their inflammatory and irresponsible rhetoric. I sat up there and listened to Governor [Jay] Nixon and I sat up there and listened to Claire McCaskill the senator and then I sat up there and listened to Eric Holder throw law enforcement officers under the bus for political expediency. These are the same individuals at election time who come around wanting support from law enforcement organizations... I expected that from Governor Nixon. I expected that from Claire McCaskill. Those are nothing but two-bit politicians, they do that sort of thing, that's what politicians do, you know that... but I did not expect that from Eric Holder, who calls himself a law enforcement officer. ...And [Holder] sat up there and... kind of insinuated that these law enforcement officers go out with some nefarious and malicious intent in their heart, to deny people their rights, and to indiscriminately shoot particular peopel for nothing. And I was incensed by that. ...And of course he didn't apologize. And of course he won't apologize." [68757]

Obama travels to Chicago to push his amnesty action. He tells the audience, "There have been periods where the folks who were already here suddenly say, 'Well, I don't want those folks,' even though the only people who have the right to say that are some Native Americans. ...Sometimes we get attached to our particular tribe, our particular race, our

particular religion, and then we start treating other folks differently... that, sometimes, has been a bottleneck to how we think about immigration. ... Whether we cross the Atlantic, or the Pacific, or the Rio Grande, we all shared one thing, and that's the hope that America would be the place where we could believe as we choose... and that the law would be enforced equally for everybody, regardless of what you look like or what your last name was. That's the ideal that binds us all together. That's what's at stake when we have conversations about immigration." (In other words, "Everyone in the world has the right to emigrate to the United States, legally or illegally; no American has the right to complain unless he is a Native American Indian; and anyone who disagrees is a an evil racist.") During his speech, Obama is interrupted by hecklers who are angry that he is still deporting illegal immigrants. He responds, "You're absolutely right that there have been significant numbers of deportations. That's true. But what you are not paying attention to is the fact that I just took an action to change the law." (This would be the same Obama who had claimed he was not, in fact, changing the law.) In his Chicago speech, Obama uses the words, "I," "me," and "my" 91 times. [68541, 68583, 68602, 68699]

According to White House deputy press secretary Eric Schultz, Obama's believes his comments about the grand jury decision in Ferguson, Missouri were effective because "most protests were peaceful." [68520]

On MSNBC, NBC legal analyst Lisa Bloom complains the statement that Michael Brown was "charging" police officer Darren Wilson is wrong because "Charging" is a "racially-tinged, offensive word..." (Bloom stops short of suggesting that Brown was "engaged in a kinetic non-military action.") [68521]

Politico reports, "Michele Flournoy has taken herself out of the running to succeed Chuck Hagel as defense secretary... Flournoy, who was undersecretary of defense for policy from 2009 to 2012 and now runs the Center for a New American Security, was considered a front-runner to replace Hagel, who announced his resignation Monday." (MSNBC's Andrea Mitchell later reports, "I was told that Flournoy was called by [Obama] both to offer her the job, cajole her, talk her into it. The fact that gets out there that I learned about it and others learned about, it is so embarrassing to a White House they've got a job, a cabinet job like this, the top tier cabinet job that they can't talk anyone into taking." The suggestion is that when Obama fired Hagel he assumed Flournoy would accept the job, and was surprised when she said no—leaving him without a successor.) [68618]

At FrontPageMag.com Jihad Watch's Robert Spencer writes that fired Defense Secretary Chuck Hagel "Hagel may have sealed his fate last week, when Charlie Rose asked him in an interview about the decline of the U.S. military. 'I am worried about it,' Hagel responded with unexpected candor, 'I am concerned about it, Chairman Dempsey is, the chiefs are, every leader of this institution'—as Bryan Preston of PJ Media has noted, he perhaps pointedly left Obama and Joe Biden off this list of concerned officials. Yet who is the single individual most responsible for the decline of the military? Hagel must have known the answer to that question when he added: 'The main responsibility of any leader

is to prepare your institution for the future. If you don't do that, you've failed. I don't care how good you are, how smart you are, any part of your job. If you don't prepare your institution, you've failed.' Did Obama take that as a reference to his steep defense cuts at a time when the world is on fire? Or did he object to Hagel's surprisingly cordial relations with Israeli officials?" [68580]

"...It is November 2014. It is extraordinarily difficult, if not impossible, for Obama at this late date to blame George W. Bush for his foreign policy disasters. Another scapegoat had to be found. Hagel, with his unexpectedly warm relations with Israel (in sharp contrast to the chill between Israeli officials and Barack Obama and John Kerry) and concern over the gutting of the military as the jihad rages more violently than ever and the JV team controls a land expanse larger than Great Britain, was the logical stand-in. He is even a Republican! And so he will be gone from the Department of Defense, as soon as Obama peers at his gaggle of sycophants and chooses one of them for a big promotion. Likely gone with Hagel will be any remaining obstacle to an increasing chill with Israel, and any murmur of dissent from Obama's mad plan of demolishing the military while simultaneously expecting it to hold back the Islamic State, Ebola, and a host of other threats. Times are tough when Chuck Hagel looks like a voice of reasoned pro-American foreign policy. And times are indeed very tough, and about to get a great deal tougher." [68580]

TheHill.com reports that during a December 2013 White House visit, entertainer Bill Joel was offered a cigarette by Obama. According to Joel, Obama said, "I'm going out on the North Portico to have a smoke. Do you want to come with me?" (Obama claimed in 2009 that he was "95 percent cured" of his smoking habit. Video showing him chewing gum—possibly Nicorette—when it is clearly impolite to do so suggests he still struggles with nicotine withdrawal.) [68522]

DailyCaller.com reports, "Twitter users are calling for retribution after New York Times reporters Julie Bosman and Campbell Robertson published the name of police officer Darren Wilson's residential street. The reporters even helpfully noted that the suburb lies 'about a half-hour drive from Ferguson' where protests are currently taking place surrounding Wilson's exoneration in the Michael Brown case." (GotNews.com later publishes Bosman's address and reports that she "keeps calling the 20th District [police] station complaining about people harassing and threatening her,' our source told us. She's also 'complaining about numerous food [that is, pizza] deliveries being sent to her residence.'") [68526, 68587, 68588, 68595, 68613, 68614, 68661, 68794]

DailySignal.com reports, "Congress and the Obama White House looked for billions of dollars a few years ago to offset the costs of a legal settlement with black farmers and American Indians, to increase education aid to the states and to develop a vaccine for swine flu. To get those billions, they looked to the same coffer: Project BioShield, a \$5.6 billion fund created specifically to prepare America for a bioterrorist attack and develop treatments for deadly viruses such as Ebola. Senator Richard Burr (R-NC) warned that the BioShield fund was not supposed to be raided as a source of 'Monopoly money for politicians.' However, a review of documents by The Daily Signal found that Congress

and the Obama administration have taken or tried to take millions from Project BioShield to pay for priorities that had nothing to do with defending the nation from bioterrorism.” [68542]

The *Daily Mail* reports, “A man has died during the Ferguson riots just yards from where Michael Brown was shot dead. Residents on Canfield Drive said that DeAndre Joshua, 20, was shot whilst in his car though police at the scene refused to confirm any details. DeAndre’s grandmother Renita Towns said that ‘somebody killed him’ during the carnage.” (One Internet rumor suggests that Joshua was killed because he provided grand jury testimony that helped exonerate police officer Darren Wilson.) [68545, 68546, 68600, 68615]

