

## *The Obama Timeline – Part II*

### *The Doomed Presidency*

*September 2013*

On September 1 Bob Taylor writes at WashingtonTimes.com, “With congress due back in Washington on September 9, [Obama] is buying time to allow the rationale for a military strike [on Syria] to dissipate and, in the process, conceal his ineptitude. Obama’s decision is not that of a wise and thoughtful commander in chief. Rather it is a calculated, devious, self-serving manipulation of political power disguised as leadership. More troubling, however, is that it is indicative of a man paralyzed by weakness who is out of touch with reality. ...If the Obama administration is serious about violations against innocent victims and disrespect for human life, they should also be informing the American people about the horrors in Mali and Nigeria. Pictures of atrocities committed by the Boko Haram in Nigeria are so gruesome and disgusting that [images of] white sheets [covering chemical attack victims] are comforting by comparison. ...Sending [Secretary of State John] Kerry to do something [make the case for war] he should have done himself is demonstrative of Obama’s methodology. [Obama] made Kerry look foolish and, in the process, he also made a fool of himself. Unfortunately, [Obama] was oblivious to it. ...Under the best of circumstances, the Middle East is a muddle; a quagmire of confusion, misinformation, chaos and turmoil. Now it has become a wildfire burning out of control, and we are fighting it with a water pistol. ...For the moment, Obama’s weaknesses transcend politics on a scale that endangers the world. Playing golf may be a refuge, but it is not an answer.” [47807]

In *The Independent*, the reliably leftist Robert Fisk turns on Obama. Fisk writes, “Watershed. It’s the only word for it. Once Lebanon and Syria and Egypt trembled when Washington spoke. Now they laugh. It’s not just a question of what happened to the statesmen of the past. No one believed that [Prime Minister David] Cameron was Churchill or that the silly man in the White House [Obama] was Roosevelt—although Putin might make a rather good Stalin. It’s more a question of credibility; no one in the Middle East takes America seriously anymore. And you only had to watch Obama on Saturday [August 31] to see why. For there he was, prattling on in the most racist way about ‘ancient sectarian differences’ in the Middle East. Since when was [Obama] an expert on these supposed ‘sectarian differences?’ Constantly we are shown maps of the Arab world with Shiites and Sunnis and Christians colour-coded onto the nations which we generously bequeathed to the region after the First World War. But when is an American paper going to carry a colour-coded map of Washington or Chicago with black and white areas delineated by streets? But what was amazing was the sheer audacity of our leaders in thinking that they could yet again bamboozle their electorates with their lies and trumperies and tomfooleries.” [47939]

On MSNBC Congressman Alan Grayson (D-FL) says, “First, it’s not our responsibility [to go to war with Syria]. Secondly, whatever we do won’t actually accomplish anything

useful, third, it's expensive, and fourth, it's dangerous. It's simply not our responsibility. We're only one country out of 196 and we have our own problems to deal with and we're not the world's policeman, nor the world's judge, jury and executioner. ...I think there is substantial evidence that there was a chemical attack... [but] it doesn't change my mind about anything I've said though. I still think it's not our responsibility, it's expensive and it's dangerous and our attack won't do any good. I've yet to have anybody explain to me why our attacking Syria will take away their ability to take away any attack in the future. It won't. ...We haven't been attacked at all. Not a single American has been attacked during the course of this entire civil war. I think Americans understand that. Let's tend to our own garden." [48052]

Reuters notes that Russian President Vladimir Putin will have an opportunity to "turn the tables" on Obama at the G20 Summit meetings in St. Petersburg on September 5 and 6. "[A]t a G8 summit in Northern Ireland in June, Putin was isolated over his backing for Syrian President Bashar al-Assad and scowled his way through talks with Obama, who later likened him to a 'bored kid in the back of the classroom.' Putin has ignored the jibe and stood his ground over Assad, dismissing Obama's allegations that Syrian government forces carried out a chemical weapons attack on August 21. Buoyed by growing pressure on the U.S., French and British leaders over Syria, the former KGB spy has also now hit back in comments referring ironically to Obama as a Nobel Peace laureate and portraying U.S. global policy as a failure. 'We need to remember what's happened in the last decade, the number of times the United States has initiated armed conflicts in various parts of the world. Has it solved a single problem?' Putin asked reporters on Saturday in the city of Vladivostok. ...Putin also seems intent on taking a swipe at Obama, who pulled out of a Russia-U.S. summit that was planned for this week after Moscow defied Washington by granting former U.S. spy agency contractor Edward Snowden a year's asylum." [47809]

Joseph Curl writes at WashingtonTimes.com, "Make no mistake: [Obama] couldn't care less about the plight of Syrians, the 1,500 gassed to death—including nearly 500 children. It's all about 2014. Win the House [of Representatives for the Democrats], reign supreme. ...The conventional wisdom is, as usual, wrong. Losing the congressional vote [on Syria] won't be an embarrassment for [Obama], as all the talking heads are still parroting. A loss would be a double win. First, because a 'No' vote would allow the foreign policy neophyte to walk away from his blundering 'red line' declaration on chemical weapons ('I wanted to go in, but Congress said no'). And second, should Republicans who voted for the Iraq and Afghanistan wars now oppose Syria, [Obama] would be armed with clear 'evidence' that their opposition is purely political. Keep in mind: [Obama] knows no way to campaign other than to blame others. He'll batter Republicans for all of 2014 as obstructionists should they be the reason the effort fails. ...[P]olls find 80 percent of Americans want Congress to decide, and nearly half oppose intervention. So [Obama]—hoping to appear magnanimous—declares he'll seek authorization (read: share the blame). ...Whatever happens, this much is clear: We're no longer talking about the IRS targeting tea party groups, the Justice Department tapping reporters' phone lines, the NSA's surveillance programs, Benghazi. [Obama] has smartly changed the subject to the most important decision a commander in chief makes: war.

And the most presidential. That, he knows, will play better in the midterm elections, whichever way Congress votes.” [47811]

At GlobalResearch.ca, Yossef Bodansky, Senior Editor, GIS/Defense & Foreign Affairs, writes, “There is a growing volume of new evidence from numerous sources in the Middle East—mostly affiliated with the Syrian opposition and its sponsors and supporters—which makes a very strong case, based on solid circumstantial evidence, that the August 21, 2013, chemical strike in the Damascus suburbs was indeed a pre-meditated provocation by the Syrian opposition. The extent of US foreknowledge of this provocation needs further investigation because available data puts the ‘horror’ of the Barack Obama White House in a different and disturbing light. On August 13–14, 2013, Western-sponsored opposition forces in Turkey started advance preparations for a major and irregular military surge. Initial meetings between senior opposition military commanders and representatives of Qatari, Turkish, and US Intelligence [‘Mukhabarat Amriki’] took place at the converted Turkish military garrison in Antakya, Hatay Province, used as the command center and headquarters of the Free Syrian Army (FSA) and their foreign sponsors. Very senior opposition commanders who had arrived from Istanbul briefed the regional commanders of an imminent escalation in the fighting due to ‘a war-changing development’ which would, in turn, lead to a US-led bombing of Syria. The opposition forces had to quickly prepare their forces for exploiting the US-led bombing in order to march on Damascus and topple the Bashar al-Assad Government, the senior commanders explained. The Qatari and Turkish intelligence officials assured the Syrian regional commanders that they would be provided with plenty of weapons for the coming offensive. ...The descriptions of these meetings raise the question of the extent of foreknowledge of US Intelligence, and therefore, the Obama White House. All the sources consulted—both Syrian and Arab—stressed that officials of the ‘Mukhabarat Amriki’ actively participated in the meetings and briefings in Turkey. Therefore, at the very least, they should have known that the opposition leaders were anticipating ‘a war-changing development’: that is, a dramatic event which would provoke a US-led military intervention.” [47875, 47928, 48027]

According to Bodansky, “Some of the evidence touted by the Obama White House is questionable at best. A small incident in Beirut raises big questions. A day after the chemical attack, Lebanese fixers working for the ‘Mukhabarat Amriki’ succeeded to convince a Syrian male who claimed to have been injured in the chemical attack to seek medical aid in Beirut in return for a hefty sum that would effectively settle him for life. The man was put into an ambulance and transferred overnight to the Farhat Hospital in Jib Janine, Beirut. The Obama White House immediately leaked friendly media that ‘the Lebanese Red Cross announced that test results found traces of sarin gas in his blood.’ However, this was news to Lebanese intelligence and Red Cross officials. According to senior intelligence officials, ‘Red Cross Operations Director George Kettaneh told [them] that the injured Syrian fled the hospital before doctors were able to test for traces of toxic gas in his blood.’ Apparently, the patient declared that he had recovered from his nausea and no longer needed medical treatment. The Lebanese security forces are still searching for the Syrian patient and his honorarium. ...Several Syrian leaders, many of whom are not Bashar al-Assad supporters and are even his sworn enemies, are now convinced that

the Syrian opposition is responsible for the August 21, 2013, chemical attack in the Damascus area in order to provoke the US and the allies into bombing Assad's Syria. Most explicit and eloquent is Saleh Muslim, the head of the Kurdish Democratic Union Party (PYD) which has been fighting the Syrian Government. Muslim doubts Assad would have used chemical weapons when he was winning the civil war. ...And there remain the questions: Given the extent of the involvement of the 'Mukhabarat Amriki' in opposition activities, how is it that US Intelligence did not know in advance about the opposition's planned use of chemical weapons in Damascus? It is a colossal failure. And if they did know and warned the Obama White House, why then the sanctimonious rush to blame the Assad Administration? Moreover, how can the Obama Administration continue to support and seek to empower the opposition which had just intentionally killed some 1,300 innocent civilians in order to provoke a US military intervention?" [47875, 47928, 48027]

WashingtonPost.com reports, "The Obama administration's request for U.S. military intervention in Syria would not pass the Congress as written because it is too broad, a senior senator said Sunday after a classified briefing on the situation." Senator Patrick Leahy (D-VT) "told reporters after the meeting that the resolution seeking military force is 'too open ended' as written. 'I know it will be amended in the Senate,' he said. Leahy's comments echoed the views of dozens of lawmakers who left the briefing and said they want to see the resolution more closely resemble ...Obama's own pledge that any strike be limited in scope." After a briefing of members of Congress by the administration, Congressman Scott Rigell (R-VA), "who led the push to force a congressional vote on military intervention, said '80 percent' of the skeptics in the room doubted that a limited strike would achieve any clear result and might instead lead to bad consequences. 'There is more a question of,' he said, 'is this the right approach?'" Congressman Scott DesJarlais (R-TN) says, "I'm just not sure the case has been clearly made." Congressman Dennis Ross (R-FL) comments, "It's interesting that [Obama] hasn't made Congress relevant at all in his administration until now. So if we don't approve it [Syrian action] he might consider us irrelevant again and do what he wants to do." [47815]

Secretary of State John Kerry—looking remarkably unlike himself because of extensive plastic surgery—makes the rounds of the Sunday television talk shows to drum up support for U.S. military action against Syria, but many believe his efforts will come up short of results. At FoxNews.com Howard Kurtz comments, "Kerry seemed dutiful and workmanlike, repeating the same talking points without much enthusiasm and often averting his gaze from the camera. People should be 'celebrating' Obama's decision to seek congressional approval, said Kerry, who hardly appeared in a celebratory mood. ...Kerry, not surprisingly, ran into a buzzsaw of skeptical questioning. 'Do you feel undermined? Do you feel the United States has undermined its leverage in the world?' David Gregory asked [on *Meet the Press*]. 'This isn't 'CSI.' This isn't a civics lesson. People's lives are at stake,' Chris Wallace said [on *Fox News Sunday*]. 'They already declared victory in Syria this morning, the Assad regime,' said [*This Week's*] George Stephanopoulos, who also spoke of the chances of 'getting sucked into a wider war.' Kerry was in the awkward position of repeatedly insisting he didn't have to address the possibility of a congressional rejection because that was not going to happen. But the

truth is it remains an open question—and Obama has had little success in getting his way on most issues.” Kerry—who enjoyed dinner with Bashar al-Assad in 2009, met with him at least six times, was one of his biggest “fans,” and, along with Hillary Clinton, considered him “moderate”—calls Obama’s willingness to seek Congressional permission to attack Syria “courageous.” (Meanwhile, Obama, Vice President Joe Biden, and Chief of Staff Denis McDonough make telephone calls to Senators and Congressmen to urge support for a military strike on Syria.) [47816, 47822, 47825, 47832, 47850, 47868, 48166]

On *Meet the Press*, Senator Rand Paul (R-KY) states, “I think it’s a mistake to get involved in the Syrian civil war. And what I would ask John Kerry is, you know, he’s famous for saying, you know, ‘how can you ask a man to be the last one to die for a mistake?’ I would ask John Kerry, how can you ask a man to be the first one to die for a mistake? I would ask John Kerry, do you think that it’s less likely or more likely that chemical weapons will be used again if we bomb Assad? I will ask him if it’s more likely or less likely that we’ll have more refugees in Jordan or that Israel might suffer attack. I think all of the bad things you can imagine are all more likely if we get involved in the Syrian civil war. ... Well, the one thing I would say that I’m proud of [Obama] for is that he’s coming to Congress in a constitutional manner and asking for our authorization. That’s what he ran on. His policy was that no president should unilaterally go to war without congressional authority. And I’m proud that he’s sticking by it. But you ask John Kerry whether or not he’ll stick by the decision of Congress, and I believe he waffled on that and wobbled and wasn’t exactly concrete that they would. But absolutely if Congress votes this down, we should not be involved in the Syrian war. And I think it’s at least 50/50 whether the House will vote down involvement in the Syrian war.” [47817]

Paul continues, “I think the Senate will rubber stamp what [Obama] wants, but I think the House will be [a] much closer vote. And there are a lot of questions we have to ask. I think it’s pretty apparent there was a chemical attack. But we now have to ask, are we going to go after chemical weapons with our bombing? Everything I read says that we’re unlikely to bomb chemical sites because of the potential for civilian damage and civilian loss of life. The other question is all of the bad things that are going on, one of the bad things going on is that hundreds of thousands of people have gone into Jordan as refugees. If we begin a bombing campaign in Syria, I think that accelerates—it accelerates the misery. If we get involved, you know, people say, well 100,000 people have died, we must act. Well, if our weapons get involved and we get involved, do you think more people will die or less [sic; fewer] people? I think the war may escalate out of control. And then we have to ask ourselves who is on America’s side over there? If the rebels win, will they be American allies? Assad’s definitely not an American ally. But I’m not convinced anybody on the Islamic side, the Islamic rebels will be American allies.” [47817]

At AtlasShrugs.com Pamela Geller writes, “On Friday, in a speech [Obama] should have given, underling John Kerry made a fierce, passionate case for taking military action in Syria. The weak and feckless Obama was unwilling to employ his endless flapping

tongue to explain to the American people as to why he was going alone to back up Al Qaeda and Muslim Brotherhood forces in Syria. ...Less than a day later, in a stunning failure of leadership, Obama reversed his position and said he would seek Congressional approval. And as urgent as the matter was just 24 hours prior, it wasn't pressing enough to summon Congress back for a vote [or keep Obama from playing golf after his statement]. No, Obama insisted they enjoy their vacation (something he does know a thing or two about) and return at their regular scheduled time—September 9th. Astounding. Iran and Syria are calling this 'the start of the historic American retreat.' Actually it began years ago under Obama. The turnover of political power to the Taliban, the complete pull-out from Iraq, the decimation of our military. But this latest piece of theater of the absurd will do incalculable damage to America's credibility and standing in the world. Is Obama a master at dismantling American hegemony and destroying America's standing in the world, or an incompetent idiot? Diabolical or stupid? One thing is certain: Iran will not worry about any American response to their nuclear weapons program from a toothless Obama." [47824]

Former Congressman Ron Paul writes, "...Obama announced this weekend that he has decided to use military force against Syria and would seek authorization from Congress when it returned from its August break. Every Member ought to vote against this reckless and immoral use of the US military. I disagree with the idea that every conflict, every dictator, and every insurgency everywhere in the world is somehow critical to our national security. That is the thinking of an empire, not a republic. It is the kind of thinking that [Obama] shares with his predecessor and it is bankrupting us and destroying our liberties here at home. ...Any chemical attack, particularly one that kills civilians, is horrible and horrendous," [and] "all deaths in war and violence are terrible and should be condemned. But why are a few hundred killed by chemical attack any worse or more deserving of US bombs than the 100,000 already killed in the conflict? For that matter, why are the few hundred civilians killed in Syria by a chemical weapon any worse than the 2,000-3,000 who have been killed by Obama's drone strikes in Pakistan? Does it really make a difference whether a civilian is killed by poison gas or by drone missile or dull knife?" [47826]

On CNN's *State of the Union*, former presidential adviser David Gergen—who has typically been very generous in his comments about Obama—says, "I think the bigger risk, what [Obama] has to work on here, is that you can say it's wise to call for the Congress to do this [approve a strike on Syria], but the way he went about it, it was so jerky and unpredictable, that I think it's raised questions about just how firm a grip he has on the wheel as a commander in chief. I mean, after all, starting with the drawing of the red line itself, which seemed to be sort of almost 'by the way, it's a red line,' as opposed to a well thought-out plan, and now we have no apparent strategy for long term in the Middle East. ...[Obama] need[s] to be seen in control of events and sort of guiding events, and not just reacting or bouncing around." [47828]

Protestors gather outside Secretary of State John Kerry's home, shouting "Hands off Syria!" [47867]

On September 2 Walter Todd Huston writes at Breitbart.com, “In what is being reported as a surprise move, the 40,000 members of the International Longshore and Warehouse Union (ILWU) announced that they have formally ended their association with the AFL-CIO, one of the nation’s largest private sector unions. The Longshoremen cited Obamacare and immigration reform as two important causes of their disaffiliation. ...The ILWU President [Robert McEllrath] made it clear they are for a single-payer, nationalized healthcare policy and are upset with the AFL-CIO for going along with Obama on the confiscatory tax on their ‘Cadillac’ healthcare plan.” [47830, 47831, 47866]

Meanwhile, TheHill.com reports, “Unions are frustrated the Obama administration hasn’t responded to their calls for changes to ObamaCare. Labor has watched with growing annoyance as the White House has backed ObamaCare changes in response to concerns from business groups, religious organizations and even lawmakers and their staffs. They say they don’t understand why their concerns so far have fallen on deaf ears. ...Most unions backed ObamaCare’s passage, but labor argues provisions in the law could cut employee hours, unfairly tax their plans and force workers off their union health plans into the law’s potentially more costly insurance exchanges. ...Unions want the administration to change ObamaCare so that those plans are treated as qualified health plans that can earn tax subsidies. Under the administration’s interpretation of the law, the multi-employer [union] plans are not eligible for the subsidies. Without those subsidies, employers may have the incentive to drop the plans and force workers onto the insurance exchanges.” [47845]

MyJoyOnline.com reports, “30,000 scientists, including the founder of The Weather Channel, have come forward to sue former US Vice President Al Gore for fraud, alleging that he made massive profits in the promotion of the global warming mythology. They scientists are hoping the lawsuit will finally give the thousands of ‘dissenting’ scientists a voice again.” [48597, 48774, 48775, 48776, 48777]

On CNN’s *New Day*, Congressman Alan Grayson (D-FL) says, “There’s [sic] only four countries in the world that have chemical weapons. The largest of the four is the United States. So are we trying to send a message to ourselves? That’s not logical. ...We are not the world’s policeman. We can’t afford this anymore, these military adventures that lead us into wars that last for a decade or more. It’s wrong. We need to cut it off before it even happens.” [47837]

According to WorldTribune.com, Obama “has encountered vigorous resistance from the military to his plans to attack Syria. Administration sources said the Joint Chiefs of Staff as well as many in the U.S. military command have opposed Obama’s directive to prepare for imminent air strikes on the regime of President Bashar Assad. The sources said the opposition within the military and the Defense Department has warned of retaliation by Iran and Syria against U.S. interests throughout the Middle East and Africa. [Obama] has been told point blank that this could be the start of a military intervention

that could take months or even a year until there is any resolution,’ a source who has been following the debate said. The sources said the biggest opponent of a military campaign against Syria has been the chairman of the Joint Chief of Staff, Gen. Martin Dempsey. They said Dempsey, who sought to maintain a low profile, has warned that the U.S. military was not ready for any sustained conflict against Syria that could involve two of its leading allies, Iran and Russia. ‘Dempsey has been unusually blunt in his remarks with both Obama and Vice President Joe Biden,’ the source said. ‘His assessment is that any U.S. war against Assad will automatically involve his foreign allies, and that means Teheran [Iran] and to a smaller extent, Moscow.’ [47838]

A DontFundIt.com petition calling for the de-funding of ObamaCare reaches one million signatures. [47839]

At CommentaryMagazine.com, Peter Wehner calls Obama “staggeringly incompetent,” and asks, “Why didn’t [Obama] seek congressional authority before the administration began to beat the war drums this past week? Did the idea not occur to him? It’s not as if this is an obscure issue. ...[Obama] didn’t seek congressional approval for his military strike in Libya. Why does he believe he needs it in Syria? ...Obama, in his Rose Garden statement on Saturday [August 31], still insisted he has the authority to strike Syria without congressional approval. So what happens if Congress votes down a use-of-force resolution? Does [he] strike Syria anyway? If so, will it be an evanescent bombing, intended to be limited in scope and duration, while doing nothing to change the war’s balance of power? Or does [Obama] completely back down? Does he even know? Has he thought through in advance *anything* related to Syria? Or is this a case of Obama simply making it up as he goes along? ...This latest *volte-face* by [Obama] is evidence of a man who is completely overmatched by events, weak and confused, and deeply ambivalent about using force. Yet he’s also desperate to get out of the corner he painted himself into by declaring that the use of chemical weapons by the Assad regime would constitute a ‘red line.’ As a result he’s gone all Hamlet on us. Not surprisingly, Obama’s actions are being mocked by America’s enemies and sowing doubt among our allies.” By now seeking Congressional approval for a strike, Obama “is preparing in advance to shift the blame if his strike on Syria proves to be unpopular and ineffective. He’s furious about the box he’s placed himself in, he hates the ridicule he’s (rightly) incurring, but he doesn’t see any way out. What he does see is a political (and geopolitical) disaster in the making. And so what is emerging is what comes most naturally to Mr. Obama: Blame shifting and blame sharing. Remember: [Obama] doesn’t believe he needs congressional authorization to act. He’s ignored it before. He wants it now. For reasons of political survival. To put it another way: He wants the fingerprints of others on the failure in Syria. Rarely has an American president joined so much cynicism with so much ineptitude.” (Obama may not be entirely inept; he may also be crafty. By dumping the Syrian issue on the lap of Congress, Obama gives the GOP-controlled House less time to discuss ways to thwart his agenda through the debt ceiling and budget issues. Obama may simply be hoping that Congress does not have the time or the desire to fight him on spending issues when they are worried about war issues.) [47840, 47853]



Senator John McCain (R-AZ) says, “The consequences [of Congress not giving Obama the authority to strike Syria] would be catastrophic because it would undermine the credibility of the United States of America and [Obama’s]. None of us want that.” (McCain is mistaken. Obama has already undermined the nation’s credibility and his own.) [47841]

Secretary of State John Kerry, urging House Democrats to vote to support military action against Syria, claims the nation faces a “Munich moment.” (Politico, HotAir.com, *The Obama Timeline*—and probably everyone else who is aware of the 1938 Munich agreement between Adolph Hitler and British Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain—have no idea why Kerry made the bizarre and unsupportable reference.) [47864]

Editor-at-large Ben Shapiro writes at Breitbart.com, “In a display of utter political incoherence, ...Obama plans to meet with lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender advocates in Russia while visiting the Kremlin, even as he attempts to lobby Russian President Vladimir Putin for support on an international military action against Syria. Russian opposition to American intervention in Syria has been a major factor in Obama’s decision to seek approval from Congress for military action in Syria.” [47843, 47877]

In an interview with *Le Figaro*, Syrian President Bashar al-Assad states, “Whoever accuses [us of using chemical weapons] must provide proof. We have challenged the United States and France to provide the slightest proof. ...Obama and [French president François] Hollande have been incapable [of doing so] even to their own people. ...Supposing our army wishes to use weapons of mass destruction. Is it possible that it would do so in a zone where it is located and where [our own] soldiers were wounded by these arms, as United Nations inspectors have noted during visits to hospitals where they were treated? Where is the logic? ...Nobody knows what will happen [if Obama strikes Syria]. Everyone will lose control of the situation when the powder keg explodes. Chaos and extremism will spread. The risk of a regional war exists. ...If Obama was strong, he would have said publicly: ‘We have no evidence of the use of chemical weapons by the Syrian State.’ He would have said publicly: ‘The only way to proceed is through UN investigations. We therefore refer everything to the Security Council.’ But Obama is weak because he is facing pressure from within the United States. ...We are fighting terrorists. Eighty to 90 per cent of those we are fighting belong to al-Qaeda. They are not interested in reform or in politics. The only way to deal with them is to annihilate them. Only then will we be able to talk about political measures.” [47847, 47865]

More than a few military experts claim that launching a few dozen Tomahawk missiles at Syria will be ineffective. At WahsingtonTimes.com Kristina Wong writes, “Most cruise missiles have no ‘bunker busting’ capabilities and are less effective against mobile targets, military analysts note. And Pentagon officials have said that chemical weapons stockpiles would not be targeted to avoid the inadvertent release of poisonous gas. Retired Air Force Lt. Gen. David A. Deptula, who planned the air attack phase of 1991’s Desert Storm operation against Iraq, noted the limited sites in Syria that could be targeted effectively by cruise missiles. ‘There’s an infinite number of launchers and ways to

deliver chemical weapons. These can be delivered by rockets of which they have thousands, and artillery shells of which they have thousands. All of this has already been dispersed in multiple hidden locations, so you're not going to have any impact on [President Bashar al-Assad's] means to apply these weapons,' said Gen. Deptula, who directed thousands of air attacks on Iraq for 43 days in 1991. 'You're not going to get his attention with a token strike with a handful of cruise missiles on a bunch of launchers. I mean, that's laughable,' Gen. Deptula said. 'Assad and his military have so many different means of delivering these weapons, that a strike with a bunch of cruise missiles, even if it's in the hundreds, is not going to make a significant impact.' ...Syria is believed to possess several hundred short- and intermediate-range ballistic missiles that can carry chemical warheads, according to a recent report by the Congressional Research Service. In addition, the Assad regime has other ways to deliver chemical payloads, including several thousand aerial bombs, cruise missiles, fighter bombers, multiple rocket launchers and artillery tubes, according to Globalsecurity.org." [47851]

Anthony H. Cordesman, the Arleigh A. Burke Chair in Strategy at the Center for Strategic and International Studies, writes, "When Samuel Beckett wrote 'Waiting for Godot,' he was not writing an instruction manual on strategy for American Presidents. Unfortunately, however, that seems to be the instruction manual ...Obama has read. He has suddenly transformed a rushed call for immediate action into a waiting game where it is not clear what he or the U.S. is waiting for, and where much of the action may come to border on tragicomedy. ...[Obama] set poorly defined red lines for Syrian use of chemical weapons, but does not seem to have prepared any contingency plans for what would happen if they were used on a level the U.S. and the world could not ignore. In spite of what various U.S. and British officials have said was 10 to 14 previous uses of chemical weapons, the Administration had no apparent plan to act if the red lines were crossed beyond the point the world could not ignore or to then make its case to the American people, Congress, and the world. The Administration doesn't seem to have created contingency plans with its allies, prepared joint plans for military action it was ready to explain and defend, or to have laid the groundwork for releasing intelligence data. Instead, our British ally released one intelligence report talking about 'at least 350 fatalities.' Secretary [of State John] Kerry was sandbagged into using an absurdly over-precise number like 1,429 dead (of which an equally precise 426 were children); [a] number which seem[s] to have been taken from an unreliable Syrian source called the Local Coordination Committees and which did not agree with other Syrian opposition sources like the Syrian Observatory for Human Rights. ...The rhetoric Secretary Kerry and [Obama] used initially in rushing towards action needed to be more measured, tuned better to international ears, and to openly address the key issue no senior official has yet touched upon: what happens in Syria and the region after the U.S. strikes—if the U.S. strikes. Instead, the Administration first rushed into the kind of rhetoric you only use if you actually intend to act regardless of domestic and international support." [47860, 47861]

"We now face the inevitable reaction. [Obama's] decisions have reinforced all of the doubts about American strength, and our willingness to act, of both our friends and foes. We now have ten days of confusion and uncertainty to deal with, and then Congress will

be evidently be asked to act only on a strike tailored to deter the future use of chemical weapons. It will still lack a meaningful plan for dealing with the Syrian civil war and its impact on the region. ...[Obama] needs to show real leadership, not overreaction, sudden reversal, and uncertainty. We need [Obama] to shape a broad policy for the Syrian civil war even more than we need a far clearer policy for preventing the use of chemical weapons. More broadly, we need leadership to deal with Iran, its moves towards nuclear weapons and any new options created by Iran's election. We need clear decisions over how the U.S. will deal with Afghanistan as it pulls out its combat troops. We need a clear definition of what 'rebalancing' in Asia really means. We need a clear concept for our future national security posture and spending, and our defense strategy, rather than a food fight over defense spending alone. This is the 21st century. It is not a play and we cannot wait for Godot." [47860, 47861]

On MSNBC Congressman Charles Rangel (D-NY) says, "I love Obama, and you'll never find a truer Democrat than me, but this whole idea of... drawing lines saying that if any country does something, that he considers wrong, that the nation is going to war, it's unheard of—drawing a red line. So, of course, it's embarrassing. I wish it didn't happen. ...I guess Secretary [of State John] Kerry is even more embarrassed than me after making his emotional speech about this was urgent [sic]. And clearly, as I said earlier, I couldn't see anything urgent about it, and I'm glad [Obama] reviewed his thinking and he is going to give us time to discuss it." [47869]

Alalam.ir reports, "Al-Qaeda linked terrorists in Syria have beheaded all 24 Syrian passengers traveling from Tartus to Ras al-Ain in northeast of Syria, among them a mother and a 40-days old infant. Gunmen from the terrorist Islamic State of Iraq and Levant stopped the bus on the road in Talkalakh and killed everyone before setting the bus on fire. According to media reports, the attack was carried out because the passengers, who were from three different villages in Ras al-Ain, supported anti-terrorist Kurdish groups which were formed recently to defend Kurdish population against anti-Syria terrorists. Bodies of a mother and her 40-days infant were also seen among the dead, which were recognized by their relatives. Syrian Kurdish leader Saleh Muslim warned on Friday that the Kurd minority is facing an ethnic cleansing by al-Qaeda terrorists. While there is no end in sight to the bloody foreign-fueled conflict in Syria, another front has been formed between the Kurdish militia and extremist militants in Northern Syria. Al-Qaeda-affiliated terrorist groups operating in the country, including the al-Nusra Front, are trying to capture Kurdish territories and make them part of a state they want to create in the region." (In assisting the ill-defined "rebels" fighting the regime of Bashar al-Assad, Obama is also aiding al-Qaeda—which infiltrated groups fighting Assad.) [47911, 47937]

On September 3 author Ann Coulter appears on *Fox & Friends* and says, "Surprisingly enough, even *The New York Times*' headline on this was, '[Obama] drags Congress into box of his own making.' I mean, what Republicans ought to be able to vote on in Congress is whether they can invent a time machine, go back and not have Obama issue an ultimatum on chemical weapons. But I'm really enjoying seeing all these liberals—the

utter, utter blinding hypocrisy of them complaining about this chemical weapons attack. Saddam Hussein killed 10 times as many people with chemical weapons—5,000 Kurds, his own Kurds, in a single day and now suddenly, ‘Oh now we must be the country that stops these genocides.’ ... We’re talking about our national security and him being the commander-in-chief and this is just a political game for them. No, you cannot trust Democrats with—to be commander in chief. And Americans remember that when you vote for a president. They cannot take national security seriously. We do not intervene in countries to make America safer. I mean, there were 20 reasons to take out Saddam Hussein, and by the way could you imagine if he were around now in the middle of this conflagration? ... I mean the entire world—they used to say under Bush, ‘Oh the world hates us, hates us.’ Now the world is laughing at us. Can you imagine what [Russian President Vladimir] Putin thinks of this guy? What will happen if he intervenes and there is an attack on Israel, or who knows where the attack could come? By the way, these chemical weapons came from Iraq. They made such a big deal of Donald Rumsfeld meeting with Saddam Hussein 20 years earlier. [But] We weren’t writing puff pieces in Vogue about Saddam Hussein as we did about Assad.” [47859]

At Spectator.org Jed Babbin writes, “For a few days ... Obama almost had us convinced. Not that we should use military force to punish Syria, but that he actually was going to take responsibility for something. But Saturday’s sudden announcement shocked even those closest to Obama. Instead of just attacking Syria, Obama decided to ask Congress for another ‘authorization for the use of military force’ (AUMF). Which means that, as he has on everything from Obamacare to Benghazi, Obama chose to let someone else take responsibility for his actions. ... To Obama we have a duty to punish Syria that arises not from an American national security interest in the Syrian civil war but from some moral calculation that floats above national concerns. He wants a ‘shot across the bow’ for Assad to warn him that if he continued to gas his people we’d do something else. Or not. ... The Obama/Kerry justification for action against Syria is nothing more than the old liberal nostrum, ‘responsibility to protect.’ Under R2P, the United States—in the absence of any national security threat to it—shoulders the responsibility to protect other nations’ civilians from their government’s depredations. Obama has tried to evolve that into another R2P, ‘a responsibility to punish.’ America, according to Obama, seeks only to repaint the ‘red line’ Obama naively drew when last year he told Assad that if Assad used chemical weapons on his own people, it would change the ‘calculus’ of Obama’s thinking. ... R2P, under Obama’s formulation or any other, has nothing to do with U.S. national security. The only reason for America to use its military power is to respond to or prevent an attack on us or our allies. To state the obvious, we have no duty to protect Syrians or residents of any nation that isn’t a real ally such as Israel (and to the exclusion of almost everyone else). May Obama have the same luck as British Prime Minister David Cameron, who—submitting a war resolution to Parliament last week—became the first Brit PM to be turned down since 1782.” [47973]

Speaker of the House John Boehner (R-OH) tells reporters he supports military action against Syria. House Minority Leader Nancy Pelosi (D-CA) says, “Weapons of mass destruction, deterring their use, is a pillar of our national security. He [Assad] crossed the line... Obama didn’t draw the red line, humanity did.” (Pelosi did not say, “We have to

support the rebels in Syria in order to find out who they are.”) It is worth noting that Pelosi met with Bashar al-Assad in Syria in 2007 and said, “We came in friendship, hope, and determined that the road to Damascus is a road to peace.” A prominent Egyptian blogger told AtlasShrugs.com, “[T]he day after Pelosi’s visits there were immediate arrests of Syrian activists. That was the fruit she yielded. ‘Oh the Americans came over and they said they have a different foreign policy and they’re more interested in placating Bashar’s ego.’ And he went out and [arrested] everyone he wanted because he knew he had an ally in Washington that wouldn’t pressure him as much. ... The moment Bush won again [in 2004] that’s when [Egyptian President Hosni] Mubarak said maybe we should have democracy because Bush didn’t go away. And had Bush gone away there wouldn’t be democracy right now... like there wouldn’t be two years of freedom and fresh air that we were able to breathe and that we’ve had.” (That is, Syria—as well as Egypt and other nations—felt freer to abuse the rights of their citizens after Obama replaced George W. Bush. They may not have liked Bush, but they respected him and his power. They neither respected nor feared Obama.) [47852, 47941, 47942]

DCClothesline.com and other web sites cite an Egyptian media report that claims Obama is a member of the Muslim Brotherhood. (As noted previously in this *Timeline*, Saad al-Shater, son of imprisoned Muslim Brotherhood leader Khairat a-Shater, told reporters in August his father had evidence that would put Obama in prison. Additionally, a U.S. delegation that included Senators John McCain (R-AZ) and Lindsey Graham (R-SC) and U.S. Deputy Secretary of State William Burns went to Cairo—some say for the purpose of gaining the release of al-Shater and preventing the release of information that would damage Obama. Why McCain and Graham would go out of their way to save Obama is not clear.) [47211, 47250, 47343, 47350, 47441, 47513, 47854, 47862, 47879, 47893]

*The Times* of London reports, “British military chiefs are being ejected from US meetings about Syria in the first direct consequence of [Prime Minister] David Cameron’s refusal to join military action. The role of senior British officers based at US Central Command in Tampa, Florida, has been downgraded because they cannot be trusted with high-level intelligence about a conflict with which they are no longer involved, military sources say.” (*The Times* incorrectly blames Cameron. In fact, Cameron was ready to join forces with Obama against Syria but was voted down by the House of Commons. Cameron did not “refuse” anything.) [47855, 47938]

*The Telegraph* reports, “A former US army chief has claimed that Barack Obama is eyeing intervention in Syria that would go beyond a mere deterrent against chemical weapons to damage the military capacity of the Assad regime. General Jack Keane, a former vice chief of staff of the US Army, told BBC Radio 4 that he had spoken to senior Republican senators who had been briefed by the US president on Monday, and had been assured that ... Obama planned to do significant damage to the forces of Bashar al-Assad. The Obama administration has previously said that military strikes would not be aimed at toppling Assad’s government nor altering the balance of the conflict. Instead, the White House has suggested, they would be intended to punish Assad for the alleged gas attack in Damascus on Aug 21 and to reinstate Washington’s ‘red line’ against the use of

chemical weapons. But Gen. Keane said he understood ...Obama was planning a more substantial intervention in Syria than had previously been thought, with increased support for the opposition forces, including training from US troops. He said the plans could involve ‘much more substance than we were led to believe.’” [48856]

Secretary of State John Kerry appears before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to discuss the prospect of military intervention in Syria. Senator Bob Menendez (D-NJ) ask Kerry if the Obama administration would officially rule out U.S. military “boots on the ground” in Syria. Kerry responds, “It would be preferable not to, not because there is any intention or any plan or any desire whatsoever to have boots on the ground, but, in the event that Syria imploded, or in the event there was a threat of a chemical weapons cache falling into the hands of” the wrong people, ‘then clearly [it is] in the interest of our allies ...to prevent those weapons of mass destruction falling into the hands of the worst elements. I don’t want to take that off the table an option that might or might not be available to [Obama].” (In other words, Obama cannot and will not guarantee that the situation will not escalate and require U.S. ground troops in Syria. It is worth noting that the Japanese did not have “boots on the ground” on December 7, 1941.) Pressed on his answer by Senator Bob Corker (R-TN), Kerry says, “There will not be American boots on the ground with respect to the civil war.” (Arguably, that response is evasive, because Kerry can later claim that U.S. troops were not sent in “with respect to the civil war” but because of the use of chemical weapons or the situation growing beyond a civil war.) [47857]

Senator Rand Paul (R-KY) says to Kerry, “I want to be proud of [Obama]. ...Make me proud today, Secretary Kerry, stand up for us and say ‘we’re going obey the Constitution,’ and if we vote you down, which is unlikely,” the administration “wouldn’t go forward with strikes.” Kerry responds that Obama would not be disobeying the Constitution if he acts in Syria in opposition to the wishes of Congress. Paul reacts, “If we do not say explicitly that we will abide by this vote, you’re making a joke of us, you’re making us into theater... if this is real you will abide by the verdict of Congress. You’re probably going to win, so just go ahead and say it’s real. ...I don’t believe [Obama] has the constitutional authority... This power is a congressional power and it is not an executive power. They [the Founding Fathers who drafted the U.S. Constitution] didn’t say ‘big’ war, ‘small war,’ they didn’t say boots on the ground or not boots on the ground, they said [only Congress has the power to] declare war. Ask the people on the ships launching the missiles whether they’re involved in war or not.” [47858]

Asked by Senator Jeff Flake (R-AZ) what Obama would do if Congress does not authorize a military strike, Kerry responds, “Well, I can’t tell you what [Obama’s] going to do because he hasn’t told me. But [Obama], as you know, retains the authority, always has the authority, had the authority to strike before coming to Congress, and that doesn’t change.” (Kerry is incorrect. Obama has the legal authority to act military if the United States is attacked or faces an imminent threat—neither of which applies to the situation in Syria.) “But I’ll tell you what will happen, where it matters,” says Kerry. “In Pyongyang, in Tehran, in Damascus, folks will stand up and celebrate. And in a lot of other capitals in

parts of the world people will scratch their heads, and sign a sort of condolence for the loss of America's willingness to stand up and make itself felt where it makes a difference to the world. I think it would be an enormous setback to America's capacity and to our vision in the world, and certainly the role of leadership that we play." (This is the same John Kerry who opposed U.S. involvement in Vietnam and Iraq, arguing that the United States cannot be the policeman of the world. As Secretary of State, he is apparently eager to have Sheriff Obama pin a deputy badge on his lapel.) [47922]

Kerry, clearly unaware he is criticizing Obama, tells the Senators, "One of the reasons Assad has been using these materials is because they have, up until now, made the calculation that the West writ large and the United States particularly are not going to do anything about it. Impunity is already working to kill a lot of people and to make things more dangerous. I guarantee you that is in their assessment." (In other words, "Assad believes Obama to be all talk and no show and that he will not act on his threats.") [47928]

Senator Ron Johnson (R-WI) addresses Kerry, "This is more of an impression I have as opposed to any exact knowledge, but it seems like initially, the opposition [in Syria] was maybe more Western-leaning, more moderate, more democratic, and as time has gone by, it's degraded, become more infiltrated by al-Qaeda. Is that basically true?" Kerry responds, "No, that is—no, that is actually basically not true. It's basically incorrect. The opposition has increasingly become more defined by its moderation, more defined by the breadth of its membership and more defined by its adherence to some, you know, democratic process and to an all-inclusive, minority-protecting constitution, which will be broad-based and secular with respect to the future of Syria." (Kerry is mistaken—or lying. The opposition in Syria has become more radical, not more moderate, and it has most certainly been joined by al-Qaeda and other extremists who have flooded across the border to help oust Bashar al-Assad.) [47965]

During Kerry's appearance, anti-war protestors waving red-painted "bloody" hands are seated in the back of the room. Among them is Code Pink co-founder Medea Benjamin, who interrupts the proceedings with shouts of "Nobody wants this war... We don't want another war." Benjamin is removed from the room, and Kerry says, "You know, the first time I testified before this committee, when I was 27 years old, uh, I had feelings very similar to... that protester. And I would just say that is exactly why it is so important that we are all here having this debate, uh, talking about these things before the country, uh, and, and that the Congress itself will act representing the American people. And I think we can all respect those who have a different point of view." (Kerry hesitates before referring to Benjamin as "that protester," as if he was going to refer to her by name. Kerry, like Obama, is certainly familiar with Benjamin and her Code Pink co-founder, Jodie Evans—a friend of Viet Cong sympathizer Jane Fonda. Evans is one of Obama's major fundraisers and has met with him personally. As noted in Part I of *The Obama Timeline*, in 2004 the Code Pink anti-war group delivered \$600,000 in cash and supplies to Iraqi terrorists who were fighting U.S. troops in Fallujah; for that act Evans should be prosecuted for treason. Evans said in a June 2008 interview that Osama bin Laden had a