Jonathan “Americans are stupid” Gruber agrees to testify before the House Oversight and Government Reform Committee. According to TheHill.com, the committee “will also hear from Obama administration official Marilyn Tavenner, who is under fire this week for using inflated enrollment figures for the healthcare law.” [68548, 68549]

In an address at the National Press Club, Senator Charles Schumer (D-NY) states, “Unfortunately, Democrats blew the opportunity the American people gave them” in the 2008 elections. “We took their mandate and put all our focus on the wrong problem—health care reform [rather than job-creation legislation]. ...As 2014 began, the parties were in stalemate, but when government failed to deliver on a string of non-economic issues—the rollout of the Obamacare exchanges, the mishandling of the surge in border crossers, ineptitude at the VA and the government’s initial handling of the Ebola threat—people lost faith in the government’s ability to work, and then blamed the incumbent governing party, the Democrats, creating a Republican wave.” Schumer, of course, believes in expanding the role of government, but he would not necessarily shove parts of it down the throats of Americans in the same sequence followed by Obama. He also says, “In order to win in 2016, Democrats must embrace government; not run away from it.” (Exactly when Democrats “ran away from big government” is not explained. NationalReview.com’s Jonah Goldberg quips, “It would be fun to see Schumer as a contestant on *Jeopardy* responding to every category, ‘What is proof we need more government?’” Schumer was, of course, an enthusiastic supporter of ObamaCare from day one. It is unlikely that he ever told the White House to put it in the back burner until the economy improved. He is now changing his tune because of the unpopularity of the law.) Despite the significance of Schumer’s remark, ABC, CBS, and NBC ignore the story during their morning and evening newscasts. [68555, 68568, 68585, 68622, 68644, 68726, 68951]

Under Obama’s amnesty order, according to WashingtonTimes.com, “businesses will have a \$3,000-per-employee incentive to hire illegal immigrants over native-born workers because of a quirk of Obamacare. ...Obama’s temporary amnesty, which lasts three years, declares up to 5 million illegal immigrants to be lawfully in the country and eligible for work permits, but it still deems them ineligible for public benefits such as buying insurance on Obamacare’s health exchanges. Under the Affordable Care Act, that means businesses who hire them won’t have to pay a penalty for not providing them

health coverage—making them \$3,000 more attractive than a similar native-born worker, whom the business by law would have to cover.” Congressman Lamar Smith (R-TX) says, “If it is true that [Obama’s] actions give employers a \$3,000 incentive to hire those who came here illegally, he has added insult to injury. [Obama’s] actions would have just moved those who came here illegally to the front of the line, ahead of unemployed and underemployed Americans.” [68582, 68645]

D. W. Ulsterman writes, “As millions across the nation watched the television images of a city streets being engulfed in flames, Ferguson city officials were wondering what had happened to the National Guard soldiers Missouri Governor Jay Nixon had already mobilized. And now that state’s Lt. Governor is pointing the finger at Obama Attorney General Eric Holder, who it is believed did not want images of National Guard soldiers being broadcast from Ferguson as it would reinforce the growing perception of an Obama administration spiraling out of control. Therefore, the safety of Ferguson was sacrificed in favor of the perception politics of the Obama White House. ...Missouri Lt. Governor Peter Kinder said the following regarding the National Guard’s odd absence from Ferguson: ‘Here’s my question that the governor must answer,’ Lt. Gov. Peter Kinder said today. ‘Is the reason that the national guard was not in there is because the Obama administration and the Holder Justice Department leaned on you to keep them out?’ ...Eric Holder was reportedly upset the Missouri Governor announced a State of Emergency days before the Darren Wilson Grand Jury decision was announced, and adamant there would be no National Guard soldiers patrolling the streets of Ferguson. (A decision that in more ‘normal’ times would be left to the governor to decide.) More off the record reports indicate Holder’s office made a number of angry calls to Governor Nixon expressing the administration’s displeasure at what they viewed to be a too strong response to the threat of rioting. Therefore, on the night of the rioting the National Guard soldiers were nowhere to be found in Ferguson, and the city was left to burn, all courtesy of Eric Holder and the Obama White House.” [68557, 68567, 68584, 68630]

According to WashingtonTimes.com, “Legal experts across the country agree that while the process that led to a grand jury’s decision not to indict Officer Darren Wilson for killing Michael Brown in Ferguson, Missouri, was unusual, it was not unfair. Rather if it was anything unusual, it was in its fairness and openness. Lawyers and academics told The Washington Times that, despite their personal opinions on the case, which has sparked riots over police brutality, St. Louis county prosecutor Robert McCulloch sought unbiased justice in presenting the jury with every piece of evidence and then making that evidence public. ‘It was the most thorough grand jury investigation that I’ve ever heard of,’ said Stephen Saltzburg, a professor of law at George Washington University Law School.’ ...Legal scholars say that Mr. McCullough’s decision to release the evidence presented to the grand jury for public scrutiny was also unprecedented, since grand-jury hearings are usually shrouded in secrecy, both while going on and after the fact. ‘Usually you don’t hear what evidence they considered,’ Mr. Saltzburg said. ‘I give the prosecutor top marks in terms of transparency and accountability.’” [68573]

DailyCaller.com quotes a May 1997 paper co-written by Jonathan Gruber for the National Bureau of Economic Research which states, “We find evidence of sizeable

positive selection: the average living circumstances of cohorts of children born immediately after abortion became legalized improved substantially relative to preceding cohorts, and relative to places where the legal status of abortion was not changing. Our results suggest that the marginal children who were not born as a result of abortion legalization would have systematically been born into worse circumstances had the pregnancies not been terminated: they would have been 70% more likely to live in a single parent household, 40% more likely to live in poverty, 35% more likely to die during the first year of life, and 50% more likely to be in a household collecting welfare. The last of these finding implies that the selection effects operating through the legalization of abortion saved the government over \$14 billion in welfare payments through the year 1994.” (In other words, it’s acceptable to kill the unborn babies of poor people because they would only grow up to be miserable ‘marginal children’ anyway.”) [68561]

According to a November 20-23 YouGov poll, a mere 21 percent of Americans strongly support Obama’s amnesty action; 30 percent of blacks strongly support the action; 38 percent of Hispanics strongly support it. [68566]

The consumer confidence index falls from 94.1 in October to 88.7 in November. [68611, 68612]

In a Newsmax TV interview, Reverend Jesse Lee Peterson (who happens to be black) says, “The liars, the [political] left, they don’t want to tell the truth, because if they told the truth, then other black Americans may wake up and start thinking and doing for themselves and it would put the race hustlers out of business. So, they’re not going to tell the truth, and some of those on the right won’t tell the truth. [They] are afraid to speak the truth because they don’t want to be called racist or they don’t want to be threatened. I can’t believe... that we have a thug [Michael Brown] that’s [sic; who is] being hailed as a hero who attacked a police officer. That is unheard of in America.” (Actually, it is not unheard of in America. As an example, many black activists and white leftists support cop-killer Mumia Abu-Jamal and have been trying for decades to get him released from prison—despite his obvious guilt.) “I saw justice served in America, and I was happy about that because I was very concerned that because of the threats of violence and things like that over the last few months, that the white part of the [grand] jury would be afraid to not indict officer Wilson. But I’m glad they were not afraid. So, I was happy to see that.” Peterson blames Obama, Attorney General Eric Holder, AL Sharpton, Jesse Jackson, [black activist preacher] T. D. Jakes, and the son of Martin Luther King, Jr. for the rioting and looting because “[t]hey have not repudiated their folks for acting out, they are acting as though Michael Brown, who was a thug, was some little innocent guy . . . and white officer Wilson had nothing else to do but to go and kill him. The facts are that Michael Brown was a thug, he attacked the owner of a store after robbing his store, so he was a felon because he used force for that. Michael Brown was not some innocent guy.” [68609]

Obama again delivers an address about the violence in Ferguson, Missouri. Author Michelle Malkin later notes, “In his 967-word statement to the nation about the Ferguson

grand jury decision on Tuesday night, ...Obama devoted precisely one sentence to the risks and sacrifices police officers make to keep the peace. One. Obama delivered a tepid, obligatory acknowledgement that ‘our police officers put their lives on the line for us every single day.’ But he sandwiched it between a finger-wagging admonition that cops need to ‘show care and restraint’ and a pandering discourse justifying the ‘deep distrust’ that ‘communities of color’ have toward law enforcement because of the ‘legacy of racial discrimination in this country.’ ...To these men and women of all colors on the front lines, risking their lives against homeland security threats of all kinds, Obama... offered hundreds of lines of warning and lecturing. But not this one word: ‘Thanks.’” [68586]

A second night of demonstrations takes place in Ferguson and other cities, albeit somewhat less violent and destructive than the previous night’s. (Fewer police cars are overturned and set on fire.) [68592]

Demonstrators in St. Louis and other cities stop traffic and block highways (including those used to access the Boston Medical Center), protesting the grand jury decision not to indict Darren Wilson. (Obama and Attorney General Eric “my people” Holder have no comment.) Stephen Kruser tweets, “Remember that time [New Jersey Governor Chris] Christie’s staff blocked a bridge & all the progs [progressives] did was talk about the 1 ambulance that didn’t get through?” [68594]

On November 26 Gary North writes at LewRockwell.com, “How do property owners deal with mob violence? If defenders face prosecution for defending their property, and the police and national guard fire tear gas canisters and rubber bullets, which do not slow down the looters, then both personal safety and private property are left without meaningful support. ...In his great book, *From Dawn to Decadence* (2000), Jacques Barzun wrote that the Western state is entering a phase of contraction. Politicians have promised welfare benefits that cannot possibly be paid for. At the same time, the state can no longer protect the nation from crime. A loss of legitimacy will undermine the state. The looters and rioters in Ferguson have sent a message: the state is impotent when it comes to protecting life and property. Yet these two protections are basic to the theoretical justification for the state’s possession of a lawful monopoly of violence. The state of Missouri visibly shares this with looters. ‘Sorry; there is nothing much we can do.’ The looters knew this, and they acted accordingly. There is a fundamental law of economics: ‘At a higher price, less is demanded.’ But modern Americans have been verbally assaulted for so long by the bullies in ghettos and their accomplices in the media that law enforcement agencies are today unwilling to hike the price on violence. Result: more violence. Push came to shove in Ferguson. The law enforcement agencies figured ‘better safe than sorry’ for them. They tried to contain the violence, not stop it. Once again, they sent a message to citizens. It was the same message sent by the looters, ‘You’re on your own. Do not resist.’” [68576]

According to a LifeNew.com review of visitor logs, Planned Parenthood president Cecile Richards, and Ilyse Hogue, head of the pro-abortion organization NARAL, have been frequent visitors to the White House—to see Obama, advisor Valerie Jarrett, and Obama political strategist David Plouffe. [68648]

The Environmental Protection Agency issues new proposals for the limiting of smog-causing pollutants. According to the Associated Press, “the EPA will recommend lowering the limit for ground-level ozone to 65 to 70 parts per billion, down from a 75 parts per billion standard set in the 2008.” WashingtonPost.com reports, “Leaked details of the proposal drew sharp criticism from industry groups, which argue that tighter restrictions will lead to higher costs and losses in jobs and economic productivity. American Petroleum Institute President Jack Gerard said air quality is already improving throughout much of the country, and many states are still struggling to adjust to the last change in ozone regulations six years ago. ‘Tightened standards could impose unachievable emission reduction requirements on virtually every part of the nation,’ Gerard said. ‘Even pristine areas with no industrial activity such as national parks could be out of attainment.’” Jay Timmons, chief executive officer of the National Association of Manufacturers, comments, “This new ozone regulation threatens to be the most expensive ever imposed on industry in America,” and will place “massive new costs on manufacturers and closing off counties and states to new business.” (It is absurd to demand that a place like New York City have air that is cleaner than that of Yellowstone National Park. The cost of meeting such a requirement—if it is even technologically possible—will, at the very least, increase consumer prices and, at the worst, drive companies out of business.) [68589, 68590, 68591, 68617]

Obama’s approval/disapproval ratings fall to 39/54 in a Quinnipiac poll; 47 percent of Americans trust the Republicans to do what is best for the nation, while 42 percent trust Obama more; 67 percent expect gridlock in Congress over the next two years, with 44 percent blaming Obama and 42 percent blaming the GOP. [68593]

Congressman Peter King (R-NY) says, “I think it would be very helpful if ...Obama went and met with the police officer [Darren Wilson], or at least invited him to the White House, and say, ‘you’ve gone through four months of smear and slander and the least we can do is tell you that it is unfortunate that it happened and thank you for doing your job.’” Of Obama’s address about the events in Ferguson, King says, “I wish he said one good word about the police—one good word about officer Wilson, who had gone through all this. ...I thought it was terrible what happened over the last four months where this narrative was put out by our national leaders and by many in the media presuming that the police officer was guilty, and I think if we are going to have peace, I think it’s important for both sides to be honest here.” [68604]

Supreme Court Justice Ruth Bader Ginsberg, age 81, has a stent placed in her right coronary artery. (Many leftists are angry with Ginsberg for having refused to retire and allow Obama to name a replacement while the Democrats still had control of the Senate. If Ginsberg, or any other Justice, were to retire or die during the next two years, Obama’s nominee to replace him or her would face confirmation by a Senate controlled by the Republicans.) [68610, 68616, 68643]