“valid argument” for the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001. Along with Benjamin, Evans met with Iran’s President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad in New York in September 2008. While in New York, Ahmadinejad gave a speech at Columbia University. His appearance was coordinated by long-time Obama friend Rashid Khalidi, and possibly encouraged by Zbigniew Brzezinski, an anti-Semite and Obama foreign policy advisor who taught international relations at Columbia University.) [104, 215, 220, 355, 395, 6160, 6163, 6322, 6481, 6523, 14760, 47896, 47925]

WhiteHouseDossier.com reports, “Even as ...Obama prepares to commit an act of war in Syria, the White House has scaled back the public questioning it will tolerate about what [Obama] is doing, holding only one televised briefing in the past seven days to justify [Obama’s] position to the American people. White House Press Secretary Jay Carney has all but disappeared, briefing reporters in any forum—televised or not—only once since holding an off-camera ‘gaggle’ aboard Air Force One August 10. ...It’s not clear why the self-proclaimed ‘openness White House’ has shut down regular public briefings. Press secretaries, who are prepped by experts from throughout the government, are supposed to be able to hold forth on sensitive issues. Americans are losing a chance to watch the press try to hold the White House accountable, and the White House is missing an opportunity to explain Obama’s shifting positions on Syria.” [47863]

CNSNews.com reminds readers: “One day before the U.N. Security Council in 2011 authorized military action against Libya, then-Senator [John] Kerry conceded that acting against the [Moammar] Gaddafi regime was not a ‘vital national security interest,’ but he argued strongly in favor of doing so, saying it would make a big difference to how Arabs view the United States. ‘You have different layers of interest,’ the then chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee said about intervening in the Libyan civil war. ‘Is it a vital national security interest? No. Is it existential to us? No. But I got [sic] news for you: Will it make a difference in the eyes of people throughout the Arab world about how they view us and a lot of other folks? Yes, profoundly, in my judgment.’” (Kerry was wrong. According to polls, the Arab world thinks less of the United States than it did in 2011. But even if interfering in Libya had “made more Muslims like us,” that is certainly not a Constitutionally acceptable justification for going to war.) [47871]

Radio talk show giant Rush Limbaugh discusses the possibility that al-Qaeda was responsible for the chemical attacks in Syria. Limbaugh notes a WorldTribune.com article by Yossed Bodansky, former director of the Congressional Task Force on Terrorism and Unconventional Warfare, in which Bodansky wrote, “There is a growing volume of new evidence from numerous sources in the Middle East—mostly affiliated with the Syrian opposition and its sponsors and supporters—which makes a very strong case, based on solid circumstantial evidence, that the Aug. 21 chemical strike in the Damascus suburbs was indeed a premeditated provocation by the Syrian opposition. The extent of U.S. foreknowledge of this provocation needs further investigation because available data puts the ‘horror’ of the Barack Obama White House in a different and disturbing light.” Limbaugh explains, “Al-Qaida was [purportedly] setting off chemical weapons on their own people... to create the situation where we take Bashar [al-Assad]



out for them because they can't do it themselves. ...If indeed this is a frame job, look how well it's being run. ...That template [for U.S. intervention] quickly came to life. It has all the energy in the world behind it. ...I'm just putting this out as a possibility. It's already out there. You know the old saying: 'We report; you decide.'" Limbaugh also notes, "The same deception... was used in Sarajevo in 1995 to provoke air strikes against the Serbs for the benefit of the Bosnian Muslims. In both cases, Muslims are involved. In both cases, Democrat Party presidents are involved. In both cases, Muslims conduct a deception, an operation of deception that we either are party to, lured into, or we are fooled by, one of the three." (Senator John McCain (R-AZ) and others claim that the rebels in Syria have no access to chemical weapons, but some chemical weapons formerly held by the Libyan regime before Obama attacked Moammar Gaddafi in 2011 are unaccounted for. McCain ignores the report of Syrian rebels caught on the Turkish-Syrian border with a 2kg cylinder full of sarin nerve gas. McCain ridicules anyone who believes al-Qaeda has access to chemical weapons; some might ridicule McCain for believing they do not.) [47624, 47814, 47844, 47872, 47873, 47874, 47875, 47876, 47880, 47889, 48067, 48256]

Making the rounds of the Internet is a YouTube.com video of a past statement by White House press secretary Jay Carney: "The fact of the matter is, he [Obama] has said, and I have said, many times—we are highly skeptical of suggestions that the Assad regime could have or did use chemical weapons. We find it highly likely that any type of chemical weapon use that has taken place in Syria was done by the opposition." (The video is not dated and there are suggestions that it may be a cleverly edited fake made up of various Carney statements.) [47881]

While Obama plans a military adventure in Syria, *The Independent* reports that his last adventure—in Libya—has left the country in chaos: "Libya has almost entirely stopped producing oil as the government loses control of much of the country to militia fighters. ...As world attention focused on the coup in Egypt and the poison gas attack in Syria over the past two months, Libya has plunged unnoticed into its worst political and economic crisis since the defeat of [Moammar] Gaddafi two years ago. Government authority is disintegrating in all parts of the country putting in doubt claims by American, British and French politicians that Nato's [sic; NATO's] military action in Libya in 2011 was an outstanding example of a successful foreign military intervention which should be repeated in Syria. In an escalating crisis little regarded hitherto outside the oil markets, output of Libya's prized high-quality crude oil has plunged from 1.4 million barrels a day earlier this year to just 160,000 barrels a day now. ...Though the [NATO] intervention against Gaddafi was justified as a humanitarian response to the threat that Gaddafi's tanks would slaughter dissidents in Benghazi, the international community has ignored the escalating violence. The foreign media, which once filled the hotels of Benghazi and Tripoli, have likewise paid little attention to the near collapse of the central government." (Obama was so eager to oust Gaddafi that he neglected to comprehend who and what might replace his regime; many Americans worry that he may be about to make the same mistake in Syria.) [47883]

At PJMedia.com David Spengler notes an Israeli report that “Minister Benjamin Netanyahu was about to order an attack on Iran in September 2012, but canceled the operation in response to U.S. pressure, the former head of Israel’s National Security Council said last month. Gen. Giora Eiland (retired) added that Israel ‘has a real ability to destroy Iran’s nuclear program,’ and that it is possible that the American veto was related to the presidential election then in progress. ...According to Eiland, the issue was raised at a meeting between Netanyahu and the Americans, who said that the planned attack was out of the question for them, which led to its cancellation. Since the cancellation of the planned attack, Iran’s nuclear program has continued to progress. Today, argues Eiland, Israel again faces a difficult choice. ‘Time has passed and we stand before exactly the same decision, with less time.’ He added, ‘The lack of resolution is dramatic.’” (Obama apparently feels he has an obligation to prevent the Syrian regime from using chemical weapons, but no such obligation to stop the Iranian regime from using nuclear weapons.) [47888]

Paul Bedard reports at WashingtonExaminer.com, “Just minutes after 35 jihadists crashed through the U.S. diplomatic compound in Benghazi, Libya, nearly one year ago, the facility got word to the State Department, FBI and Pentagon that terrorists were attacking, according to a forthcoming book that provides the fullest review of the assault to date. In ‘Under Fire, the Untold Story of the Attack in Benghazi,’ it is revealed that an unidentified security official in the Benghazi compound protecting Ambassador J. Christopher Stevens messaged the U.S. embassy in Tripoli: ‘Benghazi under fire, terrorist attack.’ Stevens and three others died that night. Twenty-five minutes after it began, the operation center at State received an electronic cable announcing the attack, according to authors Fred Burton, a former State Diplomatic Security agent and Samuel Katz, an author and expert on international special operations and counterterrorism. Their findings in ‘Under Fire,’ based on exclusive interviews of those in the battle, refute days of claims by the administration that the attack was sparked by Muslim anger at a U.S.-made anti-Muslim film, and raise new questions as ...Obama eyes military action in Syria that U.S. diplomatic posts in the region are properly protected.” (The Obama administration lied from the start about Benghazi, yet still expects the American people to trust whatever it says about Syria.) [47890, 47904]

AtlasShrugs.com posts a video message from Obama addressing the Islamic Society of North America’s 50th annual convention. Obama states, “I’m especially grateful to the work that ISNA has done to advance interfaith understanding and cooperation here at home and around the world. ...My administration is proud to be your partner. ...Over the last half century, you have upheld the proud legacy of American Muslims’ contributions to our national fabric and this gathering is a testament of that tradition.” (The ISNA has long been a front group for the Muslim Brotherhood, which founded the organization. The Muslim Brotherhood also founded the Muslim Students Association. Like the Council on Islamic-American Relations, the ISNA was an unindicted co-conspirator ) in the case against the Holy Land Foundation (HLF) for directing charitable donations to the terrorist group Hamas; five HLF officials were indicted. A 1991 Muslim Brotherhood document called the “General Strategic Goal for the Group In North America” calls for “a kind of grand jihad in eliminating and destroying the Western civilization from within

and ‘sabotaging’ its miserable house by their hands and the hands of the believers so that it is eliminated and God’s religion is made victorious over all other religions.” Among those affiliated with the ISNA or the Muslim Brotherhood are Mahdi Bray and Esam S. Omeish. Bray organized a 2000 rally outside the White House at which the crowd chanted in Arabic, “Khaybar, Khaybar oh Jews, the Army of Muhammad is coming for you!” and carried “Death to Israel” placards. According to AtlasShrugs.com’s Pamela Geller, Omeish “...is an Islamist tied to an al-Qaeda fund raiser and the spiritual adviser to the 9/11 hijackers.” Obama’s Justice Department is engaged in an “outreach” program with the ISNA.) [3683, 3684, 47891, 47892, 47894, 48029]

Obama quietly appoints James J. Zogby to serve on the U.S. Commission for International Religious Freedom (USCIRF). Zogby, the brother of veteran pollster John Zogby, is president of the Arab American Institute. (AtlasShrugs.com’s Pamela Geller notes, “Zogby is quite the notorious figure and classic Middle Eastern antisemite. James Zogby has referred to Israelis as ‘Nazis,’ and calls Israel’s actions against the PLO ‘a Holocaust.’ Zogby has a history of supporting extreme terror organizations.” At CommentaryMagazine.com Michael Rubin writes, “Zogby has long been an activist for the Democratic Party and an enthusiastic supporter of ...Obama. It’s understandable that Obama wishes to reward him for his loyalty and, perhaps, for his political views. To do so with a seat at the USCIRF at a time when minorities are under siege from Syria to Egypt to Iran, however, shows the lack of seriousness with which Obama treats religious freedom.”) [10031, 48418, 48419, 48420]

At WND.com author Aaron Klein reports, “U.N. Ambassador Samantha Power is a driving force urging ...Obama to strike in Syria, according to informed Middle Eastern diplomats. Power was notably absent during an urgent U.N. Security Council meeting last month concerning Syria’s alleged use of chemical weapons. Her name barely pops up in news media coverage of the crisis in Syria. Power’s most visible reaction to events in Syria so far has been a Tweet accusing Syrian President Bashar al-Assad of using chemical weapons. Yet behind the scenes, Power is a central player at pushing Obama to launch a military campaign in Syria, the diplomats told WND. The diplomats said Power has been working with Syrian foes Turkey and Saudi Arabia as well as with key Syrian opposition figures in trying to convince the White House to act sooner in Syria. The diplomats say that last week, Power recommended Obama strike in Syria without first consulting Congress, a move from which [Obama] clearly seems to have backed away. ...Power served on the advisory board that created the ‘Responsibility to Protect,’ or R2P doctrine that would be used to justify any U.S. strikes in Syria. ...Billionaire George Soros’ Open Society is one of only three non-governmental funders of the Global Centre for the Responsibility to Protect, the main body behind promoting the doctrine. ...The Carr Center for Human Rights Policy had a seat on the advisory board of a 2001 commission that originally formulated R2P. The center was led at the time by Samantha Power, who is reported to have heavily influenced Obama in consultations leading to the decision to bomb Libya.” [47895]

Ed Henry reports at FoxNews.com, “The White House is getting advice from some former campaign advisers on how to win congressional support for a strike on Syria, Fox News has learned, with top White House aides soliciting their input during a long strategy session Tuesday afternoon. The aides met with former top Obama campaign hands like strategist Anita [“I love Chairman Mao”] Dunn, former deputy campaign manager Stephanie Cutter and long-time adviser David Axelrod. While [Obama] himself did not attend the meeting, attendees said the goal was to kick around ideas about how to help Obama win crucial votes in Congress... Other attendees included two people who have been critical in helping plot media strategy for [Obama] over the years—former White House Press Secretary Robert Gibbs and former senior White House adviser David Plouffe, who also ran [Obama’s] first White House campaign in 2008. ...Among the White House aides who attended Tuesday’s meeting were Chief of Staff Denis McDonough, Senior Adviser Dan Pfeiffer and Communications Director Jen Palmieri.” (Political consultants meeting in the White House to advise Obama on how to “sell” military action in Syria might prompt some to ask if those consultants are being given information about war plans to which the American people are denied access.) [47900]

Congresswoman Eleanor Holmes Norton (D-NC) remarks, “If [Obama] gets saved at all [on Syria], it’ll be because of loyalty of Democrats. They just don’t want to see him shamed and humiliated on the national stage. ...I can’t believe that the only way to address it is a slight bombing which will somehow punish somebody or deter somebody. ...I think once you say, ‘I’m going to Congress,’ you can’t say, ‘Okay, I’m going to do it [military action] anyway.’” (In other words, many Democrat members of Congress will vote for military action only to save Obama from himself—perhaps risking American lives in the process.) [47901]

At Townhall.com Mona Charen writes, “[Obama’s] claim that Syria’s use of chemical weapons ‘threatens our national security interests’ is clearly absurd. The danger Syria poses is simply to Obama’s diminishing credibility. Chemical weapons are ghastly, but our revulsion at their use doesn’t amount to facing a threat. Besides, [Obama’s] proposed military wrist-slap will probably have no effect—except to further erode the world’s respect for American power. ...Iran, by contrast, is a menace. Iran hasn’t used chemical weapons on its own people (it tortures and kills in other ways), yet as the chief supporter and weapons supplier to Hezbollah, Hamas and other terror groups, and as a sometime partner to al-Qaida, it does threaten us. Since taking our diplomats hostage in 1979, the Islamic Republic has kept up attacks on the U.S. directly (in Iraq), expanded Hezbollah into South America, allied with American foes like Venezuela and attacked us through terror proxies (as in the 1983 bombing of the Marine barracks in Lebanon). ...Obama is relying on the same ‘international community’ that has proved so useless on Syria to deter Iran from developing nuclear weapons. Yet he doesn’t seem worried, which is worrying. If Bashar Assad gases the Syrian people with Sarin, it offends our sensibilities. But if the mullahs of Iran achieve their goal of getting nuclear weapons, it is conceivable that nuclear terror could threaten the American people. ...Every foreign policy action should be judged, not by whether it advances a naive fantasy of a world community punishing a miscreant, but by whether it advances American security. That means thwarting Iran by all means necessary.” [47902]

According to an ABC/Washington post poll, “Nearly six in 10 [Americans] oppose missile strikes in light of the U.S. government’s determination that Syria used chemical weapons against its own people. Democrats and Republicans alike oppose strikes by double digit margins, and there is deep opposition among every political and demographic group in the survey. Political independents are among the most clearly opposed, with 66 percent saying they are against military action.” [47908]

Based on an “analysis of public statements,” ThinkProgress.org estimates that 169 Congressmen “have either decisively ruled out supporting the measure [to strike at Syria] or say they are unlikely to back it.” Only 46 seem ready to vote in favor of military action, while more than 200 remain undecided. (Obama may face an uphill battle in gaining support. With his reputation at stake, he will likely promise anything he can to buy votes—with taxpayer dollars. The final vote will likely be close, as Congressmen who face tough reelection battles in 2014 will be reluctant to vote for a war most Americans oppose. If the resolution looks like it will pass by even a few votes, the “on the fence” Congressmen will be given last-minute “permission” to vote against it. Similarly, if the resolution looks like it will clearly be defeated, some Democrats will vote yes in order to remain in support of Obama while not really affecting the outcome.) [47915, 47916]

After a lecture at the Gerald R. Ford Presidential Museum in Grand Rapids, Michigan, former Congressman and Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld says, “You either ought to change the regime [in Syria], or you ought to do nothing. Why would you go in and fire a shot across the bow? All it does is make a splash, and ... what you’ve probably achieved is the embarrassment of the United States for being feckless and ineffective. ... [Obama] is not, in my view, providing the kind of leadership that I think almost any president in my adult lifetime would be providing. You have to have a vision. You have to know what you’re going to do, and you have to provide the kind of leadership the commander in chief would provide.” [47940]

On the *Daily Show*, comedian Jon Stewart says, “You got [sic] to see the red line. You can’t use chemicals to kill your own people. You have to do it organically. America and the world want to make sure Assad only uses locally-sourced, free, long-ranged lead ordinance. Now, back in the early 80s, we knew Iraq used chemical weapons against Iran and were likely to use them again. Not only did we not attack them we supported Iraq, we supported Iraq in doing that and, of course, we still get to use bunker-busters, cluster bombs and the Mark-77, which is not, *not* filled with napalm—technically. So, given the fact that we have no idea who has control over these chemical weapons in a failed Syria, remind us again why we have to do this? ... We have to bomb Syria because we are in seventh grade, and the red line—the red line that they crossed is actually a dick-measuring ribbon. Why does holding back look like weakness? Isn’t it maturity? It’s like the guy who is picking on Clark Kent and he doesn’t do anything, even though he knows he could throw that guy into the sun. I’ll tell you what would be real weakness—Clark Kent laying waste to a town because someone called him a pussy.” [47918]

On CNN, Senator Rand Paul (R-KY) responds to a question about Secretary of State John Kerry's insistence that if the United States doesn't hold Bashar al-Assad accountable for the use of chemical weapons "it's a guarantee that Assad will do it again. A guarantee." Paul says, "Well, he sounds like he must be a clairvoyant because he can predict the future now and we should ask him for stock picks, you name it, who will win the Kentucky Derby next year if he can guarantee the future. No one can guarantee the future. We don't know how Assad will react and I think there's an equal argument to be made that if the U.S. bombs him that it will be more likely that he launches another gas attack, more likely that he might attack Israel, more likely that there will be more instability in the region. More likely that the Russians might get involved or that Iran might get involved. So, I think there are arguments to be made on both sides of this, but it's not some kind of slam dunk guarantee that Secretary Kerry makes it out to be. He's overstating his ability to predict the future." [47960]

On September 4 New Hampshire's *Union Leader* reports, "Anthem Blue Cross Blue Shield, the only insurer approved to offer policies on the health insurance exchange created under the Affordable Care Act [ObamaCare], has narrowed [from 26] to 14 the number of hospitals for the ACA plans that will be offered beginning Oct. 1. ...The network for Anthem individual policy holders who do not purchase through the exchange will be limited as well when current policies expire." [48608, 48609]

Meanwhile, a manufacturing company's benefits specialist tells Townhall.com's Guy Benson, "Every day is a new freak show when it comes to Obamacare and figuring out exactly what we have to do to comply. Right now we are working on the 'employee notice' that every company is tasked with sending out to their employees by September 30th notifying them of the federal healthcare exchange. We were planning on including info in our notice about the 'navigator' that's been hired in [our area] to help people 'navigate' the exchange. But when I looked this person up, I discovered that not only have they not been hired yet, but the non-profit that's hiring them is looking for someone with just a GED that they can pay \$29k a year. To 'find your health insurance for you.' Meaning they will be attempting to understand a bill that even the lawmakers who passed it don't. Additionally, the government is not requiring these people to get background checks, which is truly incredible. (They're going to be handling your tax info, SSN, even past health records.) If they don't hire someone soon they're not even going to be able to complete the shortened training by October 1. ...There's one more issue here as well, which is the employer notice. There is [government-required] verbiage on that notice that says 'even if your employer offers an affordable health plan, you may still qualify for a subsidy.' That is simply a lie. And since Obama has now delayed the employer mandate, the feds have no way of knowing whether your employer offers you an affordable plan or not. In other words, they have to take my word for it and I can simply say 'my plan is really expensive at work' and get a subsidy." [48609]

MSNBC's Chris Matthews appears on *Morning Joe* and comments, "...When you hear [Senator] Barbara Boxer [D-CA], when you hear [Congressman] Jim Moran [D-VA], you

have to wonder what they would have said had it been a Republican president [pushing an attack on Syria]. Clearly people are changing sides. Just like the Democrats who supported Lyndon Johnson after the Vietnam war, after it was over they turned on Nixon. The same exact people. So partisanship shows its ugly head here. ...I think the Democrats are going to be forced to sacrifice men and women [members of Congress] who really, really don't want to vote for this. And they're going to have to vote for it to save [Obama's] hide. That's a bad position to put your party in." (Obama may have believed that when he deferred the Syrian issue to Congress most of the Democrats would clearly be on his side, along with some Republicans—and that he could use the vote against the GOP in 2014 mid-term election campaigning. He may have guessed wrong, and may find large numbers of Democrats voting against war action—preferring to go against Obama than their own constituents. Complicating the issue is that many Democrats believe Obama will strike Syria even if he loses the vote in Congress. That suggests that some Congressmen may vote against authorization, even if they support a strike, in order to stay on the same side as their constituents—knowing Obama will still launch missiles.) [47907, 47924]

Also on *Morning Joe*, Andrea Mitchell—typically one of Obama's staunchest defenders and excuse makers—says, "The support does not exist for this [military strike], they have to build it, [Obama] has to speak. I think that they also have to get past the bungling last week, the fact that [Obama] was so ambivalent but didn't even communicate that to his Secretary of State, and to his Vice President." [47931]

RT.com reports, "Probes from Khan al-Assal show chemicals used in the March 19 attack did not belong to standard Syrian army ammunition, and that the shell carrying the substance was similar to those made by a rebel fighter group, the Russian Foreign Ministry stated. A statement released by the ministry on Wednesday particularly drew attention to the 'massive stove-piping of various information aimed at placing the responsibility for the alleged chemical weapons use in Syria on Damascus, even though the results of the UN investigation have not yet been revealed.' By such means 'the way is being paved for military action' against Damascus, the ministry pointed out. But the samples taken at the site of the March 19 attack and analyzed by Russian experts indicate that a projectile carrying the deadly nerve agent sarin was most likely fired at Khan al-Assal by the rebels, the ministry statement suggests, outlining the 100-page report handed over to the UN by Russia." [48068]

After breaking rules to rush the process, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee votes 10–7 to approve a resolution granting Obama the authority to strike Syria. (The issue must also be voted on by the full Senate and the House of Representatives.) According to *WashingtonTimes.com*, the committee's resolution requires Obama "to certify that he has exhausted all diplomatic channels and gives ...Obama 60 days to act [without "boots on the ground"], with one 30-day extension. It also orders him to come up with a plan to try to push Syria's warring parties into a final negotiated settlement. One part of the agreement even presses the administration to devise a strategy for arming moderate rebels to strengthen them in their battle against Mr. Assad. Lawmakers on both sides of the aisle

have accused the Obama administration of being too reticent to take that step.” (Among those voting in favor of the resolution is Senator John McCain (R-AZ), who was caught playing video poker on his cell phone during the committee’s hearing on Syria.) One senior Republican aide comments, “This is a rush to war behind closed doors. We were told there was a need to have a thoughtful and public debate about how this nation goes to war, but this seems to be about simply getting a resolution done to cover [Obama].” [47897, 47898, 47903, 47913, 47914, 47930, 47981]

At a press conference in Stockholm, Sweden—while en route to the G20 summit in Russia—Barack “nothing is ever my fault” Obama says, “First of all, I didn’t set the red line [on the use of chemical weapons in Syria]. The world set a red line.” (One day earlier House Minority Leader Nancy Pelosi (D-CA) made a similar “humanity set the red line” statement. Whether Obama stole the phrase from Pelosi or Pelosi was told Obama would use it is an excuse is not known.) Obama adds, “The world set a red line when governments representing 98 percent of the world’s population said the use of chemical weapons are [inaudible] and passed a treaty forbidding their use, even when countries are engaged in war. Congress set a red line when it ratified that treaty. Congress set a red line when it indicated that in a piece of legislation entitled the Syria Accountability Act that some of the horrendous things happening on the ground there need to be answered for. So, when I said in a press conference that my calculus about what’s happening in Syria would be altered by the use of chemical weapons, which the overwhelming consensus of humanity says is wrong, that wasn’t something I just kind of made up. I didn’t pluck it out of thin air. There’s a reason for it.” (In other words, “I can’t be held accountable for my statements; it’s the fault of Congress; and anyone who disagrees with me is a racist.” Obama is essentially claiming, “I’m just following orders” because “the world” opposes chemical weapons. Most of the world also, of course, opposes Muslims cutting off the heads of Jews and Christians as well, but Obama seems not to be following any orders to stop those atrocities.) [47852, 47899, 47909, 47910, 47912, 47921, 47927, 47975]

Obama, whose credibility is clearly on the line, says, “My credibility is not on the line. The international community’s credibility is on the line. And America’s and Congress’ credibility is on the line because we give lip service to the notion that these international norms are important. I do think we have to act. Because if we don’t, we are effectively saying that even though we may condemn it and issue resolutions and so forth and so on, somebody who is not shamed by resolutions can continue to act with impunity and those international norms begin to erode and other despots and authoritarian regimes can start looking and saying, ‘That’s something we can get away with.’ ...Are we going to try to find a reason not to act? If that’s the case, I think the world community should admit it. You can always find a reason not act. ...The question that all of us face, not just me, our citizens face, not just political leaders [is]: ‘At what point do we say we need to confront actions that are violating our common humanity?’ I would argue that when I see 400 children subjected to gas ...the moral thing to do is not to stand by and do nothing. But it’s difficult. This is the part of my job that I find most challenging. I would much rather be talking about how to make sure every 3- and 4-year-old gets a good education than I would spending time thinking about how can I prevent 3- and 4-year-olds from being subjected to chemical weapons and nerve gas.” (Obama is cleverly shifting the argument



from him having no credibility to everyone else having no credibility. Suddenly, he becomes a “moral leader” opposed to the Assad regime, while everyone else is defending the murder of children. In fact, it was Obama who could have and arguably should have acted two years earlier to assist the Syrian rebels—when they had not yet been infiltrated so heavily by al-Qaeda and members of the Muslim Brotherhood. It was his failure to act that made the Syrian situation worse.) [47910, 47912, 47921, 47927, 47945, 47952]

Obama whines that he is treated unfairly by the American media. He says, “I’d have to say that if I were, uh, here in Europe, uh, I’d probably, uh, be considered right in the middle [politically], center of left, maybe center of right, depending on the country. Um, in the United States sometimes the, uh, the names I’m called are quite different.” [47923]

AtlasShrugs.com’s Pamela Geller responds to Obama’s statement, writing, “Obama’s bald-faced lies are nothing short of incredible. And he is so pathological that he says them *\*ahem\** with a straight and stern face. When presented with the sad fact that his word means little to nothing, we are told that it’s not his word, it’s the world’s word. What a sad and dangerous loser this buffoon really is. I didn’t say that! The world did! It’s evocative the childhood taunt, *‘I know you are but what am I?’* The fact is Syria is a sideshow—a freaky little sideshow to distract the world from the real threat of Iran. And the coward in the White House is never going to take those Islamic annihilationists on. When, in 2009, the people of Iran took to the streets begging for help in the first and only real freedom revolution against the sharia, Obama ignored them. Those poor people met bullets and bombs with sheer will, flesh and bone and Obama... went out for ice-cream with Natasha and Malia.” [47945]

The French parliament debates the use of military force against Syria. According to France24.com, “French President François Hollande has been one of the principal Western backers of an armed intervention in Syria. However, the surprise decision by Barack Obama to seek approval from Congress before authorising military strikes against Assad has cast doubt on France’s own course of action. On Tuesday [September 2], Hollande ruled out any chance of France taking unilateral military action against Syria. If the US Congress votes against strikes, France will instead ‘take up its responsibilities’ by providing support to the Syrian opposition in other ways, the French president said, without specifying exactly what this would entail.” [47905]

DailyCaller.com reports on a “rumor” that the House may not vote on the use of force in Syria and Obama will only seek approval from the Senate. (The story, if true, is bizarre and may suggest that Obama anticipates Senate approval and House rejection—and is hoping that the public won’t understand that a one-chamber approval is meaningless.) [47917]

Meanwhile, Senator Rand Paul (R-KY) suggests that while he is not eager to engage in a filibuster to block, or at least delay, a vote on approving a military strike against Syria, he may be willing to take such action. [47919, 47920]

Congressman Matt Salmon (R-AZ) tells National Review his office has had about 500 constituent calls about Syria, and only two have called for a U.S. military strike. Salmon states, “I don’t see any national security imperative for our country at all. Both sides in this equation are bad actors. ...Other than saving face for [Obama], I don’t understand what we would be doing.” Salmon, who thinks Obama will lose the House resolution by 20 votes, also says, “Nobody believes this is going to be [only] a couple surgical strikes.” [47926]

Several staunch Obama supporters in Congress are also reluctant to approve war action. Congressman Emanuel Cleaver (D-MO) says, “If I had to vote today, I would cast a ‘no’ vote.” Congressman James McDermott (D-WA) says he will probably vote against a war resolution, and states, “I am not voting my party. I am not voting my president. I am voting my country.” Congressman Rick Nolan (D-MN) says, “I am more convinced than ever that this will be a tragic mistake.” Congressman Gregory Meeks (D-NY) comments, “If we act in a unilateral way, I have huge concerns.” Congressman Alan Grayson (D-FL) states says Obama “is in a very deep hole here.” *The Wall Street Journal* notes, “The Progressive Change Campaign Committee, a liberal political-action committee, said Wednesday that a poll of about 55,000 of its almost one million members found 73% oppose action in Syria. It sent a memo to all Democrats in Congress under the heading ‘Your base opposes military action in Syria’ and launched a phone campaign to pressure lawmakers to vote ‘no.’” (Grayson charges that the Obama administration has manipulated intelligence reports to reinforce its case for war.) [47936, 47977]

Secretary of State John Kerry appears before the House Foreign Affairs Committee, where he faces tough comments from Congressman Jeff Duncan (R-SC)—who states there is a “need for trust building” with the Obama administration because of the scandals involving Benghazi, the IRS, the NSA, and Operation Fast and Furious, and warns “there are no good guys to get behind” in Syria and he “can only envision an escalation if this current conflict.” Duncan tells Kerry, “I’m upset because from now on, I can’t believe you. These issues call into question the accountability of this administration, its commitment to the personnel on the ground, and the judgment that it uses when making these determinations. The reason that I say Benghazi is germane to our discussion on Syria is this: Secretary Kerry, have there been any efforts on the part of the United States directly or indirectly to provide weapons to the Syrian rebels? That would also include facilitating the transfer of weapons from Libyan rebels to Syrian rebels.” Kerry expresses faux outrage and avoids the question, responding, “Let me begin, Congressman, by challenging your proposition that I’ve never done anything except advocate caution, because I volunteered to fight for my country and that wasn’t a cautious thing to do when I did it. When I was in the United States Senate, I supported military action any number of occasions including Grenada, Panama—I can run down a list of them. I am not going to sit here and be told by you that I don’t have a sense of what the judgment is with respect to this. We’re talking about people being killed by gas and you want to go talk about Benghazi and [Operation] Fast and Furious.” (Duncan later states, “I’m not going to let up and I’m going to keep making that connection for the American people. There is a lot of distrust of this administration on Benghazi and nobody has been brought to justice. [Obama] keeps saying there is a ‘red line’ and if we don’t act the rest of the world

is going to judge us that way. Well, the rest of the world is judging us based on our inaction in Benghazi.”) CainTV.com notes that Kerry, in fact, *opposed* U.S. military action in Grenada, and once stated, “The invasion of Grenada represents the Reagan policy of substituting public relations for diplomatic relations. ...[N]o substantial threat to U.S. interests existed and American lives were not endangered. ...The invasion represented a bully’s show of force against a weak Third World nation. The invasion only served to heighten world tensions and further strain brittle US/Soviet and North/South relations.” Additionally, Kerry was not in the Senate when the Grenada action took place. [47933, 47988]

Kerry tells the committee members that Arab nations were willing to help pay for an attack on Syria: “In fact,” says Kerry, “some of them have said that if the United States is prepared to go do the whole thing the way we’ve done it previously in other places [and oust Bashar al-Assad], they’ll carry that cost. That’s how dedicated they are at [sic] this. That’s not in the cards, and nobody’s talking about it, but they’re talking in serious ways about getting this done.” (Some might argue that putting American lives at risk with other nations paying for it is suspiciously akin to acting as mercenaries. If Saudi Arabia wants Assad gone, it should risk Saudi lives—not American lives. HotAir.com comments, “[T]hat sounds like a deal, no? We send our boys to be the tip of the Sunni spear in a sectarian war against the Shiites and in return Saudi and Qatari oilbags cut us a check for \$100 billion or whatever. I wonder how much they’d be willing to pay for a direct attack on Iran. We could structure a compensation scheme based on casualties: 500 dead American servicemen gets us \$200 billion, 1,000 dead gets us \$500 billion, and so on. Put enough guys in harm’s way and we could conceivably erase this year’s deficit. Or, alternately, give Iran the right to match the offer. If they can come up with a few hundred billion, we’ll drone the Syrian Salafi nuts of their choice. How was this offer even broached, I wonder. Was Kerry not a bit insulted at the idea of Arab dictators trying to rent American pilots as de facto Sunni mercenaries? Didn’t he once famously, in another lifetime, lament sending men off to die [in Vietnam] for a mistake? Even in the course of ruling out boots on the ground, he seems to be touting the proposal as something impressive, evidence of how seriously our ‘allies’ are treating Assad’s aggression. ...[It] Tells you a lot about our role in the modern Middle East that no one blinks at the Secretary of State mentioning that Sunni oligarchs would happily pay us to do their dirty work as a reason in *support* of going to war.”) [47948, 47961]

Kerry claims, “There are at least 10 countries that have pledged to participate. We have not actually sought more for participation. We have sought people for support and there are many, many more, obviously, that support.” (The State Department later provides a list of eight nations that have “publicly and explicitly expressed support for U.S. military action,” but which have not actually committed to providing any military support. The nine nations are France, Poland, Romania, Albania, Kosovo, Turkey, Canada, Denmark, and Australia. In other words, those nations have said, “You go first and we’ll cheer you on from the sidelines.”) [47964, 47970]

With regard to Kerry's claim that other Middle East nations have offered to help pay for the cost of military action against Syria, worth noting is a September 3 article by Michael Snyder at TheEconomicCollapseBlog.com. Snyder wrote, "Why has the little nation of Qatar spent 3 billion dollars to support the rebels in Syria? Could it be because Qatar is the largest exporter of liquid natural gas in the world and Assad won't let them build a natural gas pipeline through Syria? Of course. Qatar wants to install a puppet regime in Syria that will allow them to build a pipeline which will enable them to sell lots and lots of natural gas to Europe. Why is Saudi Arabia spending huge amounts of money to help the rebels and why has Saudi Prince Bandar bin Sultan been 'jetting from covert command centers near the Syrian front lines to the Élysée Palace in Paris and the Kremlin in Moscow, seeking to undermine the Assad regime?' Well, it turns out that Saudi Arabia intends to install their own puppet government in Syria which will allow the Saudis to control the flow of energy through the region. On the other side, Russia very much prefers the Assad regime for a whole bunch of reasons. One of those reasons is that Assad is helping to block the flow of natural gas out of the Persian Gulf into Europe, thus ensuring higher profits for [Russia's] Gazprom. Now the United States is getting directly involved in the conflict. If the U.S. is successful in getting rid of the Assad regime, it will be good for either the Saudis or Qatar (and possibly for both), and it will be really bad for Russia. This is a strategic geopolitical conflict about natural resources, religion and money, and it really has nothing to do with chemical weapons at all." (In other words, Obama may be putting American lives at risk and spending billions of tax dollars he has yet to collect—so that Qatar's billionaires can become even wealthier. Largely at the behest of Saudi Arabia, Obama is blocking the Keystone pipeline, which would create U.S. jobs, but is willing to risk U.S. lives so that Qatar can have a Syrian pipeline.) [48066, 48247, 48762, 48796]

Secretary of Defense Chuck Hagel tells the committee that a strike against Syria could cost "tens of millions" of dollars. (The claim is probably unrealistically low.) [47990]

Russian President Vladimir Putin states, "We have our ideas about what we will do [if Obama strikes Syria] and how we will do it in case the situation develops toward the use of force or otherwise. We have our plans. ...If we see that steps are taken that violate the existing international norms, we shall think how we should act in the future, in particular regarding supplies of such sensitive weapons to certain regions of the world." [47934]

Putin also says Secretary of State John Kerry "is lying." "I watched the debates in Congress," Putin states. "A congressman asks Mr. Kerry: 'Is al-Qaeda there? There has been rumor that they are gaining strength.' He says: 'No, I am telling you firmly: there are none of them there.' The principal combative unit [among the Syrian rebels] is the so-called Nusra, which is an al-Qaeda unit. And they [the Obama administration] know this. I even felt quite awkward. We are communicating with them and assume that they are decent people and he is telling an outright lie. He knows that he is lying. This is sad. ...Foreign Minister [Sergei] Lavrov has made it clear [that] Russia does not intend to fight a war over Syria." [47962, 47965, 47978]

At JarkesyPolitical.com Tom O'Halloran reports that "A hacker got access to the U.S. intelligence correspondence and published private emails of Col. Anthony J. Macdonald, who is the General Staff Director, Operations and Plans Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Intelligence the US Army Staff." The emails suggest that the chemical weapons attacks in Syria were not conducted by the regime of President Bashir al-Assad but were "staged by U.S. Military Intelligence" as a "pretext to launch a military strike on Syria." One email exchange between MacDonald's wife, Jennifer and a friend, Mary Shapiro, has Shapiro stating, "I can't stop thinking about that terrible gas attack in Syria now. Did you see those kids? I was really crying They were poisoned, they died. When is it over? I see their faces when in sleep. What did Tony say you about this?" MacDonald replies, "I saw it too and got afraid very much. But Tony comforted me. He said the kids weren't hurt, it was done for cameras. So you don't worry, my dear." [51866, 51867]

FoxNews.com reports, "The Obama administration is being accused of trying to pull a fast one on lawmakers by re-branding a controversial immigration job—a 'public advocate' for both legal and illegal immigrants—after Congress explicitly voted to defund it. The administration over the summer quietly changed the name of the position, first created in February 2012, from 'public advocate' to deputy assistant director of 'Custody Programs and Community Outreach.' It was a change in name only. The administration kept the person in charge and the job description the same. By doing so, the White House has been able to keep the post off the congressional chopping block—a move Judicial Watch called 'sneaky' in a recent report. 'It's simply part of [Obama's] well-established pattern of abusing his authority to blow off Congress, especially when it comes to immigration,' the conservative government watchdog group said." [47935]

Appearing on TheBlaze.com, Senator Ted Cruz (R-TX) says, "We certainly don't have a dog in the [Syrian civil war] fight. We should be focused on defending the United States of America. That's why young men and women sign up to join the military, not to, as you know, serve as Al Qaeda's air force. ...It appears what [Obama] is pressing for is essentially protecting his public relations because he drew a red line, and, essentially, the bluff was called." Noting that Syrian rebel groups have ties to al-Qaeda, Cruz adds, "I'll give you one of the simplest principles of foreign policy that we ought to be following: Don't give weapons to people who hate you. Don't give weapons to people who want to kill you." Senator John McCain (R-AZ) later tells reporters that Cruz was "totally uninformed." (McCain supports the "Free Syrian Army," which he believes remains the dominant force fighting the Bashar al-Assad regime. The FSA was originally formed by members of the Syrian military who sought to oust Assad. McCain seems oblivious to the fact that al-Qaeda and other America-hating groups—such as al-Qaeda's Jabhat al-Nusra (Nusra Front)—have infiltrated the FSA and joined forces with it.) [47943, 47944, 47946, 47947, 48045]

Former Vermont governor and anti-war presidential candidate Howard Dean tells TheHill.com, "Thus far I fully support [Obama], including his going to Congress" [to seek action against Syria]." (This would be the same Howard Dean who opposed George W. Bush's intervention in Iraq because Bush, in his opinion, laid out no clear objectives,

did not make a convincing case to the American people, and did not have the support of the world community. Needless to say, Obama has been far less clear than Bush, has not made a convincing case to Americans, and has nowhere near the support Bush had from other nations.) With freshly-dyed hair hiding his grey, Dean also appears on *Morning Joe* to state that he supports an attack on Syria. [47953, 47957]

The *Daily Mail* reports, “Securing Syria’s chemical weapons stockpiles and the facilities that produced them would likely require the U.S. to send more than 75,000 ground troops into the Middle Eastern country, MailOnline learned Wednesday. That estimate comes from a secret memorandum the U.S. Department of Defense prepared for ...Obama in early 2012. U.S. Central Command arrived at the figure of 75,000 ground troops as part of a written series of military options for dealing with Bashar al-Assad more than 18 months ago, long before the U.S. confirmed internally that the Syrian dictator was using the weapons against rebel factions within his borders. ‘The report exists, and it was prepared at the request of the National Security Advisor’s staff,’ a Department of Defense official with knowledge of the inquiry told MailOnline Wednesday on condition of anonymity.” (The Senate resolution authorizing military force in Syria gives Obama considerable wiggle room. Although it prohibits the use of ground forces “for the purposes of combat operations,” that wording permits “boots on the ground” for non-combat operations—such as securing and guarding chemical or other weapons caches.) [47955, 47963, 47966]

On *On the Record*, former Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld tells Greta Van Susteren, “The essence of leadership is clarity, and that’s the only way you can get unity of purpose. The fact that the Congress is at sixes and sevens about this whole thing [U.S. military action in Syria] is a reflection of the lack of leadership that we’ve seen... the fact that there has not been any coming together in the international community to speak of is, again, a reflection of the fact that [Obama] has not provided a vision, a statement as to— with clarity, as to what was to be done. ...It seems to me you either have to decide that there should be regime change and make a conscious effort to help those opposing the Assad regime [for] killing the 100,000 people that have died, or you don’t do something... Why would you say you’re not going to do this, you’re not going to do that, and you’re not going to do this, and demystify it and leave the clear impression [that Assad is] going to be there when it’s over? ...[Obama is] probably better off doing nothing, [but] If he decides he wants to change the regime because he thinks the killing of 100,000 people and the use of chemical weapons is something that is damaging and harmful to our country and to the world, I think the American people would follow him. ...The credibility of the United States has already been damaged, and it would probably be further damaged if we did, quote, ‘a shot across the bow,’ and that’s it. We’re better off not doing that, it seems to me.” [47967]

Rumsfeld continues, “But the signal has gone out to the world that the United States is not uncomfortable supporting the Muslim Brotherhood, which I think is a terrible mistake. The Islamists in the world are fundamentally against the nation-state concept, and the world order is based on the nation-state concept. The American people prefer the

nation-state concept. And the idea that some religious group would try to impose their views across nation states, which is what's taking place, and use terrorism and the killing of innocent men, women and children to achieve that, is something that it seems to me we ought to be opposed to energetically, and we didn't demonstrate that opposition in Egypt, a terribly important country. And I don't doubt for a minute that the Islamists will try to take and play an outsized role in Syria if they are successful. And so in helping the opposition to Assad, people have to be very careful that they don't end up with something worse than the Assad regime, which is hard to imagine but possible." (Arguably, and regrettably, it is not difficult to imagine.) [47967]

AFP reports, "Syria said Wednesday it was mobilising its allies against a possible US-led military strike over a suspected gas attack and would never give in, even if a third world war erupts. In an exclusive interview with AFP, Deputy Foreign Minister Faisal Muqdad said Syria had taken 'every measure' to retaliate against a potential strike, but refused to provide any clue as to what that might mean." Mugdad says, "The Syrian government will not change position even if there is World War III. No Syrian can sacrifice the independence of his country." [47982]

On September 5 Obama arrives in St. Petersburg, Russia for the G20 economic summit.