Politico reports that a tax deal brokered by Democrat and Republican leaders in Congress fell apart because it did not include an extension of the Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC)

that could be claimed by more millions of illegal immigrants to whom Obama is illegally granting amnesty. “For years,” writes Politico, “the GOP has railed against undocumented immigrants who claim the child tax credit, and Obama’s immigration order raised the prospect they would begin claiming the EITC, as well. If Republicans agreed to extend them now, it would look like they were voting to expand government benefits to illegal immigrants. Some Democrats worried that the only way Republicans would ever agree to extending the provisions is if they included tough new rules aimed at preventing illegal immigrants from claiming them. So they dropped the idea, figuring that was better than either risking a crackdown on immigrants trying to claim the breaks or not getting a deal at all.” According to DailyCaller.com, “The now-dead tax bill, dubbed the ‘tax extenders package,’ is a grab-bag of tax breaks that are usually passed late in every congressional session. If the bill is not passed, businesses and voters will both face tax increases. This year’s draft bill was expanded to include more tax-breaks for businesses, and was reputedly valued at more than \$400 billion over 10 years. ...GOP leaders reportedly refused to trade the EITC extension in exchange for the business tax cuts. The tangled deal died when the White House demanded that the illegals should get the unreformed EITC tax payments. ‘An extender package that makes permanent expiring business provisions without addressing tax credits for working families is the wrong approach... Any deal on tax extenders must ensure that the economic benefits are broadly shared,’ read a Nov. 24 statement from the Treasury Department.” (In other words, Obama won’t give tax breaks to working U.S. citizens and businesses unless the deal also includes benefits to illegal immigrants. This is yet another of Obama’s wealth redistribution schemes. Large numbers of illegal immigrant families have incomes so low that they would not pay federal income taxes at all. Instead, they would get an EITC check from the government—paid for by those Americans who do pay taxes.) [68686, 68687, 68688]

The Federation of American Scientists reports that a revised Department of Defense publication on Detainee Operations no longer refers to imprisoned terrorists as “unlawful enemy combatants.” They are now called “Unprivileged enemy belligerents.” [68640, 68641]

Breitbart.com reports, “Missouri Governor Jay Nixon adamantly denies that the White House pressured him to resist sending in the National Guard in response to violent protesters unhappy with the Michael Brown shooting decision. It is clear, however, that Nixon has been in close contact with ...Obama’s senior advisor Valerie Jarrett as the chaotic situation unfolded. According to the White House, Jarrett spoke with Nixon the first night of the protests as well as the morning after. Deputy Press Secretary Eric Schultz confirmed that Jarrett received ‘updates’ from Nixon, ‘promising to stay in close touch’ as the situation continued. ...Jarrett and Attorney General Eric Holder also spoke with civil rights leaders the first night of the protests, continuing their close coordination as the grand jury decision approached.” [68627]

According to a Gallup poll, only 27 percent of non-Hispanic whites without college degrees approve of Obama’s performance; 41 percent of non-Hispanic whites with college degrees approve. Obama’s support comes from blacks (84 percent approval

rating), Asians (64 percent), and Hispanics (54 percent). (The poll is based on data through October, before Obama's amnesty action and the events in Ferguson, Missouri.) [68628, 68629]

According to a November 18-23 national telephone poll by Quinnipiac, Mitt Romney leads the field of Republican candidates for the 2016 presidential nomination with 19 percent, ahead of former Florida governor Jeb Bush (11), New Jersey Governor Chris Christie (8), heart surgeon Ben Carson (8), Senator Rand Paul (R-K) (6), Congressman Paul Ryan (R-WI) (5), Wisconsin Governor Scott Walker (5), and former Arkansas governor Mike Huckabee (5). Romney leads Hillary Clinton 45-44 for the November contest. [68635, 68636]

At WashingtonExaminer.com Jim Kouri writes, "In the aftermath of Monday night's rioting and looting in Ferguson, Missouri, there's a question as to why the National Guard was not deployed to quell the violence, and some are speculating ... Obama and Attorney General Eric Holder may have encouraged the lack of action. ... On Tuesday morning Missouri Lt. Gov. Peter Kinder asked the question: Did the Obama administration lean on Governor Nixon to ignore pleas from Ferguson Mayor to send in National Guard? Kinder then answered his own question: 'I cannot imagine any other reason why the governor who mobilized the National Guard would not have them in there to stop this.' ... 'Somebody wanted this to happen,' declared Rush Limbaugh on his national broadcast Wednesday. 'We all knew what was coming. It was scripted. Nobody made a move to stop it! The cameras were in place. The media was in place. The only question was: How many cars will burn? How many stores will be destroyed? How many Molotov cocktails? Just how big the destruction? No effort to stop it. The media didn't want it stopped. It was great programming. That's why I say get the cameras out of there and a lot less of this kind of crap goes on but that's never gonna happen either,' said Limbaugh, who is the most hated man in America by the liberal-left. ... There were some powerful people within the Obama administration or the White House, perhaps even the Attorney General Eric Holder's office, who called the governor of Missouri, Jay Nixon, and ordered him not to allow the National Guard troops to respond to the mayhem. They had been deployed even before the grand jury decision and they were placed on ready status. And then they were made to stand down." [68630, 68634]

Of course, Holder or White House advisor Valerie Jarrett would not have told Nixon to hold back the National Guard troops without Obama's knowledge. If there was such an order, it came from Obama or with his approval. A reasonable person would want a peaceful demonstration without violence. Violence would not reverse the grand jury decision not to indict police officer Darren Wilson. But Obama is not a reasonable person. He is a schemer who views everything through a political and racial lens. From his perspective, riots and violence serve a purpose: they keep race in the forefront, ahead of other issues, and provide him with an excuse to attempt to "transform" the nation's judicial system. For example, Obama and Holder both want to address the issue that the blacks are far more likely to be sent to prison than whites. The average person assumes that means blacks commit more crimes than whites, but Obama and Holder believe blacks are targeted by police and imprisoned because they are black. They want to

change the laws, rather than the behavior of black youths—and rioting helps them “prove” there is discrimination that needs to be addressed. Additionally, Obama, Holder, and the Democrat establishment *need* racial divisiveness to continue. It is what keeps blacks voting for Democrats. Peace and prosperity in black communities helps Republican candidates because voters believe the GOP will help them “keep what they’ve got,” while Democrat candidates promise to “get them what they don’t have.”

On November 27—Thanksgiving—Obama “pardons” two turkeys, saying, “I’m here to announce what I’m sure will be the most talked about executive action this month. Today I’m taking an action, fully within my legal authority—the same kind of action taken by Republicans and Democrats before me—to spare the lives of two turkeys, Mac and Cheese from a terrible and delicious fate.” (Elizabeth Lauten, the communications director for Congressman Stephen Fincher (R-TN), is forced to resign after writing a Facebook post criticizing Obama’s daughters for wearing too-short dresses to the turkey-pardon event and for looking disinterested—which they probably were. Although no one ever heard of Lauten, the story is played up by the mainstream media—which somehow did not find the time to report on the recovery of Lois Lerner’s missing emails, virtually ignored Jonathan Gruber’s statements that ObamaCare was sold with lies, and reported next-to-nothing about Terrance Patrick Bean, a top Obama campaign contribution bundler and Air Force One guest who was arrested in Portland and charged with two felony counts of having sex with a minor. It is worth noting that talk show host David Letterman did not lose his job over a rape “joke” about Sarah Palin’s underage daughter, and Carol Costello still works at CNN despite having gleefully reported that one of Sarah Palin’s daughters was assaulted outside a bar.) [68328, 68329, 68333, 68358, 68544, 68651, 68662, 68699, 68731, 68732, 68764, 68765, 68769, 68770, 68771, 68773, 68774, 68799, 68800, 68923]

The White House commemorates Thanksgiving by tweeting a photograph of Obama (in what many describe as a “gay” pose) sitting at his desk and allegedly speaking with U.S. troops overseas. [68659]

Activists protesting the non-indictment of police officer Darren Wilson block the northbound lanes of Interstate 5 in San Diego, the 101 Freeway in Los Angeles, I-95 in Providence, I-580 in Oakland, and I-75 in Detroit. (It is worth noting that no one rioted or blocked highways in October 2012, when there was no indictment of Mobile, Alabama police officer Trevis Austin after he shot and killed an unarmed 18-year-old named Gilbert Collar. Austin is black and Collar was white.) [68642, 68653, 68657]

Butler Schaffer writes at LewRockwell.com, “The ongoing events in Ferguson, MO, illustrate Thomas Pynchon’s point that ‘if they can get you asking the wrong questions, they don’t have to worry about answers.’ Like the Rodney King, and Trayvon Martin cases, the killing of Michael Brown by a white Ferguson policeman provided the state and its sycophantic media an opportunity to reinforce the popular mindset that social disorder derives from the inherently divisive nature of human behavior; that violent conflict is inevitable among people; and that only the authority of the state can protect us from a ‘nasty, brutish, and short’” fate. From a statist perspective, Brown’s killing

confirms that categories of people grounded in race, religion, gender, lifestyle, economic interests, and numerous other abstract divisions, define humanity, and make social conflict an inescapable outcome of human nature. ...Every political system thrives on the legal use of violence. Each requires our separation into exclusive groupings who can then be manipulated into warfare with one another, thus allowing the state to coercively intervene to reconfirm its violence-based powers over us all. ...As long as we succumb to our statist conditioning by which we define one another as 'enemies' against whom the state promises to 'protect' us, we shall continue to help generate the kinds of tragedies that occurred in Ferguson. If we can learn to see our problems not in terms of 'white man kills black man,' but as the consequences of our embracing institutionalized violence, we may find a solution to what our thinking has created. What if we began to see violence—a power for which the state insists upon having a legal monopoly—as the real threat to human well-being? What if events in Ferguson had begun with a report that 'state employee shoots and kills young man?'" [68631]

The *St. Louis Post-Dispatch* reports, "Two men indicted last week on federal weapons charges allegedly had plans to bomb the Gateway Arch—and to kill St. Louis County Prosecuting Attorney Robert McCulloch and Ferguson Police Chief Tom Jackson... Sources close to the investigation were uncertain whether the men had the capability to carry out the plans, although the two allegedly did buy what they thought was a pipe bomb in an undercover law enforcement sting. The men wanted to acquire two more bombs, the sources said, but could not afford to do it until one suspect's girlfriend's Electronic Benefit Transfer card was replenished. An indictment, with no mention of bombs or killings, was returned in federal court here Nov. 19 and unsealed Friday upon the arrest of Brandon Orlando Baldwin and Olajuwon Ali Davis. ...One of the defendants' plans, the sources said, included planting a bomb inside the observation deck at the top of the Arch. It was not clear how they could have gotten a bomb past airport-style security screening for rides up. It also wasn't clear, the sources said, whether the men intended to use bombs as the means to kill McCulloch and Jackson." [68623, 68624, 68675, 68678, 68689, 68691, 68692]

Retired Lieutenant General Jerry Boykin, former commander of the Green Berets and currently the executive vice president for the Family Research Council, argues that departing Secretary of Defense Chuck Hagel should now wait until Obama leaves office before he reveals his insider knowledge of the status of the U.S. military. Boykin states, "Public statements made today by ...Obama and Secretary Hagel regarding the state of our military do not reflect reality. Once Secretary Hagel leaves his position, he should speak out about the impact of [Obama's] policies on military readiness as well as his feckless foreign policy. It would be wrong to wait, like his predecessors, until a book deal comes out. ...The American people deserve and have a right to hear the truth about the damage [Obama's] policies have inflicted on the military. We can't wait any longer to restore the readiness of our military. Our national security depends upon it. The reluctance of the current Joint Chiefs of Staff to resist damaging policies is having a devastating impact on military readiness and consequently national security. Programmed cuts in the military budget as well as cuts resulting from sequestration are reducing America's readiness to a dangerously low level. From personnel to major weapons

systems, military leaders and defense analysts alike agree we are placing our national security on a dangerous footing. It's time for senior military leaders to go public with their objections even if it results in their resignation or termination. Consider that America has been at war for 13 years and our military has an all-time high suicide rate, out-of-control PTSD, and family disintegration at unprecedented levels. The Obama administration has not announced a serious and coherent strategy to destroy ISIS. Now we are sending our young men and women—who are not adequately trained to fight Ebola—on something that is NOT a military mission in the first place.” [68646]

FoxNews.com reports, “Shoppers ready to look for deep Black Friday retail deals could get more than they bargained for this year. Malls in a number of states across the country are allowing health care navigators to set up shop around stores to hawk the benefits of ObamaCare. It's all part of a Health and Human Services campaign to snag as many sign-ups as possible. Government reps will be armed with information packets and other promotions to pitch to Americans. ...As part of the new outreach initiative, Westfield malls in eight states, including California, Florida, Illinois and New Jersey, will let navigators and other enrollment workers hand out fliers and other outreach work to get people to enroll.” [68647, 68649]

The legal advocacy firm Cause of Action tells DailyCaller.com, “[T]he Treasury Inspector General for Tax Administration (TIGTA) informed Cause of Action that there exist nearly 2,500 potentially responsive documents relating to investigations of improper disclosures of confidential taxpayer information by the IRS to the White House.” The information is the result of a lawsuit filed by Cause of Action to determine whether and how often the IRS has illegally shared taxpayer information with the Obama administration. TIGTA refuses to release the tax return documents, arguing that they contain confidential taxpayer information. But that refusal itself confirms laws have been broken, because the IRS should never have given the White House that confidential taxpayer information. The questions remain, therefore, “Why did the IRS give the White House confidential tax return information? To which individuals and businesses did that information pertain? And what did the White House do with that information?” [68652, 68735, 68818, 68847, 68849, 68860]

At WND.com Joseph Farah writes, “Barack Obama's amnesty gambit is not *just* a bid to ensure a steady stream of new Dependocrat voters. That's only part of the scheme. ... You have to recall the political strategy you were warned about here as early as 2008, when Obama was first running for the presidency—the Cloward-Piven Strategy. ...[T]he Cloward-Piven strategy is about manufacturing crises to bring about the destruction of the free-enterprise system to usher in the socialist utopia.” (Richard Cloward was a Marxist professor at Columbia University; Frances Fox Piven was his assistant.) “What they authored became known as ‘the Cloward-Piven Strategy of Orchestrated Crisis.’” (As noted previously in this *Timeline*, the strategy involves taking action to force deliberate failure in society to foster change toward socialism, by overloading the bureaucracy with impossible demands and lawsuits, holding officials to the extreme letter of the law, etc. The Cloward-Piven method is intended to push society into economic collapse, forcing a fear and resentment of capitalism and making it easier to usher in

socialism. The Cloward-Piven strategy is one of the tactics frequently used by community activists and organizers—such as storming welfare offices and violently demanding immediate action—to strain the system, and to force the hiring of more government workers than necessary to deal with their ever-increasing demands. Obama may very well have met and been personally influenced by Cloward and Piven when he attended Columbia.) [68655]