Members of the of the al-Qaeda-affiliated Jabhat al-Nusra group—which the Associated Press merely refers to as "activists"—attack a Christian village in Maaloula, Syria, "beheading priests and brutally killing others." (Obama—and Senator John McCain (R-AZ)—have not explained how aid and weapons provided to the "moderate" rebels in Syria will not end up in the hands of the more radical fighters who are also seeking to remove Assad from power.) [47949, 47950, 47951, 47958, 48070, 48088, 48395]

Noting Secretary of State John Kerry's claim that Obama was "courageous" in seeking Congressional approval to attack Syria, Associated Press reporter Matt Lee asks State Department spokeswoman Jennifer Psaki, "I don't understand why he [Kerry] is so full-throatedly in favor of this [military action]. He over the weekend said [Obama] was acting courageously by taking this to Congress, and I don't understand what is courageous about asking permission for something that you say you don't need and to do what you believe to be the right thing not just morally but in general. Can you explain why this is a courageous move, and why the secretary would call it a courageous move?" After a predictable non-answer from Psaki, Lee asks, "Was there some kind of, like, group spine-removal procedure at the White House over the weekend? I don't understand. How is this courageous?" [47959]

ThinkProgress.org updates its estimate of the pro-war votes Obama will get in Congress: "[An] analysis of the public statements of 407 Representatives found that 213 lawmakers have either decisively ruled out supporting the measure or say they are unlikely to back it. Just 44 of the 400 members of the House of Representatives said they will definitely or likely vote in favor of the resolution. A vote in the House is not expected until next week at the earliest. 152 members have publicly said they are undecided and the positions of 26

members are unknown. All told, 325 members either have not decided, or indicated they are willing to consider changing their position.” [47968]

Congressman Michael G. Grimm (R-NY) states, “When ...Obama announced his plans to strike Syria in response to the discovery that the Assad regime used chemical weapons to kill thousands of men, women and children; my initial reaction, as a Marine combat veteran, was to stand by the Commander in Chief and support immediate, targeted strikes. I believed that the reputation and credibility of the United States was on the line and that we had to send a strong message that the use of chemical weapons is reprehensible and will not be tolerated. Unfortunately, the time to act was then and the moment to show our strength has passed. As debate has dragged on in Congress, [Obama] has weakened his position as our leader and deteriorated our credibility on the world stage. [Obama] has changed his red line to the world’s red line, he showed his hand when he should have kept it close, he failed to gain the support of key allies, and continues to delay action indefinitely until Congress acts. Now that the Assad regime has seen our playbook and has been given enough time to prepare and safeguard potential targets, I do not feel that we have enough to gain as a nation by moving forward with this attack on our own. Additionally I have heard from many constituents who strongly oppose unilateral action at a time when we have so many needs here at home. Thus, after much thought, deliberation and prayer, I am no longer convinced that a U.S. strike on Syria will yield a benefit to the United States that will not be greatly outweighed by the extreme cost of war.” [47969, 48064]

Obama cancels a planned fundraising trip to Los Angeles originally scheduled for September 9. [48065]

“The ill effects of Obamacare continue to add up,” reports FreeBeacon.com: “Towns in New Jersey plan to cut full time workers’ hours to avoid offering them health insurance because of Obamacare. The Middletown township has announced that it will reduce hours from 25 of its employees to prepare for the looming implementation of Obamacare. The school district will cut back hours as well. Toms River officials will also act accordingly to keep their costs low, due to the high expenses that Obamacare will impose. Sharing the same plight, the Berkeley township (the municipality devastated by Hurricane Sandy) is considering a similar move. The township says that Sandy left them deep in financial throes and that Obamacare costs are simply out of their already limited budget. Township administrator Chris Reid explained that the ‘municipality will take a hard line on this issue when negotiating union contracts later this year.’ ...Speaking to News Channel 12, Chris Reid said ‘There isn’t one employee that anybody would want to see hurt. ...[But] If it came down to shaving hours in order to save substantial dollars, that would be something that would have to be considered.’” [48606, 48607]

On *Special Report*, Charles Krauthammer says, “Look, I think it’s wrong to make a decision about whether you enter a war or not purely on humanitarian motives. Yes, they’re always part of the calculation, but the ultimate calculation has to be the national security interest of the United States, otherwise, we would be at war right now in the



Congo and in half of West Africa and in places a lot of Americans haven't even heard about. So it has to be the principle of natural interest. Whether or not, you are never going to see a CSI level, you know, a determination of what exactly happened, you never get that. And as to choosing your enemies, remind everybody of the obvious fact, that in the Second World War, the good war, we were allied, helping, supplying, doing everything that we could to help [Joseph] Stalin, who is the second worst man in the world because we had to defeat the first worst. So, we have to make a determination, do we have a preference among the combatants in Syria? Where's our national interest? And the speech by [Samantha] Power, our ambassador at the U.N., was a nice speech, you know, that you give at a debating society. But unfortunately, the world is a tough place and we have to make a decision not in decrying the heartlessness of the rest of the world. The rest of the world acts in its interests. That's always been true, it remains today, and always will be." (At the leftist think-tank, Center for American Progress, the incredibly naive Power said, "We worked with the UN to create a group of inspectors and then worked for more than six months to get them access to the country on the logic that perhaps the presence of an investigative team in the country might deter future attacks. Or, if not, at a minimum, we thought perhaps a shared evidentiary base could convince Russia or Iran— itself a victim of Saddam Hussein's monstrous chemical weapons attacks in 1987-1988—to cast loose a regime that was gassing it's people." NetRightDaily.com comments, "You read it right. Our ivory tower U.N. ambassador freely admits that she thought KGB born and bred Vladimir Putin would be swayed by the gassing of civilians in a civil war, and that the Iranian mullahs who cling to power through state terrorism would suddenly see the light if only exposed to her brilliance." *The Obama Timeline* wonders if, were Power older, she might have led 1960s Vietnam war protestors in a rousing chorus of, "All we are saying, is give 'a shared evidentiary base' a chance.") [47971, 48171]

Breitbart.com reports, "World leaders arrived Thursday for a dinner hosted by Russian President Vladimir Putin where they would discuss the crisis in Syria, with ...Obama showing up alone and well after the main group. The main group of leaders led by Putin arrived together at the historic Peterhof palace outside Saint Petersburg, with British Prime Minister David Cameron and French President Francois Hollande seen talking animatedly at the back of the pack. But Obama was nowhere to be seen and only arrived at the palace a good half an hour after the rest. ...Also arriving late, showing up to the dinner just before Obama, was Brazilian President Dilma Rousseff. It was not immediately clear why they lagged behind the main group. Putin said earlier that the G20 leaders would have the chance at the dinner to discuss the conflict in Syria, which until now was not on the G20 agenda. Brazil-US tensions are running high after Brasilia demanded explanations from Washington for reports that the US National Security Agency (NSA) spied on Rousseff's communications." (Putin masterfully seats Rousseff next to Obama at the dinner table.) [47974, 48189]

At WND.com Jerome Corsi reports that "Obama's Kenyan half-brother, Malik Obama, appears headed for the Egyptian terror watch list because of his Muslim Brotherhood ties. Complaints have been filed with Egypt's prosecutor-general calling for Malik to be put on Egypt's terror watch list and brought to Egypt to be questioned by state criminal investigators for allegedly financing terrorism, according to former PLO member and

native Arabic-speaker Walid Shoebat. According to Egyptian newspaper and television reports, Malik Obama has become a target in an Egyptian government terrorist investigation because of his role as an owner and investment adviser for the Sudan-based Islamic Dawa Organization, or IDO, and the organization's umbrella group, the Muslim Brotherhood." [47976, 50150, 50151]

DailyCaller.com reports, "Iran is vowing to back Bashar al-Assad's regime to the hilt and threatening to unleash terrorism should the U.S. strike. Qassem Soleimani, the head of Iran's Quds Forces, Wednesday told the Assembly of Experts—the body that chooses the supreme leader—that '[w]e will support Syria to the end.' And in an unprecedented statement, a former Iranian official has warned of mass abductions and brutal killings of American citizens around the world and the rape and killing of one of Obama's daughters should the United States attack Syria. Alireza Forghani, the former governor of southern Iran's Kish Province, threw down the gauntlet last week. Forghani is an analyst and strategy specialist in the supreme leader's camp and closely aligned with Mehdi Taeb, who heads the regime's Ammar Strategic Base, a radical think tank, and thus speaks with the blessing of the Islamic regime. 'Hopefully Obama will be pigheaded enough to attack Syria, and then we will see the ...loss of U.S. interests [through terrorist attacks],' he threatened. 'In just 21 hours [after the attack on Syria], a family member of every U.S. minister [department secretary], U.S. ambassadors, U.S. military commanders around the world will be abducted. And then 18 hours later, videos of their amputation will be spread [around the world].' In addition, Forghani warned, 'We should remind Obama that if you are a bastard, there are other bastards all around the world who can assault [your daughter] Sasha.' The statement is written in both English and Farsi, but in the Farsi version, Forghani clearly stated that Sasha will be raped by someone who has been able to get close to the Obama family." [47979, 47980]

AtlasShrugs.com reports that the Senate may vote on a Syrian war resolution on Wednesday: September 11, 2013. Pamela Geller writes, "This is a nightmare. Are we so far gone that our elected officials would vote to authorize military action in support of Al Qaeda on the twelfth anniversary of the day al Qaeda declared war on America and slaughtered 3,000 of our sisters and brothers?" [47981]

McClatchydc.com reports that in July Russia provided the United Nations with a 100-page report containing what it claims is evidence that rebels carried out a chemical attack in Aleppo, Syria in March 2013, and not the Syrian government. (The report purportedly provides specific evidence of rebel involvement, as opposed to the Obama administration's largely circumstantial evidence blaming the August chemical attack on the Assad regime.) [47983, 47984, 47985, 47996]

Russian warships cross Turkey's Bosphorous Strait and head to the eastern Mediterranean. [47986, 47987]

At WashingtonPost.com retired U.S. Army General Robert H. Scales writes, "The tapes tell the tale. Go back and look at images of our nation's most senior soldier, Gen. Martin

Dempsey, and his body language during Tuesday's Senate Foreign Relations Committee hearings on Syria. It's pretty obvious that Dempsey, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, doesn't want this war. As Secretary of State John Kerry's thundering voice and arm-waving redounded in rage against Bashar al-Assad's atrocities, Dempsey was largely (and respectfully) silent. Dempsey's unspoken words reflect the opinions of most serving military leaders. By no means do I profess to speak on behalf of all of our men and women in uniform. But I can justifiably share the sentiments of those inside the Pentagon and elsewhere who write the plans and develop strategies for fighting our wars. After personal exchanges with dozens of active and retired soldiers in recent days, I feel confident that what follows represents the overwhelming opinion of serving professionals who have been intimate witnesses to the unfolding events that will lead the United States into its next war. They are embarrassed to be associated with the amateurism of the Obama administration's attempts to craft a plan that makes strategic sense. None of the White House staff has any experience in war or understands it. So far, at least, this path to war violates every principle of war, including the element of surprise, achieving mass and having a clearly defined and obtainable objective. They are repelled by the hypocrisy of a media blitz that warns against the return of Hitlerism but privately acknowledges that the motive for risking American lives is our 'responsibility to protect' the world's innocents. Prospective U.S. action in Syria is not about threats to American security. The U.S. military's civilian masters privately are proud that they are motivated by guilt over slaughters in Rwanda, Sudan and Kosovo and not by any systemic threat to our country." [48007]

Scales continues, "They are outraged by the fact that what may happen is an act of war and a willingness to risk American lives to make up for a slip of the tongue about 'red lines.' These acts would be for retribution and to restore [Obama's] reputation. Our serving professionals make the point that killing more Syrians won't deter Iranian resolve to confront us. The Iranians have already gotten the message. Our people lament our loneliness. Our senior soldiers take pride in their past commitments to fight alongside allies and within coalitions that shared our strategic goals. This war, however, will be ours alone. They are tired of wannabe soldiers who remain enamored of the lure of bloodless machine warfare. 'Look,' one told me, 'if you want to end this decisively, send in the troops and let them defeat the Syrian army. If the nation doesn't think Syria is worth serious commitment, then leave them alone.' But they also warn that Syria is not Libya or Serbia. Perhaps the United States has become too used to fighting third-rate armies. As the Israelis learned in 1973, the Syrians are tough and mean-spirited killers with nothing to lose. Our military members understand and take seriously their oath to defend the constitutional authority of their civilian masters. They understand that the United States is the only liberal democracy that has never been ruled by its military. But today's soldiers know war and resent civilian policymakers who want the military to fight a war that neither they nor their loved ones will experience firsthand." [48007]

"Civilian control of the armed services doesn't mean that civilians shouldn't listen to those who have seen war. Our most respected soldier president, Dwight Eisenhower, possessed the gravitas and courage to say no to war eight times during his presidency. He ended the Korean War and refused to aid the French in Indochina; he said no to his

former wartime friends Britain and France when they demanded U.S. participation in the capture of the Suez Canal. And he resisted liberal democrats who wanted to aid the newly formed nation of South Vietnam. We all know what happened after his successor ignored Eisenhower's advice. My generation got to go to war. Over the past few days, the opinions of officers confiding in me have changed to some degree. Resignation seems to be creeping into their sense of outrage. One officer told me: 'To hell with them. If this guy wants this war, then let him have it. Looks like no one will get hurt anyway.' Soon the military will salute respectfully and loose the hell of hundreds of cruise missiles in an effort that will, inevitably, kill a few of those we wish to protect. They will do it with all the professionalism and skill we expect from the world's most proficient military. I wish Kerry would take a moment to look at the images from this week's hearings before we go to war again." [48007]

Reuters reports, "Secretary of State John Kerry's public assertions that moderate Syrian opposition groups are growing in influence appear to be at odds with estimates by U.S. and European intelligence sources and nongovernmental experts, who say Islamic extremists remain by far the fiercest and best-organized rebel elements. At congressional hearings this week, while making the case for ...Obama's plan for limited military action in Syria, Kerry asserted that the armed opposition to Syrian President Bashar al-Assad 'has increasingly become more defined by its moderation, more defined by the breadth of its membership, and more defined by its adherence to some, you know, democratic process and to an all-inclusive, minority-protecting constitution. And the opposition is getting stronger by the day,' Kerry told the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on Tuesday [September 3]. U.S. and allied intelligence sources and private experts on the Syrian conflict suggest that assessment is optimistic. While the radical Islamists among the rebels may not be numerically superior to more moderate fighters, they say, Islamist groups like the al Qaeda-aligned Nusra Front are better organized, armed and trained. ...As recently as late July, at a security conference in Aspen, Colorado, the deputy director of the Pentagon's Defense Intelligence Agency, David Shedd, estimated that there were at least 1,200 different Syrian rebel groups and that Islamic extremists, notably the Nusra Front, were well-placed to expand their influence." [48023]

NBCNews.com reports, "As debate grows over the extremism of some armed factions battling to overthrow Syrian President Bashar Assad's regime, an incendiary illustration on the Facebook page of one such group leaves little doubt where its leaders envision the uprising ending—with masked Islamic fighters marching through Washington, D.C., as the U.S. Capitol burns in the background. The image is one of eight photos posted on the official Facebook page of the 'Al-Aqsa Islamic Brigades,' a small armed Sunni rebel faction fighting with the [Obama-backed and John McCain-backed] Free Syrian Army, the main umbrella military organization of the opposition forces. Two other photos posted on the group's page feature the widely recognized black flag of the al Qaeda in Iraq terrorist group, which operates freely in Syria." [48025, 48026]

*The New York Times* reports that Obama "has directed the Pentagon to develop an expanded list of potential targets in Syria in response to intelligence suggesting that the

government of President Bashar al-Assad has been moving troops and equipment used to employ chemical weapons while Congress debates whether to authorize military action. Mr. Obama, officials said, is now determined to put more emphasis on the 'degrade' part of what the administration has said is the goal of a military strike against Syria—to 'deter and degrade' Mr. Assad's ability to use chemical weapons. That means expanding beyond the 50 or so major sites that were part of the original target list developed with French forces before Mr. Obama delayed action on Saturday to seek Congressional approval of his plan. For the first time, the administration is talking about using American and French aircraft to conduct strikes on specific targets, in addition to ship-launched Tomahawk cruise missiles. There is a renewed push to get other NATO forces involved." ("Using American... aircraft" means, of course, exposing them to the possibility of being shot down by Syria's sophisticated air defense system—which it purchased from Russia. There may not be U.S. "boots on the ground;" there may be U.S. "bodies on the ground." Pamela Geller comments at AtlasShrug.com: "He's escalating the war, and we aren't even in it yet. This self-important fool could get us mired in Syria for years, and provoke a much larger conflict.") [48033]

On *The O'Reilly Factor*, Bill O'Reilly asks Democrat consultant and Daily Beast columnist Kirsten Powers if Obama should give back his Nobel Peace Prize? Powers responds, "Yeah. He should have given it back a long time ago, actually—for the drone war, for the escalating the war in Afghanistan, having all these people die unnecessarily. Plenty of civilians have been killed by his drone war, including children, an estimated 200 children have been killed by the drone war." [47972]

On September 6 Obama meets privately with Russian President Vladimir Putin to discuss Syria. [48008]

Residents of Ma'loula [sometimes reported as Maaloula], Syria send a letter to the U.S. Congress: "First, let us tell you what has happened today in Ma'loula and then explain what Ma'loula is like. At 4.00 AM [Damascus time], gangs of the [Obama- and John McCain-backed] 'Free Syrian army,' terrorists and killers... attacked the town, violating the security of houses, monasteries and churches, desecrating icons, and demanding that people renounce their faith and accept Islam. Yes, that is what has happened today at dawn in Ma'loula, when the armed gangs burst into the town, shot in the square, desecrated the icons, and closed the gates. These are the crimes aimed at Christian towns, and the terrorism directed against Christians; and this is only a part of the larger plan of wiping out Christians from our native homes. This is happening now, when our state is still strong. But what will happen when it weakens, when the air force of the USA is bombing Syria? What awaits Christians in the towns and villages? It is terrible and it is scaring us. What happened in Ghassaniyeh [where a Catholic priest-monk, Father Francois Mourad, was brutally killed], in the Monastery of St. Simeon the Stylite, and in Holms, where terrible attacks on churches and monasteries took place. What has happened in all these places, arouses one's conscience, makes one suffer. What have I done to stop terrorism in Syria? I am not even speaking about the massacres that have happened in all towns to the Christian minority." (Pravoslavie.ru notes that the people in

Ma'loula still speak Aramaic—the language spoken by Jesus.) Reverend Raymond Moussalli says that if the Syrian army leaves, the Christians “will be massacred” by the Obama-backed rebel forces. As many as 200,000 Christians reside in Aleppo, and their lives may depend on Bashar al-Assad staying in power. [48319, 48320, 48325, 48507, 48508, 49121]

According to China's state news agency Xinhua, Chinese President Xi Jinping tells Obama, “A political solution is the only right way out for the Syrian crisis, and a military strike cannot solve the problem from the root. We expect certain countries to have a second thought before action.” [48024]

On *CBS This Morning*, Mark Phillips complains that Pope Francis has “taken sides” by opposing Obama's proposed military strike against Syria. Phillips states, “This Pope with the common touch has been uncommonly active, lobbying against an attack on Syria. He's used his last two major public appearances in St. Peter's Square to appeal to world leaders—and that primarily means ...Obama—not to do it... Pope Francis has followed up his appeal by writing to Vladimir Putin as current president of the G-20. ‘Armed conflicts create profound divisions and deep wounds, which require many years to heal,’ he said. It must have been music to the Russian president's ears. The Pope may be taking a moral position, in his mind, but in arguing against military action, he has entered into the world of partisan international politics. He's taken sides.” (NewsBusters.org notes, “Phillips then played [a] clip from British author Michael Walsh. An on-screen graphic labeled Walsh a ‘Vatican historian,’ but the journalist didn't once mention that Walsh is a former Jesuit priest who maligned then-Pope Benedict XVI in the dissenting Catholic publication *The Tablet* in 2012... This isn't the first time the CBS correspondent has given a platform to dissenters inside the Catholic Church. On the night of Pope Francis' election, he singled out two radical feminists who were present in St. Peter's Square, and let them spout in favor of women's ordination and ‘LGBT issues [and] reproductive health care.’ Near the end of the segment, Phillips pointed out that the pontiff has ‘called for a mass prayer, fast, and peace vigil for St. Peter's Square this Saturday,’ but then referred to it as a ‘religious street protest.’” [48019, 48036, 48063, 48099]

Obama holds a press conference in St. Petersburg, Russia as he prepares to return to Washington, D.C. from the G20 summit. He tells reporters his conversation with Putin was “candid.” “I said [to Putin], ‘Listen, I don't expect us to agree on this issue of chemical weapons use,’ although it is possible that after the U.N. inspector's report, it may be more difficult for Mr. Putin to maintain his current positions about the evidence.” [48008]

Obama also announces that he will address the nation on September 10 to make his case for an attack on Syria. (September 10 is a Tuesday. Some might suspect that the prime time address will not be delivered sooner because the White House does not want to interrupt football games on Sunday night and Monday night. It is apparently critical that the nation go to war, but so critical that the National Football League should be inconvenienced.) [47991, 48013, 48014]

Obama tells CNN's Brianna Keilar he has been persuading members of Congress to support military action against Syria, even though there are reports that they have left classified briefings with the administration even more resistant to war than they were before those meetings. Later on CNN, Dana Bash diplomatically tells Jake Tapper, "I respectfully disagree with [Obama] disagreeing with Brianna, because that is absolutely what we're hearing. ... What people are not convinced of, inside, from these classified briefings, and have even more questions about coming out is, again, the military action and the consequences from military action and the fact that—they've questions about whether the administration really has a handle on, uh, what to do for all kinds of contingencies." [47995]

Obama is asked if he is considering alternatives to a missile strike on Syria. He replies, "I'm not itching for military action... and if there are good ideas that are worth pursuing, then I'm going to be open to them. ... I am listening to all these ideas, and some of them are constructive. My goal is to maintain the international norm on banning chemical weapons. I want that enforcement to be real... I want people to understand that gassing innocent people, you know, delivering chemical weapons against children, is not something we do." (To some, Obama's response may sound like, "In case I lose the vote in Congress over military action, I'm starting to give myself other options now.") [48001]

Obama is given a hard time by ABC's Jonathan Karl, who asks, "Why should members of Congress go against the will of their constituents and support your decision on this [a Syria strike], and I still haven't heard a direct response to [the] question, 'If Congress fails to authorize this, will you go forward with an attack on Syria?'" Obama responds, "Right, and you're not getting any direct response..." Karl: "It's a pretty basic question." An irritated Obama: "... What I have said, and I will repeat, is that, uh, uh, I, uh, put this before Congress for a reason. I think we will be more effective and stronger if, in fact, uh, Congress authorizes this action. Uh, I'm not going to engage in parlor games now, Jonathan, about whether or not it's going to pass..." NewsBusters.org notes, "NBC's Chuck Todd, mentioning how the American mood is shifting against strikes, wondered, 'And it seems as if the more you press your case, the more John Kerry presses the case on your behalf, the more the opposition grows... Why do you think you've struggled with that?' Julie Pace of the Associated Press offered a basic question. Regarding aides who claim that a large number of countries back [Obama], she quizzed, 'Can you tell us, publicly, what countries are backing your call for military action and did you change any minds here? [in Russia]?' Major Garrett of CBS News questioned if the public tide against [Obama] had impacted his thinking: 'I wonder if you leave here and return to Washington seeing the skepticism there, hearing it here, that might delay military action?' Clearly, these journalists are capable of actually pressing Obama. If only they would do it more often." [48041, 48059, 48100]

Obama, ridiculing the United Nations, says, "Frankly, if we [in my administration] weren't talking about, uh, the need for an international response right now, this wouldn't be what everybody [all the reporters] would be asking. Um, you know, there would be

some, uh, resolutions that were being proffered in the United Nations, and the usual hocus pocus but... the world and the country would have moved on. So, uh, trying to impart a sense of urgency about this, why we can't have an environment in which, uh, over time, people start thinking, 'We can get away with chemical weapons use,' uh, it's, it's a hard sell but it's something I believe in." (In other words, "I, Barack Obama, am the only brave soul courageously pursuing action against the Syrian regime, but if I don't do it no one else will.") At AtlasShrugs.com Pamela Geller writes, "Who else recalls the hoops George W. Bush had to jump through to go into Iraq? Who else remembers the endless documentation from every US intel agency and the intel from our allies across the world concerning Saddam Hussein's WMD? Years of intel. And majority validation by Democrats and Republicans (who can forget Hillary?) And still Bush was monstrously vilified. Now we have a puffed-up, truly great phony going into Syria still without having provided adequate evidence that Assad is using chemical weapons. Or whose chemical weapons? The WMD the Democrats [claimed] didn't exist? Saddam's? These? These? An Iranian proxy vs Al Qaeda/ Muslim Brotherhood opposition. Only a puffed up moron would jump into those shark-infested waters. At least Assad protected the millions of religious minorities in Syria. And now he [Obama] bypasses the UN, something that as a Senator he never would have let Bush get away with. He is a self-important buffoon hurling the United States into catastrophic action. Where is the statecraft? What can we expect Syria (or Egypt and Libya, for that matter) to look like in ten or twenty years, after Obama wreaks havoc and assists in Muslim Brotherhood/Al Qaeda reigns of terror? And the Republicans are in the tank for him. Who will stop this tyrant?" [48032]

Obama says, "I did not put this before Congress, you know, just as a political ploy or as symbolism." (The inclusion of the word "just" is revealing, and suggests that a political ploy and symbolism are, in fact, elements of his action. (ABC's George Stephanopoulos apparently agrees, as the Media Research Center notes that he intentionally omits the word "just" in quoting Obama on *Good Morning America* and *This Week*.) [48098]

On MSNBC, political analyst and network executive editor Richard Wolffe says, "I do think that [Obama's] press conference today was actually embarrassing. It was as muddled and unconvincing as you could possibly imagine. ...If you want to take a country to a difficult place, which is this authorization for war, you have to be much more clear and convincing [sic; be clearer and more convincing] about what the rationale is. And the rationale is clearly about chemical weapons. But you're not gonna [sic] make a case about chemical weapons by talking about treaties and red lines and international law. At the heart of this was the absolute moral outrage of those civilians being gassed in their sleep. That's it. And this administration cannot seem to stick to that line, which is how they got into this position in the first place." [48051]

According to a WashingtonPost.com estimate, a resolution to go to war with Syria would likely fail, with 108 Congressmen likely to vote against the measure, 116 leaning "no," 184 "undecided," and 25 in favor of military action. Obama has more support in the Senate, where 23 Senators favor action, 52 are undecided 16 oppose action, and 9 lean against a strike. HotAir.com notes that a Gallup poll shows only 36 percent of Americans



favor military action against Syria. (When Clinton ordered military action in Kosovo, his approval rating was 60 percent. George W. Bush's approval rating was 67 percent when a resolution authorizing action in Iraq was approved. Obama's approval rating is at a mere 44 percent—not a strong position to be in when seeking for support for a war that cannot easily be justified.) [47992, 47993, 47994, 48000, 48005, 48006]

French President Francois Hollande announces that his nation's military forces will not join in any U.S. military strike on Syria—at least not before a full United Nations report on the use of chemical weapons is released. Hollande tells reporters, “Yes, we will wait for the inspectors' report.” [48058]

Townhall.com reports that “two more Russian ships are heading to the Mediterranean Sea. The destroyer Nastoychivy of the Baltic Fleet and the patrol combatant Smetlivy of the Black Sea Fleet will join the Russian Navy's task force in Mediterranean in the next few days. ... The Russian navy task force in the Mediterranean Sea is supposed to comprise 16 ships of various types. ... They have the capability to harass any US naval formation of destroyers. ... Navy and Marine Corps veterans question the wisdom of using fleet defense assets—destroyers—in an offensive strike role. The key question is who or what protects the destroyers after they shoot, with Russian destroyers and patrol combatants around. Submarines presumably, but they are not effective in preventing harassment and disruption of surface formations.” [47996]

After a town hall meeting in which he was hammered with concerns about risking American lives in Syria, Senator John McCain (R-AZ) tells KFYI, “The fact is [Syrian President] Bashar [al-] Assad has massacred 100,000 people. The conflict is spreading... The Russians are all in, the Iranians are all in, and it's an unfair fight. And no one wants American boots on the ground. Nor will there be American boots on the ground because there would be an impeachment of [Obama] if they did that. ... [Obama] has bungled this beyond belief. Announced that he's going to strike and then say, 'No, I'm going to the American Congress.' I can't believe how badly he's mishandled this issue.” [47997, 48016, 48037]

WhiteHouse.gov posts a pro-war propaganda page supporting a military strike on Syria. Townhall.com's Katie Pavlich notes, “The page has a video of ... Obama meeting with Congressional leaders about intervention and a transcript of Obama's speech in the Rose Garden last weekend has been posted. What the page doesn't have: Cost of intervention. Number of troops needed for intervention. Who will take over when Assad falls. How long intervention will be. Details about U.S. interests in Syria.” (Even if U.S. military action is successful in ousting or killing Bashar al-Assad, Iran will see to it that a successor is promptly installed in office—and that successor will certainly be sympathetic to Iranian and Russian interests.) [47998, 47999]

The Department of Labor reports that the economy created 169,000 jobs in August—most of which are part-time and low-wage positions. (Economists anticipated 175,000 new jobs.) The unemployment rate falls to 7.3 percent—as a result of 312,000 people

who cannot find jobs leaving the workforce. According to CNSNews.com, “the number of Americans who actually held jobs during August dropped 115,000 from July. The simultaneous decline in both the unemployment rate and the number of people with jobs was possible because the ‘labor force participation rate’ dropped to 63.2 percent in August. That is the lowest it has been since August 1978. The labor force participation rate is the percentage of adults 16 years or older who either had a job or actively sought one in the last four weeks. ...The labor force participation rate had been 63.4 percent in July before dropping to 63.2 percent in August. In January 2009, when ...Obama took office, it was 65.7 percent. [There are about 10 million more Americans age 16 and over who are not in the workforce than when Obama entered the White House.] In July, the Bureau of Labor Statistics estimated that there were 144,285,000 Americans with jobs. In August, the BLS estimated there were 144,170,000—a decline of 115,000.” Although the official unemployment rate declined from 7.4 to 7.3 percent, the unemployment rate for black Americans increased from 12.6 to 13 percent. “[T]he number of African Americans 16 year or older who held jobs dropped from 16,318,000 in July to 16,108,000 in August—a decline of 210,000.” Meanwhile, “The number of workers employed by the government went up 324,000 between July and August while the number of workers in the private sector declined 278,000, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics.” (The government also revised downward the June and July job figures—by a total of 74,000 fewer jobs.) [48002, 48003, 48004, 48012, 48034, 48035, 48038, 48039, 48049, 48129]

The Department of Energy admits it will lose \$42 million on a “green energy” loan to a Michigan company, Vehicle Production Group, or VPG. (According to FreeBeacon.com, “...James Johnson, the former top executive at federal mortgage giant Fannie Mae and a major Obama fundraiser, chaired an investment firm, Perseus LLC, with a stake in the company. Johnson bundled between \$200,000 and \$500,000 for Obama’s 2008 campaign. His financial support for Obama dates back to 2003, when he donated \$1,000 to his U.S. Senate campaign.”) [48161, 48162]

The U.S. government orders “non-essential” U.S. diplomats in Lebanon to leave the country. (The Obama administration apparently believes that its planned “shot across the bow” in Syria will have repercussions elsewhere—repercussions it is not admitting to publicly. Meanwhile, FoxNews.com reports, “U.S. officials have intercepted intelligence indicating Iran recently urged militants to strike the U.S. embassy in Baghdad—raising the possibility that the country is looking to orchestrate revenge attacks if the United States launches missiles at its ally Syria. The Wall Street Journal first reported that the U.S. had intercepted an order from Iran to militants in Iraq, telling them to attack if there is a Syria strike. A senior military source told Fox News that there is indeed such an intelligence intercept, but the intelligence has not been completely vetted.” [48009, 48022, 48028]

JPost.com notes an ABC report that the United States “is planning an aerial strike in addition to a salvo of Tomahawk missiles from Navy destroyers,” and a *New York Times* report that “Obama ordered [an] expansion of [the] list of targets following reports Assad moved troops, equipment. Despite statements from both ...Obama and Secretary of State

John Kerry that a US-led strike on Syria would be a ‘limited and tailored’ military attack, ABC News reported on Thursday that the strike planned by Obama’s national security team is ‘significantly larger’ than most have anticipated. According to ABC News, in addition to a salvo of 200 Tomahawk cruise missiles fired from four Navy destroyers stationed in the eastern Mediterranean, the US is also planning an aerial campaign that is expected to last two days. This campaign potentially includes an aerial bombardment of missiles and long range bombs from US-based B-2 stealth bombers that carry satellite-guided bombs, B-52 bombers, that can carry air-launched cruise missiles and Qatar-based B-1s that carry long-range, air-to-surface missiles, both ABC News and *The New York Times* reported.” (There may not be U.S. combat “boots on the ground” in Syria, but there will be U.S. planes in the air over Syria—vulnerable to advanced anti-aircraft weaponry Syria obtained from Russia.) [48010, 48011]

At NationalReview.com Katrino Trinko reports, “Aides to GOP House members consistently say that overwhelmingly the calls and e-mails that their offices are receiving about Syria are against taking any military action there. Many Republicans have heard from no more than a handful of constituents supporting intervention. Several staffers ... say that, of the hundreds of calls and e-mails they’ve received about Syria, those in support of military intervention can be counted on the fingers of both hands.” The office of Congressman Chris Gibson (R-NY) has received about 850 e-mails—840 of which state opposition to a military strike against Syria. “Gibson opted to go further. Instead of simply waiting for constituents to contact him, his office e-mailed to their list a survey regarding Syria. Of the 5,400 who responded, 85 percent agreed with Gibson: It would be a mistake for the United States to take military action there.” [48015]

Jerome Corsi reports at WND.com, “Evidence is mounting that the strategy by Sen. John McCain, R-Ariz., and Secretary of State John F. Kerry to cast members of the Free Syria Army as ‘moderates’ among the rebel forces opposing the government of Bashar [sic; Bashar] al-Assad was the brain-child of Elizabeth O’Bagy, a 26-year-old graduate student pursuing a Ph.D. in Arab studies and political science at Georgetown University, who is working on a dissertation on woman’s militancy. In his testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on Tuesday, Kerry cited O’Bagy, arguing that the war in Syria is ‘not being waged entirely or even predominately by dangerous Islamists and al-Qaida die-hards,’ but rather the struggle is being led by ‘moderate opposition forces—a collection of groups known as the Free Syria Army.’ ...The O’Bagy narrative, however, is contradicted by intelligence estimates and experts specializing in the region. After Kerry’s testimony to Congress this week, Reuters reported: ‘Secretary of State John Kerry’s public assertions that moderate Syrian opposition groups are growing in influence appear to be at odds with estimates by U.S. and European intelligence sources and non-governmental experts, who say Islamic extremists remain by far the fiercest and best-organized rebel elements.’” (O’Bagy, who opposes labeling al-Qaeda’s al-Nusra Front a terrorist group, opposed ousting Saddam Hussein but supports ousting Bashar al-Assad, is a “Senior Research Analyst and the Syria Team Lead at the Institute for the Study of War, where she focuses on Syrian politics and security.” O’Bagy works “on a contractual basis” as the “Political Director and Humanitarian Aid Coordinator” for the Syrian Emergency Task Force, “an important subcontractor for the United States and

British governments in providing aid and assistance to the Syrian people.” In other words, O’Bagy’s job is to raise funds for groups that oppose Bashar al-Assad. It is not, therefore, surprising that she would work to convince Kerry, McCain, and others that those Syrian rebel groups are “moderates.” According to DailyCaller.com, “In December, O’Bagy opposed the Obama administration’s attempts to designate [Jabhat] al-Nusra—a powerful Syrian rebel group—as a terror organization because of its ties to al-Qaida.” A terrorist designation, of course, means that funds cannot be legally collected for the group in the United States.) [48020, 48042, 48043, 48044, 48053, 48131, 48210, 48327, 48328, 48329, 48433]

FoxNews.com reports, “The Palestinian Authority is doling out millions of dollars in cash grants to convicted terrorists recently released from Israeli prisons in a program announced the same day as the P.A. accepted \$148 million in the latest round of U.S. aid. The authority announced Aug. 18 it would disburse \$15 million in so-called ‘Dignified Life Grants’ to more than 5,000 prisoners who had served more than five years in Israeli lockups, but had been recently released as a show of good faith by the Jewish state to bolster the Middle East peace process, according to Palestinian Media Watch. The announcement came on the same day the State Department’s Michael Ratney, consulate general of the U.S. in Jerusalem, signed off on \$148 million in aid to the cash-strapped Palestinian Authority, currently in the throes of a budget crisis.” [48021]

MorningStarNews.com reports on the brutal killings of Christians in Adu, Nigeria by Fulani Muslims. “Christians believe Islamic extremist groups have increasingly incited Fulani Muslims to attack Christians in Kaduna and Plateau states as well as in Bauchi, Nasarawa and Benue. They fear that Fulani herdsmen, with backing from Islamic extremist groups, want to take over the predominantly Christian areas in order to acquire land for grazing, stockpile arms and expand Islamic territory.” (The Christians were killed by bullets, rather than poison gas, but remain dead nevertheless. Obama has no comment and no plans to fire a “shot across the bow” of the Fulani Muslims, and his ambassador to the United Nations, Samantha Power, has not proclaimed any “responsibility 2 protect” the persecuted Christians.) [48030, 48031, 48323, 48324]

WhiteHouseDossier.com Keith Koffler writes, “If this were Bill Clinton or George W. Bush, I’d think yeah, [a Congressional resolution approving war with Syria] will pass in the end. But not this guy. I can’t say that Obama’s motion to attack Syria will fail, but I can’t say it will pass either. Because Obama has acted very unpresidential for the past four and a half years. Usually that would mean ‘undignified.’ But in this case I mean that he has failed the basic test of... schmoozing members of Congress while staying in touch with the public on important issues. ... I covered both Bush and Clinton, and I’d constantly see a line of lawmakers’ cars parked on the West Wing driveway while their owners hashed something out with the president in the Oval Office. With Obama, the driveway is always nice, tidy and empty. Obama has ignored his homework. He failed to sow the seeds of trust and friendship. And now, suddenly, he wants something. ‘[Obama] is on line one,” congressional aides around Capitol Hill will be saying over the next week to their bosses. For many members, it will be their first serious chat with him. And,

they'll figure, probably their last. ...Meanwhile, Obama hasn't bothered to talk much to the public about national security over the years, about the dangers we still face and the continued need for military action. Instead, he's downplayed the war on terror and focused instead on, I don't know, college education for the masses. And now he'll be back to us Tuesday night asking for us to support a possible war. And he'll wonder how people could possibly be perplexed. We used to require a couple of years of experience of presidential candidates before we leased them the White House. Obama was elected having proven nothing about himself to the public other than an ability to get elected and write autobiographies. And now we see he is entirely bereft of the skills needed to function effectively... He had the momentum of an election at his back to help him achieve, barely, his one real accomplishment—Obamacare. But now he's in danger of being seriously undermined as... commander in chief by what would be a politically catastrophic loss in Congress on Syria. ...[H]e might well lose, because his chickens are coming home to roost.” [48048]

NYTimes.com reports that radical Islamists attacked Christians in Dalga, Egypt. “The monastery’s 1,600-year-old underground chapel was stripped of ancient icons, and the ground was dug up in the belief that a treasure was buried there. ‘Even the remains of ancient and revered saints were disturbed and thrown around,’ Father Yoannis said. Dalga, a town of about 120,000 people, including 20,000 Christians, has been outside government control since hard-line Islamist supporters of [the Obama-backed, Muslim Brotherhood President Mohamed] Morsi drove out the police and occupied the police station on the day the Egyptian military removed Mr. Morsi. Nearly 40 Christian-owned homes and stores have been attacked by Islamists, according to activists in Minya. Bandits from the nearby desert joined the looting and burning, they said. Among the homes burned was that of Father Angelos, an 80-year-old Orthodox priest who lives near the monastery. Father Yoannis’s house was spared a similar fate by his Muslim neighbors. A Christian who fired shots from his roof to ward off a mob was dragged down and killed, the activists said. Armed men can be seen in the streets, and nearly every day Islamists hold rallies demanding Mr. Morsi’s reinstatement. Most Christians remain indoors as much as possible, particularly during the rallies. ‘The Copts in Dalga live in utter humiliation,’ said a local rights activist, Ezzat Ibrahim. ‘They live in horror and cannot lead normal lives.’” (Former President Hosni Mubarak, who Obama arguably helped remove from office, protected Coptic Christians in Egypt by restricting the actions of their persecutors, the Muslim Brotherhood.) [48062]

On September 7 Australian voters elect a new conservative government, tossing the socialist Labor Party out of power. The new prime minister will be Tony Abbott. Abbott states, “Something very significant has happened today. Today the people of Australia have declared the right to government to Australia... belongs to you the people of Australia. From today I declare that Australia is under new management.” On Abbot’s agenda: eliminating the nation’s “carbon tax” and abolishing its “Climate Change Ministry”—including the \$180,000-per-year, part-time job of climate commissioner Tim Flannery. (A few days later, voters in Norway give conservatives control of their parliament for the first time in 24 years.) [48040, 48056, 48096, 48128, 48149, 48150, 48173, 48356, 48535, 48682, 48728, 48864]

*The Guardian* reports, “Egypt’s descent into violent chaos entered a new phase on Saturday as the military-backed government signalled [sic; signaled] a plan to outlaw the Muslim Brotherhood, while troops cleared a Cairo mosque of Brotherhood supporters who were protesting against the removal of President Mohamed Morsi last month. New deaths fuelled a grimly confrontational mood at the end of a week that saw around 800 people killed, and fast-fading hopes for the future of the 2011 revolution that had come to symbolise the Arab spring. Talk of the risk of an Egyptian civil war is no longer outlandish. The government said that 173 people had died across the country on Friday alone. The latest victims included the son of Mohamed Badie, the Brotherhood’s leader. ...[T]he government said that the prime minister, Hazem el-Beblawi, was ‘studying’ plans for the legal dissolution of the Brotherhood, a move that would force it back underground and justify a crackdown that would return it to its position during the days of deposed president Hosni Mubarak and his predecessors.” [48090]

FoxNews.com reports, “International Business Machines Corp. plans to move about 110,000 retirees off its company-sponsored health plan and instead give them a payment to buy coverage on a health-insurance exchange, in a sign that even big, well-capitalized employers aren’t likely to keep providing the once-common benefits as medical costs continue to rise. The move, which will affect all IBM retirees once they become eligible for Medicare, will relieve the technology company of the responsibility of managing retirement health-care benefits. IBM said the growing cost of care makes its current plan unsustainable without big premium increases. IBM’s shift is an indication that health-insurance marketplaces, similar to the public exchanges proposed under ...Obama’s health-care overhaul, will play a bigger role as companies move coverage down the path taken by many pensions, paying employees and retirees a fixed sum to manage their own care. ...IBM told retirees that its current retiree coverage will end for Medicare-eligible retirees after Dec. 31, 2013, according to documents reviewed by *The Wall Street Journal* and confirmed by IBM.” [48046]

Reuters reports, “With the United States threatening to attack Syria, U.S. and allied intelligence services are still trying to work out who ordered the poison gas attack on rebel-held neighborhoods near Damascus. No direct link to President Bashar al-Assad or his inner circle has been publicly demonstrated, and some U.S. sources say intelligence experts are not sure whether the Syrian leader knew of the attack before it was launched or was only informed about it afterward. While U.S. officials say Assad is responsible for the chemical weapons strike even if he did not directly order it, they have not been able to fully describe a chain of command for the August 21 attack in the Ghouta area east of the Syrian capital. It is one of the biggest gaps in U.S. understanding of the incident, even as Congress debates whether to launch limited strikes on Assad’s forces in retaliation. ...The Syrian government, backed by Russia, blames Sunni rebels for the gas attack. Russia says Washington has not provided convincing proof that Assad’s troops carried out the attack and called it a ‘provocation’ by rebel forces hoping to encourage a military response by the United States.” [48047]

Obama returns from the G20 summit in Russia...and plays golf at Andrews Air Force Base. (The trip is arguably a waste of taxpayer dollars, as Obama gained nothing in policy changes or international agreements that would help Americans find jobs. Additionally, he went to Russia with France backing him in Syria, and left with France having second thoughts.) [48050, 48061, 48091, 48125]

Newsmax.com reports, “Suggesting an uphill fight for ...Obama, House members staking out positions are either opposed to or leaning against his plan for a U.S. military strike against Syria by more than a 6-1 margin, a survey by The Associated Press shows. The Senate is more evenly divided ahead of its vote next week. Still, the situation is very fluid. Nearly half of the 433-member House and a third of the 100-member Senate remain undecided. By their statements or those of aides, only 30 members of the Republican-led House support intervention or are leaning in favor of authorizing the president to use force against Syrian President Bashar Assad’s government in response to a chemical weapons attack last month. Some 192 House members outright oppose U.S. involvement or are leaning against authorization, according to the AP survey.” [48054]

IJReview.com writes, “Hollywood’s silence on Barack Obama’s intent to launch a military strike against Syria has been deafening. Now, Ed Asner, the dean of Hollywood anti-war liberals, explains why: They ‘don’t want to feel anti-black.’ ...Finally. A Hollywood liberal had the courage to say it. Hollywood’s ‘moral convictions’ against war and military actions of any kind—which could very well lead to the killing of innocent civilians—are trumped by its fear of being labeled ‘racist’ for opposing” Obama, who is “hellbent on carrying out those military actions—simply because he is black. ...The unspoken message, of course: We must never oppose Barack Obama or his policies. Because he’s black. To oppose the actions of blacks—or fail to blindly take up their causes precisely *because* they’re black [see: Trayvon Martin], means we’re ‘racists.’ In the hypocritical eyes of the left, that is. Wasn’t the nation’s first ‘post-racial president’ ...supposed to change all that?” (Celebrities who were intensely anti-war before Obama entered the White House and who have been silent about Syria include Cheryl Crow, Bruce Springsteen, Martin Sheen, Sean Penn, Tim Robbins, George Clooney, Jackson Browne, Janeane Garofalo, Neil Young, Jessica Lange, Barbra Streisand, Danny Glover, and Susan Sarandon. Entertainer Cher, however, sends a Twitter message: “I Believe,If Pres.Obama,Bombs Syria,it might b His Downfall.He could go From Loved 2 Loathed.U Cant Go Against The Will Of 80% Of AMERICANS.” Whether Cher will be called a racist for opposing Obama is not known.) [48055, 48077, 48085, 48344]

After visiting his dictator “friend” Kim Jong-Un in North Korea, former Chicago Bulls basketball player Dennis Rodman lands in China and is asked if he had tried to secure the release of an imprisoned American missionary, Kenneth Bae. Rodman responds, “Guess what? That’s not my job, to ask about Kenneth Bae. Ask Obama about that. Ask Hillary Clinton.” (Rodman is apparently unaware that John Kerry replaced Clinton as Secretary of State. Rodman is arguably entitled to be peeved by the question, of course, as no reporters have asked Obama about Bae.) [48057]

RonPaulInstitute.org posts a letter to Obama from “Veteran Intelligence Professionals for Sanity (VIPS)” They write, “We regret to inform you that some of our former co-workers are telling us, categorically, that contrary to the claims of your administration, the most reliable intelligence shows that Bashar al-Assad was NOT responsible for the chemical incident that killed and injured Syrian civilians on August 21, and that British intelligence officials also know this. In writing this brief report, we choose to assume that you have not been fully informed because your advisers decided to afford you the opportunity for what is commonly known as ‘plausible denial.’ ...Our sources confirm that a chemical incident of some sort did cause fatalities and injuries on August 21 in a suburb of Damascus. They insist, however, that the incident was not the result of an attack by the Syrian Army using military-grade chemical weapons from its arsenal. That is the most salient fact, according to CIA officers working on the Syria issue. They tell us that CIA Director John Brennan is perpetrating a pre-Iraq-War-type fraud on members of Congress, the media, the public—and perhaps even you. We have observed John Brennan closely over recent years and, sadly, we find what our former colleagues are now telling us easy to believe. Sadder still, this goes in spades for those of us who have worked with him personally; we give him zero credence. And that goes, as well, for his titular boss, Director of National Intelligence James Clapper, who has admitted he gave ‘clearly erroneous’ sworn testimony to Congress denying NSA eavesdropping on Americans. ...Although the ‘Government Assessment’ is being sold to the media as an ‘intelligence summary,’ it is a political, not an intelligence document. The drafters, massagers, and fixers avoided presenting essential detail. Moreover, they conceded upfront that, though they pinned ‘high confidence’ on the assessment, it still fell ‘short of confirmation.’” [48060]

The letter to Obama from intelligence professionals continues, “There is a growing body of evidence from numerous sources in the Middle East—mostly affiliated with the Syrian opposition and its supporters—providing a strong circumstantial case that the August 21 chemical incident was a pre-planned provocation by the Syrian opposition and its Saudi and Turkish supporters. The aim is reported to have been to create the kind of incident that would bring the United States into the war. According to some reports, canisters containing chemical agent were brought into a suburb of Damascus, where they were then opened. Some people in the immediate vicinity died; others were injured. ...Possible also is a false-flag attack by an interested party resulting in the sinking or damaging, say, of one of the five U.S. destroyers now on patrol just west of Syria. Our mainstream media could be counted on to milk that for all it’s worth, and you would find yourself under still more pressure to widen U.S. military involvement in Syria—and perhaps beyond, against Iran. ...We hope your advisers have warned you that retaliation for attacks on Syrian are not a matter of IF, but rather WHERE and WHEN. Retaliation is inevitable. For example, terrorist strikes on U.S. embassies and other installations are likely to make what happened to the U.S. ‘Mission’ in Benghazi on Sept. 11, 2012, look like a minor dust-up by comparison.” Signers of the letter include former NSA employee Thomas Drake, former CIA officer Philip Giraldi, former Marine Captain Matthew Hoh, former National Intelligence Council member David MacMichael, and retired Army Colonel Ann Wright.” [48060]



*The Washington Post* reports, “The Obama administration secretly won permission from a surveillance court in 2011 to reverse restrictions on the National Security Agency’s use of intercepted phone calls and e-mails, permitting the agency to search deliberately for Americans’ communications in its massive databases, according to interviews with government officials and recently declassified material. In addition, the court extended the length of time that the NSA is allowed to retain intercepted U.S. communications from five years to six years—and more under special circumstances, according to the documents, which include a recently released 2011 opinion by U.S. District Judge John D. Bates, then chief judge of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court. What had not been previously acknowledged is that the court in 2008 imposed an explicit ban—at the government’s request—on those kinds of searches, that officials in 2011 got the court to lift the bar and that the search authority has been used. ...The court decision allowed the NSA ‘to query the vast majority’ of its e-mail and phone call databases using the e-mail addresses and phone numbers of Americans and legal residents without a warrant, according to Bates’s opinion.” [48069]

Obama’s approval rating drops to 42 percent in the Gallup poll. [48071]

At NationalReview.com Andrew C. McCarthy writes, “In one corner, we have Bashar Assad. ...Assad is an anti-U.S. thug, the junior partner of Iran, America’s mortal enemy on the Shi’ite side of the Islamic-supremacist street. ...Now on to the other corner: the Sunni Islamic supremacists, who are called ‘rebels’ by the Beltway clerisy to avoid the inconvenience that they describe themselves as mujahideen (jihad warriors). The rebels are teeming with al-Qaeda-affiliated and al-Qaeda-inspired operatives—‘extremists,’ as the Obama administration and the GOP’s McCain wing call them, avoiding the inconvenience that what they are ‘extreme’ about is Islam. ...[T]he Obama Left and the GOP’s McCain wing are applying Washington’s lunatic definition of ‘moderate.’ By this thinking, the Islamic ummah is divided into two camps: an al-Qaeda fringe in one, and in the other the teeming millions of ‘moderate,’ tolerant, peace-loving ‘democracy’ activists. In this fantasy, the Muslim Brotherhood—whose name the Beltway strains to avoid uttering in discussions of Syria—is moderate... and never you mind the bloody catastrophe the Brothers have wrought in nearby Egypt over the last few weeks and months. In truth, the Brotherhood is an implacably Islamic-supremacist organization that is ‘moderate’ only by comparison with al-Qaeda, and, even then, only if we are talking about al-Qaeda’s methodology of full-time savagery—the Brothers are part-timers who, unlike al-Qaeda, think violent jihad is just one item on the sharia-installation menu. ...The contention that there is a strong alternative force within the opposition — rebel factions that oppose Assad, and that not only oppose the Qaeda/Brotherhood factions but are capable of winning without them and then running the country despite them—is a pipedream.” [48072]

McCarthy continues, “The ‘rebels’ know this even if Washington won’t come to grips with it. Colonel Fatih Hasun is General Salim Idriss’s deputy in the Free Syrian Army (FSA)—the assortment of purportedly moderate militias Senator McCain and the Obama administration claim it is in America’s interest to support. On August 22, Colonel Hasun

announced that most of the senior commanders were threatening to resign from the FSA's supreme military council because they reject two Western 'red lines': the demands that they (a) cease collaboration with al-Qaeda and (b) refrain from seizing Assad's chemical-weapons sites. The FSA has no problem working with terrorists. Ideologically, many of its members have more in common with jihadists than they do with the West; more significantly, they know they cannot win without the jihadists. Moreover, there's the dirty little secret about chemical weapons: The rebels not only want them, they have them and they quite likely have used them, both in Syria and elsewhere. Al-Qaeda has been seeking to procure and use chemical weapons for over 20 years—and unlike Assad, al-Qaeda affiliates are quite likely to use them against the United States and Israel if they have the chance.” [48072]

“Personally,” writes McCarthy, “I believe al-Qaeda is worse, by far, than the use of chemical weapons. And someone somewhere must agree with me since Congress, by something close to 535–0, voted [after September 11, 2001] to authorize the use of military force against al-Qaeda. No one, by the way, needed to twist arms or promise the American people we wouldn't put 'boots on the ground' to get that authorization. It was a slam-dunk because it was so patently in the national interest—even though it has meant a dozen years of war, with ground troops, missiles, drone strikes, indefinite detentions, thousands of casualties, the whole run of gore that war entails. So by all means, let's assume Assad has used chemical weapons on a small scale against other Syrians during a bloody civil war that, though undeniably awful, poses no threat to American national security. By contrast, Assad's 'rebel' opposition, spearheaded by the anti-American Muslim Brotherhood, systematically uses al-Qaeda in its military operations—not one or two times, but every single day, and in virtually every attack that causes real damage to the regime. Why is Assad's alleged use of chemical weapons worse than the rebels' use of al-Qaeda?” [48072]

Congressman Justin Amash (R-WI) sends Twitter messages: “If Americans could read classified docs, they'd be even more against Syria action. Obama admn's public statements are misleading at best.” “Attended another classified briefing on Syria & reviewed add'l materials. Now more skeptical than ever. Can't believe [Obama] is pushing war.” “Asked Obama admn officials to correct admn's public statements that are inconsistent w/ info presented at briefings. Public must have facts.” [48078]

In Paris, Secretary of State John Kerry claims, “There are a number of countries, in the double digits, who are prepared to take military action. And I have said previously and I repeat again: We have more countries prepared to take military action than we actually could use in the kind of military action being contemplated.” (The actual count is reportedly zero—which arguably could be written as double digits: 00.) [48128]

On September 8 Obama's chief of staff Denis McDonough admits to Candy Crowley on CNN's *State of the Union* that the United States has no allies willing to join in a military strike against Syria. “Not at this point,” says McDonough, “but it is specific support for holding him [Syrian President Bashar Assad] to account, and it is a recognition that it

happened. We feel very good about the support we have, and we'll continue to build more." McDonough—who also appears on the Sunday talk shows on ABC, CBS, NBC, and Fox to push Obama's case for war—claims, "Nobody now debates the intelligence, which makes clear... that in August, the Assad regime used chemical weapons against its own people. The entire world believes that. Congress has the opportunity this week to answer a simple question: Should there be consequences for him for having used that material." (In fact, many people doubt the intelligence and suspect that rebels used chemical weapons and blamed Assad for their use in an attempt to get the United States drawn into their civil war.) McDonough promises, "This is not Iraq or Afghanistan. This is not Libya. This is not an extended air campaign." (In other words, "Don't worry, Assad, this is just for show—and for Obama's credibility.") [48075, 48079, 48120]

On *Fox News Sunday* McDonough laughably claims, "Politics is somebody else's concern. [Obama] is not interested in the politics of this. [Obama] is interested in making sure that our national security is protected. That's the question, first and foremost, for us." [48081]

McDonough essentially admits that there is no firm evidence tying the Assad regime to chemical weapons use: "All of that leads to, as I say, a quite strong common sense test, irrespective of the intelligence, that suggests that the regime carried this out. ...Do we have a picture or do we have irrefutable, beyond a reasonable doubt evidence? This is not a court of law. And intelligence does not work that way." (The Obama administration is calling for a military strike "irrespective of the evidence" because it only "suggests" that Assad was responsible.) [48086, 48087, 48095, 48174]

Congressman James McGovern (D-MA) also appears on State of the Union and suggests that Obama not bother seeking approval to attack Syria. "If I were [Obama]", says McGovern, "I would withdraw my request." [48080, 48124]

Gregory Hicks, former deputy chief of the diplomatic facility in Benghazi, is interviewed on ABC's *This Week* and says, "I don't know why I was punished" for speaking out on the events in Benghazi on September 11, 2012. "I don't know why I was shunted aside, put in a closet if you will." (According to NationalReview.com, "While Hicks still remains on staff at the State Department, he has not been reassigned to a post since being called back from Libya. In a statement to *This Week*, the State Department said Hicks was not removed from Libya as a result of the statements he has made about the Benghazi attacks and it is working on reassigning him.") [48073, 48113]

Also on *This Week*, Congressman Adam Kinzinger (R-IL)—a former U.S. Air Force pilot who served in Iraq—says, "I don't even know who my White House liaison is. My office actually reached out to the White House and said, 'Hey, we support the strike on Syria, we're going to help you round up support if you need it.' I haven't heard back from the White House yet. ...I haven't heard back from anyone. You can't begin to build a relationship with Congress for the first time when you need their support on something like this." [48080, 48103]

On *Face the Nation*, Congressman Mike Rogers (R-MI), chairman of the House Intelligence Committee—who had initially backed Obama’s plan to attack Syria—says “I’m [now] skeptical myself” and the White House has made a “confusing mess” of the situation. “They [Obama and other White House personnel] don’t have strong relationships in Congress today—that’s a huge problem for them. I think it’s very clear [Obama has] lost support in the last week. ... You have a reluctant commander in chief, first of all, who’s trying to come to the American people and say, ‘I’m going to do something, but I’m not going to do a lot.’ They’re not sure exactly what we’re trying to do.” [48080, 48122]

Also on *Face the Nation*, Congressman Justin Amash (R-MI) says, “I think that there are some things being embellished [by the Obama administration] in public statements [about Syria]. The evidence is not as strong as the public statements that [Obama] and his administration have been making. ... The [intelligence] briefings haven’t given me comfort. [They] make me more skeptical about the situation.” Amash states that opposition from his constituents to an attack on Syria was overwhelming: “[I held] Eleven [town hall] meetings in two days, and what I saw was astonishing. What I saw was not just disapproval of war, it was overwhelming... you really have to take that very seriously.” [48101]

Congressman Elijah Cummings (D-MD) also states that advocating military action is a tough sell: “[Obama] has to come in front of Congress and the nation. When you ask Congress to be involved, you’re also asking our constituents.” Cummings notes that Obama “is being held to a higher standard, the reason being Iraq. ... If we go in and find ourselves mired in a civil war, what do we do?” [48101]

On *Meet the Press*, former California Congresswoman Jane Harman is trotted out to push for Obama’s attack on Syria. Remarkably, she states, “All these folks in both parties, especially in the House, are worried about being primaried [challenged in the primary election]. The base in each party is against this. ... So these folks think that their reelection... matters more than perhaps taking a principled stand. ... They want it to pass... They just don’t want to vote for it.” (John Fund translates Harman’s remarks at NationalReview.com: “In other words, one of the most prominent advocates of ... Obama’s Syrian resolution basically called out many members of Congress as cowards. I have heard from three House members who were appalled at this as a lobbying tactic. ‘We’re elected in part to represent our constituents, and she makes listening to 90 percent of them a sign of cravenness,’ one member texted me. ‘Dale Carnegie [author of *How to Win Friends and Influence People*] this is not.’ ... Up until now, the White House lobbying effort has been dismal. In an astonishing display of either ignorance or brazenness, the White House will mark the first anniversary of the Benghazi terrorist attack this Wednesday by sending National Security Adviser Susan Rice to Capitol Hill to argue the administration’s case for military force in Syria. Rice infamously delivered false talking points on national television, blaming the Benghazi attacks on a spontaneous demonstration against an anti-Islam YouTube video. Sending Rice to Congress to brief

members on Syria is like sending Typhoid Mary to lecture on public health. Her credibility is, to use a diplomatic term, limited.”) [48103, 48121]

Also on *Meet the Press*, Congressman Peter King (R-NY) says, “I just wish [Obama] had laid this out better. I wish he’d quit backing away from his own red line, and I wish he was more of a Commander-in-Chief than a community organizer. ...What I mean by that is, he was Commander-in-Chief. For one year he said this red line was there. And then the red line is crossed, and he sends [Secretary of State John] Kerry and [Secretary of Defense Chuck] Hagel out, all set to basically have an attack. We’re told that Congress is not needed. At the eleventh hour he brings in Congress. And then he says it’s not his red line. So here’s a person who’s vacillating. I can’t imagine Harry Truman and John Kennedy or Ronald Reagan or Dwight Eisenhower ever putting the nation in a position like this on a military policy.” [48115]

According to *The Telegraph*, “There has been a 60 per cent increase in the amount of ocean covered with ice compared to this time last year, they equivalent of almost a million square miles. In a rebound from 2012’s record low an unbroken ice sheet more than half the size of Europe already stretches from the Canadian islands to Russia’s northern shores, days before the annual re-freeze is even set to begin. The Northwest Passage from the Atlantic to the Pacific has remained blocked by pack-ice all year, forcing some ships to change their routes. A leaked report to the UN Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC)... has led some scientists to claim that the world is heading for a period of cooling that will not end until the middle of this century. If correct, it would contradict computer forecasts of imminent catastrophic warming. The news comes several years after the BBC predicted that the arctic would be ice-free by 2013.” According to Sail-World.com, “The first blockage area is at Prince Regent Inlet... This effectively closes the 2013 Northwest Passage without Canadian Coast Guard icebreaker escorts for transit. The alternative is a very technical and risky southern navigation through Fury & Hecla Strait mostly blocked with sea ice.” (In 2007 Al Gore predicted that the Arctic would be ice-free in the summer by 2013. Obama continues to argue in favor of expensive schemes to combat “global warming.”) [48074, 48372, 48386]

Aaron Klein reports at WND.com, “On the eve of a critical Capitol Hill discussion on Syria and two days before his address to the nation, ...Obama has offered Syrian President Bashar al-Assad a way out of any U.S. bombing campaign. Informed Middle Eastern intelligence officials tell WND the U.S. passed a message to Assad through Russia offering a deal that would ensure against U.S. military action if the Syrian leader agrees to the following terms: Serious political reforms that will result in free and fair presidential elections. Assad will not be allowed to run in future presidential elections and agrees to step down from power. An international committee will supervise control of Syria’s chemical weapons arsenal. The international community, with U.S. participation, will help rebuild the Syrian army and security services to guarantee participation from all factions of the population. ...The Middle Eastern security officials told WND that Russia has already objected to the term that bars Assad from running in

future presidential elections. The security officials further stated the U.S. believes Assad will likely reject the deal.” [48076]

CBSNews.com reports, “Several hundred thousand Christians in Syria fear an American attack could lead to their widespread persecution by weakening the Assad government and strengthening Islamic rebels, many of them linked to al Qaeda. ...Christians have flourished under the protection of President Bashar [al-] Assad, but there’s widespread fear that era has ended as Muslim extremists gain power within the armed opposition. ...No one is saying ethnic cleansing yet, but they're thinking it. Christians are not the only ones fearing for their life. Minority groups in Syria do not all agree with President Assad, but they say that he at least keeps them safe. If he goes, they fear a blood bath.” (Christians have been free to worship under Assad, as they had been under Hosni Mubarak in Egypt. In seeking the removal of both Mubarak and Assad, Obama has arguably signed a death warrant for Christians—who now face severe persecution from Muslims in Egypt and Syria.) [48083]

While Obama ignores the persecution of Christians in Egypt and Syria, the Russian Foreign Ministry issues a statement: “Moscow is deeply concerned over the fact that terrorist attacks in Syria have affected Maalula, a symbol of the Christian presence in this country. Its residents speak the Aramaic language, which is almost extinct and is the language in which Jesus Christ preached, and the churches located in this city are among the oldest and most honored churches of Christians.” The statement calls on “everyone who cares about the fate of the people of Maalula to do everything possible to prevent their killing and the destruction of Christian holy places. Terrorist attacks need to be stopped immediately. Special responsibility for them rests with those forces in the region and outside of it that encourage terrorists, intentionally or not.” (At AtlasShrugs.com Pamela Geller writes, “*Russia?* We are living in an alternative universe. This is what America should be doing. Instead, [Obama] is going to Congress to intervene militarily on behalf of the jihadists attacking the Christians. Shameful. Obama’s abandonment of religious minorities under Islamic attack and under the sharia will be the legacy most notorious and remembered of his failed presidency. Mark my words. And where are the church leaders in America on this? Are they too busy banning counter-jihad speakers?”) [48089]

In a radio interview in Switzerland, Carla del Ponte, a war crimes prosecutor and member of the United Nations Commission of Inquiry on Syria, reportedly says, “According to the testimonies we have gathered, the rebels have used chemical weapons, making use of sarin gas.” (At a press conference in Geneva the next day she states, “There are no good or bad ones—they are all bad. Government forces and rebels are both committing war crimes as serious and incredible as each other. I have never seen such acts of torture, even in the Balkans conflict. ...Military intervention would only lead to more victims and deaths and make a political solution more difficult. A negotiated solution is the only one possible for the Syrians.” [48107, 48108]

On the *Smiley and West* radio program, Princeton University professor Cornel West says, “It doesn’t make sense to commit more war crimes. ...If [Obama] doesn’t get the vote that he wants... then I hope he has more sense then to go ahead anyway. But you [co-host Tavis Smiley] used the phrase ‘dictatorial’—and that’s exactly what it would be. You would think in some ways grounds for impeachment.” (West, a leftist who is also black, has been unhappy with Obama because he has not veered the nation far enough to the political left.) [48119]

On September 9 Reuters reports, “White House efforts to convince the U.S. Congress to back military action against Syria are not only failing, they seem to be stiffening the opposition. ...Most opponents of the proposed U.S. military strike do not contest the administration’s view that the Syrian government gassed its own people on August 21. Their expressed concerns focus instead on the effectiveness and potential unintended consequences of a U.S. military response. Only about a quarter of the Senate’s 100 members and fewer than 25 members of the 435-seat House have been willing to go on record in support of Obama’s request, according to a tally by the Washington Post. Seventeen senators and 111 House members are on record against. Leaders of both parties have characterized Syria as a ‘conscience vote,’ not subject to the usual pressure for party discipline. House Minority Leader Nancy Pelosi, for example, has not made a personal pitch for votes in any of the five ‘Dear Colleague’ letters she has sent her fellow Democrats. The White House plans to step up what it has called a ‘flood the zone’ lobbying effort this week, with briefings on Capitol Hill by Secretary of State John Kerry and Defense Secretary Chuck Hagel.” [48080]

In an interview with Charlie Rose on *CBS This Morning*, Syrian President Bashar al-Assad says the United States could “expect everything” in response if it attacks his country. “You should expect everything. Not necessarily from the government.” (That is, retaliation could come from Hezbollah terrorists and others who are not officially part of the Syrian government.) Asked by Rose if he would use chemical weapons, Assad replies, “I am not fortune teller. If the rebels or the terrorists in this region or any other group have it. It could happen, I don’t know.” Assad further states, “We are against any WMD, any weapons of mass destruction whether chemical or nuclear. It’s not only me as a state, as a government. In 2001, we proposed to the United Nations... to get rid of every WMD in the Middle East and the United States stood against that proposal... so this is our conviction and policy. ...Israel has WMD and it has to sign [the existing agreement prohibiting chemical weapons]. And Israel occupying our land. So that’s why we talked about Middle East, not Syria, not Israel. It should be comprehensive. [T]he Russians have completely opposite evidence that the missiles [with chemical weapons] were thrown from area where the rebels controlled. ...In this case, [Secretary of State John] Kerry didn’t even present any evidence. He [said], ‘We have evidence.’ And he didn’t present anything, not yet. Nothing so far.” [48082, 48094, 48114]

AtlasShrugs.com reports that an eight-year-old Muslim bride in Yemen died of genital tears and internal bleeding on her wedding night. “The groom was five times her age.” (Obama has no comment.) [48084]

The *Chicago Sun-Times* reports, “The U.S. attorney’s office in Springfield [Illinois] has been busy the past few years investigating a variety of fraud schemes involving state grants. Thirteen people have been charged so far, six who have pleaded guilty. Two of them have ties to ...Obama. One is the daughter of his controversial former pastor, the Rev. Jeremiah Wright. Another was chief of staff to Obama’s longtime friend Eric E. Whitaker when Whitaker was Illinois’ public health chief. In all, prosecutors are alleging a total of \$16 million in fraud involving state health or commerce department grants and contracts.” [48167, 48168]

In Sukham, Abkhazia, Russian Ambassador Dmitry Vishernev is assassinated. WashingtonTimes.com reports, “The tragedy coincided with the fifth anniversary since the establishment of diplomatic relations between Russia and Abkhazia, the report said. ‘The law enforcement bodies in Abkhazia immediately declared that the terrorist act was thoroughly planned beforehand,’ Noviy Izvestia newspaper said. ‘If the suggested motive of the terrorist act is correct, then it first prompts a conclusion that it has ‘a Georgian track.’ As a matter of fact, no subversive agents from Georgia, who were earlier involved in subversive acts in Abkhazia, and in the 1990s in particular, have been heard of in Abkhazia for more than five years already. Besides, their activity was traditionally confined to the Ghali region. One might suppose that there is a link between the murder of the diplomat with the recent developments in Abkhazia. Thus, recently, President of Abkhazia Aleksander Ankwab declared that Abkhazia was prepared to initiate lifting the ban on sale of land in Abkhazia to foreigners. However, it is well known that there are quite a few opponents of the suggested step in Abkhazia.’” [48237]

At a press conference in London, Secretary of State John Kerry says the planned military strike in Syria will be “unbelievably small” and “limited.” “We’re not going to war,” says Kerry. “We will be able to hold [Syrian President] Bashar al-Assad accountable without engaging troops on the ground or any other prolonged kind of effort, in a very limited, very targeted, very short-term effort that degrades his capacity to deliver chemical weapons without assuming responsibility for Syria’s civil war. That is exactly what we are talking about doing; an unbelievably small, limited kind of effort. ...The end of the conflict [the Syrian civil war] requires a political solution. There is no military solution and we have no illusions about that.” (Kerry’s comment will no doubt please Syrian President Bashar al-Assad.) [48092, 48093, 48105]

Kerry also says that a military strike against Syria could be avoided if Bashar al-Assad would “turn over every single bit of his chemical weapons to the international community in the next week. Turn it over, all of it, without delay and allow a full and total accounting. But he isn’t about to do it, and it can’t be done.” Kerry, clearly shooting from the hip without White House approval, is later “overruled” by State Department spokesperson Jennifer Psaki, who says Kerry’s remark [what HotAir.com calls a “gaffe heard ’round the world”] was “rhetorical” and his point “was that this brutal dictator with a history of playing fast and loose with the facts cannot be trusted to turn over chemical weapons.” Meanwhile, Russia and Syria stall for time, calling for United Nations to send



inspectors back to Syria to examine chemical weapons evidence. Russia then calls Kerry's bluff, saying it is willing to work toward having Syria's chemical weapons placed under international control to reduce tensions. Syrian Foreign Minister Walid Moallem says, "Syria welcomes the Russian proposal out of concern for the lives of the Syrian people, the security of our country and because it believes in the wisdom of the Russian leadership that seeks to avert American aggression against our people." (HotAir.com's Ed Morrissey notes, "After Kerry's statement, it's going to be more difficult for the White House to argue that the time for diplomacy has ended," and "This is the difference between playing checkers and three-dimensional chess." Obama and Kerry are clearly out of their league when playing hardball with Russia. Obama does not dare attack Syria after its offer to relinquish control of its chemical weapons—regardless of whether Obama believes Russia and Syria cannot be trusted to comply with the terms of such an agreement. Obama simply cannot refuse to give them the opportunity to negotiate a deal.) [48110, 48112, 48117, 48126, 48127, 48176, 48226]

On *Morning Joe*, Congressman Mike Rogers (R-MI) comments on Secretary of State John Kerry's pledge that an attack on Syria would be, "unbelievably small and "limited." Rogers says, "I don't understand what he means by that. I don't think describing the size or effort of what our target sets are or what ship fires what missile is in our national security interest, candidly. And again, this is part of the problem. That's a very confusing message—certainly a confusing message to me that he would offer that as somebody who believes this is in our national security interest." At Townhall.com Daniel Doherty asks, "What's the point? If the airstrikes against the Syrian regime are going to be so 'unbelievably small' as to accomplish little or nothing—a seemingly symbolic gesture that gives Obama political cover for issuing his ill-fated red-line proclamation—then why even bother? I mean, is it really worth risking a confrontation with, say, Russia and/or China if the conflict unexpectedly escalates once the U.S. military starts launching bombs? The staunchest opponents of intervention argue rather persuasively that we must not intervene in Syria because, well, it's not in our national security interests, and that attacking Assad will only benefit the rebels—many of whom are al-Qaida affiliated and anti-American. These are important points to consider. And yet Secretary Kerry seems to be making the case for war... so that [Obama] can 'check the box' and say he Did Something to hold Bashar-al Assad responsible for alleged war crimes. This will not do." (*The Obama Timeline* suggests, "You cannot blame Kerry. He had been hearing Michelle complain about Barry being 'unbelievably small' and 'limited' and the phrase stuck in his mind.") [48092, 48093]

Senator John McCain (R-AZ) calls Kerry's "unbelievably small" remark "unbelievably unhelpful." [48130]

At IllinoisReview.com an Oak Lawn, Illinois pastor writes that his handicapped 24-year-old daughter has lost insurance coverage because of ObamaCare. "Rachel has a genetic condition known as Smith-Magenis syndrome. She is mentally challenged. And she suffers from seizures and other health issues related to her disability. Several weeks ago Nadia, my wife, took Rachel for an appointment with the neurologist whom she has seen

for many years. This doctor accepts Medicaid. Upon arriving at the office Nadia and Rachel were informed, however, that the doctor will not accept patients who are covered under the Affordable Healthcare Act. This was upsetting because this doctor provides important care for Rachel. He has seen her for most of her life and is familiar with her condition and her medical history. Nadia offered to simply pay for his services out of our pocket. She was told the doctor could not do that. In fact, she was informed that would be illegal. ...Referring to the health care ID card provided by the [ObamaCare] system under which Rachel is now covered, Nadia called the primary doctor listed on the card. She was informed by this doctor's office that they are not taking patients who are covered under the Affordable Healthcare Act. [Yet] This is the doctor who is listed on the card! ...So, Rachel is no longer able to see any of the doctors who have treated her for her entire life and, at this point in time, she really does not have a doctor. ...The fact that our system has now resulted in a situation where someone like our daughter, Rachel, is currently without all of the doctors who know her is sad, puzzling and, quite frankly, shameful!" [48097]

Newsmax.com notes increasing criticism of Obama over his Syria strategy: " 'I was stunned,' former U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations John Bolton tells Newsmax. 'What [Obama] did was a display of weakness of the kind we haven't seen in an American leader in decades, if not since the 19th century.'" Congressman Peter King (R-NY) says Obama is "abdicating his responsibility as commander in chief and undermining the authority of future presidents." "So far, Israelis and Arabs alike appear troubled by Obama's rendition of Hamlet. Former Israeli UN Ambassador Dan Gillerman called it a 'fiasco reminiscent of the Carter days,' and warned it would bring 'gloating and celebrating' in Tehran. Gillerman told The New York Times the decision would cast 'a very dark shadow' over U.S. credibility." "Arab experts are critical as well. 'He is seen as feckless and weak,' Salman Shaikh, head of the Brookings Doha Center, told the Times. 'Many Arab leaders already think that Obama's word cannot be trusted—I am talking about his friends and allies.'" *Wall Street Journal* columnist and foreign-policy expert Bret Stephens tells Newsmax, "We have the physical capability for deterrence, [but] you have to have both the wherewithal and the will. What we seem to be losing, as we confront the challenges in Syria and Iran, is credibility. We're not taken seriously. And we're not taken seriously because [Obama] issues a red line—as he said a red line 'for me'—and then several months later tells us that he didn't issue the red line, it was the world." Obama is, says Stephens, "hollowing out American credibility." [48102]

Congressman David Nunes (R-CA) tells NationalJournal.com a Syria war resolution is "dead. Completely dead. The House, for sure, it's not even going to be close." Nunes adds that he has "never been so sure about something in my whole [11-year] career here." [48124]

National Security Advisor Susan Rice—probably the person with the least credibility in the White House—discusses the Syria situation at the New America Foundation. Rice states that not punishing Assad for the use of chemical weapons would increase the risk "that deadly chemicals would spill across borders into neighboring Turkey, Jordan,

Lebanon, and Iraq.” HotAir.com asks, “How so? Logically, bombing Assad is more likely to make that happen than any alternative. If you hit him hard, he might retaliate by handing off nerve gas to Hezbollah or to his military units with instructions to go nuts on civilians. Or, if you take out the units that safeguard the gas, you might inadvertently clear the way for jihadi rebels to seize their arsenal before U.S. troops can reach it to secure it. The less Assad has to lose, the greater the risk that he’ll open the valves; the harder the U.S. hits him, potentially turning the tide of the war, the less he has to lose. Punishing this degenerate to send a message to would-be gassers in other countries is fine, and maybe would reduce the use of chemical weapons long-term, but understand that the price of that is probably more gas in the near term, not less.” (On September 11 Rice will brief Congress on Obama’s case for attacking Syria. Whether she will use a “controversial YouTube video” to reinforce her argument is not known.) [48104, 48116, 48121, 48157]

Rice also says, “We do not assess that limited military strikes will unleash a spiral of unintended, escalatory reactions in the region. Assad and his allies would be more than foolish to take on the forces of the United States or our allies.” (Rice’s remark is remarkable, considering that Secretary of State John Kerry has compared Assad to Hitler, the Assad regime has taken the lives of tens of thousands of Syrians, and Assad has supposedly used chemical weapons on innocent civilians. Assad has demonstrated to the world that he is a brutal dictator capable of almost anything, yet Rice and Obama believe he would not do anything foolish—as if killing his own citizens with poison gas and risking world condemnation is not foolish.) [48157, 48165]

On CNN’s *New Day*, Ben Rhodes, White House Deputy National Security Advisor for Strategic Communication and Speechwriting, tells Chris Cuomo, “It’s simply not in anybody’s interest to invite further strikes from the United States by doing anything. We’re going to make it very clear; we’re prepared for any contingency. Our military can handle whatever comes at us. But the fact of the matter is, we don’t think it’s in the interest of Assad or any of his allies in the region to... test the resolve of the United States by doing something after we take this strike.” (In other words, “Don’t worry, if the U.S. military strikes Syria, neither Bashar al-Assad, Hezbollah, al-Qaeda, or anyone else will respond.” Some might argue that Rhodes’ claim is not persuasive—or even believable.) [48165]

In an interview with National Public Radio, Samantha Power, Obama’s new ambassador to the United Nations, says, “If we take military action in this context, it will be a legitimate, necessary, and proportionate response to this large scale and indiscriminate use of chemical weapons by the regime. Nobody has tried harder than this administration to work through the security council over two and a half years. As you’re well aware of, of course, even modest humanitarian and political measures have been rejected by Russia in New York. We’ve had three vetoes put forward—three resolutions put forward, all of which have been vetoed by Russia. And on chemical weapons, specifically, and perhaps most heartbreakingly, even on the day of August 21, when those ghastly images were broadcast all around the world, we couldn’t even get a press release out of the security

council condemning generically use of chemical weapons.” Power is asked, “So let me make sure that I’m clear on this: You’re saying that something needs to be done and it is time to go outside the legal system, outside the legal framework. You believe it is right to do something that is just simply not legal.” Power responds, “In the cases of—we’ve seen in the past—there are times when there is a patron like Syria backed by Russia, we saw this in Kosovo as well, where it was just structurally impossible to get meaningful international action through the security council, and yet in this case you have the grave breach of such a critical international norm in terms of the ban on chemical weapons use, it is very important that the international community act so as to prevent further use.” (Power is both naive and arrogant at the same time, being surprised that Russia would veto Security Council resolutions—as if that is anything new or unexpected—and essentially declaring that Obama can and should ignore the United Nations.) [48109, 48164]

Senators Lamar Alexander (R-TN), Roy Blunt (R-MO), Heidi Heitkamp (D-ND), John Hoeven (R-ND), and Johnny Isakson (R-GA) announce their opposition to a Syrian war resolution. HotAir.com observes, “Mitch McConnell [R-KY], to no one’s surprise, is also leaning no. Suddenly, not only is 60 votes in doubt, 51 is in doubt too, which would be a catastrophic humiliation for the White House in a chamber controlled by their own party. Reid had no choice but to pull the plug, at least for now” by delaying a vote scheduled for September 11. [48112]

At the White House, Obama grants interviews to CNN, CBS, NBC, ABC, Fox, and PBS for broadcast on their evening news programs. WhiteHouseDossier.com’s Keith Koffler observes, “As ...Obama today begins seizing the airwaves to promote his bomb-Syria strategy... the White House must reckon with a single sad fact: Obama has never been able to sell the American people anything other than himself. That is, the man can campaign, but he can’t govern. ...Obama doesn’t really want to put the time into the sometimes grinding mechanics of governing. He not only doesn’t care about building relationships on Capitol Hill, but he has failed to create consistent, reliable messages about his policies that people feel they can grab onto and believe. And you can’t govern by attacking Mitt Romney. ...Obama’s TV campaign to bash [Syrian President] Bashar [al-Assad] won’t change many minds. Unless one means that some inclined to support him will recoil in horror and oppose the attack. If he’s going to win this, he’ll have to twist arms on Capitol Hill, pleading to skeptical Democrats that his presidency is on the line and to Republicans that Al Qaeda will, if we don’t punish Assad, get the green light to set off chemical weapons up and down the prairie. Problem is, nobody on Capitol Hill really believes him either.” (Obama’s problem is not that members of Congress don’t trust him—most of them never have. *His problem is that they now don’t care if everyone knows they don’t trust him.*) [48106, 48130]

In his CNN interview, Obama says of the possibility of averting war if Syria gives control of its chemical weapons to Russia: “It’s possible if it’s real. ...And, you know, I think it’s certainly a positive development when, the Russians and the Syrians both make gestures toward dealing with these chemical weapons. This is what we’ve been asking for not just

over the last week or the last month, but for the last couple of years.” (There is no evidence that the Obama administration has spent a “couple of years” worrying about—let alone doing anything about—chemical weapons in Syria.) On PBS Obama says, “If we can exhaust these diplomatic efforts and come up with a formula that gives the international community a verifiable, enforceable mechanism to deal with these chemical weapons in Syria, then I’m all for it. But we’re going to have to see specifics, and I think it is reasonable to assume that we would not be at this point if there were not a credible military threat standing behind the norm against the use of chemical weapons.” (Obama does not explain why diplomatic efforts were not attempted in the first place. The administration was seemingly content to ignore the civil war in Syria until Obama’s flippant “red line” comment came back to haunt him.) [48156, 48205]

In his interview with Fox News Channel’s Chris Wallace, Obama responds to the news of Russia’s offer to have Syria’s chemical weapons placed under international control: “I welcome the possibility of the development. We should explore and exhaust all avenues of diplomatic resolution to this. ... We will pursue this diplomatic track. I fervently hope that this can be resolved in a non-military way.” But Obama still wants Congress to authorize the use of military force: “I think it is important for us not to let the pedal off the metal when it comes to making sure they understand we mean what we say.” (Meanwhile, Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid (D-NV) postpones a test vote on the issue that was previously scheduled for September 11.) Remarkably, Obama also calls Syria’s military capabilities “not significant relative to the U.S. military.” (Although it is certainly true that Syria’s military might pales in comparison to that of the United States, for Obama to taunt the Assad regime is arguably less than advisable. What the Syrian military cannot or will not do, Hezbollah and thousands of other Islamist terrorists might do—and crazed ideologues willing to blow themselves up have proven to be quite effective against the U.S. military.) [48111, 48112, 48141, 48142, 48158]