Farah continues, “Cloward and Piven specifically calculated their strategy as a way to end poverty by bringing the capitalist system to collapse through a series of escalating demands that could never be met. ... One way that was to be accomplished, they explained in their treatise, was for social workers to sign up the poor in existing social programs at such levels as to tax the system to the breaking point. ... Today, Obama is still employing the Cloward-Piven strategy, but not as a community organizer. Today he is the Community Organizer in Chief. He’s still creating crises as a means of empowerment. And the biggest experiment yet in the Cloward-Piven model is Obamnesty. It’s a two-fer: Not only does it ensure a steady stream of Dependocrat voters for the foreseeable future, it also ensures the greatest expansion of welfare rolls in history. And it won’t even require an army of community organizers to make it happen. It was done with a stroke of the pen.” [68655]

At least 10 people protesting the grand jury decision in Ferguson, Missouri are arrested in Portland, Oregon. [68709]

On November 28 shoppers seeking “Black Friday” deals at post-Thanksgiving sales at the Galleria Mall in Richmond Heights, Missouri find many stores closed due to pro-Michael Brown protestors staging a “die-in.” Some protestors lie down on the mall floors and “pretend” they were shot by white police officers. Others march through the mall chanting, “We shut shit down!” and “Hands up, don’t shoot!” (Obama has no comment, but HotAir.com writes, “Yeah, brothers and sisters! That should show ’em! Because we all know that one of the chief contributing factors in friction between law enforcement and minority citizens in economically disadvantaged communities is ... people buying Christmas presents at Target? I’m sorry, but what the heck do these two things have to do with each other? *Justice for Mike Brown* is somehow typified by not looking for a deal on a new Playstation 4 for your kid? If you were fighting for an increased minimum wage or some other union sponsored astroturfing against major retailers, (as misguided as such efforts may be) you could kind of see why a Black Friday boycott could sort of make sense. But this is crazy. Do these protestors not actually understand why it’s called Black Friday and think that it’s something to do with race?”) [68650, 68653, 68654, 68670]

A group of mostly white, young protesters in Seattle, Washington force the Westlake Mall to close five hours early and disrupt a Christmas tree lighting ceremony. One demonstrator says, “Who cares” if the children’s event was ruined. “Mike Brown doesn’t get a Christmas.” (Had Brown not been shot he would have had his Christmas in jail as a consequence of robbing a store and attacking a police office.) [68695]

Black Friday sales of guns strain the FBI's National Instant Criminal Background Check System with an average of three per second—and perhaps enough to break the record of 144,758 in a single day. [68671, 68672, 68693]

Jim Kouri writes at Examiner.com, “The scuttlebutt on Friday ‘Inside the Beltway’ regarding Defense Secretary Chuck Hagel’s departure from the Obama administration has to do with his hesitancy to cave in [Obama’s] hasty timetable to close down the Guantanamo Bay military detention center (Gitmo) and transfer those prisoners to undisclosed locations. ...Obama and his national security team—especially Susan Rice and Ben Rhoades—and Valerie Jarrett, Obama’s closest advisor, are pushing the Pentagon to transfer more detainees from Gitmo before the Republicans takeover the U.S. Senate, which gives the GOP more power to stop what they consider a dangerous endeavor by the Obama administration. The Wall Street Journal reported on Friday that, following five detainees released last week, there will be another round of ‘transfers’ in December, but as usual officials would not give any details [of] the identities or nationalities of the terrorists being released to other countries. ...Defense Secretary Hagel was fiercely criticized by Obama minions who told the Wall Street Journal he was moving at a snail’s pace to ‘certify detainees for release.’ ‘Senior officials at the White House are impatient as [Obama’s] term in office draws nearer to its end with the promise of the closure of Guantanamo unfulfilled,’ according to the Wall Street Journal.” (Not only has the Obama administration been releasing terrorist detainees from Guantanamo, it has not placed any additional terrorists there either. That harms U.S. security because the intelligence community cannot interrogate terrorists who are not in their custody. Obama and Attorney General Eric Holder prefer giving terrorists civilian trials in the United States, but once they are “lawyered up” they also “clam up.”) [68658, 68660, 68673]

International Business Times reports, “According to a study published by the Judicial Watch, a large number of votes cast by non-citizens were responsible for ...Obama’s victory in the 2008 elections. The study, ‘Do non-citizens vote in U.S. elections?’ which examined the participation rates of non-citizens in United States elections using a nationally representative sample found that it does indeed happen on such a large scale that it can make significant impact on the election outcomes. The study also claims that it is likely for Obama to have won... owing to the illegal votes of non-citizens. ...The influence of the illegal votes is so much that it even affects the Electoral College votes, and Congressional Elections. The study claims, ‘Non-citizen votes likely gave Senate Democrats the pivotal 60th vote needed to overcome filibusters in order to pass health care reform and other Obama administration priorities in the 111th Congress.’” [68679, 68680, 68681]

DailyCaller.com posts a video of Don Cravins, Jr., chief of staff for Senator Mary Landrieu (D-LA), telling a crowd on November 3, “He [Obama] can’t finish his agenda, because he doesn’t have people like Mary Landrieu with him... So I’m asking you to go out and vote tomorrow for Senator Landrieu. She’s been in office for 18 years, and in the Senate, that’s what you need to get things done, and she will go on to vote with Barack Obama 97 percent of the time!” [68696, 68714]

Don Cravins, Sr., the Democrat mayor of Opelousas, Louisiana, tells the same audience, “That’s the kind of progress that we want in Opelousas. That’s why you need leadership. That’s why you need someone who knows how to do business. And that’s why I’m asking you to go out tomorrow and vote for [ballot line] number 99. If you voted early, go vote again tomorrow. One more time’s not gonna [sic] hurt and tomorrow we’re gonna [sic] elect Earl Taylor as the D.A. [district attorney] so he won’t prosecute you if you vote twice.” [68712]

RebelPundit.com posts a video of Jonathan Gruber at a January 18, 2012 health care reform seminar in which he says, “Despite what candidates will tell you, Republicans can not come in and repeal this law overnight, certainly not if they don’t have close to 60 votes in the Senate, [and] even if they did have close to 60 votes in the Senate, they can not do that. What they can do, is they can essentially kill it from the inside, because this is such a complicated transformation that fundamental leadership is required at the federal level, okay, and that leadership has to come from [Obama] and the administration, both in terms of financing decisions, and just, sort of, cheerleading as this thing gets implemented. The lack of cheerleading and financial support could cause the implementation to go terribly and cause this thing to crater in on itself. So there’s enormous risk the entire law just craters if there’s not, uh, someone in the White House who cares about making it work. So you don’t need active repeal. You just need... ignoring the law, and letting it wither on the vine, that may be enough, and that’s the real threat, that’s the major threat I think the law, uh, the law faces.” [68698]

TheGatewayPundit.com notes a White House Twitter message directing people to a HuffingtonPost.com article, “5 Ways to Teach About Michael Brown & Ferguson.” One of the suggestions for teachers is to “Create a classroom memorial” for Michael Brown. [68742, 68743]

On November 29 a court in Egypt drops all charges against former president Hosni Mubarak. The charges stemmed from the deaths of protesters in the 2011 rioting that led to Mubarak’s ouster and replacement by the radical Muslim Brotherhood’s Mohammed Morsi—who was himself removed from power some time later. Pamela Geller comments, “I don’t believe the decision will meet with a rebuke from the Obama administration, despite the fact that Obama strongly supported the terrorist coup by the Muslim Brotherhood and even went so far as to punish the Egyptian people when they ousted the Muslim Brotherhood regime of Morsi. The US needs Egypt in its feeble pushback against the Islamic State. Obama needs Cairo’s strong public support for the US campaign. 33 million Egyptians took to the streets to oust Morsi, so 1,000 in Tahrir Square [protesting against Mubarak] is not significant. I expect the enemedia will try to make much out of it, but it is purely agenda-driven. We had twice that in Union Square this past summer to protest Hamas and ISIS, but the media didn’t report on it. Look for biased coverage of this historic verdict. The left loves the Muslim Brotherhood.” [68704]

John Ransom observes at Townhall.com the recent boost in the Gross Domestic Product: “That’s what happens during an election year when the administration decides to accelerate federal spending in the 3rd quarter so that they can make the economy appear

more buoyant than it really is. The latest release from the Commerce Department tells the story: ‘Real federal government consumption expenditures and gross investment increased 9.9 percent in the third quarter,’ reports the Bureau of Economic Analysis, ‘in contrast to a decrease of 0.9 percent in the second. National defense increased 16.0 percent, compared with an increase of 0.9 percent. Nondefense increased 0.4 percent, in contrast to a decrease of 3.8 percent.’ ...It’s distressing that we live at a time so corrupt that we aren’t even surprised anymore that the administration would fool with the GDP numbers so gratuitously... and no one would care. Because this is the type of practice that got the guys at Enron jailed, but is apparently legal in DC. When you do it for a company you go to jail. When you do it for a nation you get a Nobel Prize.” [68665]

The Associated Press reports, “On a trip to Afghanistan during ...Obama’s first term, Defense Secretary Robert Gates was stunned to find a telephone line at the military’s special operations headquarters that linked directly back to a top White House national security official. ‘I had them tear it out while I was standing there,’ Gates said earlier this month as he recounted his discovery. ‘I told the commanders, ‘If you get a call from the White House, you tell them to go to hell and call me.’” To Gates, the phone in Kabul came to symbolize Obama’s efforts to micromanage the Pentagon and centralize decision-making in the White House. That criticism later would be echoed publicly and pointedly by Gates’ successor, Leon Panetta. [Obama’s] third Pentagon chief, Chuck Hagel, was picked partly because he was thought to be more deferential to Obama’s close circle of White House advisers. But over time, Hagel also grew frustrated with what he saw as the West Wing’s insularity.” [68674]

Police officer Darren Wilson resigns from the Ferguson, Missouri police department. [68676, 68677, 68690]

Speaking at Morgan State University in Baltimore, Maryland, Obama’s Chicago neighbor and Nation of Islam leader Louis Farrakhan says the violence of Ferguson, Missouri protesters was justified. “We [are] going to die anyway. Let’s die for something.” He also urges parents, “Teach your baby how to throw the [Molotov Cocktail] bottle if they can. Fight. ...In this book [the Qu’ran], there’s a law for retaliation. A law for retaliation. ...As long as they [whites] kill us [blacks] and go to Wendy’s and have a burger and go to sleep, they’ll keep killing us. But when we die and they die, then soon we’re going to sit at a table and talk about it! We’re tired! We want some of this earth or we’ll tear this goddamn country up! ...Tonight in Ferguson everybody is on edge. White folks have never been on edge after they killed a black man. Tonight they’re on edge; so on edge that [Obama] has come out from behind the curtain to ask young black people, ‘Cool it. That’s not our way.’ I heard you, Mr. [Obama], and I asked myself a question: What brings you out of the shadows? ...Why the hell don’t you stand up and tell them [white police departments] that your [their] killing of black youth and brown youth is not going to hold no more [sic].” [68694]

While Obama and his fellow Democrats brag seven more people have health insurance because of ObamaCare, they neglect to mention that millions more cannot afford to use the insurance they have. According to a Gallup poll, “One in three Americans say they

have put off getting medical treatment that they or their family members need because of cost. ...[That] is among the highest readings in the 14-year history of Gallup asking the question. ...One of the goals of opening the government exchanges was to enable more Americans to get health insurance to help cover the costs of needed medical treatments. While many Americans have gained insurance, there has been no downturn in the percentage who say they have had to put off needed medical treatment because of cost. This may reflect high deductibles or copays that are part of the newly insured's plans..." (Some families that had been without insurance may now have it because of ObamaCare, but they cannot afford to use it because of incredibly high deductibles and out-of-pocket expense limits. For many Americans, insurance is essentially meaningless if they have to pay the first \$7,000 or \$8,000 before their coverage kicks in.) [68683, 68684]

On November 30, in St. Louis, Missouri, a 32-year-old white man named Zemir Begic is beaten to death with hammers by four black and Hispanic teenagers. (Obama, Al Shapron, and Jesse Jackson have no comment.) [68722, 68723, 68736, 68930]

D. W. Ulsterman writes, "For some time now there have been various reports suggesting Barack Obama to be, even by typical [Obama Office] standards, an aloof character with seemingly few friends and even less personal interest in things and events outside of himself. Now entering his next to last year [in the White House], rumors are circulating via Capitol Hill sources of a man lost in his own manufactured past who is desperate to be free of a White House he loathes, and an America he despises even more. Apparently the day-to-day White House staff are seeing less and less of Barack Obama. When in Washington D.C., [he] rarely goes beyond his private residence study, even including fewer of his beloved golf outings. Day to day operations are channeled through [advisor Valerie] Jarrett's office, and it is that longstanding rule that has Congressional Democrats seething. Jarrett often ignores requests to speak with her—even if such a request comes from figures like [Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid [D-NV]] and [House Minority Leader] Nancy Pelosi [D-CA]. One Democrat who was recently deemed worthy of the Senior White House Adviser's attention was Senator Chuck Schumer [D-NY] who recently declared during a public speech that Obamacare was a mistake for the party, in essence a problem that should not have taken up so much of the party's time in 2009 and 2010. Both Barack Obama and Valerie Jarrett were in mutual fits of rage over the senator's words, and repeated calls to Schumer that he make a hasty retraction." [68697]

"Schumer has to date, apparently ignored the request, and refuses to speak directly to Jarrett but has indicated he'd be willing to meet with [Obama]. Other whispers are putting Schumer as the new Democratic leader of the Senate by 2016—a promise made to him months earlier and then repeated more recently by figures close to the Clinton Machine. While the anti-Obamacare message from Schumer still has Jarrett reportedly plotting revenge, [Obama] himself has withdrawn even further into the protective bubble that so often is a White House under siege, coming out only briefly to give words to the Jarrett manufactured script that had former Defense Secretary Chuck Hagel being shown the door. The Hagel dismissal was yet another White House decision that had senators from both parties angry at the White House, with Harry Reid apparently suggesting the White House should not expect a simple confirmation for [Obama's] next choice to

replace Hagel. Last week Barack Obama was described by a Capitol Hill staffer who communicates regularly with individuals linked to the White House as an ‘isolated, insolent, and inebriated’ figure who recently had difficulty even reading from a teleprompted script and was required to do several takes before coming up with a performance that did not make his compromised condition so obvious. This same Capitol Hill source suggested it may not be just the friction between the White House and Senate Democrats that has [Obama] in such an emotional downward spiral—there are yet more rumors the White House is preparing for a potential public relations disaster looming in early 2015 that even has the normally haughty Jarrett office ‘hoping to survive.’” (The “potential public relations disaster” may relate to the emails of former IRS official Lois Lerner, or perhaps a demand for a divorce by Michelle Obama, or even a press conference from Sheriff Joe Arpaio’s “cold case posse” investigation of Obama’s forged birth certificate.) [68697]