On ABC, Diane Sawyer prefaces a softball interview with Obama with the words, “And moments ago, I sat down with ... Obama who seemed to be signaling the tough stand by the U.S. may have caused a dictator to back down.” On CBS, Scott Pelley is less generous than Sawyer, telling Obama, “The people aren’t with you. ... [T]he administration has described evidence to the American people and the world, but it hasn’t shown evidence. And I wonder, at this point, what are you willing to show? What are we going to see, in terms of the evidence that you say we have?” On NBC, Savannah Guthrie asks, “You’ve said that these strikes, if they take place, will be limited. My question to you is, how could you possibly know that? If we strike and Assad retaliates, or Iran does, or Hezbollah, they strike U.S. interests, or even strike U.S. citizens at home, what then? You may want limited action, but can you really promise it?” [48204]

TheBlaze.com reports, “Whatever the State Department and CIA were doing in Benghazi likely ‘had a direct connection to U.S. policy in Syria,’ Rep. Frank Wolf (R-VA.) said Monday evening. During a discussion on the ‘unanswered questions’ surrounding the Benghazi terror attack, the GOP congressman suggested that the State Department and CIA could have been stockpiling weapons for Syrian rebels when the U.S. compound

came under attack on Sept. 11, 2012. ‘Were these rebels being armed with weapons collected in Benghazi? Again, there is reason to believe this may be the case and a clear explanation is warranted,’ Wolf asked, according to a copy of his prepared remarks obtained by the Washington Free Beacon. Because Congress is currently debating aiding Syrian rebels with military strikes against the Assad regime, Wolf says it is ‘more important than ever that the Congress understand U.S. support and assistance to Syrian rebels and either groups responsible for the American deaths in Benghazi may have been at the same time benefiting from U.S. assistance in Syria.’ He went to say that Congress needs more answers on Benghazi before it can make an ‘informed decision’ on a military strike against Syria. ‘The two [issues] are intimately related and may [have] a direct bearing on U.S. national security,’ Wolf added.” [48159]

On Facebook, an astute Obama administration cynic, noting that the Obama had recently closed numerous embassies, writes, “Well, it has come to my attention that they had a very good reason for staging the false terrorist attack possibility. In order to close the embassies there had to be a reason, thus, the phony terrorist threat which even the terrorists denied existed. Why then did the administration need the ruse and why did they need to close the embassies? The answer is so simple it escaped most knowledgeable people for awhile, what happens when an embassy is closed in a panic? All documents and records are scrubbed and destroyed. This would require much explaining unless there were an urgent reason to do so. What did Obama start pushing for immediately after this event?” [48118]

Former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton visits the White House and endorses Obama’s effort to win Congressional approval for a strike on Syria. She says, “I will continue to support [Obama’s] efforts and I hope the Congress will as well. ...Now if the [Assad] regime immediately surrenders its [chemical weapons] stockpile to international control as was suggested by Secretary Kerry and the Russians that would be an important step. But this cannot be another excuse for delay and obstruction and Russia has to support the international community’s efforts sincerely or be held to account.” (Obama has threatened Syria; Clinton now threatens Russia—although she does not define what she means by “held to account.”) Clinton—who cannot afford to lose Obama’s support in 2016—eagerly gives him credit for possibly defusing the Syrian situation: “It is very important to note that this discussion that has taken hold today, about potential international control over Syria’s stockpiles, only could take place in the context of a credible military threat by the United States to keep pressure on the Syrian government as well as those supporting Syria, like Russia.” [48132, 48163]

RollCall.com reports, “An offhand remark by Secretary of State John Kerry that Syria could escape a U.S. strike if it gives up its chemical weapons seemed to be leading to a possible way out of the crisis Monday afternoon. ...By Monday afternoon, the White House was taking credit for the movement but insisted it did not undermine its push to have Congress vote to give the president authorization for military action. ‘We need to keep the pressure on,’ White House Press Secretary Jay Carney said would be the message to Congress. ‘The only reason why we are seeing this proposal is because of the

U.S. threat of military action.” (In the space of a few hours, the White House turns, “Russia and Syria called our bluff” to “We are brilliant negotiators whose mere mention of an ‘unbelievably small’ strike frightened Russia and Syria into action.” Carney does not explain how Kerry’s non-serious “rhetorical” remark could have been so persuasive.) [48110, 48112, 48117, 48126, 48127, 48133]

TheHill.com reports, “The White House insisted Monday that it was legally able to launch a strike on Syria without congressional approval even as it intensified its courting of lawmakers to support military action. White House counsel Kathryn Ruemmler told the New York Times that a strike would be lawful under both domestic and international law. She told the paper that [Obama] could strike because of the ‘important national interests’ surrounding the use of chemical weapons, even without Congress or United Nations approval. Ruemmler contended that while the Syria situation ‘may not fit under a traditionally recognized legal basis under international law,’ it would nevertheless be ‘justified and legitimate. [Obama] believed that it was important to enhance the legitimacy of any action that would be taken by the executive,’ Ruemmler added, ‘to seek Congressional approval of that action and have it be seen, again as a matter of legitimacy both domestically and internationally, that there was a unified American response to the horrendous violation of the international norm against chemical weapons use.” [48134, 48164]

A Pew Research Center/USA Today poll shows a 15 percent increase in the number of Americans opposed to a military strike against Syria. (The percentage jumped from 48 to 63 percent—in only one week.) [48135]

A Fox News poll shows 60 percent of Americans disapprove of Obama’s handling of the Syria situation. His overall approval rating is a mere 40 percent, with 54 percent expressing disapproval of his job performance. According to the poll, 48 percent of American voters “think the United States is less respected around the world today than it was five years ago... up from 37 percent who felt that way last year...” [48136, 48143]

Obama meets with members of the Congressional Black Caucus (CBC) in an attempt to persuade them to support military action in Syria. (According to *The Wall Street Journal*, only two of the 42 members of the caucus supports going to war. According to TheHill.com, “CBC Chairwoman Marcia Fudge (D-OH) sent an email... to CBC members asking them ‘to limit public comment on the issue.’” In other words, “Don’t say anything that will hurt Obama, even if you disagree with him.”) [48154, 48240]

Senator John Thune (R-SD) introduces legislation prohibiting labor unions from receiving special ObamaCare waivers and “backroom deals” to help them avoid following the legislation they helped get passed with their massive support of Democrat legislators. Thune states, “Union leaders are now awakening to the ugly reality of ObamaCare,” Thune said in a statement. “Now that the full consequences of the Democrats’ law are nearing, these same union leaders are seeking a special backroom deal from the White House.” [48137]

After the “Two Million Bikers to DC” rally is denied a permit to gather in Washington, D.C. on September 11, 2013 (even though a permit was granted for a “Million Muslim March”), the motorcyclists are invited to join Special Operations Speaks and Patriots4America—which were granted permits. [48138, 48152, 48153]

Breitbart.com reports, “Sources close to House conservative leaders have confirmed... that House GOP leadership is planning to cave and fund Obamacare’s implementation for at least the rest of 2013. Text of the Continuing Resolution (CR) that will fund the government for 60–75 days will be released on Tuesday [September 10], the conservative source said, before a House vote on Thursday [September 12]. The move comes abruptly as conservatives are ramping up their final push on House leadership with a big Tea Party rally outside the Capitol on Tuesday calling for Obamacare’s defunding.” [48139]

FoxBusiness.com reports, “Small business owners who thought they were off the hook for ObamaCare regulations until 2015 may be in for an expensive wake-up call next month. Beginning Oct. 1 [2013], any business with at least one employee and \$500,000 in annual revenue must notify all employees by letter about the Affordable Care Act’s health-care exchanges, or face up to a \$100-per-day fine. The requirement applies to any business regulated under the Fair Labor Standards Act, regardless of size. Going forward, letters are to be distributed to any new hires within 14 days of their starting date, according to the Department of Labor. Earlier this summer, the employer mandate, which states that every business with at least 50 or more full-time employees must offer workers acceptable coverage or face a \$2,000 penalty per-worker, per-year, was pushed back until 2015. But the Oct. 1 employee-notification deadline stands. Keith McMurdy, partner at FOX Rothschild LLP, says the \$100 per-day fine has been ‘unfortunately overlooked’ by many small businesses, and the dollar amount on the penalty comes from the general per-day penalty under the ACA.” [48140]

In Grand Rapids, Michigan, WWMT reports that Stryker, a Kalamazoo company, has “laid off more than a thousand people” because of ObamaCare and “owes the federal government upwards of \$100 million this year alone” because of the law’s 2.3 percent medical device tax on gross (pre-tax) sales. (The White House has threatened a veto of any bill that repeals the tax, even though it is costing thousands of jobs and is expected to generate only \$30 billion in tax revenue over 10 years.) [48172, 48951]

WashingtonTimes.com reports, “As ...Obama ran to election victory last fall with claims that al Qaeda was ‘decimated’ and ‘on the run,’ his intelligence team was privately offering a different assessment that the terrorist movement was shifting resources and capabilities to emerging spinoff groups in Africa that posed fresh threats to American security. Top U.S. officials, including [Obama], were told in the summer and fall of 2012 that the African offshoots were gaining money, lethal knowledge and a mounting determination to strike U.S. and Western interests while keeping in some contact with al Qaeda’s central leadership, said several people directly familiar with the intelligence. The gulf between the classified briefings and ...Obama’s pronouncements on the campaign



trail touched off a closed-door debate inside the intelligence community about whether the terrorist group's demise was being overstated for political reasons..." [48144]

At McClatchyDC.com Matthew Schofield reports, "Syrian President Bashar Assad has repeatedly rejected requests from his field commanders for approval to use chemical weapons, according to a report this weekend in a German newspaper. The report in Bild am Sonntag, which is a widely read and influential national Sunday newspaper, reported that the head of the German Foreign Intelligence agency, Gerhard Schindler, last week told a select group of German lawmakers that intercepted communications had convinced German intelligence officials that Assad did *not* [emphasis added] order or approve what is believed to be a sarin gas attack on Aug. 21 that killed hundreds of people in Damascus' eastern suburbs. ...The newspaper's article said that on numerous occasions in recent months, the German intelligence ship named Oker, which is off the Syrian coast, has intercepted communications indicating that field officers have contacted the Syrian presidential palace seeking permission to use chemical weapons and have been turned down. The article added that German intelligence does not believe Assad sanctioned the alleged attack on August 21." [48187, 48188]

On *Hannity*, author Ann Coulter says, "...Democrats think being president is a Hollywood movie, and if they just come out and say it's in America's national security interest, Americans will all swoon, you know, like they do in 'The West Wing' when Aaron Sorkin is writing it. But it's not that way in real life. Americans do have a vague grasp of what our national security is, which is why they supported the war in Iraq and they do not support this [Syrian] nonsense. ...I just tweeted out a very interesting article... suggesting that this whole thing was set up by Putin to make Obama look like a monkey. I mean, he controls Assad. Assad is his puppet. Obama issues this red line ultimatum thinking, 'Well, of course, Assad is never going to use chemical weapons. Why would he? This is just my way of announcing we are not interested in the Syrian civil war.' So Putin puts pressure on Assad, or simply places a phone call and says, 'Hey, why don't you use some chemical weapons.' And then the ultimatum has been met. And now you have [Secretary of State John] Kerry doing the same thing, thinking he's setting up a situation, an ultimatum that would never come to pass. 'Well, why don't they just turn over their chemical weapons?' and Putin and Assad leap forward and say, 'Yeah, okay, we'll do that,' and now they are stuck with that ultimatum." (Leftists immediately pounce on Coulter's "monkey" comment, claiming it is racist.) [48155]

On September 10 the Syrian regime—apparently confident that it has bested Obama and delayed a U.S. strike—renews its bombing attacks on rebel forces. [48170]

Obama asks Congress to delay a vote to authorize military action against Syria to give Russia a chance to persuade President Bashar al-Assad to relinquish control over his chemical weapons. Senator Carl Levin (D-MI) says, "What [Obama] wants is to check out the seriousness of the Syrian and the Russian willingness to get rid of those chemical weapons in Syria. He wants time to check it out." [48145, 48146]

The United Nations cancels a Security Council meeting about Syria's chemical weapons. [48146, 48186]

The Syrian government admits that it does have chemical weapons and is willing to give control over them to Russia. [48146, 48151]

In *The Telegraph*, retired British Ambassador Charles Crawford calls September 9, 2013 “the worst day for U.S. and wider Western diplomacy since records began.” [48258]

Sea World in Orlando, Florida confirms that it will cut employee working hours to avoid ObamaCare's health insurance requirement. TownHall.com reports, “Part-time employees at SeaWorld are now limited to 28 hours of work per week, compared to the previous limit of 32 hours. The Affordable Care Act stipulates that all employees who work an average of 30 hours a week must be offered comprehensive health insurance.” (Senator Marco Rubio (R-FL) invites Secretary of Health and Human Services Kathleen Sebelius to visit Sea World on her scheduled trip to Orlando. Rubio writes, “It is my sincere hope that meeting with these men and women will help give you a better picture of what is truly happening in communities across America, as well as why my colleagues and I remain committed to defunding Obamacare before it inflicts additional damage on hard-working Americans.” Sebelius is unlikely to take him up on his offer.) The “Trader Joe's” supermarket chain plans to stop providing [about 1,300] part-time employees with insurance coverage; the “Land's End” clothing company is reducing worker hours to no more than 29 per week; the movie theater chain Regal Entertainment is slashing hours to fewer than 30 per week; and New England Motor Freight implemented an hourly cap in June. (Trader Joe's provides part-time employees with insurance that is similar to the higher-priced “gold” plans provided by the ObamaCare exchanges. For most part-time employees, retaining that level of coverage would cost more than what they have been contributing toward their existing coverage. They can reduce costs by selecting ObamaCare coverage at the “silver” level, but that would provide them with lesser benefits than they have been receiving. Trader Joe's is therefore taking advantage of the health care law by dumping part-timers onto the ObamaCare exchanges—and forcing onto the taxpayers the burden of any subsidy to which those employees may be entitled.) [48147, 48209, 48245, 48251, 48644, 48973, 49026]

At HumanEvents.com Raymond Ibrahim writes, “Now that the attacks on Egypt's Christian churches have subsided, stage two of the jihad—profiting from the fear and terror caused by stage one—is setting in: reports are arriving that the Muslim Brotherhood and its supporters are forcing the roughly 15,000 Christian Copts of Dalga village in south Minya province to pay *jizya*—the money, or tribute, that conquered non-Muslims historically had to pay to their Islamic overlords ‘with willing submission and while feeling themselves subdued’ to safeguard their existence, as indicated in Koran 9:29. According to Fr. Yunis Shawqi, who spoke yesterday to Dostor reporters in Dalga, all Copts in the village, ‘without exception,’ are being forced to pay tribute, just as their forefathers did nearly 1,400 years ago when the sword of Islam originally invaded Christian Egypt. He said that the ‘value of the tribute and method of payment differ from

one place to another in the village, so that, some are being expected to pay 200 Egyptian pounds per day [\$29 per day], others 500 Egyptian pounds per day...’ In some cases, those not able to pay have been attacked, their wives and children beaten and/or kidnapped. As a result, some 40 Christian families have now fled Darga, joining the ever growing list of displaced Christians in the Middle East.” (Coptic Christians were allowed to follow their religion without interference under former president Hosni Mubarak. That changed when, with the help of Obama, the Muslim Brotherhood ousted Mubarak and their representative, Mohammed Morsi, was elected.) [48269, 48270, 48421]

In *The Wall Street Journal* Peggy Noonan writes that Obama is “backing off” from his eagerness to strike Syria “Because he knows he doesn’t have the American people and isn’t going to get them. The polls, embarrassingly, show the more people hear the less they support it. [Obama’s] problem with his own base was probably startling to him, and sobering. He knows he was going to lose Congress, not only the House but very possibly—likely, I’d say—the Senate. The momentum was all against him. And he never solved—it was not solvable—his own Goldilocks problem: A strike too small is an embarrassment, a strike too big could topple the Assad regime and leave Obama responsible for a complete and cutthroat civil war involving terrorists, foreign operatives, nihilists, jihadists, underemployed young men, and some really nice, smart people. Obama didn’t want to own that, or the fires that could engulf the region once Syria went up. His plan was never good. The choices were never good. In any case he was going to lose either in terms of domestic prestige, the foreign result or both. Likely both. He got himself into it and now Vladimir Putin, who opposes U.S. policy in Syria and repeatedly opposed a strike, is getting him out. ...A serious foreign-policy intellectual said recently that Putin’s problem is that he’s a Russian leader in search of a Nixon, a U.S. president he can really negotiate with, a stone player who can talk grand strategy and the needs of his nation, someone with whom he can thrash it through and work it out. Instead he has Obama, a self-besotted charismatic who can’t tell the difference between showbiz and strategy, and who enjoys unburdening himself of moral insights to his peers.” [48180, 48311]

Noonan suggests that Obama’s Syria war speech will be “quite remarkable. It will be a White House address in which [Obama] argues for an endeavor he is abandoning. [He] will be... appealing for public support for an action he intends not to take. ...He will claim the moral high ground. He will temporarily reserve the use of force and welcome recent diplomatic efforts. He will suggest it was his threat of force that forced a possible diplomatic solution. His people will be all over the airwaves saying it was his deft leadership and steely-eyed threat to use force that allowed for a diplomatic break. The real purpose of the speech will be to lay the predicate for a retrospective judgment of journalists and, later, historians. He was the [leader] who warned the world and almost went—but didn’t go—to war to make a point that needed making. ...In any case it’s good for America that we’ve dodged either bad outcome: Congress votes no and [Obama] moves anyway, or Congress votes no and he doesn’t. Both possibilities contained dangers for future presidents. ...[G]et ready for the spin job of all spin jobs. It’s already begun: the White House is beginning to repeat that a diplomatic solution only came because [Obama] threatened force. ...Really, they’re going to say this. And only in part because

this White House is full of people who know nothing—really nothing—about history. They’ve only seen movies.” [48180]

To the surprise of no one, Obama’s former campaign guru, David Axelrod, gives Obama credit for Russia pressuring the Assad regime on chemical weapons: “If [Obama] hadn’t threatened credible military response, does anyone believe Russia and Syria would be coming forward now? No time to falter.” (In fact, Russia has played Obama like a fiddle. It may have avoided a military strike on Syria and saved the Assad regime—and it arguably makes little difference whether Syria’s chemical weapons are “officially” controlled by Russia or by Assad.) [48148]

At DCClothesline.com Robert Parry reports, “A U.S. congressman who has read the Obama administration’s classified version of intelligence on the alleged Syrian poison gas attack says the report is only 12 pages—just three times longer than the sketchy unclassified public version—and is supported by no additional hard evidence.” Congressman Alan Grayson (D-FL), “also said the House Intelligence Committee had to make a formal request to the administration for ‘the underlying intelligence reports’ and he is unaware if those details have been forthcoming, suggesting that the classified report—like the unclassified version—is more a set of assertions than a presentation of evidence.” Grayson states in a *New York Times* editorial, “ ‘We have reached the point where the classified information system prevents even trusted members of Congress, who have security clearances, from learning essential facts, and then inhibits them from discussing and debating what they do know. And this extends to matters of war and peace, money and blood. The ‘security state’ is drowning in its own phlegm. My position is simple: if the administration wants me to vote for war, on this occasion or on any other, then I need to know all the facts. And I’m not the only one who feels that way.” [48169]

HotAir.com comments, “Assad’s not going to give up all of his gas but maybe he’ll give up enough to let the west claim ‘victory.’ If worse comes to worst, Iran and/or Russia will resupply him down the line. ...All the White House really wants from this fiasco is a promise that Assad won’t cause them another headache by using WMD again. They don’t care if he owns chemical weapons, which Syria has had for decades. They don’t even much care if he uses them on a small, plausibly deniable scale. ...What the west cares about is not being dragged into the Syrian maelstrom. Assad’s almost unpardonable sin here was using WMD on a large enough scale that the White House had to do something to save face. The unspoken deal was that he’s free to kill Syrians (preferably jihadis) in whatever numbers he likes so long as he respects the taboo against chem/bio/nuclear. When he crossed the line, he forced a situation where someone, either the U.S. or Assad himself, was going to lose face. And that’s a dangerous spot given how many major powers are involved in the Syria mess. So, who volunteers to lose face in the name of resolving this diplomatically? Easy: Assad does, because ultimately he doesn’t care about that. He wants to win the war and hold onto power and he’s in the process of doing so. If he can keep the U.S. off the battlefield by eating a little crow, it’s worth it. The timing is perfect too since now Obama can claim ‘victory’ in his speech tonight, which ought to further dampen Americans’ enthusiasm for a strike they already perceive as unnecessary.

...The deal that you're going to see at the UN, I suspect, is [Russian President Vladimir] Putin agreeing that the U.S. shouldn't have to take the threat of unilateral force off the table (which is fine since force won't be used now) in return for us agreeing to water down the language of the eventual Security Council resolution so that Assad's noncompliance doesn't automatically trigger an attack. O wants to look tough without having to be tough. That's the perfect way to give him what he wants. Putin's blather this morning was just his way of pushing a demand that he knows he'll have to concede later in return for something more valuable." [48151]

At Townhall.com Neal Boortz writes, "[H]ere's how I see the developments of the last few days. Either it's all very simple, or I'm just simple-minded. ...Putin (background – ass-kicking KGB operative) sees a way to take advantage of this situation to both embarrass and establish a stronger dominance over Obama (background – pot-smoking community organizer). Putin heard John Kerry make a bit of a mistake at a presser [press conference]. Kerry is asked what Assad can do to avoid an attack. The Poodle [Kerry] suggests that Assad could turn over his chemical weapons. The White House immediately refutes the idea, and Kerry's handlers start trying to walk the comment back. But Putin was listening... and he makes his move. Putin, loyal to his primary goal here [which] is to keep his pal Assad in power, immediately seizes on Kerry's idea and makes it a firm proposal. Just that quickly Putin takes control. Now Obama sees a way out. He knows that Putin is controlling the situation here, but at least now he can avoid an embarrassing congressional 'no' vote, the first in American history." [48160]

"But hmmm," Boortz speculates, "Maybe Obama can get some of his groove back here. So he tells us that he was actually talking about this plan for Assad to give up his chemical weapons when he was meeting with Putin last week! Yeah... sure. ...An agreement will be reached between the ass-kicker, the community organizer and the gasser for Syria to turn over 'all' of its chemical weapons. Of course 'all' of the weapons will not be turned over. There will be inspections, but Putin will work with Assad to make sure the inspections are not too thorough. In the end Assad will keep a good portion of those chemical weapons, and Putin will supply him with even more arms. The violence in Syria will continue, though the rebels will be dispirited. In time Assad will once again use whatever chemical weapons he retained to keep the rebels at bay if that becomes necessary. But wait! How can Assad use these weapons and not as much as admit that he didn't turn them all over to the United Nations? Well, that one is easy. He'll use the weapons and tell the world 'See! I told you I didn't use those weapons in the first place! You didn't believe me. Now I gave up my chemical weapons... yet they're still being used against the rebels! This just proves, as I said, that the rebel factions have these weapons and are using them and blaming it all on me!' High fives in Putin's lair!" (Putin has another reason to be happy: Russia's military bases in Syria may have been spared U.S. bombing by his outmaneuvering Obama.) [48160]

At Breitbart.com John Nolte writes, "Monday morning [September 9], Secretary of State John Kerry made what an administration official called a 'major goof' with a never-going-to-happen hypothetical that suggested Syria could avoid American airstrikes by

surrendering their chemical weapons. Even the State Department walked Kerry's statement back. But Russian Foreign Minister Sergei Lavrov immediately seized upon Kerry's flub, and now a member of the Russian parliament is gloating over Putin's checkmate of Obama. Watching one administration bungle after another unfurl, Alexi Pushkov, the chairman of the Parliamentary Foreign Affairs Committee, is publicly mocking Obama. Via Twitter, Pushkov wrote that this mess 'knocks the ground out from under Obama's plans for a military strike.' Kerry's flub played right into the Russians hands; and by breaking weak, stepping back from his own red line, and embracing Kerry's hypothetical proposal during a round-robin of network interviews Monday night, ...Obama chose to repeat Kerry's mistake. Russian President Vladimir Putin now looks like the world's peacemaker, and Syria can dig in and drag this out forever as the West tries to figure out how to secure and destroy a thousand tons of chemicals weapons without putting 'boots on the ground' in the middle of a civil war. The real win for Syria and Russia, though, is that when this diplomatic quagmire is all over, Assad remains in power. This, after Obama said he must go. As I write this, Assad is already taking advantage of the Putin/Kerry monkey wrench. For the first time since the talk of America military action began, today Syria resumed its bombing attacks against the rebels. From Obama's off-script red line comment last year to Kerry's off-script second red line yesterday, the only thing driving American foreign policy regarding Syria are administration blunders. Today, even Israel is laughing at us." [48170]

WeeklyStandard.com writes that Obama's "supporters and publicists in the press know how to package Obama's weakness. The fear that everyone else in the world smells emanating from him like a wounded animal is really just humility and modesty—fitting attributes for the leader of a superpower that needs to make amends for having meddled so long in the affairs of others. And besides, this talk of strength and weakness is juvenile—the world is not a schoolyard. And so Obama ignored Putin's slights and held his head high. This revealed to Putin Obama's real liability, his vanity. Obama always needs to look good. He will embrace defeat so long as he can still imagine himself a handsome princeling. After pushing Obama around for five years, now Putin escorts him out of the Middle East. Here, friend, take my hand. Let me help you to the sidelines. ...Putin's goal is to replace the United States as the regional power broker. Sure, Russia is less a state than a criminal enterprise with lots of energy to sell, while the United States drives the global economy, but so what? What good are American aircraft carriers if you don't have the will to use them? Putin will use anything he has to win, while Obama is looking for a reason not to fire a few cruise missiles into the Syrian desert. There is absolutely no chance Obama would risk a shooting war with Iran. The Russian proposal not only saves Obama from having to do something about Syria, it also, and much more important, shows the way forward with Iran. From the White House's point of view, its credible threat of force made Syria buckle and will similarly bring Iran to the negotiating table. Putin has shown his bona fides as a credible interlocutor with Damascus and will do the same with Iran. Obama can relax now and imagine that he has finally earned his Nobel Peace Prize and that that sound he hears is the tide of war receding. In fact, it is the sound of American allies around the world—the Poles and Czechs, the Japanese and the South Koreans, the Saudis, Jordanians and Israelis, among others—gnashing their teeth.

They now see that they are on their own, and that the word of the United States means nothing.” [48175]

JudicialWatch.org reports, “An Obama-appointed federal judge has handed the administration a major victory, ruling that a Muslim woman’s civil rights were violated by an American clothing retailer that didn’t allow her to wear a head scarf as required by her religion. The lawsuit was filed by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC), the federal agency that enforces the nation’s workplace discrimination laws. In 2011 the agency sued the retail giant, Abercrombie & Fitch, accusing it of religious discrimination for firing 19-year-old Umme-Hani Khan for wearing a hijab at a northern California store. The company, which focuses on hip casual wear for consumers aged 18 to 22, has a policy against head covers of any kind for its employees.” (Whether Victoria’s Secret will be forced to hire hijab-wearing models for its lingerie ads is not known.) [48177]

BeforeItsNews.com reports, “I have received information originating from a well-known former General at the Pentagon; everybody knows this guy’s name. This information comes to me second hand, but I consider the go-between to be very reliable. The information that I have received so far is that five of the US Military’s highest-ranking Generals have met with Barack Obama and warned him that if he orders an attack on Syria he will be arrested and charged with Treason for attempting to provide aid and comfort to our enemies, namely the al-Qaeda affiliate al-Nusra Front in Syria. The generals reportedly punctuated that statement with a promise that if he is convicted of Treason, Barack Obama will find himself swinging at the end of a rope at Leavenworth.” (*The Obama Timeline* is highly skeptical of this and other reports at BeforeItsNews.com, but notes the article here because of its timeliness and the fact that the unfolding Syria events have been strange and unexpected.) [48235]

The Obama administration announces that Secretary of State John Kerry will travel to Geneva, Switzerland to meet with Russian Foreign Minister Sergey Lavrov on September 12 to discuss the Syrian crisis.

RT.com reports, “Two Europeans who were abducted and held hostage for several months in Syria claim they overheard an exchange between their captors which proves that rebels were behind the recent chemical attack. In a number of interviews to European news outlets, the former hostages—Belgian teacher Pierre Piccinin and Italian journalist Domenico Quirico—said they overheard an English-language Skype conversation between their captors and other men which suggested it was rebel forces, not the government, that used chemical weapons on Syria’s civilian population in an August 21 attack near Damascus. ‘It is a moral duty to say this. The government of Bashar al-Assad did not use sarin gas or other types of gas in the outskirts of Damascus,’ Piccinin said during an interview with Belgium’s RTL radio station. Piccinin stressed that while being held captive, he and fellow prisoner Quirico were secluded from the outside world and had no idea that chemical weapons were deployed. But the conversation which both men overheard suggested that the use of the weapons was a strategic move by the opposition,

aimed at getting the West to intervene. ‘In this conversation, they said that the gas attack on two neighborhoods of Damascus was launched by the rebels as a provocation to lead the West to intervene militarily,’ Quirico told Italy’s La Stampa. ‘We were unaware of everything that was going on during our detention in Syria, and therefore also with the gas attack in Damascus.’ While stating that the rebels most likely exaggerated the accident’s death toll, the Italian journalist stressed that he could not vouch whether ‘the conversation was based on real facts.’ However, he said that one of the three people in the alleged conversation identified himself as a Free Syrian Army general, La Stampa reported. Based on what both men have learned, Peccinin told RTL that it would be ‘insane and suicidal for the West to support these people.’ ‘It pains me to say it because I’ve been a fierce supporter of the Free Syrian Army in its rightful fight for democracy since 2012,’ Piccinin added.” [48178, 48312, 48313]

Syrian Foreign Minister Walid al-Moualem states, “I am authorized to confirm our support for the Russian initiative regarding chemical weapons in Syria in compliance with the regime of the [1992] Organization for the Prevention of Chemical Weapons. We are ready to inform about the location of chemical weapons, halt the production of chemical weapons and also show these objects to representatives of Russia, other states and the United Nations.” [48185]

Russian President Vladimir Putin states, “All this will work only in case we hear that American side and all those who support it will denounce using force.” (That is, any deal requiring Syria to relinquish control of chemical weapons to Russia must also require a pledge from Obama not to strike Syria.) AtlasShrugs.com’s Pamela Geller comments, “Obama has been totally played. Putin is Henry Gondorff and Assad is Johnny Hooker, and the mark in the White House is Doyle Lonnegan [the three characters are from the movie *The Sting*], only not nearly as smart. The threat of military force is the only card Obama has”—and with the help of John Kerry, Putin has taken it away. [48185]

Reuters reports, “Secretary of State John Kerry told Russian Foreign Minister Sergei Lavrov his comments about Syria averting a US military strike by turning over its chemical weapons within a week were rhetorical and not meant to be a proposal, a senior US Official said on Monday. Kerry also voiced ‘serious skepticism’ when Lavrov offered to explore the idea, saying that the United States would take a look at any serious proposal, but this could not be a reason to slow the White House’s efforts to secure congressional authorization to use force against Syria...” (Two hours later, Reuters laughably changes its story to suggest that Kerry and Obama had offered such proposals all along.) [48184]

Rush Limbaugh comments, “It’s surreal. We are a worldwide joke and everybody knows it but us. [Do] You know what’s happened on this Syria thing? Have you kept up with this? This is a *Saturday Night Live* skit! ... This is not easy to say, but I’m telling you: In the eyes of the world, this country has to be a laughingstock. It has to be a joke, and most of the people of this country don’t even know it. They’re absorbed with Miley Cyrus or what have you. So, basically John Kerry, in typical John Kerry fashion, misspeaks. He



commits a major gaffe. He attempted to walk the gaffe back. He attempted to take it back. He attempted to recall the gaffe. The Russians, Vladimir Putin, and Bashar Assad, leapt on the gaffe and took it—and the John Kerry gaffe has become the official policy of the United States in Syria with Obama and the media now claiming credit for a brilliant strategy! We have an absolute joke of a secretary of state making an incompetent comment that is so bad for us that the Russians and Assad glom on to it and say they accept it. Kerry tries to walk it back. They say, ‘No, no, no! We’re going with this.’ Obama then says, ‘We can take this,’ and then he quotes Reagan. He says, ‘All we gotta do here is ‘trust and verify’ that the Syrians actually abide by their agreement with this gaffe.’ The media, in the meanwhile, mobilized at full speed to make it look like this whole thing was a strategic initiative orchestrated by Obama, brilliantly and flawlessly executed after being brilliantly conceived.” [48184]

Limbaugh gives his radio audience examples of how the media reacts to the Kerry gaffe: Diane Sawyer: “What a turn of events today.” Erin Burnett: “This proposal from John Kerry, things have changed in the past few hours it seems.” Andrea Mitchell: “The Russians, perhaps seeking a way out of the crisis, jumped on it.” Jessica Yellin: “The John Kerry goof this morning which may have actually been a goof that saves [Obama]” Anderson Cooper: “An offhanded remark. A goof.” John King: “A goof, a mess-up. I’ve never seen a day like this.” Stephanie Cutter: “This is a great development! We could potentially avert a military action! Something worked!” Martha Raddatz: “If [Obama] can get some sort of breakthrough here with Syria, they don’t have to strike.” Van Jones: “A god comes down from the machine and just fixes everything. Deus ex machina. The gaffe that saves the world!” Wolf Blitzer: “Diplomatic, national security win for the US, right? [Obama] would have to deserve a lot of credit.” Andrew Sullivan: “Just a fantastic end result for [Obama]!” Christiane Amanpour: “If this works, it is genius!” [48184]

Limbaugh continues, “Folks, do you realize what’s happening? Somebody has finally taken John Kerry seriously at one of the most inopportune times for United States. It just illustrates that all of this always has been about nothing but Obama. It’s not about the rebels. It’s not about saving lives. It’s not about compassion. It’s not about this, these dreaded chemical weapons, weapons of mass destruction. Obama, in the heat of a presidential campaign, draws a red line. He says, ‘Not while I’m here,’ and nobody listened to him, and nobody paid him any mind because he doesn’t scare anybody. The US is demonstrably now, either in reality or simply because of who runs it, too weak to do anything about it around the world. We’re not going to, and everybody knows it. The first chance Obama had to slither out of a commitment to use force, he took it. A John Kerry mistake. A John Kerry gaffe. Like white on rice, they attached themselves to this, and now the media’s in the process—even though acknowledging that Kerry committed a gaffe—of talking about how genius it was. ‘You know, even when Kerry is stupid, he’s a genius. Even when we liberals make goofs, we are geniuses. We are so smart,’ and then it was learned that Obama, smarter than everybody, had been talking about this with Putin behind the scenes for weeks and nobody knew. We’re being asked to believe this. ... This is all about making Obama look good, folks. You have to understand this. It’s not about anything else, and the way this has transpired proves it and the way the media is covering it proves it. It’s all about yanking Obama out of a mess, a huge one. But now his address

to the nation tonight is gonna be totally different than what he was gonna go out and try to prepare everybody for a strike...” [48184]

Senator Chris Murphy (D-CT) tells CNN’s Jake Tapper, “...I do believe that [Obama] has been talking to the Russians about this [Syrian chemical weapons oversight] for a number of days at least, and ultimately, there are some pretty smart guys in this administration who I know have been thinking long and hard about every possible way around war. And that’s what [Obama] told us today in our caucus meeting with the Democrats, is that he has no interest in going to war. He has no interest in military strikes if he can find a way out of it. I think that the Obama administration has been thinking in very creative ways for a long time about how to avoid military intervention if possible.” (Murphy is either incredibly naive in believing John Kerry’s gaffe was part of a brilliant plan by Obama, or incredibly shameless in pushing that nonsense on the American public.) [48297, 48298]

At NYTimes.com, columnist Maureen Dowd—once a strong supporter of Obama—writes, “Just as Obama and [John] Kerry—with assists from Hillary [Clinton] and some senators—were huffing and puffing that it was their military threat that led to the breakthrough, [Vladimir] Putin moved to neuter them, saying they’d have to drop their military threat before any deal could proceed. The administration’s saber-rattling felt more like knees rattling. Oh, for the good old days when Obama was leading from behind. Now these guys are leading by slip-of-the-tongue. Amateur hour started when Obama dithered on Syria and failed to explain the stakes there. It escalated last August with a slip by the methodical wordsmith about ‘a red line for us’—which [Obama] and Kerry later tried to blur as the world’s red line, except the world was averting its eyes. Obama’s flip-flopping, ambivalent leadership led him to the exact place he never wanted to be: unilateral instead of unified. Once again, as with gun control and other issues, he had not done the groundwork necessary to line up support.” [48211]

On *Special Report*, syndicated columnist Charles Krauthammer calls House Minority Nancy Pelosi (D-CA) “delusional” for claiming that the developments in Syria are a “victory” for Obama. “The policy now is in total disarray. What happened yesterday was clear: the Russians were throwing Obama a lifeline because [John] Kerry had made a gaffe. They gave an opening for Russia to look like the peacemaker, but... their single objective is to make sure that Assad wins the civil war. That’s their [the Russians’] interest. They have no interest in chemical weapons one way or the other. They have a [military] base there; this is the Iran-Hezbollah-Syria axis; it dominates the Middle East; [and] the Russians are behind it. They supplant America as the dominant actor in the region, the first time since 1970, so what was offered yesterday? ‘We’ll deal with the chemicals, but you’re gonna have to deal with Assad [as far as carrying out weapons inspections, etc.]. ...Putin isn’t even stealthy about it. He said openly today that if there’s going to be anything [done] about chemical weapons, the United States has to openly say it will not use military force. ...Anyone who was naive enough to imagine that this was a sincere offer, to quote Hillary Clinton yesterday, this was the [Russian] objective: no American action, a promise and a pledge so that Assad and his side wins. ...[But] there’s

no way the chemicals are gonna be dismantled in the middle of a [civil] war; Libya took eight years when there was no war. ...So their strategy is clear; Obama has walked completely into it and he's got nowhere to go now." [48198]

Obama addresses the nation (in a frantically rewritten speech to reflect the dramatic change in the Syrian situation) in an effort to increase support for a military strike on Syria, despite a Syrian offer to turn over control of its chemical weapons to Russia. Obama states, "Over the last few days we've seen some encouraging signs," but "it's too early to tell" if negotiations over chemical weapons will succeed. "...The images from this massacre are sickening. We know the Assad regime was responsible. When dictators commit atrocities, they depend upon the world to look the other way. ...The facts cannot be denied. The question now is what the United States of America, and the international community, is prepared to do about it. ...I know that after the terrible toll of Iraq and Afghanistan the idea of any military action no matter how limited is not going to be popular." Countering John Kerry's "unbelievably small and limited" remark, Obama says, "The United States military doesn't do pinpricks" and "Even a limited strike will give a message to Assad that no other nation can deliver." (Obama may not advocate pinpricks, but he previously advocated a "shot across the bow" in Syria.) But Obama insists, "I will not put American boots on the ground in Syria. I will not pursue an open-ended action like Iraq or Afghanistan. I will not pursue a prolonged air campaign like Libya or Kosovo. This would be a targeted strike to achieve a clear objective, deterring the use of chemical weapons and degrading [Bashar al-] Assad's capabilities." (Obama may not put "boots on the ground" but he will put "pressurized flight suits in the air." Meanwhile, his "pinpricks" remark prompts immediate ridicule across the Internet: "John Kerry was for pinpricks before he was against them." "Given the events of the past few days, it appears that Putin circumcised this little pinprick.") [48179, 48181, 48182, 48190, 48199, 48200, 48206, 48208, 48220]

Obama says, "I don't think we should remove another dictator with force. We learned from Iraq that doing so makes us responsible for all that comes next." (Obama conveniently ignores the fact that he removed Libya's Moammar Gaddafi with military force—and the disaster left behind as a result.) "But a targeted strike can make Assad—or any other dictator—think twice before using chemical weapons." In another remarkable statement, Obama says, "We don't dismiss any threats, but the Assad regime does not have the ability to seriously threaten our military." (Obama is dangerously dismissing the strength of Syria's Russian-supplied military might—as well as the threat of retaliation by Hezbollah and al-Qaeda.) "Any other—any other retaliation they might seek is in line with threats that we face every day. Neither Assad nor his allies have any interest in escalation that would lead to his demise, and our ally, Israel, can defend itself with overwhelming force, as well as the unshakable support of the United States of America." (Obama is here essentially saying, "Don't worry about terrorist attacks because they could happen at any time anyway." He is oblivious to the fact that an attack on Syria would increase the odds of such attacks. Americans should apparently be willing to accept that risk without question.) Obama notes, "It's true that some of Assad's opponents are extremists. But al-Qaeda will only draw strength in a more chaotic Syria if people there see the world doing nothing to prevent innocent civilians from being gassed

to death.” (The statement is absurd. Al-Qaeda would also “draw strength” if a military strike on Syria leads to a rebel victory over Assad—and al-Qaeda taking over the country and its weaponry.) [48179, 48181, 48182, 48190, 48199, 48200, 48206, 48220]

Senator Rand Paul (R-KY) responds to Obama’s call for war authorization: “Twelve years after we were attacked by Al Qaeda, 12 years after 3,000 Americans were killed by Al Qaeda, ...Obama now asks us to be allies with Al Qaeda. Americans by a large majority want nothing to do with the Syrian civil war. We fail to see a national security interest in a war between a leader who gasses his own citizens and Islamic rebels who are killing Christians. Some argue that American credibility is on the line, that because ...Obama drew a red line with chemical weapons, America must act or lose credibility. I would argue that America’s credibility does not reside in one man. ...There is no clearly defined mission in Syria, no clearly defined American interest. In fact, the Obama Administration has specifically stated that ‘no military solution’ exists. They have said the war will be ‘unbelievably small and limited.’ To me that sounds like they are pre-announcing that the military strikes will not punish Assad personally or effect regime change. It is said that America must act to prevent Assad from using chemical weapons again. But it is unknown whether attacking Assad encourages him or discourages him. It is equally likely that Assad could feel cornered and resort to chemical weapons in an expanded fashion. It is equally likely that the bombing could de-stabilize Assad and he could lose control of the chemical weapons. The Obama Administration has indicated that it would take 75,000 ground troops to secure the weapons and that they are prepared to do just that despite the resolution's admonition against ground troops.” [48183, 48197, 48203]

“The question must be asked, ‘Would a U.S. bombing campaign make it more or less likely that Assad loses control of the chemical weapons?’ The same question can be asked of a series of bad outcomes. ‘Would a US bombing campaign make it more or less likely that Assad attacks Israel with chemical weapons?’ Would a bombing campaign make it more or less likely that refugees stream into Jordan? Just the threat of bombing has increased the flow of refugees. Would a bombing campaign in Syria make the region more or less stable? Would it make it more or less likely that Iran or Russia becomes more involved? Just about any bad outcome you can imagine is made more likely by U.S. involvement in the Syrian civil war. ...Some will say that only the threat of force brought Russia and Syria to the negotiating table. In fact, Russia has been negotiating with the US for over a year to find a peaceful resolution to the Syrian civil war. The possibility of a diplomatic solution is a good thing, though we must proceed with caution on the details. But one thing is for certain, the chance for diplomacy would not have occurred without strong voices against an immediate bombing campaign. If we had simply gone to war last week or the week before, as many advocated, we wouldn’t be looking at a possible solution today. The voices of those in Congress and the overwhelming number of Americans who stood up and said "slow down" allowed this possible solution to take shape. ...If the [war authorization] vote occurs, I will vote no and encourage my colleagues to vote no as well. [Obama] has not made a compelling case that American interests are at risk in Syria. The threshold for war should be a significant one. [Obama] maintains that he still has the power to initiate war. This is untrue. The Constitution gave

the power to declare war to Congress. James Madison wrote that the ‘Constitution supposes, what history demonstrates, that the executive is the branch most prone to war. Therefore the Constitution, with studied care, vested the power to declare war in the legislature.’ This is no small question. I see the vote on whether to go to war in very personal terms. I will not vote to send my son, your son, or anyone’s daughter to war unless a compelling American interest is present. I am not convinced that we have a compelling interest in the Syrian civil war. May God help us make the wise decision here and avoid an unnecessary war.” [48183, 48197, 48203]

Charles Krauthammer responds to Obama’s speech: “[He] urgently addresses the nation on all channels to call for a pause in something that the nation does not want to do in the first place. This is, you know, almost unbelievable. And the fact that he puts so much weight on the Russian proposal, which is a farce. The Russians have said what they’re trying to do is to get a guarantee that America will never strike Syria, meaning Russia wants the installation and the maintenance of the Assad regime, which Obama said had to go, to be a principal of any settlement, which will undo any attempt on the part of the West to ultimately dislodge the man who unleashed the weapons. So, I don’t see that there is a serious proposal. I think Obama sees this as a way to negotiate, to pause, to draw it out. And after a couple of weeks, inspections, negotiation, as if there will not be a vote in Congress, there will not be a strike and we will not have the removal of weapons out of Syria.” [48207]

At GlobalSecurity.org Michael Bowman reports, “Hours before ...Obama was to address the nation on the need to confront Syria’s use of chemical weapons, he met with senators of both major political parties on Capitol Hill. Lawmakers emerged saying a vote authorizing the use of force against Syria is unlikely for now, and any final resolution will take international diplomatic developments into account. ...Obama had little to say after meeting separately with Democratic and Republican senators. ‘It was a good conversation. Thank you very much,’ said ...Obama.” [48314, 48315]

Hillary Clinton is heckled as she concludes a speech after accepting “2013 Liberty Medal.” A demonstrator yells out, “Benghazi! Benghazi! Benghazi!” [48224]

On *On the Record*, retired Lieutenant Colonel Oliver North says, “They ought to remove the *Resolute* desk from the Oval Office because Obama does not deserve to sit behind it.”

In Colorado, two Democrat state senators lose recall elections because of their support for gun control legislation. At NationalReview.com Charles C. W. Cooke reports, “Victor Head, a plumber who had never been politically active, took down a senator in a district that went Democratic in 2012 by ten points; a group of six concerned men from the AR15.com chat room removed the state’s top-ranking legislator.” (While Democrat National Committee chairwoman Debbie Wasserman Schultz blames the Democrat defeats on GOP voter fraud, Politico reports, “Public Policy Polling admitted... that it decided to not release a poll earlier this week showing a Colorado lawmaker being recalled by a wide margin, saying the firm did not believe the results.” Pollster Tom

Jensen states, “We did a poll last weekend in Colorado Senate District 3 and found that voters intended to recall Angela Giron by a 12 point margin, 54/42. In a district that Barack Obama won by almost 20 points I figured there was no way that could be right and made a rare decision not to release the poll. It turns out we should have had more faith in our numbers.” On CNN, Giron charges that she lost because of GOP “voter suppression” and “voter confusion,” but Democrat turnout in her district far exceeded GOP turnout and she outspent her opponent by a reported six-to-one—and she was still defeated. Giron is apparently unaware that many Democrats also own guns and believe in the Second Amendment. In fact, more Democrats than Republicans signed the recall petition calling for the special election to remove her.) [48192, 48193, 48202, 48212, 48218, 48242, 48249, 48250, 48279, 48304, 48332, 48335, 48342, 48354, 48456]

In response to the recall results, a clueless Colorado Governor John Hickenlooper—who was perhaps lucky his own name was not on the recall ballot—says, “Obviously I’ll have to do a better job of getting the facts out there.” (Colorado voters respond to gun control legislation by voting out of office two state senators who want to severely limit their Second Amendment rights, and the Democrat governor believes the problem is simply that they did not do a good enough of job of explaining to “ignorant voters” why they want to limit those rights.) According to a Quinnipiac poll, only 45 percent of Coloradoans think Hickenlooper deserves to be reelected in 2014. Only 44 percent believe Senator Mark Udall (D-CO) deserves to be reelected. (The voter outrage in Colorado is not so much over background checks and gun registration but magazine capacity limits.) [48275, 48286, 48456]

Former Congressman Anthony Weiner finishes a distant fifth in New York City’s Democrat mayoral primary—with a mere 4.9 percent of the vote. Former Governor Eliot Spitzer comes in second place in the race for Comptroller. [48217]

At the leftist web site OpEdNews.com Michael Collins writes, “‘Thank you President Putin for saving me.’ This line was omitted from [Obama’s] speech. Secretary of State Kerry claims that this approach was being negotiated for months. This stretches the limits of credibility to the point of breaking. Hillary Clinton also seemed to take credit for the deal. It is far more likely that Putin offered up this alternative earlier and events in Congress, the likely defeat of the war resolution, made the plan appealing on any number of levels. [Obama] acted coy for a few hours [and] then accepted the Russian offer to take possession of the chemical weapons stockpile in Syria. Putin’s offer saved Obama from a profound political humiliation in the Senate Friday, possibly, and certainly in the House when the authorization was considered. His proposal for action would have been defeated. He could launch an attack anyway, a political catastrophe, or sit silently in defeat. This was a huge favor by Putin. ...[Obama] failed to account for the hundreds of millions of dollars in [U.S.] aid to Syrian rebels and how that prolonged the civil war. This accounted for the hostilities that produced 100,000 deaths, according to the United Nations. [Obama’s] rationale for giving aid to the ‘good rebels’ (the Free Syrian Army) knowing that the bad rebels, Al Qaeda foreign fighters, would benefit, at least indirectly from this aid was odd. He said that failing to act, through a military strike, would have

sent a message to the Syrian people that the U.S. would do nothing, thus guaranteeing Al Qaeda's success in Syria. Al Qaeda is going [sic; doing] the military heavy lifting for the rebels. What makes anyone think they'll just walk off if the rebels win?" [48229]

At NationalReview.com Howard Kurtz writes, "America still doesn't quite grasp the novelty of what Obama is doing in Syria. This is an intervention driven primarily by humanitarian concerns. ...[Obama's] speech confirms that he is committed to taking significant strategic risks on behalf of strictly humanitarian goals. That is not typical of American foreign policy, which is precisely what U.N. Ambassador Samantha Power aims to change, and precisely why we've run into trouble. ...This speech was a close reflection of Power's views. The overwhelming emphasis was on humanitarian goals, with a brief, secondary, and noticeably weak effort to buttress that case with talk about threats to our interests. ...[Obama's] speech tonight failed to persuade that the risks mooted in our debates over Syria are not in fact grave. Obama's line about taking humanitarian steps when it's merely a matter of 'modest effort and risk' comes straight out of Power's work. Unfortunately, the risks in Syria are far from modest. ...A foreign policy that intentionally subordinates traditional calculations of strategic interest to humanitarian ends will inevitably sacrifice our strategic interests. And having lost strategic position, our ability to sustain humanitarian ends, insofar as we can do so consistently with[in] our interests, will be correspondingly reduced. This is what happened in Libya and Syria when we put Power's policies into practice. So not only are we now facing a substantial reduction of our influence in the Middle East and the rise of Russia in our place, but the Syrians are unlikely to give up their chemical weapons in the end. All of this follows logically from Power's theories. Move humanitarianism to the center of our foreign policy at the expense of traditional strategic concerns, and strategic disaster follows. In the end, that means more humanitarian problems, not less [sic; fewer]. Humanitarian interventionism has been tested in the Middle East and found wanting." [48238]

*National Journal* editorial director and veteran journalist Ron Fournier writes, "The good news is we're not at war. The bad news is ...almost everything else about ...Obama's handling of Syria—the fumbling and flip-flopping and marble-mouthing—undercut his credibility, and possibly with it his ability to lead the nation and world. As he addressed a global audience Tuesday night, liberal elites blindly accepted White House fiction that Russian intervention this week was somehow part of Obama's master plan. Their conservative counterparts practically rooted against a diplomatic breakthrough, preferring an Obama black eye over peace. ...Where to start? Obama reversed course on congressional authorization at the last minute, after a private chat with his chief of staff, and to the surprise of his national security team—all in violation of presidential best practices. He then left the country on a quixotic trip to Russia, allowing misgivings to grow in Congress and the public before he could build a case for striking Syria. Boxed in, Obama seized upon a Russian proposal to put Syria's weapons in the hands of the international community. It's an impractical solution, a fig leaf. Either Obama trusts Russian President Vladimir Putin (a mistake) or he is a partner in deceit (an outrage). A Democratic strategist who works closely with the White House, and who requested anonymity to avoid political retribution, told me, 'This has been one of the most

humiliating episodes in presidential history.’ ...As he faced an international and constitutional crisis, Obama and his team were in a familiar state: isolated, insular, and alone.” Meanwhile, *The New Republic*’s Julia Ioffe quotes a congressional staffer who called the Obama’s Syria fiasco “an unmitigated cluster\*\*\*\*” (clusterfuck).” [48265, 48266, 48277, 48288]

At WashingtonPost.com Dana Milbank writes that Secretary of State John Kerry “can be forgiven for being at odds with [Obama, who] in the space of his 16-minute address, was often at odds with himself. He spent the first 12 minutes arguing for the merits of striking Syria—and then delivered the news that he was putting military action on hold.” [48278]

At WeeklyStandard.com William Kristol writes, “Near the end of his speech to the nation on Syria, ...Obama quoted Franklin Roosevelt: ‘Our national determination to keep free of foreign wars and foreign entanglements cannot prevent us from feeling deep concern when ideas and principles that we have cherished are challenged.’ Which of FDR’s stirring wartime speeches does this quotation come from? None of them. The sentence Obama quoted is from a speech Roosevelt gave on October 2, 1935, in San Diego. It’s part of a section of the speech defending a non-interventionist ‘good neighbor’ policy in Latin America and non-interventionism more broadly. Indeed, FDR mentions our ‘deep concern’ mostly to make clear that our involvement will be *limited* [emphasis added] to such concern, because, as he says, other nations’ policies contrary to our rules of conscience and conduct ‘are beyond our jurisdiction.’ Presumably Obama didn’t know the context of his quotation from FDR. But it seems inadvertently fitting that Obama quoted not the FDR who fought Hitler but the FDR of the 1930s. As it happens, the day after the San Diego speech, Mussolini invaded Ethiopia. Italian troops repeatedly and brazenly used poison gas in that conflict. The world, including of course the U.S., expressed ‘deep concern’—but did nothing. As Obama now seems to be finding excuses to do nothing.”[48352]

On September 11 Libya’s foreign ministry building in Benghazi is bombed. Several bystanders are injured by flying glass. [48211, 48213]

At the Pentagon, Obama addresses the families and friends of victims of the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks: “We pray for the memory of all those taken from us—nearly 3,000 innocent souls. Our hearts still ache for the futures snatched away, the lives that might have been—the parents who would have known the joy of being grandparents, the fathers and mothers who would have known the pride of a child’s graduation, the sons and daughters who would have grown, maybe married and been blessed with children of their own. Those beautiful boys and girls just beginning to find their way who today would have been teenagers and young men and women looking ahead, imagining the mark they’d make on the world. ...Even more than memorials of stone and water your lives are the greatest tribute to those that we lost. For their legacy shines on in you—when you smile just like him, when you toss your hair just like her, when you foster scholarships and service projects that bear the name of those we lost and make a better world. When you join the firehouse or you put on the uniform or you devote yourself to a



cause greater than yourself, just like they did, that's a testimony to them. And in your resilience you have taught us all there is no trouble we cannot endure and there is no calamity we cannot overcome." [48191]

Because the State Department chose not to organize a formal event, employees hold their own private ceremony to remember and honor the four Americans killed in the Benghazi attack one year earlier. (Secretary of State John Kerry does nothing but acknowledge the anniversary in an email. According to TalkingPointsMemo.com, "A State Department staffer who worked with [Ambassador Christopher] Stevens in Libya and asked not to be named [said] there were about 20 to 25 staffers at the memorial. The informal gathering was put together after staffers inquired and learned the department would not be holding an official event to mark the anniversary." The staffer relates, "It was very meaningful—we hugged, told stories, laughed, cried. Someone put flowers by the wall, we stood awkwardly, then we went back to work.") [48443]

Katie Pavlich reports at Townhall.com, "The State Department, under the direction of Secretary of State John Kerry, is still refusing to provide requested Benghazi eyewitnesses to the House Oversight Committee for interviews about what happened one year ago today. Yesterday, Chairman Darrell Issa [R-CA] sent a letter to Kerry stressing the only people who can provide a full picture of the 9/11 terror attack are witnesses who survived. 'The survivors of the attacks are the only people who can give testimony to the Committee about what happened on the ground in Benghazi,' Issa wrote in the letter. 'Details provided by the survivors will not only help the Committee determine what took place during the attack, but will also help the Committee and other interested parties determine ways to prevent future tragedies.' A request was made by the Oversight Committee on August 14, 2013 for transcribed interviews with Benghazi survivors. The State Department responded on August 23 by saying it was 'not prepared to provide witnesses for those interviews.'" [48194]

Tens of thousands of motorcyclists drive through the nation's capitol in support of 9/11 victims and members of the Armed Forces, while only a few hundred Muslims—if even that many—attend the "Million Muslim March." (One estimated placed the number of motorcyclists gathered in Washington, D.C at 1.2 million. The contingent from just one city, Los Angeles, was four lanes wide and 55 miles long when it left the west coast.) [48195, 48196, 48206, 48221, 48223, 48225, 48227, 48230, 48231, 48232, 48236, 48252, 48274, 48282, 48321, 48361]

According to a CNN/ORC International poll, "those who watched [Obama's speech] were divided on whether Obama made a convincing case in his speech for U.S. military action in Syria, with 47% saying he did and 50% saying he didn't." [48214]

Victor Davis Hanson tells radio host Hugh Hewitt, "I was underwhelmed [by Obama's speech]. I'd like to think everybody was. He wants to use force, but he doesn't quite want to use force. It's going to be substantial, but not very substantial. He really thinks it's important to consult Congress, but he wasn't going to do it. But then when he got in

trouble, he was going to do it, and then when they were going to vote no against him, he postponed it. He really believes you always have to do it, but of course, he didn't do it in Libya. And the winner of everything is Vladimir Putin. I mean, he's Machiavelli. He's absolutely, in a diabolical way, brilliant, because suddenly, a man with no aircraft carrier group, no Nobel Prize, no big economy, no democracy, is the moral superior to [Obama]. He's posing as a man who stopped a rash and immature Obama from killing people and breaking stuff. Meanwhile, he stole Bashar Assad; 99% of the people you kill, you don't need WMD. You just keep killing them. And we'll talk for the next month about WMD while this naïve [sic] in America keeps trusting us. It's a win-win situation for everybody. And then Obama is reminded by Putin, 'I prevented you from embarrassing yourself, because you would have been turned down by the Congress.' He couldn't have acted anyway. This way, you've got an out with my phony negotiations, which have already made you alter your ... address. And next week, I'll probably alter it again with a new idea." [48215, 48268]

HotAir.com's Ed Morrissey comments on Obama's Syria speech: "At least it was short. That, however, was its only virtue, but even that wasn't enough to raise questions about why Barack Obama bothered to give such a momentous speech to say ... nothing at all new, and nothing at all about what he wanted from the American people. ... Obama sounded contradictory and confused. He attempted to rouse moral outrage over the use of chemical weapons against scores or hundreds children in Damascus on August 21st, which is an easy case to make—but thousands of children have been killed in the Syrian civil war in all sorts of ways, by all sides. Obama argued that Bashar al-Assad had to be deterred from using chemical weapons in the future, but left out any call for regime change, which is still the official strategic goal of the Obama administration. To Americans reluctant to engage in another war, Obama cajoled us to action, claiming that only the United States had the power to bring Assad to heel. And then almost in the same breath, Obama then acknowledged that a diplomatic solution had arisen, despite two weeks of beating the drums for war. Just after arguing that only the US military could solve the problem, Obama said that he was turning to Russia for a potential solution. Not only that, but he also announced that he had asked Congress to hold off on a vote to authorize military action until the Russia and UN track played itself out. This change was necessitated by the fumbling of his Secretary of State, even though Obama himself had just called the UN 'hocus pocus.' So what was Obama asking of the American people? Nothing. What new and convincing information did Obama bring to the American people? None. What new argument did Obama make to shift the strong momentum against military action? He had none. There was nothing new in this speech from Obama that hadn't been argued at length in his six broadcast-network interviews the day before, or that his White House and State Department hadn't offered in the previous week before the speech." [48219]

Politico reports, "The Syria researcher whose Wall Street Journal op-ed piece was cited by Secretary of State John Kerry and Sen[ator] John McCain [R-AZ] during congressional hearings about the use of force has been fired from the Institute for the Study of War for lying about having a Ph.D., the group announced on Wednesday. 'The Institute for the Study of War has learned and confirmed that, contrary to her

representations, Ms. Elizabeth O’Bagy does not in fact have a Ph.D. degree from Georgetown University,’ the institute said in a statement. ‘ISW has accordingly terminated Ms. O’Bagy’s employment, effective immediately.’” [48222, 48241, 48244]

The BBC reports, “Russia has now handed over to the US its plans for making Syria’s chemical weapons safe, Russian media say. Russia announced its plans for placing Syria’s stockpile under international control on Monday and Syria said it welcomed the initiative.” [48228]

PJMedia.com—and just about every other major conservative web site and media outlet—reminds readers of Mitt Romney’s widely-ridiculed 2012 statement that Russia is “our number one geopolitical foe; they fight for every cause for the world’s worst actors.” (The Obama campaign argued that Romney’s statement proved he was naive about world affairs and was still living in the Cold War era. Obama may have won the election, but Romney has been proven right.) [48302, 48454]

The Missouri State House of Representatives votes 109–49 to override Governor Jay Nixon’s veto of the “Second Amendment Preservation Act.” The Act states, “All federal acts, laws, orders, rules, and regulations, whether past, present, or future, which infringe on the people’s right to keep and bear arms as guaranteed by the Second Amendment to the United States Constitution and Article I, Section 23 of the Missouri Constitution shall be invalid in this state, shall not be recognized by this state, shall be specifically rejected by this state, and shall be considered null and void and of no effect in this state.” [48233, 48234]

According to *The Telegraph*, National Health Service (NHS) patients in Great Britain are 45 percent more likely to die in the hospital than U.S. patients: “Previously unpublished data collated by Professor Sir Brian Jarman over more than 10 years found NHS mortality rates were among the worst of those in seven developed countries. A patient in England was five times as likely to die of pneumonia and twice as likely to die of septicaemia [septicemia; a disease caused by toxic microorganisms in the bloodstream] compared to similar patients in the US, the leading country in the study, the data suggested. The elderly were found to be particularly at risk in English hospitals compared with those in the other countries. The figures showed that the situation had improved since 2004, when the death rate in English hospitals was 58% higher than that in the best performing country. But NHS institutions still lagged behind in the most recent data, from 2012, despite reforms of the health service and increased funding.” (Donald Berwick, Obama’s former head of the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, has frequently heaped praise on the NHS. He has also stated that “...any health care funding plan that is just, equitable, civilized, and humane must, *must* redistribute wealth from the richer among us to the poorer and the less fortunate. Excellent health care is by definition redistributive. ...Britain, you chose well. ...I am romantic about the NHS; I love it. ...The decision is not whether or not [sic] we will ration care. The decision is whether we will ration with our eyes open.” According to the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development, Great Britain “...languishes near the bottom of the breast cancer

league table, with a survival rate of 78.5 per cent. ...Heart attack victims in Britain are also more likely to die after entering hospital than in most other developed nations. Around 6.3 per cent of patients who have suffered a heart attack have passed away within 30 days of entering a British hospital—significantly higher than the 4.3 per cent average. The figures also show that British life expectancy is much lower than [its] nearest neighbours.”) [11177, 11178, 11212, 11287, 11345, 11346, 49405]

CNSNews.com reports that “73 percent of all U.S. Afghan War casualties have occurred since Jan. 20, 2009 when Obama was inaugurated. The 91 U.S. casualties in Afghanistan so far in 2013 are more than those that occurred in the first two full calendar years of the war (2002 and 2003) combined, when 30 and 31 U.S. troops were killed there.” [48239]

FoxNews.com reports, “Highly sensitive U.S. military equipment stored in Libya was stolen over the summer by groups likely aligned and working with terrorist organizations, State Department sources told Fox New—in raids that contributed to the decision to pull Special Forces personnel from the country. The stolen equipment had been used by U.S. Special Forces stationed in the country. Lost in the raids in late July and early August were dozens of M4 rifles, night-vision technology and lasers used as aiming devices that are mounted on guns and can only be seen with night-vision equipment. ‘This stuff is how we win wars. The enemy doesn’t have that,’ one source said. The overnight raids happened at a military training camp run by American Special Forces on the outskirts of Tripoli, in the weeks before the team was pulled from the country in August.” [48243]

Fox also reports that Citigroup “plans to lay off an estimated 2,200 workers within its mortgage business by early next year, as rising mortgage rates have hurt mortgage lending and refinancings... Freddie Mac reports the average for a 30-year fixed-rate home loan is now over 4.6%, versus less than 3.5% before the summer. The sudden, sharp rise in mortgage rates has caused a drop in consumer demand, and is helping to push bank workers out the door as bank executives fear mortgage lending will continue to dry up.” Bank of America is eliminating 2,100 jobs and closing 16 mortgage offices. Wells Fargo and JPMorgan Chase are together cutting more than 10,000 jobs. (A 4.6 percent rate is still remarkably low, by historical standards, but many consumers have been led to believe otherwise. A 4.6 percent mortgage remains desirable—when considering what the rates may be in the future.) [48246, 48253, 48254, 48255]

The Heritage Foundation unveils a 67 x 90 foot billboard in New York City’s Times Square that reads, “WARNING: Obamacare may be hazardous to your health.” [48248]

AFP reports, “Russian President Vladimir Putin will offer to supply Iran [with] S-300 air defence missile systems as well as build a second reactor at the Bushehr nuclear plant, the Kommersant business daily reported Wednesday. ...Russia in 2007 signed a contract to deliver five of the advanced ground-to-air weapons—which can take out aircraft or guided missiles—to Iran at a cost of \$800 million. In 2010, then-president Dmitry Medvedev cancelled the contract after coming under strong US and Israeli pressure not to go ahead with the sale of the weapons system, drawing vehement protests from Tehran.”

(Putin now feels emboldened to proceed with the sale, anticipating only a weak response from the Obama administration.) [48257, 48259, 48267]

Tennessee Lieutenant Governor Ron Ramsey sends a Twitter message: “As [Obama] attempts to ally w/ Al-Qaeda in Syria’s civil war, we must always remember who attacked us on our soil 12 years ago.” (Leftists immediately condemn Ramsey for “insulting” Obama. Ramsey refuses to back down, the next day writing at Facebook.com: “Every September 11 since that tragic Tuesday in 2001 has been a day of remembrance. We remember those who died, those who served and those who carry on. But we must also remember those who attacked us and why. The Syrian rebels connections to Al-Qaeda are well-established and well-known. I am proud to stand with leaders like Senator Ted Cruz and Senator Rand Paul against coming to the aid of our enemies, enemies who continue to hate our country from afar as they kill Christians in their own country.”) [48316, 48317, 48318]

At WSJ.com Daniel Henninger writes, “A consensus assessment of the past week’s events could easily form around Oliver Hardy’s famous lament to the compulsive bumbler Stan Laurel: ‘Here’s another nice mess you’ve gotten us into!’ In the interplay between Barack Obama and John Kerry, it’s not obvious which one is Laurel and which one is Hardy. But diplomatic slapstick is not funny. ...The past week was a perfect storm of American malfunction. Colliding at the center of a serious foreign-policy crisis was Barack Obama’s manifest skills deficit, conservative animosity toward Mr. Obama, Republican distrust of his leadership, and the reflexive opportunism of politicians from Washington to Moscow. It is Barack Obama’s impulse to make himself and whatever is in his head the center of attention. By now, we are used to it. But this week he turned himself, the presidency and the United States into a spectacle. We were alternately shocked and agog at these events. Now the sobering-up has to begin. ...The belief by some that we can ride this out till a Reagan-like rescue comes in the 2016 election is wrong. Jimmy Carter’s Iranian hostage crisis began on Nov. 4, 1979. One quick year later, the American people turned to Ronald Reagan. There will be no such chance next year or the year after that—not till November 2016. ...The White House, Congress and Beltway pundits are exhaling after the president of Russia took America off the hook of that frightful intervention vote by offering, in the middle of a war, to transfer Syria’s chemical weapons inventory to the U.N.—a fairy tale if ever there was one. Ask any chemical-weapons disposal specialist. Syria looks lost. The question now is whether anyone who participated in the fiasco, from left to right, will adjust to avoid a repeat when the next crisis comes. [Obama] himself needs somehow to look beyond his own instinct on foreign policy. ...Allowing this week to become the status quo is unthinkable. A 40-month run of Laurel and Hardy’s America will endanger everyone.” [48259]

The editors of NationalReview.com write, “It’s hard to recall a more pathetic spectacle in the annals of American national security than ...Obama trying in a speech to the nation to talk his way out of his proposed war in Syria via a transparently cynical Russian diplomatic initiative. There have been more damaging episodes, but perhaps none quite as cringe-inducing. [Obama] made a case for action, pounding his chest about the U.S.

military not doing pinpricks, and then reverted to the unworkable Putin proposal as just the thing to defuse the crisis. He elided [sic; eluded, omitted] the fact that the plan—such as it is—issued from John Kerry’s gaffe in speaking off the cuff about how Syria could avoid a strike by giving up its chemical weapons. Kerry then added the important and sensible caveat that such a scheme wouldn’t work. Given the extent of Syria’s chemical weapons (hundreds of tons), the state of the country (ravaged by civil war), and the sincerity of the Assad regime and the Kremlin (nil), Kerry will surely be proved out. But such was the desperation of the administration that it has grasped this tenuous lifeline to keep its head above water a few more days, hoping that attention to the matter will fade and it will never have to hear the phrase ‘red line’ again. ...Make no mistake: Everyone around the world—our adversaries and our allies—knows who blinked. In supporting a strike, we warned that a failure to act would lead to a loss of U.S. credibility. This deal is the immediate, concrete expression of that loss, with Putin elevated, Assad more secure, and Obama humiliated. Some opponents of a strike argued that Assad would suffer nothing important from it, continue to deploy chemical weapons, and gain prestige from withstanding the military might of the United States. Assad evidently disagreed. That the Syrian regime has now admitted that it has chemical weapons (after long denials), and feels compelled to play along with the disarmament plan, shows that the mere presence of U.S. warships off its shores concentrated the mind. American power is a fearsome thing. But the American presidency at the moment, occupied by a rank amateur, is not.” [48287]

Adam Ereli, former U.S. ambassador to Bahrain, tells Politico the Kerry/Putin/Syria chemical weapons proposal is a “smoke screen. Nobody knows how many weapons they have, nobody knows where they are. It all depends on the Syrians providing full, accountable transparency.” Former State Department official Robert Joseph says, “I don’t think for one moment that the Syrians will give up their chemical weapons stocks. They will say they will give it up and they will play the game to undercut any support for a military strike. But they will then start to put conditions on verification and on the foreign presence in Syria. Soon, they will start in with Israel; demanding that Israel’s nuclear weapons be put on the table. All of this will lead nowhere for the United States—exactly where Damascus and Moscow want it to go.” [48292, 48293]

*The Washington Post* reports, “The CIA has begun delivering weapons to rebels in Syria, ending months of delay in lethal aid that had been promised by the Obama administration, according to U.S. officials and Syrian figures. The shipments began streaming into the country over the past two weeks, along with separate deliveries by the State Department of vehicles and other gear—a flow of material that marks a major escalation of the U.S. role in Syria’s civil war. ...The arms are being delivered as the United States is also shipping new types of nonlethal gear to rebels. That aid includes vehicles, sophisticated communications equipment and advanced combat medical kits.” (An estimated 50 percent of the rebel forces are Islamist extremists. The *Post* does not explain how Obama plans to keep U.S. arms out of their hands. Opposition fighters certainly do not wear clearly-identifiable “good guy” and “bad guy” uniforms.) [48294, 48295]

Judicial Watch releases a report on the Benghazi attack of September 11, 2012 titled, “Unanswered Questions and the Quest for Accountability From the Obama Administration.” According to ConservativeAngle.com, the 42-page document “asserts that the story of Benghazi is a ‘story of political treachery in high places.’ Part One is devoted to in-depth analysis, supervised by former State Department Security Special Agent Raymond Fournier. It details the critical time period before the Benghazi attack, when the numerous requests for added security by U.S. personnel were ignored by top State Department officials. In addition, the Obama’s ludicrous and misleading claim that ‘an obscure Internet video’ triggered the attacks is reviewed. ...Part Two of the Special Report deals with new information accrued revolving around the aftermath of the Benghazi attacks. This section shows how the Obama administration withheld information about the attacks and how the Administration responded. It also includes a ‘Benghazi Chronology,’ listing more than 30 violent incidents revolving around Benghazi all the way back to December 2011, and also details the cable Ambassador Christopher Stevens sent to Washington D.C. the morning of September 11, 2012, which stated Libyans’ ‘growing frustration with police and security forces who were too weak to keep the country secure.’ ...Judicial Watch President Tom Fitton concluded: ‘Here we are, one year after the Benghazi attack, and there has been zero accountability. No military action, no drones, no arrests. No one has been fired for the Obama administration lies and malfeasance. Without a select committee, Congress will continue to drift on Benghazi accountability. Grassroots Americans want justice for the Benghazi Four but I fear, but for our independent investigations and lawsuits, the Washington Establishment would be happy to sweep Benghazi under the rug.’ [48307]

According to Debka.com, “Iran, and not just Russia and Syria, is taking advantage of ...Obama’s decision to refrain from military force against Syria to collect a shower of diplomatic and political dividends. ...For ...Obama, the two issues—the disposal of Syria’s chemical weapons and resolution of the nuclear controversy with Iran—were closely interwoven in his quiet exchanges with Vladimir Putin, which emphasized the diplomatic, non-military route. The Russian leader appears to have assured Obama that an agreed formula for defusing the Syrian chemical weapons issue without military force would provide the key to progress in nuclear talks with Iran. Our Iranian sources report that Tehran was in on all stages of the discreet Obama-Putin discussions on Syria: High-ranking Iranian officials were present in Damascus and Moscow throughout, and points of agreement were brought to Tehran for approval.” [48326]

At Mychal-Massie.com venture capitalist Dan Bubalo writes, “I have been able to verify something *extremely* troubling in the past 12 hours. A close and verifiable source contacted me to lament the deployment of a friend from Ft. Hood to Egypt, where this particular soldier will be for the next nine months. We have no military base in Egypt, so we’re all trying to understand the assignment and wonder if he and the other 400 soldiers are living in a tent in the desert, and if they are, how do they receive supplies, from everything to food, water, ammunition, and fuel to conduct whatever mission they are to fulfill, for I cannot imagine a C-140 [transport plane] being allowed to land at Cairo International. The following information has been sourced thoroughly. This particular soldier said that while he was not really thrilled about the assignment to Egypt, it was

better than the soldiers that remained at the military base *BECAUSE THEY HAD JUST RECEIVED THEIR DEPLOYMENT ORDERS TO GO TO SYRIA*. That certainly contradicts the posturing and false reassurances and table-pounding of Obama and Kerry, does it not? ...[D]on't forget: the man who lied about gun running to the Mexican cartels, IRS targeting, the contents of the health care bill, NSA eavesdropping, is the same psychopath that assured Americans there would be 'no boots on the ground,' and that it will be a very small, strategic attack. Why, then, do soldiers at Ft. Hood already have in hand their deployment assignments to go to Syria?" [48364, 48365]

On MSNBC's *Hardball*, Chris Matthews criticizes Obama for being "reactive," and says, "It doesn't look good; it doesn't inspire." Liberal *Washington Post* columnist Dana Milbank says, "What we know from the [George W.] Bush presidency, love him or hate him, there was always forceful leadership. He got stuff done. He got *bad* stuff done, but he got stuff done. ...[H]e hammered away relentlessly, whereas Obama sort of, uh, flits and flies from, uh, topic to topic." [48306]

On PBS, Charlie Rose remarks, "Two questions about this I'm fascinated by in terms of whether there's a developing idea that [Obama's] not so good at foreign policy, number one. And number two, whether this whole Syrian crisis will just take more air out of whatever leverage he has for the future of his administration." CBS news political director John Dickerson, an Obama apologist, responds, "Some would say it's a complex, ugly world, and this goes back to [Obama's] red line. He's not meaning red line if we just pay close attention. He's got a sense here and the complexity of the world is what's the problem, not his talent for handling this." (In other words, "Obama is the smartest person in the world, but the world is so screwed up that even *he* cannot resolve its problems!") "On the domestic front Democrats certainly would argue Republicans weren't willing to work with him anyway. How does this change that dynamic? I'm not sure it changes it a whole lot because the dynamic was pretty darn bad to begin with." (In January, Dickerson wrote, "The challenge for ...Obama's [inaugural] speech is the challenge of his second term: how to be great when the environment stinks. ...If he wants to transform American politics, he must go for the throat. ...Obama's only ...option is to pulverize [the Republican Party]. Whether he succeeds in passing legislation or not, given his ambitions, his goal should be to delegitimize [sic] his opponents.") [41697, 41698, 48310]

September 12 marks the one year anniversary of the day Obama said, "We will not waver in our commitment to see that justice is done for this terrible act [in Benghazi, Libya, in which four Americans were killed]. And make no mistake, justice will be done." (One year later, justice has not been seen—even though media reporters have been able to easily find and interview one of the perpetrators of the attack.) [48284, 48285]

*The New York Times* prints an editorial from Russian President Vladimir Putin. He writes, "The potential strike by the United States against Syria, despite strong opposition from many countries and major political and religious leaders, including the pope, will result in more innocent victims and escalation, potentially spreading the conflict far



beyond Syria's borders. A strike would increase violence and unleash a new wave of terrorism. It could undermine multilateral efforts to resolve the Iranian nuclear problem and the Israeli-Palestinian conflict and further destabilize the Middle East and North Africa. It could throw the entire system of international law and order out of balance. Syria is not witnessing a battle for democracy, but an armed conflict between government and opposition in a multireligious country. There are few champions of democracy in Syria. But there are more than enough Qaeda fighters and extremists of all stripes battling the government. The United States State Department has designated Al Nusra Front and the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant, fighting with the opposition, as terrorist organizations. This internal conflict, fueled by foreign weapons supplied to the opposition, is one of the bloodiest in the world. Mercenaries from Arab countries fighting there, and hundreds of militants from Western countries and even Russia, are an issue of our deep concern. Might they not return to our countries with experience acquired in Syria? After all, after fighting in Libya, extremists moved on to Mali. This threatens us all. ...No one doubts that poison gas was used in Syria. But there is every reason to believe it was used not by the Syrian Army, but by opposition forces, to provoke intervention by their powerful foreign patrons, who would be siding with the fundamentalists. Reports that militants are preparing another attack—this time against Israel—cannot be ignored.” [48262, 48263, 48296, 48301, 48396]

Putin observes, “It is alarming that military intervention in internal conflicts in foreign countries has become commonplace for the United States. Is it in America's long-term interest? I doubt it. Millions around the world increasingly see America not as a model of democracy but as relying solely on brute force, cobbling coalitions together under the slogan ‘you're either with us or against us.’ But force has proved ineffective and pointless. Afghanistan is reeling, and no one can say what will happen after international forces withdraw. Libya is divided into tribes and clans. In Iraq the civil war continues, with dozens killed each day. In the United States, many draw an analogy between Iraq and Syria, and ask why their government would want to repeat recent mistakes. ...A new opportunity to avoid military action has emerged in the past few days. The United States, Russia and all members of the international community must take advantage of the Syrian government's willingness to place its chemical arsenal under international control for subsequent destruction. Judging by the statements of ...Obama, the United States sees this as an alternative to military action. I welcome [Obama's] interest in continuing the dialogue with Russia on Syria. We must work together to keep this hope alive...” (It is noteworthy that, with his “you're either with us or against us” remark, Putin does his best to equate Obama with George W. Bush—knowing that would most certainly annoy the thin-skinned Obama. Putin's warning, “Mercenaries from Arab countries fighting there, and hundreds of militants from Western countries and even Russia, are an issue of our deep concern,” should be taken seriously—even if one considers the rest of his op-ed gloating unworthy of attention.) [48262, 48263, 48296, 48301, 48396]

AtlasShrugs.com's Pamela Geller comments on Putin's op-ed: “There is a yiddish expression, ‘oz abaim falt springen hint.’ It translates poorly but it's dead on nonetheless. ‘As the tree falls the dogs jump.’ In other words, as a tree falls down, dogs jump on it and try to climb it. Now everyone knows dogs can't climb trees, but as a tree is falling down

they jump on it, climb on it, because they can. The metaphor, of course, is when a giant is falling, the Lilliputians all jump up to destroy him. And so we have this latest smackdown. Vladimir Putin, ex-KGB agent, schools Obama on leadership, clarity, and messaging in... The New York Times. We have come full circle. And while I see right through this thuggish spoof, he pulls this off quite deftly using American terms. His condescending, informed tone is a slap in the facer coming from an authoritarian. The [reader] comments are largely with Putin. Putin 3, Obama 0.” [48330]

FoxNews.com reports, “The AFL-CIO approved a resolution saying that ...Obama’s health care overhaul will drive up the costs of union-sponsored health plans to the point that workers and employers are forced to abandon them. In a strongly worded resolution released Wednesday [September 11], the federation said that labor unions still support the Affordable Care Act’s overall goals of reducing health costs and bringing coverage to all Americans, but added that the law is being implemented in a way that is ‘highly disruptive’ to union health care plans. Some individual unions have complained about the law’s impact for months, but the resolution marks the first time the nation’s largest labor federation has gone on record embracing that view. Unions were among the most enthusiastic backers of the law when it passed in 2010. A labor official told The Associated Press that White House officials had been calling labor leaders for days to urge them not to voice their concerns in the form of a resolution. The official, who wasn’t authorized to discuss the conversations publicly and requested anonymity, said many union leaders insisted that they wanted to highlight their concerns. ...Union officials are seeking rule changes that would make their low-income workers eligible for the same types of federal subsidies they could get in the exchanges. They have also suggested rules that would treat their multi-employer plans as qualified exchange plans under the new law.” [48260, 48261, 48276, 48299]

At the AFL-CIO convention Terry O’Sullivan, president of the Laborers’ International Union of North America, states, “[I]f the Affordable Care Act is not fixed, and it destroys the health and welfare funds that we have all fought for and stand for, then I believe it needs to be repealed. We don’t want it repealed. We want it fixed, fixed, fixed. ...We can’t have the unintended consequences for the proud men and women that we represent to be collateral damage in the healthcare fight in this country. ...We’ll be damned if we’re going to lose our health insurance because of unintended consequences in the law!” (O’Sullivan, like most members of Congress, apparently did not read the ObamaCare legislation—yet endorsed it anyway and worked for its passage.) [48387]

At WeeklyStandard.com Jeryl Bier warns, “With the launch of the Obamacare Health Insurance Marketplace less than three weeks ago, one of the only functions consumers were already able to access, creating an account, has been taken ‘offline’ for ‘upgrading.’ ...There have been reports of technical glitches, delays, and security concerns with the new Marketplaces. It is unclear of this latest move by HHS is a reflection of those issues.” (The fact that the “create an account” function does not even work just a few weeks before the official launch of the ObamaCare exchanges suggests there may be

significant problems with the software—even though the Obama administration has had more than three years to design and program the system.) [49520]

At Townhall.com political editor Guy Benson reports on a CNN poll that has brutal results for Obama, whose approval/disapproval ratings are “significantly underwater on the economy (43/56), deficits (36/61), and healthcare (42/55). “Obamacare’s weak public support continues to erode. Asked whether they support all or most of the law’s provisions, or oppose all or most of the provisions,” the results were: “Support all: 6 percent (!); Support most: 33 percent; Overall support: 39 percent; Oppose all: 20 percent; Oppose most: 37 percent; Overall opposition: 57 percent.” [48264]

According to Politico, Senator Bob Corker (R-TN), “one of the administration’s closest GOP allies on Syria, said the briefings—and shifting messages from the White House—have been ‘so bad’ that it makes it ‘really, really hard’ to continue backing military force in the region. He said the administration has failed to make the case that attacking the Assad regime is in the national interest, adding that the lack of credibility the United States now has globally is ‘stunning.’ ‘Their message is just so muddled... Different audiences, they stress different things. ...They keep trying to find some footing that makes them feel good, or the audience feel good; it’s been the most muddled thing I’ve ever seen in my life.’” Corker tells CNN that Obama is “a diminished figure here on Capitol Hill. I can assure you that. ...I really do think they hurt our credibility around the world, just in the muddled way that they have dealt with this Syrian issue. It is just a complete muddlement [sic], if you will. And, I don’t know, [Obama] just seems to be very uncomfortable being commander-in-chief of this nation.” (Obama, the “boy wonder,” has become the “boy blunder” in the eyes of many—and for him to “recapture the magic” of his former status will be impossible.) [48271, 48272, 48273, 48305]