An American Airlines plane is evacuated at JFK airport in New York after a telephoned bomb threat. No bomb is found. Meanwhile, British police investigate an alleged Islamist terrorist plot to bomb five airliners before Christmas. [68700, 68701, 68702, 68703, 68705]

The *Daily Mail* reports, “Islamic State fanatics claim to have constructed a dirty bomb after stealing 40kg of uranium from an Iraqi university. Militants boasted of the device on social media, with one even commenting on the destruction such a bomb would wreak in London, four months after the chemical was reported missing from Mosul University. Among extremists making online threats to the West is British explosives expert Hamayun Tariq, who fled his home in Dudley, West Midlands, for the Middle East in 2012. Using the Muslim name, Muslim-al-Britani, he posted on Twitter: ‘O by the way Islamic State does have a Dirty bomb. We found some Radio active material from Mosul university,’ the Mirror reports. He continued: ‘We’ll find out what dirty bombs are and what they do. We’ll also discuss what might happen if one actually went off in a public area.’” (Pamela Geller writes, “The West watches and waits. Operation fetal position. Declaring, ‘no, they can’t do this’ (but they do it) or ‘they can’t do that’ (but they do it) or ‘it’s not Islamic’ or ‘stamp out islamophobia and the jihadis will stop killing,’ and the band plays on. The slaughter increases. The genocide of Christians and religious minorities spreads. Towns fall. And the West watches and waits. And Obama clicks the heels of his red ruby slippers together three times and says, ‘Islam is peace.’”) [68706, 68707, 68748, 68821]

Congressman and Senator-elect Tom Cotton (R-AR) appears on *Meet the Press* and tells host Chuck Todd that Obama “just lost an election in no small measure because wages for working families are declining and unemployment is still too high in too many places. And the first big action he took after the election was to make it easier for illegal immigrants to get jobs, not for working families to get jobs.” Cotton says the new Congress will pass legislation to begin “building a border fence or enforcing our interior immigration laws, and getting a handle on legal immigration that could actually drive down wages and increase unemployment. ...Too many Arkansans are worried about the impact that rampant illegal immigration is having on their communities and local

services, on the impact it's having on jobs, jobs for working families all the country, and that's why they [the voters] want us to address those problems in the new congress. ...Hezbollah has tried to launch terrorist attacks right here in Washington, D.C. They're under federal indictment collaborating with locals in Mexico to cross our border to attack us here. As long as our border is open and it's defenseless, then it's not just an immigration issue—it's a national security issue. We know these drug cartels in Mexico are focused primarily on power and profit. They'll branch out into any activity if it brings them more money and helps them consolidate control. That's yet another reason why we need control of our border." When Todd accuses his guest of fear-mongering, Cotton responds, "The Islamic State is cutting the heads off of Americans right now, and their leader has said they want to strike us in the United States. That's something we should be fearful of and that we should take a stance against, whether in Iraq and Syria or whether it's securing our southern border." [68710, 68727]

Also on *Meet the Press*, National Review editor Rich Lowry, outnumbered four-to-one by leftists, states the obvious about Ferguson, Missouri: "[L]et's not pretend that this particular incident was something it wasn't. If you look at the most credible evidence, the lessons are really basic. Don't rob a convenience store. Don't fight a policeman when he stops you and try to take his gun. And when he yells at you to stop, with his gun drawn, just stop!" (BizPacReview.com later comments, "The look on [Andrea] Mitchell's face said it all—a deer stuck in the headlights is a charitable description. As to [Eugene] Robinson, the guy spends his ink in the Washington Post alternately sucking up to and advising the Obama administration. That means reality isn't his beat, so being hit with it on the fly was just too much.") [68721, 68729]

On *Fox News Sunday*, former New York City mayor Rudi Giuliani says, "This is the kind of case [in Ferguson, Missouri] had it not ...had the racial overtones and the national publicity... a prosecutor would have come to the conclusion that there's not enough evidence to present to the grand jury. It's an impossible case to present to a grand jury. ...There is more interaction and more unfair interaction among police officers, white and black, in the black community than in the white community. And I think some of that responsibility is on the police department and on police departments to train their officers better and to make their police departments much more diversified. But I think just as much, if not more, responsibility is on the black community to reduce the reason why the police officers are assigned in such large numbers to the black community. ...It's because blacks commit murder eight times more per capita than any other group in our society. And when I assigned police officers with Commissioner [William] Bratton and Commissioner [Howard] Safir, we did it based on statistics. We didn't do it based on race. If there were a lot of murders in a community, we put a lot of police officers there. If I had put all my police officers on Park Avenue, and none in Harlem, thousands and thousands more blacks would have been killed during the eight years I was mayor." [68725]

Speaking at the Friendly Temple Missionary Baptist Church in St. Louis, Missouri, Al Sharpton says, "We lost the round, but the fight ain't [sic] over. You won the first round, Mr. Prosecutor, but don't cut your gloves off, 'cause the fight's not over. Justice will

come to Ferguson.” (Some would say that is a threat of more violence; others would say, “That’s just race-hustler Sharpton being Sharpton.”) [68728]

The *Daily Mail* reports that the names Nur and Maryam have joined Muhammad in the list of most common names given to newborn babies in Great Britain. Muhammed (or some other variation of the name) is the most common name given to baby boys. The girl’s name Maryam is number 35. Nur is 29. Omar, Ali, and Ibrahim are all in the top 100. (Jihad Watch’s Robert Spencer asks, “What do British authorities think when they hear this news? What do they think Britain will be like in twenty or thirty years? Do they think that all these Muhammads will grow up to be upstanding, loyal British subjects...? Does it ever occur to them that some of them might end up embracing the ‘extremism’ that they are so confident that Muslims in Britain do not hold—despite the evidence of hundreds and hundreds of young Muslims leaving Britain to join the Islamic State?”) [68750]

In Cairo, Palestinian Authority President Mahmoud Abbas says, ““We will never recognize the Jewishness of the state of Israel. ...Return to negotiations is possible if Israel agrees to a full freeze of settlement [construction], including Jerusalem, release of the fourth group of long-term prisoners, and setting a timetable for negotiations, which will begin with setting borders.” According to RT.com, “Now Abbas is threatening all security relations with Israel will be cut unless peace negotiations that collapsed in April are revived. The Arab foreign ministers in Cairo are behind him in seeking Israel’s withdrawal beyond the pre-1967 lines, as well as the establishment of an independent Palestinian state. Israel has been refusing any negotiations lately on the grounds that Abbas will not disassociate himself from the Hamas militant group in a Palestinian unity government.” (Israel will never agree to a return to the pre-1967 “Auschwitz borders,” which would render it virtually defenseless.) [68977]