DailyCaller.com reports that Congressman Dave Camp (R-MI), chairman of the House Ways and Means chairman, “vowed that ‘there will be consequences’ after revealing secret emails that embattled Washington-based IRS official Lois Lerner sent to her colleagues suggesting collusion between the IRS and Democratic operatives and claiming that tea party applications should not be processed through the agency’s Cincinnati office. ‘Tea Party Matter very dangerous... Counsel and Judy Kindell need to be in on this one... Cincy should probably NOT have these cases,’ Lerner said in a February 2011 email, despite the fact that IRS officials initially claimed that the agency’s Cincinnati office was solely responsible for the improper targeting of tea party and conservative groups. ‘Perhaps the FEC will save the day,’ Lerner said in an email, responding to a complaint the Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee registered with the Federal Elections Commission. The IRS and FEC reportedly collaborated on tea party targeting. ‘There is increasing and overwhelming evidence that Lois Lerner and high-level IRS employees in Washington were abusing their power to prevent conservative groups from organizing and carrying out their missions. There are still mountains of documents to go through, but it is clear the IRS is out of control and there will be consequences,’ Camp said. The IRS did not immediately return a request for comment, but is ‘working on a statement.’” (ABC, CBS, and NBC ignore the story. According to the Media Research

Center, the three networks “have stopped covering the IRS scandal altogether. It’s been a whopping 79 days since ABC last ran a story, on June 26, on the IRS imbroglio. NBC last mentioned the scandal 78 days ago. CBS had the most recent mention, 50 days ago, on July 24.”) [48280, 48283, 48370, 48375, 48439]

Obama tries to put the Syria situation behind him, telling reporters, “I am hopeful that the discussions that Secretary [of State John] Kerry has with [Russia] Foreign Minister [Sergei] Lavrov as well as some of the other players in this can yield a concrete result. ...It is still important to recognize that we have a lot of things left to do... [T]he American people are still interested in making sure that our kids are getting the kind of education they deserve, that we are putting people back to work.” Meanwhile, White House press secretary Jay Carney tells reporters Obama will focus on economic issues in the weeks ahead. (HotAir.com’s Ed Morrissey observes, “Democrats are happy to see the pivot, so that both parties can look bad, rather than just the one controlling foreign policy.”) [48281, 48291]

White House press secretary Jay Carney defends Obama’s indecisiveness on Syria, telling reporters that the American people “appreciate a president who doesn’t celebrate decisiveness for decisiveness’ sake.” (HotAir.com’s Ed Morrissey comments, “It’s always good to see an American administration take a tough stand for *indecision*. However, while this latest spin beats the Pee Wee Herman Defense (‘I *meant* to do that!’), it hardly provides any significant improvement, and ignores the context of the last few weeks. ...Diplomacy is, after all, the *first* option that is supposed to be taken, not the last, and Obama had a full year to the day to work out diplomatic solutions to the chemical-weapons issues with Syria and Russia, and to work with Congress on a unified-front policy. Instead, Obama demanded military strikes first, and insisted that no other options existed. He had his allies, including Hillary Clinton, go out and make the same argument to Capitol Hill and the nation—and then pirouetted back into diplomacy, even while most of them were still arguing that diplomacy had been exhausted. He left his friends twisting in the wind, along with his credibility.”) [48331]

The Associated Press reports, “U.S. Secretary of State John Kerry is rejecting Syrian President Bashar Assad’s suggestion he begin submitting data on his chemical weapons arsenal one month after signing an international chemical weapons ban.” (Kerry’s “red line” for action apparently falls far short of 30 days. Whether Obama knows about the new red line is not clear.) Kerry states, “Should diplomacy fail, force might be necessary.” He also tells reporters, “This is not a game.” (HotAir.com responds, “But... it is a game. That’s the whole point. If the White House takes this disarmament charade seriously at the UN with demands that Assad turn over his arsenal expeditiously and verifiably, it’s going to put Obama right back in the war box... Russia’s proposal is attractive to [Obama] *because* it’s a charade, because it can be slow-walked and fudged at the UN while Congress and the American public gradually forget about Syria. To turn this from kabuki into a semi-serious process defeats the purpose. Granted, Kerry has no choice but to talk tough while people are still paying attention, but it sounds like they

mean business on compliance. Which, as I say, means more headaches for O to come, not less [sic; fewer].”) [48289, 48290]

The Department of Labor reports 292,000 claims for new unemployment benefits in the week ending September 7. (Although that is a decrease of 31,000 from the prior week, data from two states is not included in the report because of computer problems. The 292,000 figure will, therefore, eventually be revised upward.) [48291]

At a high school in Watertown, Wisconsin, Michelle Obama encourages Americans to drink more water. She states, “Water is so basic.. And because it is so plentiful, sometimes we just forget about it amid all the ads we watch on television and all the messages we receive every day about what to eat and drink. ...The truth is, water just gets drowned out. ...I’ve come to realize that if we were going to take just one step to make ourselves and our families healthier, probably the single best thing we could do is to simply drink more water. It’s as simple as that. Drink just one more glass of water a day and you can make a real difference for your health, for your energy and the way that you feel. Water is the first and best energy drink. I drink a ton of water. ...That one little change made all the difference in our lives, to our girls, to me and Barack. We felt healthier and we felt more alert. And the more water we drank, the better we felt.” (Politico quotes Dr. Stanley Goldfarb, University of Pennsylvania kidney specialist: “There really isn’t data to support this. I think, unfortunately, frankly, they’re not basing this on really hard science. It’s not a very scientific approach they’ve taken. ...To make it a major public health effort, I think I would say it’s bizarre. ...The idea drinking water increases energy, the word I’ve used to describe it is: quixotic. We’re designed to drink when we’re thirsty. ...There’s no need to have more than that.” Environmentalists are angry that Obama’s “Drink Up!” campaign—sponsored by bottled water giant Nestle—is not pushing tap water.) At Time.com, Nick Gillespie argues that it is time to phase out First Ladies: “The Office of the First Lady is a boondoggle and an offense to women. Let’s shut it down.” [48300, 48357, 48594]

NationalReview.com reports that Indiana University “is laying off 50 workers and sending them to a temp agency because of Obamacare. Indiana University, which currently spends \$215 million a year on health care, will shift 50 maintenance and custodial employees to an outside contractor that will hire them and will manage their hours. According to Indiana’s WRTV, the university is doing so to avoid paying for health insurance for the workers—Obamacare will require that all hourly employees who work 30 or more hours a week be provided with ‘affordable’ health insurance. Graduate students at IU have also fallen victim to Obamacare, as the university will be limiting the number of hours they can work to keep them under the 30-hour threshold as well.” [48308, 48343]

Syrian President Bashar al-Assad tells Russian media he will not turn over his chemical weapons unless Obama agrees to stop arming the rebel opposition: “When we see that the U.S. genuinely stands for stability in our region, stops threatening us with military intervention and stops supplying terrorists with weapons, then we will consider it

possible to finalize all necessary procedures and they will become legitimate and acceptable for Syria.” Predictably, Assad adds, “If we really want stability in the Middle East, all the countries [in the region] must honor the agreements. And the first country to do so is Israel because it possesses nuclear, chemical and biological weapons—all types of weapons of mass destruction.” [48309]

Reuters reports, “The Hamas Islamist group ruling Gaza has been teaching Egyptian Islamists how to plant bombs in cars, Egyptian state television said on Thursday. Hamas also gave 400 landmines to Egyptian militant groups, said the television [report].” [48322]

By a voice vote, the U.S. Senate confirms Victoria Nuland to be the Assistant Secretary of State for European and Eurasian Affairs. TheBlaze.com notes, “Nuland is a career State Department employee who has worked for Republican and Democrat administrations. She was the spokesperson for the State Department during Obama’s first term.” Nuland was also “quoted in emails saying the al-Qaeda warnings “could be abused by members [of Congress] to beat up the State Department for not paying attention to warnings, so why would we want to feed that either? Concerned...” and may have been involved in the outrageous decision to blame the Benghazi attack on a YouTube video. An outraged Joe diGenova, an attorney who represents one of the Benghazi whistleblowers, says, “The vote is an insult to all who died in Benghazi.” [48384]

The House of Representatives votes 235–191 to approve a “No Subsidies Without Verification Act” to prohibit ObamaCare insurance subsidies from being applied without first having in place a mechanism to ensure that those who claim to be eligible are, in fact, eligible. Guy Benson notes at Townhall.com, “The legislation would head off the widespread fraud and other abuses expected to result from the administration’s eleventh-hour weakening of required standards. Under the new rules, individuals and families can receive generous taxpayer-funded benefits without proving that they qualify for them.” The legislation will likely not be passed by the Senate, and Obama has threatened a veto if it does. (Senate Democrats and Obama apparently have no problem with people who earn \$100,000 claiming they earn only \$20,000 in order to receive a taxpayer-funded subsidy for their health insurance.) [48336, 48337, 48338]

*The Wall Street Journal* reports, “The Obama administration plans to block the construction of new coal-fired power plants unless they are built with novel and expensive technology to capture greenhouse-gas emissions, according to people familiar with a draft proposal. The administration’s rule on emissions from new power plants, a long-awaited measure that is one of the capstones of the administration’s climate-change agenda, is set to be formally proposed by the end of next week. While the new rule isn’t final yet and is likely to face a legal challenge, it would be another blow to a coal industry already buffeted by a bonanza of cheap natural gas and increasing regulation. [Individuals who were] briefed on the rule said such stringent limits would ban new coal plants, which generally release about twice as much carbon dioxide as the proposed limits. Even the newest, most advanced coal-fired power plants in the world would fall

far short of that revised standard, they said. The only way coal plants could comply is to capture carbon-dioxide emissions and stick them underground—a costly process that hasn't been demonstrated at commercial scale before. 'This shows the administration discounts and does not appreciate the value of coal and how it can serve the country. You're impairing the backbone of the power grid,' said Hal Quinn, chief executive of the National Mining Association, an industry trade group." (The new rules will eventually cost thousands of jobs in the power industry, and cause electricity rates to skyrocket. Roughly 42 percent of the nation's electricity comes from coal-fired power plants. The Obama administration is essentially outlawing new coal plants and making it impossible to operate existing power plants without passing on to consumers the cost of complying with strict new environmental regulations. Some argue that Obama's efforts have less to do with promoting a cleaner environment and more to do with pleasing the Saudis—who want to control the price of oil and keep the United States dependent on it.) [48339, 48340, 48341, 48762, 48796]

It should not come as a surprise that the Obama administration is working to destroy the coal industry and shut down as many coal-fired power plants as it can. In January 2008 Obama told the *San Francisco Chronicle*, "[I]f somebody wants to build a coal-powered plant, they can; it's just that it will bankrupt them because they're going to be charged a huge sum for all that greenhouse gas that's being emitted." He pledged that he "...would put a cap-and-trade system in place that is as aggressive, if not more aggressive, than anybody else's out there. ...Under my plan of a cap-and-trade system, electricity rates would necessarily skyrocket... even regardless of what I say about whether coal is good or bad, because I'm capping greenhouse gasses, coal power plants, natural gas... you name it... whatever the plants were, whatever the industry was, they would have to retrofit their operations. That will cost money... they will pass that [cost] on to the consumers." [442, 443, 450, 455, 3814, 6265, 8479, 8535, 48340, 48358]

Vice President Joe Biden ridicules Republicans in Congress who opposed reauthorization of the "Violence Against Women Act," calling them a "Neanderthal crowd." (Biden does not bother to explain why some lawmakers opposed reauthorization. Among other things, Democrats modified the legislation to provide more protections for lesbians, gays, bisexuals, and transgenders, and immigrants. (The law would consider a homosexual man beating his gay lover to be "violence against women.") The law also encourages local communities to implement mandatory-arrest policies—which would force police officers to arrest someone any time they respond to a domestic violence call. According to TheAtlantic.com, "Other controversial new proposals in reauthorizing the act have included a prohibition against discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation and an expansion of the visa program that grants permanent residency to immigrant victims of abuse." (An illegal immigrant could conceivably claim her spouse abused her in order to avoid deportation.) The legislation passed in both the House and the Senate earlier in the year—with significant Republican support—and Obama has already signed it into law. (There is no reason for Biden to bring up the topic other than partisan politics. Biden and other Democrats most certainly will continue their "Republicans are anti-women" attacks as long as they believe it will help them in the 2014 mid-term elections.) [48377, 48378, 48379]

On Newsmax.TV's The Steve Mahlberg Show, former Congressman and director of NextGeneration.TV Allen West tells former Congressman Pete Hoekstra that Russian President Vladimir Putin "is a judo master and if you understand what judo is, it's to take the perceived strength and the weight of your opponent and counterbalance it and use it against them, and that's exactly what Putin did [with Obama]. He was able to lay out all of his points [in his *New York Times* editorial], really attack what we feel have been our strengths as the United States of America—our respect of international law, human rights and dignity, our use of military force only when we believe it was necessary, and our belief that we are an exceptional nation. Barack Obama said that we're really not. He said every country feels that they're exceptional. So he was pretty self-consistent. ...They [Russia's KGB operatives] know how to get inside your head and get inside your decision cycle, and that's exactly what he [Putin, a former KGB official] has been able to do. ...He is going to really start being the influencer in Middle East politics. ...He is engaged in Syria, which they want, need, because of the long water seaport. He's making, cutting deals with Iran, selling them the new S300 anti-aircraft systems, which means that it'll be really tough for us to come in and conduct the air strikes against them, which [means] eventually we're going to have to contend with Iran. Iran has been our enemy ever since they took our embassy [in 1979], and they've been supplying al-Qaeda forces and other radical Islamic forces, especially Hezbollah, ever since. ...[But Americans are] living in bizarro world when a Russian president is lecturing the United States of America about respecting international law, human rights, dignity, not utilizing brute force, and then about American exceptionalism. That's the point where we have gotten with this [administration]. Really, when you think about the Barack Obama in this second term, now we know what a second term under Jimmy Carter would have looked like." [48380]

According to *The Wall Street Journal*, "A secretive Syrian military unit at the center of the Assad regime's chemical weapons program has been moving stocks of poison gases and munitions to as many as 50 sites to make them harder for the U.S. to track, according to American and Middle Eastern officials. The movements of chemical weapons by Syria's elite Unit 450 could complicate any U.S. bombing campaign in Syria over its alleged chemical attacks, officials said. It also raises questions about implementation of a Russian proposal that calls for the regime to surrender control of its stockpile, they said. U.S. and Israeli intelligence agencies still believe they know where most of the Syrian regime's chemical weapons are located, but with less confidence than six months ago, U.S. officials said." [48347]

At EndOfTheAmericanDream.com, Michael Snyder argues that "war is coming" and lists "10 reasons why a diplomatic solution to the Syria crisis is extremely unlikely." Among the items Snyder believes are unlikely to happen: "Assad wants a guarantee that he will not be attacked by the United States or by anyone else before he will give up his chemical weapons." "Assad is not going to agree to any chemical weapons deal unless the U.S. stops giving weapons to al-Qaeda terrorists and other jihadist rebels that are fighting against the Syrian government." "The Syrian 'rebels' desperately want the U.S. military to intervene in the war in Syria." "Saudi Arabia desperately wants the U.S. military to



intervene in Syria.” “Obama does not want to look weak, and he seems absolutely obsessed with starting a war with Syria.” “There have been reports that U.S. soldiers are now receiving orders to deploy to Syria.” [48363]

NYTimes.com reports that “Richard Stengel, the managing editor of Time magazine, is leaving to become under secretary of state for public diplomacy and public affairs at the State Department... Mr. Stengel became Time’s 16th managing editor in 2006, after serving as a writer who covered the 1988 and 1996 presidential campaigns. He got a glimpse of the responsibilities that are to come when he traveled with Secretary Clinton to the Middle East in 2012.” (Stengel becomes another of many media leftists who have temporarily abandoned their private careers to help Obama “fundamentally transform” America. White House press secretary Jay Carney is another refugee from *Time* magazine. Rush Limbaugh comments, “There’s an incestuous relationship that exists between the Washington press corps and any Democrat administration. But I think the Obama administration has seen more members of the press corps leave the press corps and join the Regime than any previous Democrat regime in my lifetime, anyway. ... Journalists are simply leftists disguised as reporters. They’re political activists disguised as reporters. That’s all they are, and this is just the latest example. ... You could easily get to 100 if you count the number of reporters who’ve gone to work for the Regime, the number of people in the Regime who are married to reporters [Carney’s wife is ABC News reporter Claire Shipman], the number of reporters married to people that work at places like Fannie Mae or Freddie Mac. So there’s no possibility of objectivity. It’s not even possible. That’s why they’re not even a pretense to it anymore.”) [48368, 48369, 48515, 48662]

In an audio tape message broadcast over the Internet, al-Qaeda leader Ayman al-Zawahri calls on Muslims to launch limited attacks on the United States: “We should bleed America economically by provoking it to continue in its massive expenditure on its security, for the weak point of America is its economy, which has already begun to stagger due to the military and security expenditure. ... And keeping America in tension and anticipation only costs a few disparate attacks here and there, meaning as we defeated it in the gang warfare in Somalia, Yemen, Iraq and Afghanistan, so we should follow it with that war on its own land.” [48371, 48373, 48374]

On *Special Report*, Charles Krauthammer comments, “These are the fruits of a completely incompetent, epically incompetent foreign policy diplomacy by Obama. Here is [Obama], being lectured - insultingly, really, in an American newspaper about human rights, about international law, about the protection of the elderly and children in wartime. I mean, the chutzpah of writing that, by a KGB thug, whose last adventure in the world was to invade Georgia, detach two of its provinces, and declare them independent. And who, for the last decade, has been supplying [Syrian President Bashar al-] Assad—who we are essentially calling a war criminal—with huge amounts of weaponry, including the elements of poison gas. I mean, this— what we’re seeing here is Putin so confident of himself, after Obama had to acquiesce to this face-saving

negotiation, that he could actually engage in this. It's an index of how, sort of, Obama has been played and continues to be, right now, in Geneva." [48351]

On ABC's *World News*, Martha Raddatz calls the Obama versus Putin conflict over Syria a "showdown of world titans." Diane Sawyer says, "And moments ago, I sat down with ...Obama, who seemed to be signaling the tough stand by the U.S. may have caused a dictator [Bashar al-Assad] to back down." (Some might argue that Russia caused Obama to back down, by calling Secretary of State John Kerry's unintentional bluff.) [48440]

On September 13 AFL-CIO union leaders meet with Obama, Vice President Joe Biden, and Secretary of Labor Tom Perez at the White House to complain about ObamaCare—and press for waivers and exemptions to make the law more acceptable to them. (Later in the day, Politico reports, "The Obama administration on Friday told labor union leaders that their health plans would not be eligible for tax subsidies under Obamacare next year. A White House official said the Treasury Department has concluded that such an exemption is not possible under the Affordable Care Act. The labor unions have been asking that their union plans, known as Taft-Hartley plans, be eligible for premium subsidies the way plans on the new insurance exchange will be. A senior administration official said the White House looked at several ways to make the union plans eligible for subsidies but couldn't find one. 'It's black and white,' the official said—there is no way to make the union plans, which are considered workplace benefits and already receive special tax treatment for that status, eligible." *The Obama Timeline* believes the White House statement is a cover, and that Obama will do his best to find a way to please his labor union supporters.) [48333, 48334, 48362, 48366, 48430, 48595]

CNSNews.com reports, "The federal government raked in a record of approximately \$2,472,542,000,000 in tax revenues through the first eleven months of fiscal 2013, which ran from Oct. 1, 2012 through the end of August, according to the Monthly Treasury Statement for August. That is up about \$285 billion from the approximately \$2,187,527,000,000 in taxes the government took in through August of fiscal 2012. Despite these record tax revenues, the federal government still accumulated a \$755 billion deficit in the first eleven months of fiscal 2013. Total federal spending through the first eleven months of the fiscal year was \$3.228 trillion." [48463]

ChristianPost.com reports on the slaughter of Christians in Syria by jihadist rebel forces: "Ghastly attacks on Christians mocked as 'Crusaders' in Syria continued unabated as Jihadists reportedly forced one man to convert to Islam at gunpoint and slit the throat of another Christian woman's fiancé and then told her, 'Jesus didn't come to save him.' Residents who fled from the ancient town of Maalula in Syria told AFP that jihadists ambushed the town last week and forced a man to convert to Islam at gunpoint. 'They arrived in our town at dawn... and shouted 'We are from the Al-Nusra Front and have come to make lives miserable for the Crusaders,' said one woman identified as Marie in Damascus, where many people from Maalula fled after rebels first attacked that town on Sept. 4." A woman named Rasha states that when she telephoned her fiancé Atef, someone else answered the phone and answered, "Good morning, Rashrush [her

nickname]. We are from the Free Syrian Army. Do you know your fiancé was a member of the shabiha [pro-regime militia] who was carrying weapons, and we have slit his throat? ...Jesus didn't come to save him.” (The Free Syrian Army is allegedly a “moderate” rebel groups supported by Obama, Senators John McCain (R-AZ) and Lindsey Graham (R-SC), and others.) [48395]

RaymondIbrahim.com reports, “Following news that the Muslim Brotherhood has revived the practice of collecting tribute from conquered ‘infidels’—that is, collecting *jizya* from Egypt’s Coptic Christians in the village of Dalga, first reported on this site—according to a new report published today by the popular Egyptian newspaper *Youm7*: ‘The Muslim Brotherhood is passing by the homes of the Copts in the village, accompanied by Al Jazeera photographers, forcing them to record interviews with them saying that they are safe in the village, and that what was published by the ‘pro-government media’ [about *jizya* collection] is not true.’ The Brotherhood working hand-in-hand with Al Jazeera to disseminate falsehoods in their interest is, of course, nothing new. Earlier, for example, Al Jazeera aired a video of a Brotherhood member supposedly killed by Egyptian security forces who, nonetheless, appeared to ‘come alive’ right before the recording stopped. Moreover, Fr. Ayoub, the priest of the local church in Dalga, confirmed that the situation is dangerous, that the Brotherhood is in charge of the village, and that the Copts are indeed being threatened with violence to pay *jizya*.” (Pamela Geller writes at AtlasShrugs.com, “Al Jazeera is a terrorist organization, and Egypt did well in shutting them down. Here in gullible America, Obama and his RINO lackey Senator John McCain [R-AZ] are lauding the terror org. McCain is America’s poster boy for Al Jazeera. Is it any wonder that he’s Obama’s chief propagandist for the jihadists in Syria? ...Al Jazeera should be designated a terrorist organization like Al Manar (Hezb’aalab’s television network. Instead it has come to America’s airwaves.”) [48421, 48422]

The *Daily Mail* reports on the public beheadings of supporters of Syrian President Bashar al-Assad by rebels. “Although it is difficult to confirm the political affiliation of those involved, an eyewitness told Time that the executioners belonged to ISIS—an Al-Qaeda faction opposed to President Bashar Assad’s regime. The captives, meanwhile, are understood to belong to the fearsome Shabiha (‘ghosts’)—thugs loyal to Assad who are said to roam the country massacring women and children.” (With bloodthirsty thugs killing other bloodthirsty thugs, most Americans likely wonder why the United States should get involved in Syria’s civil war. Obama has chosen to support the rebels—consistent with his practice of siding with Sunni Muslims against Shi’ite Muslims.) [48423]

Catherine Herridge reports at FoxNews.com, “Plans by the administration to use U.S. criminal courts to prosecute those responsible for last year’s terror attack in Benghazi have thrown up yet another roadblock to investigating the case, the Republican chairman of the House Intelligence Committee told Fox News Friday. ‘This whole plan has been, all along, to bring them to a criminal court in the United States. I’m not sure that’s in our national security best interest,’ Congressman Mike Rogers [R-MI] said in an exclusive

interview. ‘I don’t know how anyone could come to the conclusion that it hasn’t slowed it down. Certainly I’m frustrated, I think the committee’s frustrated, and by the way, I think the people who do this for a living are really frustrated,’ Rogers said. Based on intelligence reporting, the delay has allowed the Benghazi suspects to remain free and engaged within their terrorist organizations.” (Pamela Geller comments at AtlasShrugs.com, “Over a year now after the jihad against our consulate in Benghazi that led to the suspected rape and murder of our Ambassador and the murder of the US attaches, and no one has been apprehended. ...Now FOX News is reporting that the Obama administration’s intention is to try the enemy combatants in US courts. This is not a law enforcement issue, this is war; but Obama would rather see Americans dead than admit jihad exists and means to destroy the West. So this is ...street crime? And what would Obama try them with, anyway? ‘By the time the FBI reached the consulate where four Americans died on Sep. 11, 2012, the crime scene was contaminated.’ It took them a month to get there, and the AP reported that the FBI came and left after about 12 hours on the ground. ‘Agents arrived in Benghazi before dawn on Thursday and departed after sunset, after weeks of waiting for access to the crime scene to investigate the Sept. 11 attack.’ And these keystone cops are going to prosecute this case?” [48416, 48417, 48432]

Obama announces that Jeffrey D. Zients, former acting chief of the U.S. Office of Management and Budget, will replace Gene B. Sperling as director of the National Economic Council. (Like Mitt Romney, Zients once worked for Bain & Company. In February 2012 Zients argued before a Congressional committee that the ObamaCare penalty for not having health insurance is a fine, rather than a tax—while others in the administration were arguing that it was a tax and not a fine. Zients also refused to give Congress the year in which Obama’s projected budgets would balance—because they never do.) [28319, 28320, 28367, 29206, 29228, 29265, 48345, 48360]

According to an NBC/Wall Street Journal poll, Americans oppose raising the debt ceiling by a 44–22 percent margin. (The federal government will reach the current debt limit by mid-October.) [48348, 48349]

CNSNews.com reports, “While the international community has been focused on the crises in Syria and Egypt, North Korea evidently has been quietly preparing to resume operations at a nuclear reactor which it agreed under an international deal eight years ago to shut down, before warning amid heightened tensions last April that it would restart. Commercial satellite images captured in late August show columns of steam rising from a building alongside the five-megawatt plutonium-based reactor at Yongbyon, prompting experts at the U.S.-Korea Institute at the Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies to say it will likely be operational shortly.” [48353]

WashingtonExaminer.com reports that Obama’s “General Motors bailout team ultimately made the decision to ‘top up’ the pensions of United Auto Workers employees at General Delphi, GM’s former chief parts supplier, but not the pensions of nonunion salaried workers—leaving almost 20,000 workers short by as much as 70 percent of their

retirement benefits. ‘It was [the Department of the] Treasury who made the decision on the collective bargaining agreement,’ Christy Romero, the special Inspector General for the Troubled Asset Relief Program [SIGTARP], told a Congressional oversight panel Wednesday in a hearing examining the Treasury Department’s role in the Delphi pension deal. Romero said despite Treasury officials’ previous assertions that they acted as advisers and not decision-makers, GM management testified to SIGTARP that they felt Treasury, as the purchaser, was in control. GM could have topped off the pensions for both UAW and salaried employees, but members of the auto team told the House Oversight and Government Reform Subcommittee on Government Operations that doing so wouldn’t have been a wise use of taxpayer money. ‘Some people were unfairly treated, according to the [SIGTARP] report, and Treasury did have discretion to make a different decision,’ said Florida Republican John Mica, subcommittee chairman.” (It would, of course, have been fairer to reduce the retirement benefits of both the union and the salaried Delphi workers. The Obama administration chose to fully protect the benefits of the union workers and dramatically slash the benefits of the salaried workers. One could easily argue that the decision was based on the substantial support Obama received from the United Auto Workers union in the 2008 campaign. The UAW expected to be paid back—and Obama did so.) [48355]

DailyCaller.com reports, “Attorney General Eric Holder and IRS officials advised black ministers on how to engage in political activity during the 2012 election without violating their tax-exempt status. Holder, then-IRS commissioner Douglas Shulman, and Peter Lorenzetti, a senior official in the scandal-plagued agency’s exempt organizations division, participated in a May 2012 training session for black ministers from the Conference of National Black Churches at the U.S. Capitol hosted by the Congressional Black Caucus (CBC). Holder spoke at the event. ‘We’re going to, first of all, equip them with the information they need to know about what they can say and what they cannot say in the church that would violate their 501(c)(3) status with the IRS,’ said then-CBC chairman Rep. Emanuel Cleaver, a Democrat from Missouri. ‘In fact, we’re going to have the IRS administrator there. We’re going to have Attorney General Eric Holder there... the ACLU.’ ...‘[The CBC] had the IRS members there specifically to advise them on how far to go campaigning without violating their tax-exempt status,’ George Washington University law professor Jonathan Turley told The Daily Caller. ‘I viewed the meeting as highly problematic. Eric Holder heads the agency that prosecutes organizations who give false information to the government. The Justice Department coordinates with the IRS on actions taken against not-for-profits. These ministries are given not-for-profit status on the basis that they are not engaging in any political activities. Here, the Obama administration was clearly encouraging them to maximize their efforts by showing them where the lines were drawn in federal case law,’ Turley said. ‘It is a fundamental precept that cabinet members should not engage in political activities. The most important of those cabinet members would be the attorney general of the United States. To have the attorney general actively advising political allies of [Obama] showed remarkably poor judgment on his part,’ Turley told TheDC.” (While Holder was helping black churches retain their tax-exempt status, the IRS was intentionally discriminating against conservative groups that were seeking tax-exempt status.) [48359, 48480]

FoxNews.com reports, “An employee at MNsure, Minnesota’s new online [ObamaCare] health insurance exchange, accidentally distributed confidential information about more than 2,400 insurance agents. MNsure officials acknowledged mishandling private information. They said the employee sent an e-mail to the office of an Apple Valley insurance broker on Thursday afternoon that contained Social Security numbers, names, business addresses and other identifying information. ...MNsure officials said the mistake was quickly resolved and was their first [known] security breach. MNsure’s online marketplace, which launches Oct. 1, is the main vehicle for implementing federal health care changes. People will be able to comparison-shop among various health insurance options, with federal tax subsidies available to help the uninsured and underinsured get coverage. ...Democratic Gov. Mark Dayton defended MNsure on Friday. ‘There’s going to be mistakes [sic], there’s going to be glitches [sic] and there’s going to be human error, as there is in any enterprise—particularly just a large one like this that’s just getting under way,’ he said. But two Republican senators, who have previously raised concerns about data privacy related to MNsure, requested a special meeting of a legislative oversight panel to review the data breach.” (The ObamaCare exchanges do not officially “open” until October 1, and there has already been an improper release of private information. Millions of Americans, insured or not, may be unwilling to be part of a system that they cannot trust to protect their private information.) [48367]

At ThePostEmail.com private investigator Susan Daniels is interviewed by Sharon Rondeau. Daniels, who discovered in 2009 that Obama was using a Social Security number (SSN) issued in 1977 to someone in Connecticut—a state in which he never lived or worked—provides an update on her research into the various frauds Obama has perpetrated. Although the SSN most frequently used by Obama (he has used more than one) was reportedly issued in 1977, there is no evidence that he actually used it until 1986. (It does, however, appear on Obama’s forged Selective Service registration form.) Daniels suspects that Obama’s mother, Stanley Ann Dunham, never legally married Barack Hussein Obama, Sr., but thinks Obama was born in the Seattle area and not Kenya. Daniels tells Rondeau, “A reliable source told me that the Hawaii Department of Health inserted a record for Obama into their system in 2008.” She notes that Henry Graff, a professor who taught at Columbia University for 46 years, remembers many of his students—including former Secretary of State Madeline Albright—but has absolutely no recollection of Obama, even though Graff taught political science. (No one has been able to find any Columbia professors who taught Obama. Fox News contacted as many as 400 Columbia students from the period Obama allegedly attended classes and none remembered him. In addition, Obama does not appear in the school yearbook.) Daniels observes that Obama “has more strange things wrong with his life or “mistakes” of anybody I’ve ever seen. How is that possible? I do know that the Social Security number he has [been using lately, 042-68-4425,] is wrong.” Daniels notes that Obama’s alleged Selective Service registration acknowledgement form includes the pre-printed signature and name of Lawrence G. Romo, as Selective Service Administration Director—yet Romo did not gain that position until years later. In 1980, when Obama supposedly registered, the agency director was Dr. Bernard D. Rostker. (Obviously, Romo’s

signature would not have been on a form printed in 1980. It is more likely that a forged registration form for Obama was entered into the system in 2007 or 2008, and an acknowledgement form was automatically created by the system in response. Such an automatic form would have had Romo's signature.) [332, 346, 1182, 10585, 10586, 10587, 10701, 10702, 10730, 48381, 48385, 48394]

Betsy McCaughey, former Lieutenant Governor of New York and the author of *Beating ObamaCare*, writes at Creators.com, "If you think the Obama health law is only for the uninsured and you won't be affected, you're in for a surprise next time you go to the doctor. Be prepared for questions unrelated to why you are seeking medical help—questions that you don't want to answer. Whether you're at the dermatologist or the cardiologist, you'll likely be asked: 'Are you sexually active? If so, do you have one partner, multiple partners or same-sex partners?' Doctors are being turned into government agents, where they're pressured financially to ask questions they consider inappropriate and unnecessary and violate their Hippocratic Oath to keep patients' records confidential. ...Doctors and hospitals who don't comply with the federal government's electronic health records requirements forego incentive payments now and face financial penalties from Medicare and Medicaid starting in 2015. The Department of Health and Human Services has already paid out over \$12.7 billion in incentives to doctors and hospitals. Dr. Richard Amerling, a nephrologist and associate professor of medicine at Albert Einstein Medical College, explains that your medical record should be 'a story created by you and your doctor solely for your treatment and benefit.' But the Obama administration's electronic record requirements are turning it 'into an interrogation, and the data will not be confidential.'" [48388, 48389]

WSB-TV reports, "We have confirmed [that] more than 100 Emory Healthcare employees are going to lose their jobs, in part because of the Affordable Care Act [ObamaCare]." [48399]

LATimes.com reports, "To hold down premiums, major insurers in California have sharply limited the number of doctors and hospitals available to patients in the state's new health insurance market opening Oct. 1. New data reveal the extent of those cuts in California, a crucial test bed for the federal healthcare law. These diminished medical networks are fueling growing concerns that many patients will still struggle to get care despite the nation's biggest healthcare expansion in half a century. Consumers could see long wait times, a scarcity of specialists and loss of a longtime doctor. ...In Los Angeles County, for instance, Health Net customers in the state exchange would be limited to 2,316 primary-care doctors and specialists. That's less than a third of the doctors Health Net offers to workers on employer plans. In San Diego, there are only 204 primary-care doctors to serve Health Net patients. ...Statewide, Blue Shield of California says exchange customers will be restricted to about 50% of its regular physician network." [48400]

Reuters reports, "U.S. officials have warned energy companies to be on the alert for 'potential terrorist activities' at fuel storage plants but there were no immediate threats,

an oil industry group told members on Friday. The Petroleum Marketers Association of America [PMAA] told members the Federal Bureau of Investigation ‘is concerned about terrorists attempting to purchase or steal fuel from a bulk plant to use in a weapon of mass destruction.’ The PMAA said it sent members a message on Friday after the FBI handed out the warning at an energy conference last week ahead of the anniversary of the 9/11 attacks on New York and Washington.” [48414]

At the Pentagon, press secretary George Little is asked by a reporter if U.S. “boots on the ground” would be needed to secure chemical weapons in Syria. Little responds, “I’m not going to speculate on who may or may not be participating in a process that may or may not take place. We’ve got to see where the process goes.” [48390, 48409]

Comedian Bill Maher remarks, “Forget the Syria debate, we need to debate on why we’re always debating whether to bomb someone. Because we’re starting to look, not so much like the world’s policeman, but more like George Zimmerman—itching to use force and then pretending it’s because we had no choice. ...How did we inherit this moral obligation to bring justice to the world via death from above? Are we Zeus? It doesn’t make sense. Our schools are crumbling and we want to teach everyone else a lesson.” [48391]

MSNBC’s Ed Schultz, noting Obama’s falling approval numbers, says, “It amazes me that people don’t love Obama... It just amazes me he can’t get above 50 percent when it comes to a favorable view of the economy.” (Schultz is probably also amazed that his own television ratings are in the toilet.) [48438]

On September 14 the United States and Russia reach a tentative agreement on how to control chemical weapons in Syria. According to WashingtonTimes.com, “The deal announced in Geneva by U.S. Secretary of State John Kerry and Russian Foreign Minister Sergey Lavrov provides a path for ...Obama to avoid the air strikes he had promised to launch against Syria for its recent use of sarin gas on civilians in a Damascus suburb. ‘We have committed to a standard that says, verify and verify,’ Kerry said during a news conference with his Russian counterpart, according to The Associated Press. ...The deal includes a timetable and specific actions Syria must take [sic] comply [sic; comply with]. Kerry said the U.S. and Russia had agreed on grounds under which they might request a Security Council ‘Chapter 7’ resolution—authorizing both military and non-military sanctions.” Lavrov states, “Any violations of procedures... would be looked at by the Security Council and if they are approved, the Security Council would take the required measures, concrete measures. Nothing is said about the use of force or about any automatic sanctions. All violations should be approved by the Security Council.” (“Might request” authorization to use force against Syria means, “Obama caved in and did not insist that a use-of-force U.N. resolution be included in the agreement.”) [48376, 48382, 48383, 48392, 48450]

Lavrov adds, “Of course, it does not mean that every violation [by Syria] that will be reported to the Security Council will be taken [at its] word. Of course, we will investigate



every case, because there are a lot of false information, pieces of information in the world, and we should be very cautious about every fact. And when we are sure—100 percent—then we in the Russian Federation will be ready to adopt [a] new resolution of the Security Council, to embed the measures to punish the perpetrators of this violation. It's nonsense to continue the speculations on the matter today." (In other words, Russia will not agree to a United Nations Security Council resolution calling for a strike against Syria unless Russia agrees that the Assad regime has violated the terms of any agreement. It will not be enough for Obama to claim Syria "crossed a red line." Russia will rule on whether the line was, in fact, crossed. Russia is not only the fox guarding the hen house; Russia will decide whether any hens are missing.) [48450]

While John Kerry works to resolve the Syrian chemical weapons crisis, Obama plays 27 rounds of golf. [48393]

According to TheHill.com, "The Obama administration is nearing completion of a proposal to require that movie theaters offer technology so blind and deaf people can go to the cinema. The draft rule, which is part of a decades-long effort by advocates for people with disabilities, would likely require thousands of movie theaters across the country to offer devices that display closed captioning and provide audio narration of what's happening onscreen. Disability associations say that the new regulation will make sure that blind and deaf people can appreciate the latest blockbuster just like everyone else. But theater owners worry that a federal mandate will force small, rural and struggling theaters to close given the costs associated with the rule. 'These theaters can barely stay in existence and often need community support to break even,' the trade group wrote in a comment to the Justice Department's 2010 precursor to the upcoming proposal. 'To require them to install expensive closed captioning technology at this time is an undue financial burden that may result in these theaters closing.' The upcoming proposal from the Justice Department is expected to require that a certain percentage of the more than 40,000 movie screens across the country offer headsets that provide a running commentary of visual action for the blind, glasses that display closed captioning for the deaf or other devices to explain what's happening onscreen." (Whether the Obama administration will demand the removal of rocks from the Grand Canyon to make it wheelchair-accessible remains to be seen.) [48407, 48408, 48504]

According to Russia's Fars News Agency, Russian President Vladimir Putin will visit Tehran to help plan strategy for Iran's nuclear program. [48468]

Attorney Orly Taitz reports that a court decision is due on Monday, September 16, with regard to her lawsuit seeking the release of Obama's application for a Social Security number (SSN). (Taitz believes, as does *The Obama Timeline*, that Obama has used multiple stolen SSNs over the years and that Obama either never filled out an application form or his records would provide evidence that he committed felony fraud. The SSN Obama has used most often, 042-68-4425, was issued in 1977 in Connecticut. Because Obama never lived or worked in that state and lived in Hawaii in 1977, it is difficult to believe that he filled out an application from Connecticut and listed a Connecticut

address. If the court demands that the application form be presented by the Social Security Administration, the information it contains should prove interesting. This *Timeline* assumes that the court will not order a release of the form, but if it does it may very well be a forgery—like his birth certificate and Selective Service registration form.) [48385]

On September 15 Newsmax.com reports, “Artists, photographers, writers, and other members of the ‘creative class’ who have access to health insurance through many professional organizations will lose that coverage when Obamacare is implemented. Professional organizations have offered reduced-rate insurance plans for their members, through insurance providers. ‘But thanks to the fine print in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, on January 1, 2014, many of these plans will fail to pass legal muster,’ The Weekly Standard reported. One professional organization, the College Art Association—a 13,000-member group for practitioners and scholars in art, art history, and art criticism—posted this notice on its website: ‘The New York Life Insurance Company recently informed CAA that it will no longer offer catastrophic healthcare coverage previously available to CAA members.’ The notice disclosed that it ‘is no longer an option’ for ‘associations whose members reside in different states’ to provide coverage. Instead, members will have to seek coverage from their home state’s new Obamacare exchanges. The Entertainment Industry Group Insurance Trust’s website stated: ‘All individual and/or Sole Proprietor Health Insurance will terminate January 1, 2014. This includes plans acquired as members of our Affiliated Associations and their groups.’ Those associations include the American Federation of Television and Radio Artists, the Dramatists Guild, the Graphic Arts Guild, NY Women in Film and Television, and others. In most cases, freelance artists, designers, and musicians forced to enter the state-run exchanges will see their insurance premiums rise, according to The Weekly Standard. Ironically, Nancy Pelosi back in 2010 touted the benefits of Obamacare this way: ‘Think of an economy where people could be an artist or a photographer or a writer without worrying about keeping their day job in order to have health insurance.’ The Weekly Standard notes: ‘Pelosi’s vision of a world full of carefree artists, musicians, and writers is a mirage and becoming fainter the closer we get to January 1.’” [48397]

Obama appears on ABC’s *This Week* and tells George Stephanopoulos, “I think what the Iranians understand is that the nuclear issue is a far larger issue for us than the chemical weapons issue, that the threat... against Israel that a nuclear Iran poses is much closer to our core interests. My suspicion is that the Iranians recognize they shouldn’t draw a lesson that [because] we haven’t struck [Syria] to think we won’t strike Iran. ...My view is that if you have both a credible threat of force, combined with a rigorous diplomatic effort, that, in fact you can... strike a deal [with Iran].” Noting criticism of his handling of the Syrian issue, Obama laughably responds, “I think that folks here in Washington like to grade on style. And so had we rolled out something that was very smooth and disciplined and linear, they would have graded it well, even if it was a disastrous policy. We know that, because that’s exactly how they graded the Iraq war. I’m much more concerned about getting the policy right. ...As a consequence of the steps that we’ve taken over the last two weeks to three weeks, we now have a situation in which Syria has

acknowledged it has chemical weapons, has said it's willing to join the convention on chemical weapons, and Russia, its primary sponsor, has said that it will pressure Syria to reach that agreement. That's my goal. And if that goal is achieved, then it sounds to me like we did something right." (In other words, "I only look like I don't know what I am doing. I am really a foreign policy genius, and what looks absurd is really part of my master plan.") "Mr. Putin and I have strong disagreements on a whole range of issues, but I can talk to him. We have worked together on important issues. ... This is not the Cold War. This is not a contest between the United States and Russia." (Obama may not believe it is a contest, but Putin certainly does.) [48398, 48412, 48435, 48447, 48457]

Asked by Stephanopoulos, "Have you reached out personally to the new president [of Iran, Hassan Rowhani]?" Obama responds, "I have, and... and he's reached out to me. We haven't spoken, directly. But..." Stephanopoulos: "By letter?" Obama: "Yeah." [48469]

Noting the wide gap between the wealthy and the poor in the United States, Stephanopoulos asks Obama, "Do you look at that four and a half years in and say, maybe [you] can't stop this accelerating inequality?" Obama accepts none of the blame, and whines that companies "have eliminated entire occupations because they're now robotized. We don't have travel agents, we don't have bank tellers." Stephanopoulos offers Obama another lifeline: "It's bigger than Washington." Obama eagerly agrees: "Right." (The Media Research Center's Brett Baker writes, "Imagine a major news network anchor, in 1985, telling President Reagan that five years into his presidency rising income inequality wasn't his fault. Ludicrous, given how the media used the term Reaganomics to denigrate his policies, policies far more successful than ... Obama's in turning around an inherited poor economy." The media is increasingly using the excuse, "the problems are just too enormous for one man to handle, even someone as brilliant as Obama," to cover for his ineptitude and reckless policies. The journalists may not be aware that, in 2016, they will have to argue, "Hillary Clinton is even smarter than Obama" in order to push her candidacy. Or they may argue, "The problems are too big for one man—but not for one woman.") [48437]

Stephanopoulos asks, "You put gun control at the top of the agenda, immigration reform, climate change—all of it's stalled or reversing. How do you answer the argument that beyond the deficit, this has been a lost year, and how do you save it?" Obama complains that House Republicans have blocked "immigration reform," and claims, "If [House] Speaker [John]Boehner [R-OH] put that bill on the floor of the House of Representatives right now, it would pass. It would pass. So the question then is not whether or not the ideas that we put forward can garner a majority of support, certainly in the country. ... I mean, gun control, we had 80, 90 percent of the country that agreed with it." (Obama does not explain how, if 80–90 percent of Americans agree with him on gun control, two Colorado state senators lost a recall election because of their support of gun control legislation.) "The problem we have is we have a faction of the Republican Party, in the House of Representatives in particular, that view compromise as a dirty word, and anything that is either remotely associated with me, they feel obliged to oppose. And my

argument to them is real [sic; really] simple. That's not why the people sent to [sic; me] here." (In other words, "Because I am black, the racist Republicans oppose everything I propose.") [48449]

On *Meet the Press*, former Congressman Barney Frank says, "First of all, many of the banks didn't want this [TARP] money. It's not that we did it for them. But secondly, the federal government made money on the advances to the banks [in 2008]. What cost us money was the automobile industry bailout [in 2009]. But we made money on the banks." (Frank, a Democrat, is admitting that a George W. Bush scheme did not cost the taxpayers any money while Obama's General Motors and Chrysler bailouts did.) [48404, 48405]

At RightSideNews.com L. Lavi and N. Shamni provide examples of the growing resentment against the United States and Obama because of the administration's apparent support of the Muslim Brotherhood (MB). The "anti-U.S. onslaught has taken the form of declarations by senior Egyptian government officials, articles in newspapers identified with the regime and the army, and political and popular campaigns in social media and on the street. One prominent example of this was [Egyptian Defense Minister Abdel Fattah] Al-Sisi's direct appeal to the American administration in his August 3 interview with *The Washington Post*, where he stated: 'You left the Egyptians. You turned your back on the Egyptians, and they won't forget that...' ...The Egyptian pro-regime and army press published articles notable in their vilification of ...Obama himself—insulting his mother, calling him mentally deficient and his administration 'the Adolf Obama Reich,' and even going so far as to offer a prayer that he would die in agony. Many articles contended that Obama and his administration supported terror by virtue of their support for the MB; columnists also opposed U.S. intervention in Egypt's internal affairs, and, in response to American threats to cut off aid, argued that Egypt was better off without it."

(AtlasShrugs.com reminds readers that "Muslim Brotherhood operatives have direct access to the White House. Arif Alikhan, assistant secretary of Homeland Security for policy development; Mohammed Elibiary, a member of the Homeland Security Advisory Council; Rashad Hussain, the U.S. special envoy to the Organization of the Islamic Conference; Salam al-Marayati, co-founder of the Muslim Public Affairs Council (MPAC); Imam Mohamed Magid, president of the Islamic Society of North America (ISNA); and Eboo Patel, a member of ...Obama's Advisory Council on Faith-Based Neighborhood Partnerships. ...Back in 2011, ...Elibiary was given access to a sensitive database of state and local intelligence reports, and then allegedly shopped some of those materials to a media outlet [in an effort to defame Texas Governor Rick Perry]... Who else? We do not know. Instead of being fired at the time, Elibiary was just given ...a promotion.") [48401, 48415, 48509, 48558]

FreePatriot.org posts a letter from an unnamed member of the U.S. Special Forces to author and Iraq War veteran Kevin Lake. The soldier writes, "I'll tell you something you that will make you think... Did you ever ask yourself why our Government never showed (undeniable) proof of the dead body of Osama Bin Laden? And why nearly the whole SEAL TEAM SIX got killed in strange circumstances? Helicopter crashes, parachute

accidents etc.? Well, I have a friend in that team who told me that they never made a capture of Bin Laden... it was a set up from Obama to get elected again... No Sailor or Soldier had ever seen the funeral or the dead body of Bin Laden on board the aircraft carrier. People say that Osama died years ago in a Drone strike... and Navy Seals are not allowed to give any information about that mission were [sic; during which] Bin Laden was captured. We believe our Government—everything they tell to us—like dumb sheep. They manipulate us with the media which is also working for the government. America is dying step by step, because of stupid people who still believe or support Obama. He is the modern Anti-Christ, who will lead us into a 3rd World War! It's just a question of time... you will see! Obama is even supporting the Muslim Brotherhood! The Muslim Brotherhood has already infiltrated our senate and congress. One day Islam will rule, and they will slaughter us like they slaughter their own people. We have to stand up against this, otherwise we're lost!" [48402]

*The Telegraph* reports, "Nearly half the rebel fighters in Syria are now aligned to jihadist or hardline Islamist groups according to a new analysis of factions in the country's civil war. Opposition forces battling Bashar al-Assad's regime in Syria now number around 100,000 fighters, but after more than two years of fighting they are fragmented into as many as 1,000 bands. The new study by IHS Jane's, a defence consultancy, estimates there are around 10,000 jihadists—who would include foreign fighters—fighting for powerful factions linked to al-Qaeda. Another 30,000 to 35,000 are hardline Islamists who share much of the outlook of the jihadists, but are focused purely on the Syrian war rather than a wider international struggle. There are also at least a further 30,000 moderates belonging to groups that have an Islamic character, meaning only a small minority of the rebels are linked to secular or purely nationalist groups. The stark assessment, to be published later this week, accords with the view of Western diplomats estimate that less than one third of the opposition forces are 'palatable' to Britain, while American envoys put the figure even lower. Fears that the rebellion against the Assad regime is being increasingly dominated by extremists has fuelled concerns in the West over supplying weaponry that will fall into hostile hands. These fears contributed to unease in the US and elsewhere over military intervention in Syria. Charles Lister, author of the analysis, said: 'The insurgency is now dominated by groups which have at least an Islamist viewpoint on the conflict. The idea that it is mostly secular groups leading the opposition is just not borne out.'" (Nevertheless, Obama and some members of both political parties somehow believe the United States can "arm the rebels" without weapons—or victory—falling into the hands of the wrong people.) [48403]

Obama announces, "Earlier today, I spoke with Larry Summers and accepted his decision to withdraw his name from consideration for Chairman of the Federal Reserve. Larry was a critical member of my team as we faced down the worst economic crisis since the Great Depression, and it was in no small part because of his expertise, wisdom, and leadership that we wrestled the economy back to growth and made the kind of progress we are seeing today. I will always be grateful to Larry for his tireless work and service on behalf of his country, and I look forward to continuing to seek his guidance and counsel in the future." (With Summers saying he is out of the running to replace Ben Bernanke, the odds increase that Obama will nominate Janet Yellen, the current vice chairman of the

Federal Reserve Board of Governors. Yellen, like Bernanke, is a proponent of expanding the money supply to allow the government to continue its deficit spending schemes. At Townhall.com John Ransom observes, “Yellen, as Fed Chairman, will do what her cold, brilliant(!) economist, misguided, liberal heart tells her to. Summers on the other hand would bend purely to politics over policy. Summers is more a liberal politician; Yellen is more a liberal banker.”) [46852, 46887, 46890, 47053, 48406, 48427, 48436, 48489, 48529, 48720]

At Politico, Jonathan Allen writes, “Barack Obama’s got a knack for turning trial balloons into piñatas, and then leaving his allies to pick up the mess. The pattern: He floats a buddy for a top job early, deliberates long enough for the opposition to gather steam, defends his pal too late to do any good and then regretfully accepts defeat. First it was Susan Rice, his choice for secretary of state. Now, Larry Summers has withdrawn from consideration to become the next chairman of the Federal Reserve. Their candidacies were so poorly handled that neither ever made it to the stage of being nominated, much less getting blocked—or voted down—by the Senate. ‘So much for no-drama Obama,’ said Jim Manley, a senior director at QGA Public Affairs who worked for Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid. ‘This was always going to be a tough vote. There was no slam dunk involved here. ... Why would they want to go through that?’ The Summers snafu is particularly problematic because the choice badly divided Obama’s fellow Democrats. Word from Hill allies was that the Senate could reject Summers, and already as many as four of the 12 Democrats on the Senate Banking Committee were ready to vote against him. A larger question is of [Obama’s] toughness. Liberal Democrats rallied against a Summers nomination. In another debate that never came up for a vote the White House could have easily lost, Obama was led into asking Congress for approval to bomb Syria. His summer-long fight with Russian President Vladimir Putin over NSA leaker Edward Snowden and the Syria issue has also hurt. ‘It’s a consistent pattern where he says he’s going to do something, says he’s really going to fight for it, and then buckles the moment there’s any opposition,’ said one veteran Democratic strategist. ‘It’s like the kiss of death if he wants... you for a job.’” [48458]

*The Jerusalem Post* reports that a “Lebanese daily [newspaper] says 20 trucks crossed into Iraq last week, bearing equipment and material used for manufacturing chemical weapons. Syria has moved 20 trucks worth of equipment and material used for the manufacturing of chemical weapons into neighboring Iraq, the Lebanese daily *Al-Mustaqbal* reported on Sunday. The government in Baghdad has denied allegations that it is helping the Syrian government conceal chemical stockpiles. ... The newspaper reported that the trucks crossed the boundary separating Syria with Iraq over the course of Thursday and Friday. Border guards did not inspect the contents of the trucks, which raises suspicions that they contained illicit cargo, according to *Al-Mustaqbal*.” [48410]

FoxNews.com reports, “The State Department review of the Benghazi terror attack let senior officials off the hook for the policy decisions that led to sub-standard security at the U.S. compound in eastern Libya, according to a draft House committee report obtained by Fox News. The nearly 100-page report concludes that the State Department’s

internal review board—called the Accountability Review Board, or ARB—was flawed. The report by Republicans on the House Oversight and Government Reform Committee alleges the board’s probe was not comprehensive, its interviews were not thorough, and the investigation itself may have been damaged by conflicts of interest. A central finding is that the department, as a result of the board’s findings, meted out discipline to four mid-level officials (who were later re-instated anyway), but the board glossed over the actions and decisions of senior-level officials. The report claims the internal review identified many of the security problems with the Benghazi compound, while ignoring who was behind the policy decisions that led to them.” At CBSNews.com Sharyl Attkisson reports, “According to the official House Oversight Committee report, the ARB downplayed security decisions made by senior officials at the State Department, especially that of Under Secretary Patrick Kennedy, and instead blamed four subordinates who, in some cases, ‘had little to no’ responsibility for the key events. In some cases, ‘the ARB correctly identified poor individual decisions while apparently failing to take into account decisions made by more senior [State] Department officials,’ reads a draft of the report obtained by CBS News. ‘Such senior-level decisions played an equal if not greater role in the vulnerability of the U.S. diplomatic mission in Benghazi.’” [48411, 48444, 48446]

Senator John Barrasso (R-WY) points out in *The Wall Street Journal* that “Moscow is not even complying with a commitment to eliminate its own chemical weapons. A State Department assessment in January reported that Russia has provided an ‘incomplete’ list of its chemical agents and weapons to be destroyed. It has also missed deadlines to convert former chemical-weapon production plants. Why would we expect Moscow to help enforce similar restrictions against Syria? ...Based on the experience of the past four years, the Russians, like the Iranians, are well aware that pretending to go along can buy time until the Obama administration becomes distracted with another issue. The U.S. should be prepared for the diplomatic effort on Syria to fall flat and have more effective alternatives ready.” [48442]

In an interview with DailyCaller.com author Paul Kengor says Obama “wouldn’t have been reelected because of Benghazi” if he were a Republican. Kengor also points out, “I have never seen one single news report—print media, TV, or anything, or NPR—on the homeless under Obama. If this was a Republican, that would be used to paint the most dire scenario of the U.S. economy since the Great Depression.” (There are approximately twice as many homeless people under Obama than there were during the Reagan presidency.) Kengor also notes Obama’s communist mentor, Frank Marshall Davis: “If Mitt Romney had had a mentor as a young man who was a closet Nazi or... who was a John Bircher, it’d be on the front page of The New York Times, front page of The Washington Post. Everybody in America would know about it. [But] “in the case of Obama, they make fun of the accusers, of the whistle-blowers.” [48479]

WhiteHouseDossier.com posts Obama’s schedule for Monday, September 16:

- 10:00 am – receives his daily briefing
- 10:45 am – meets with senior advisors

11:40 am – delivers remarks to mark the five-year anniversary of the financial crisis  
7:25 pm – delivers remarks at “Música Latina: In Performance at the White House.”  
[48413, 48484]

On September 16, at least one shotgun-wielding gunman engages in a mass shooting at the Washington, D.C. Navy Yard’s Naval Sea Systems Command Center. Twelve innocent people are killed, and shooter Aaron Alexis, age 34, of Forth Worth, Texas is killed by the police. (There are conflicting news reports about the possibility of other gunmen.) During live coverage, CNN’s Carol Costello says, “I was just saying that this is so unusual, because this is such a heavily-secured military facility. I’ve worked in Washington for many years, I’ve never heard of such a thing happening.” (Costello apparently slept through November 2009 coverage of the Fort Hood terrorist shootings, as well as Naveed Haq’s attack in Seattle in 2006, and the 2007 jihadist killings at the Trolley Square Mall in Salt Lake City.) Although the shootings will spark another round of discussion over gun control, the fact that two Democrat state senators lost recall elections because of their support for tough gun legislation effectively means the debate is—at least for a while—over: few legislators will risk their political careers over weapons bans. Initial media reports incorrectly state that an AR-15 “assault weapon” was used. One shotgun and two pistols were used. (Actually, an AR-15 reportedly *was* used—by the police to take down Alexis.) [48424, 48425, 48428, 48429, 48445, 49448, 48452, 48467, 48473, 48486, 48490, 48491, 48505, 48513, 49782]

According to various reports, Alexis—a black, Obama-supporting liberal—had an arrest record and, in a fit of anger, once shot out the tires of someone’s car. He also served in the Navy between 2007 and 2011 and was discharged for anger management problems and a “shooting incident.” Alexis gained access to the facility as a government contractor with valid identification. (Why he was granted a security clearance will be a topic of conversation. Why his 10-year security clearance, granted in 2007 when he joined the Navy, was not taken away when he was discharged will likely also be an issue.) Alexis reportedly had been treated by the Veterans Administration for mental problems and was taking SSRI drugs. [48461, 48462, 48470, 48472, 48485, 48487, 48494, 48499, 48510, 48530, 48534, 48542, 48547]

The family of Aaron Alexis issues a statement to the families of his victims: “Our hearts go out to you. We apologize for the inconvenience of losing a loved one, we also lost a loved one.” [48475]

Obama notes the five-year anniversary of the financial crisis, takes credit for saving the nation, and criticizes Republicans—after a brief and oddly unemotional reference to the Navy Yard killings. Obama says, “We are confronting yet another mass shooting and today it happened on a military installation in our nation’s capital. [The victims] are men and women who were going to work, doing their job, protecting all of us. They are patriots. They did not expect to be attacked at home while in their offices. ... We’re going to be investigating thoroughly what happened, as we do so many of these shootings, sadly, that have happened, and do everything that we can to try to prevent them.”



(Obama's perfunctory words come across as less sincere than a weatherman reading a five-day forecast, as if he considered the task only a formality that is delaying his attack on Republicans.) [48453, 48457, 48459]

Obama threatens and postures, "I will not negotiate" on the debt ceiling, but says, "Let's stop the threats. Let's stop the political posturing, let's keep our government open. Let's pay our bills on time. Let's pass a budget. ...I will not negotiate over whether or not America keeps its word and meets its obligations. I will not negotiate over the full faith and credit of the United States. This country has worked too hard for too long to dig out of a crisis just to see their elected representatives here in Washington purposely cause another crisis." (For legislators to stand firm on their principles is, in Obama's opinion, threatening and posturing; for him to do so is not.) [48460]

White House press secretary Jay Carney is asked by a reporter, "[W]as there any consideration by the White House, given that there was an active manhunt, like, four miles away, to cancel today's economic remarks [by Obama]?" Carney replies, "No." (It is worth noting that media leftists and other Democrats went ballistic when Mitt Romney made a political remark not long after the attack on Benghazi in which four Americans were killed. (Romney had stated, "I'm outraged by the attacks on American diplomatic missions in Libya and Egypt and by the death of an American consulate worker in Benghazi. It's disgraceful that the Obama administration's first response was not to condemn attacks on our diplomatic missions, but to sympathize with those who waged the attacks." While Romney made those statements, Michelle Obama was appearing on the Dr. Oz television program, stating that obesity is "absolutely" the nation's "number one greatest national security threat.") Romney was excoriated, but Obama is given a pass for engaging in a partisan attack just minutes after an incident in which 12 Americans were killed. [36875, 36876, 36888, 36905, 37058, 37059, 37070, 48488, 48496]

WashingtonTimes.com reports that "federal authorities had to release 2,837 convicted sex offenders back onto the streets" and that news "has renewed focus on a Supreme Court case that requires the government to release immigrants whose home countries won't take them back. A report released last week by the Government Accountability Office [GAO] said the nearly 3,000 sex offenders are part of the 59,347 immigrants who the courts have ruled cannot be held, whom the U.S. has been unable to send home, and who instead were released under some sort of supervision as of September 2012. The GAO took a sample of the sex offender cases and concluded that about 5 percent of the time U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement [ICE] didn't ensure that the immigrants released were properly registered with local authorities as sex offenders. 'I'm surprised that only 5 percent of them are not properly registered,' said Jessica Vaughan, director of policy studies at the Center for Immigration Studies. She said ICE isn't particularly rigorous about monitoring many of those it releases. ...In this case, the sex offenders and other immigrants—legal and illegal—who have been released are thanks to a 2001 Supreme Court ruling in what is known as the Zadvydas case. The court ruled 5-4 that detention for immigration purposes can't be punitive; therefore, if there isn't a likelihood someone

can be deported, they generally have to be released.” ...Judy Rabinovitz, deputy director at the American Civil Liberties Union’s Immigrants’ Rights Project, said the GAO report highlights how the system is supposed to work: Once illegal immigrants are released, they are supposed to be under supervision, and ICE is supposed to make sure the sex offenders register with authorities according to state and local laws.” [48426]

DailyCaller.com reports, “Time magazine’s cover for its Sept. 16 issue features a picture of contented-looking Russian president Vladimir Putin, complete with a black background and a damning caption that declares ‘America’s weak and waffling, Russia’s rich and resurgent.’ But Time’s editors are shielding Americans from the demoralizing picture, putting a cheerful, sky-blue photo on the covers of magazines distributed in the United States. ‘It’s time to pay college athletes,’ says the chirpy, non-political U.S. cover, which shows a ball-carrying football player with arm outstretched. The cover most Americans saw at the checkout counter safely overlooked a widely perceived fumble by ...Obama that left Russia to carry the ball in the Syrian war. ...The foreign covers acknowledge Putin’s triumph over Obama, telling foreigners that Putin ‘doesn’t care what anybody thinks of him.’ The protective covers arrive as Time’s managing editor departs for a job working for one of the architects of the Syrian debacle, Secretary of State John Kerry. In ‘early summer,’ editor Rick Stengel was asked by Kerry, and immediately accepted, the job of running the department’s public diplomacy mission, according to Politico. ...This is not the first time the magazine has downplayed stories that might not put Stengel’s new boss—Obama—in a good light.” (White House press secretary Jay Carney also worked at *Time* magazine before joining the Obama administration.) [48434, 48575]

At TakiMag.com, Jim Goad responds to Vice President Joe Biden’s September 12 description of Republicans as “Neanderthals,” writing, “The most stubbornly hypocritical glitch in the egalitarian mindset is that eugenics is roundly and vigorously dismissed as a dangerous and discredited pseudoscience... *unless* it can be wielded to portray ideological enemies as genetically inferior throwbacks. Thus, the same sheltered, daydreaming buttercups that strain to deny even basic visual differences between ethnic groups are the first to blame rural white poverty on things such as inbreeding and overall crappy genes. In such cases, eugenics are not only suddenly real, they are highly pertinent—decisive, even. The same double standard permits politicians—who’d never dare publicly suggest that sub-Saharan Africa is not exactly the Hope Diamond of intellectual achievement—to smear large swaths of people who don’t kowtow to their dim notions of ‘progress’ as ‘Neanderthals.’ Vice President Joseph Biden, that asshole, recently referred to Republicans as ‘Neanderthals.’ A couple of years ago, current Secretary of State John Kerry, who resembles an archeological dig even while alive, dismissed global-warming critics as ‘Neanderthals.’ In 2003, now-dead Senator Ted Kennedy said he would resist the appointment of any ‘Neanderthal’ that George W. Bush might nominate as a judge. The Daily Kos, that festering armpit of self-congratulatory leftist delusion, recently suggested that NRA members possessed the ‘Neanderthal gene.’ The pejorative ‘Neanderthal,’ despite being anthropologically hurtful and unabashedly homo sapiens-supremacist, is thrown around with gleeful impunity by the selfsame egalitards who insist that everyone is created equal... except, of course, for the knuckle-

dragging prehistoric losers who don't think like they do. If I know one thing about people, it's that they need to feel superior to other people, and since it's no longer culturally permissible to suggest that sub-Saharan Africa may be a teeny bit backward, one is free to indulge their innate craving to feel superior at the expense of the stocky, hairy, big-browed, club-wielding descendants of *homo neanderthalensis* whose genetic vestiges now listen to heavy metal, attend NASCAR races, own hunting rifles, pray to Jesus, handle serpents, and vote Republican." [48377, 48451]

At RenewAmerica.com, Judicial Watch president Larry Klayman writes, "On Sept. 11, 2013, a dangerous and viral strain of Muslims invaded Washington, D.C., to march and declare victory over Christians and Jews and to otherwise thumb their noses at everyone who does not believe in Allah. ...It is time that we Christians, Jews, people of faith and all true patriots say enough is enough and ourselves, in a very real way, 'Occupy Washington' to cleanse the nation of the half-Muslim, anti-white, socialist fraud in the White House before the nation goes under for the final count. Having done little to nothing about the growing list of 'phony' Obama scandals, ranging from Benghazi-gate, to IRS-gate, to Navy SEAL Team VI-gate, to Fast and Furious-gate, to NSA-gate, to name just a few, it is clear that our elected representatives do not have the will or courage to remove the mullah-in-chief from office. ...Just look at the judges, state and federal, who have had the chance to effectively remove Obama over his lack of eligibility to be president, as he is not a natural born citizen. From Florida, to Alabama, to Georgia, to California, lower court judges have fudged the law to squirm out of having to actually rule on not only his 'phony' birth certificate but also his lack of having two American-born citizen parents as required by our Constitution." [48506]

Klayman continues, "...Millions should stand in front of the White House and other national treasures and demand that Barack Hussein Obama leave. If the Egyptians can do this with regard to another radical Muslim, former president Mohamed Morsi of the Muslim Brotherhood, then can't we Americans do it with Obama? And, when we do converge on and 'Occupy Washington' in the millions on a date to be announced for the week before Thanksgiving, the people may think about chanting: 'Mr. [Obama], put the Quran down, get up off your knees and come out with your hands up!' The power of the people will then be heard without firing one proverbial shot. This fraudster, who stole the presidency and has done so much harm, will finally know that his time has come to leave his perverted, Islamic concept of Mecca, our nation's hallowed capital. I do not advocate violence, but it is time we show Obama that we mean business. He would be well advised to ride off into his Islamic sunset, link up with 72 virgins and party on at his expense—not ours!" [48506]

At RealClearPolitics.com Robert Tracinski observes, "If Obama's goal was to punish the Assad regime for using chemical weapons, he achieved the opposite. Assad has been rewarded with a guarantee of immunity from American action. He was pretty much getting that already in practice, but [for him] it's nice to have it in writing. More broadly, Assad emerges from this deal, not just untouched, but *indispensible*." (That is, Assad is at least considered to be "on the hook" for dealing with chemical weapons. If Assad were

removed from power, whatever regime follows him would be under no obligation to continue the agreement to dispose of chemical weapons. Assad might not be considered trustworthy, but his successors might be even less so.) “If this whole deal is going to work, Assad is the guy we have to work with. He has gone from being the partner and tool of our geopolitical adversaries, Iran and Russia, to now being accepted as our partner and de facto ally—while still maintaining his alliance with our enemies. Which is to say that we have been bamboozled into supporting our strategic opponents. From the perspective of the Obama administration, this idea, that the Syrian dictator is the indispensable man whom we have to support or else everything is chaos, is a clumsy accident. From the perspective of the Assad regime, it’s no accident at all. It’s the long con the Assad family has been running for decades. The con game is pretty straightforward: they create chaos, which they then pretend to ‘stabilize.’ They set fire to everything, then show up dressed as the fire brigade and offer to keep the blaze under control.” [48455]

At AmericanThinker.com author Jack Cashill writes, “In these last few months, the world has seen what happens when an intellectual lightweight with no fixed principles beyond the vestigial Marxism of his youth faces off against an unscrupulous post-Marxist survivor like [Russian President Vladimir] Putin. For those paying attention, it wasn’t hard to predict. ...When Putin shot Obama’s balloon down over Syria no one should have been surprised. As America first learned at Benghazi, you can fake your way through college, fake your way through the Senate, even fake your way through the presidency, but you can’t fake your way through a civil war in the Middle East.” [48471]

At WahsingtonPost.com Ruth Marcus writes, “Style points? Seriously? *Style points?* That’s what ...Obama thinks the criticism of his zigzag Syria policy amounts to? As [Obama’s] spin, this is insulting. As [Obama’s] conviction—if this is what he really believes—it’s scary. ...First, we’re a long way from knowing that this episode has ended well. No one can rely on Russian promises and Syrian good will. This may well be a bullet only temporarily dodged, a pause in the crisis rather than a signpost of its solution. Even a successful outcome of a chemical-weapons deal risks the perverse impact of further entrenching a regime that has murdered tens of thousands of its own people. Second, [White House] actions have ripples beyond ripples. Obama may have lucked—or his secretary of state accidentally may have stumbled—into an approach that averted ‘The Perils of Pauline’ moment. But the indecision, the mind-changing, the lurching—and, note, Obama did not dispute such characterizations so much as dismiss them—have consequences. ‘Style,’ as [Obama] would have it, matters. Adversaries and allies, foreign and domestic, take a measure of [his] steel. They judge whether he can be trusted, whether he will back down, whether he has what it takes to lead his country and the world. In the past few weeks, I have encountered not a single person outside the White House, Republican or Democrat, who has kind words for Obama’s performance. Scornful may not be too strong a word for the consensus view, though it is scorn leavened, at least among the more thoughtful critics, with appreciation for the no-good-options reality of Syria.” [48521]

Marcus continues, "...Obama's dawdling and eventual capitulation on Larry Summers, his reported first choice for chairman of the Federal Reserve, further reinforce the perception [that he is] weak and indecisive. Given the other matters on [his] agenda, it may not have made sense to launch a fight, this one with his supposed allies, over Summers. But once again, Obama made the situation worse by allowing it to fester for so long, and for the opposition to Summers to build. So Obama enters yet another treacherous period in a weakened state, with his political allies distrustful and his political opponents caught up in their own dysfunction. Machiavelli advised that it is better to be feared than loved; at the moment, in Congress, Obama is neither." [48521]

In an interview with InfoWars.com, Mike Zullo, chief investigator of Sheriff Joe Arpaio's "cold case posse," says a person "in a position to know" told him "there never was [an Obama] birth in Hawaii." According to ThePostEmail.com, Zullo also stated "that passport and INS microfilm records from August 1 to August 10, 1961 which would have shown the arrivals of travelers from foreign countries are missing." According to Zullo, Congressman Steve Stockman (R-TX) is willing to assist in pushing a congressional investigation into the crime of Obama's forged birth certificate. Zullo says, "I think Mr. Stockman is going to help us tremendously." (Evidence of the birth certificate forgery has been included in a Georgia lawsuit, *Cody v. Obama* 12-5276, filed by Cody Robert Judy, a 2012 Democrat presidential candidate who argues that Obama's fraudulent candidacy hindered his own. Note: *The Obama Timeline* has provided Zullo with information about Obama's past in an effort to assist the investigation.) [48516, 48550]

Republican National Committee chairman Reince Priebus tells radio talk show host Hugh Hewitt, "I think [Obama] wants this thing to happen, a shutdown of the government. I'm totally cynical on the thing. I think that's exactly what he wants. In fact I think he's got a bunch of Democrats that [sic; who] are sick and tired of it as well because they're sitting in red states and they're nervous as anything they're going to get stuck with ObamaCare then they're going to have to go out there and defend it. I think it's actually going to be a big problem in the end though, Hugh, for the Democrats. I think he's being cute by half, and the biggest albatross around his neck is not only the economy but Obamacare. It's his foreign policy. He picked the absolute worst time in the agenda to come across as weak and you know he's not only doing his best to humiliate himself but he's doing his best to humiliate this country and I think it's going to come back to bite him." [48482]

On *Special Report*, Brit Hume notes Obama's partisan attack on Republicans during his speech about the economic crisis: "...I think a lot more people saw the criticism of Republicans just now on your [news] program than saw it live. Three cable networks, straight news cable networks as opposed to business networks, had all dumped out. [Obama] was talking [mostly] to C-Span and people online. And so not that many people heard it, which I think is probably good for him. I think [Obama] tends to engage in partisan attacks from the platform at the White House more than any... that I can remember. Usually... it's vague, 'Those who this' or 'some who say' and all that. [But] He is just talking about the party and he attacks the Republican Party with regularity." On

Obama's welcoming a government shutdown, Hume says, "I don't think it's particularly attractive but I do think this: He wants this fight. He wants this fight, and he wants shutdown in the middle of it and he will talk about it and attribute to talking about it to everybody else. Republicans are talking about 'we want to keep the government open but shut down ObamaCare.' They are not saying they want to shut the government down... [Obama] wants this fight because he think it's a loser for Republicans and on that count, I think he's right." [48481]

The "Música Latina: In Performance at the White House" is canceled because of the Navy Yard shootings.

On September 17 Joe Scarborough slams Obama for his anti-Republican speech while Washington, D.C. was still reeling from the killings of 12 people. The MSNBC *Morning Joe* host says, "[It] was a harsh, partisan speech... But you know what? [Obama] is frustrated and there is—he certainly has every right to do that [deliver a speech]. But on the day while people were hiding, while people were bleeding, while people were dying, while the nation was locked in on this—he's talking about harsh partisanship and Republicans wanting to hurt people. [W]hat is more partisan than not being able to put aside one of these stupid Washington battles... for a day. [It] Never came under consideration. [They] Never considered it. There's not one person in the White House that said, 'You know, right down the block, people are dying right now and there's a gunman on the loose, and there's local schools are on shutdown [sic], the Capitol is on shutdown, and there may be a second or third gunman. And you know what? Maybe we'll just give this speech tomorrow.' Really, nobody even considered that? You believe Jay Carney—it never came under consideration? It's unbelievable. ...[Obama] should be smart enough—the guy should be smart enough. There should be one person there that had the guts to say, 'Mr. [Obama], you know people are dying right now. You probably should not do this. You know, comfort the nation today, attack Republicans tomorrow.'" [48478]

WashingtonExaminer.com reports that Obama "waived a provision of federal law designed to prevent the supply of arms to terrorist groups to clear the way for the U.S. to provide military assistance to 'vetted' opposition groups fighting Syrian dictator Bashar [al-]Assad. Some elements of the Syrian opposition are associated with radical Islamic terrorist groups, including al-Qaeda... Assad's regime is backed by Iran and Hezbollah. [Obama], citing his authority under the Arms Export Control Act, announced today that he would 'waive the prohibitions in sections 40 and 40A of the AECA related to such a transaction.' Those two sections prohibit sending weaponry to countries described in section 40(d): 'The prohibitions contained in this section apply with respect to a country if the Secretary of State determines that the government of that country has repeatedly provided support for acts of international terrorism,' Congress stated in the Arms Control Export Act. ...The law allows the president to waive those prohibitions if he 'determines that the transaction is essential to the national security interests of the United States.'" (Obama does not explain why arming al-Qaeda, the Muslim Brotherhood, and other radical Islamists is in the nation's security interests. Obama's action to waive the arms prohibition is, of course, an admission that he, Senator John McCain (R-AZ), and others

are lying when they claim that Assad's opposition consists mostly of "moderates" and not terrorists.) [48464, 48466, 48633]

In response to Obama's action, Glenn Beck asks, "Why are we not talking about treason today? Why are we not talking about impeachment" if Obama is giving weapons "Aid and Comfort") to the enemies of the United States? (The Constitution states, "Treason against the United States, shall consist only in levying War against them, or in adhering to their Enemies, giving them Aid and Comfort.") [48633, 48634]

Free-lance investigator Jon Rappaport writes, "After covering a number of mass shootings and bombings over the last 20 years, I question the official explanation when a new one occurs. Automatically. Always. Every single time. They lie. They obfuscate. They parrot. They don't investigate beyond a comfortable point. They leave loose ends, which are often far more important than the supposed central facts. ...If the purported shooter at the Navy Yard, Aaron Alexis (where is/are the other shooters?), was suffering from PTSD, as his family apparently claims, was he seeing a psychiatrist? What was the diagnosis? What drugs were prescribed? What effects do these drugs have? Perfectly reasonable and legit questions. ...[A *USA Today*] article cites a federal law-enforcement source (off the record) who states that Aaron Alexis, the accused shooter, cleared a Navy Yard security checkpoint in his car. After parking in the lot, he got into an argument and opened fire on one or two people. He then entered the building where he went on a killing spree. So did Alexis shoot his way past security guards at the building's separate checkpoint? Why weren't the guards waiting for him just outside the building with their weapons drawn, after he, Alexis, had already shot people in the parking lot?" [48465]

At Townhall.com Michael Schaus reports that LG Chem, a Holland, Michigan company that received "over \$150 million in federal funds, and roughly \$175 million in green-energy tax credits"—to build batteries for the Chevy Volt, "was finally scheduled to manufacture a battery or two after years of endless delays. ...[But] After being open for business... for barely a month, the company declared they would have to halt production because of a chemical that has yet to be approved by the Environmental Protection Agency. ...The most recent delay in manufacturing is also irony-flavored icing on the cake. The environmentalists who hungrily gobbled up money from Big Government to fund their altruistic quest for efficient battery power, are now being stopped by environmentalist-driven Big Government regulations. It is almost poetic justice. Except poetry shouldn't cost taxpayers \$300 million." [48474]

White House press secretary Jay Carney tells reporters that Barack "never let a crisis go to waste" Obama will issue additional executive orders related to gun control, and states that Obama "supports, as do an overwhelming majority of Americans, common-sense measures to reduce gun violence." [48475, 48476, 48511]

Asked about Obama's mishandling of the Syrian crisis, Carney responds, "What matters here is the result, and the result is that the positions [Obama] took—both in his negotiations and his consultations, and his public presentations—helped produce the result that we see today, which is the possibility that we can achieve the goal of military

force, and then some, without the use of military force, by relieving Assad of his chemical weapons and destroying them. That's far more significant than, you know, assessments about how it looked as it unfolded. What's important is the result—and the result of his consistency has been the potential for a diplomatic breakthrough.” [48518]

Judicial Watch announces that on September 5 it filed a lawsuit against the Department of Justice for its failure to provide documents related to Operation Fast and Furious that it had requested under the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA). Judicial Watch president Tom Fitton states, “[Attorney General] Eric Holder is using his legal battle with Congress to keep the American people from knowing the full truth about the Obama administration's Fast and Furious killings and lies. And yet, Eric Holder has been dragging out the 'settlement' talks to the point where Congress has called them a 'waste of everyone's time.' The Obama gang would rather stall for time than defend the Obama's administration secretive claims of executive privilege on Fast and Furious in court.” [48477, 48498]

FreeBeacon.com reports, “A CIA employee who refused to sign a non-disclosure agreement barring him from discussing the Sept. 11, 2012 terrorist attack in Benghazi, Libya, has been suspended as a result and forced to hire legal counsel, according to a top House lawmaker.” Congressman Frank Wolf (R-VA) “revealed at an event on Monday that his office was anonymously informed about the CIA employee, who is purportedly facing an internal backlash after refusing to sign a legal document barring him from publicly or privately discussing events surrounding the Benghazi attack. The revelation comes about a month after several media outlets reported that CIA employees with knowledge of the terror attack had been forced to sign non-disclosure agreements (NDA) and submit to regular polygraph tests. ‘The reports on the NDA are accurate. We're getting people who call,’ Wolf said Monday during an event marking the launch of the Citizens' Commission on Benghazi, a panel of former military and intelligence officials who are investigating unanswered questions surrounding the Benghazi incident.” Retired Air Force Col. Richard Brauer, co-founder of the group Special Operations Speaks, states, “We're tired of the lies and the cover-up that continues to this day. Who gave the order [to stand down], to remain in place in Tripoli and the other locations and do nothing. When was this order given and why? Forces were available on that very night, likely champing at the bit, but they were told to stand down. These are words that will live in infamy.” (At AtlasShrugs.com Pamela Geller writes, “Obama, covering for Muslim terrorists ... again. Treason, my friends. Hardcore treason.”) [48483, 48559]

CNSNews.com reports, “A Kentucky entrepreneur is seeking funding to produce a new board game called Obamacare. ‘Everybody has to pay. Nobody ever wins,’ the news release promises. (‘You're either broke or you're dead,’ the game board says.) Game creator Jack LeFeber says regardless how you view the health care law, ‘You'll love the creative insanity that only a government bureaucracy can cobble together. It's fun, educational and a little scary, all at the same time.’ Players can choose to be Democrats, Republicans, or members of the Tea Party, Green Party, Occupy Wall Street, or the IRS. Each player starts out on the ‘Buy Insurance’ square as a small business owner (except for the Occupy Wall Streeters, who begin the game unemployed). Along the way, players



are taxed, troubled, hospitalized, or may even fall victim to a death panel as they make their way across the board.” [48492]

Thousands of Americans sign a petition at the White House web site calling on Obama to give his Nobel Peace Prize to Russian President Vladimir Putin. [48493]

In New York City, Caroline Biden, a niece of Vice President Joe Biden, is arrested after a dispute between her and her roommate. According to MyFoxNY.com, “Biden was later charged with obstructing governmental administration, resisting arrest and harassment.” [48495, 48573, 48593]

Rush Limbaugh provides examples of journalists—many of them liberals—who thought Obama should not have gone into an anti-Republican diatribe while news of the Naval Yard shootings was still being reported. Maria Bartiromo: “Did they ever consider not giving the speech as a result of this?” Tyler Mathisen: “I was very surprised that they let this pre-planned event go on in light of what was happening.” Lou Dobbs [not a liberal]: “[Obama] expressed (pause) empathy before going ahead with his speech containing deep partisan attacks.” Peter Alexander: “At no time did they consider canceling today’s events.” Mara Liasson: “I really wonder now if they are having some second thoughts. The tone was a little off for a day like today.” Willie Geist: “The timing if the speech was inappropriate.” John Heilemann: “You can imagine if the similar thing had happened under George W. Bush that a lot of people would be outraged.” Eamon Javers: “Very jarring to hear what you heard from the White House at a time when there was an active shooter investigation here at the Washington Navy Yard.” (Javers then provides an excuse for Obama: “I have heard folks at the White House say, time and time again, that you’ve gotta [sic] be able to do one, two, three things at a time because the rest of the nation may not be as focused on a local law enforcement situation as we are here, and the rest of the country wants to hear about other things. And, of course, they also talked about Syria in that speech. So [Obama was] addressing a wide range of calamities and disasters all in one speech. It gives you some sense of the breadth of the scale of the problems that [he] has to deal with.”) [48496, 48501]

According to BeforeItsNews.com, “[W]ith fuel prices continuing to rise, wages dropping, jobs becoming harder to find, and rampant corruption in Washington D.C. furthering the country’s economic death spiral, America’s truck drivers, like the majority of our fellow citizens, are fed up. Between October 11th and 13th they have called for a general strike, asking truck drivers around the country to refuse to haul freight, a move that could carry with it a significant impact on the American economy. The protest calls for truckers to make their way to Washington D.C. in a massive convoy in an effort to call attention to, among other things, the Benghazi cover-up, the recent attack which killed 25 members of Seal Team 6, ever rising fuel prices, and claims that ...Obama has engaged in treasonous crimes. Moreover, they’ve requested that the American people join them in solidarity by not shopping or engaging in any economic activity that benefits the government or their corporate interests.” [48497]

RollCall.com reports, “Unable to find the votes for a strategy that only superficially defunds Obamacare, it now appears the House GOP may pursue the plan that tea-party-inspired members have been clamoring for—a stopgap spending bill that will actually defund the health care law but keep the rest of the government running. ...[T]he House will likely vote this week on a continuing resolution that funds the government but cuts off funding for Obamacare. Sources confirmed to CQ Call that Republican leaders discussed such a plan at their Elected Leaders Conference on Tuesday afternoon, but Michael Steel, a spokesman for Speaker John A. Boehner, said late Tuesday afternoon that leaders had not yet formally decided to move ahead with that plan. Instead, they are expected to present the plan to members on Wednesday morning [September 18]. ...GOP leaders are expected to be frank with members of their conference about the political realities that lie ahead and that a government shutdown should not be considered. They will likely tell members that if the Senate can’t pass a measure defunding Obamacare, the conference needs to support a plan to keep the government funded without that piece. House GOP leadership aides were tight-lipped about the details of the new CR proposal, but rumblings suggested that the stopgap spending bill would adhere to the current sequester levels of \$988 billion. Democratic leaders have called that a ‘non-starter’ in negotiations, but it is still more palatable to the minority than the \$967 billion level proposed by more conservative House rank-and-file members.” [48500]

CNSNews.com interviews the father of a Navy Yard employee, who says, “I know a lot of people are concerned about guns these days, but you know if everybody had arms, then there wouldn’t be these problems. My son was at Marine Barracks—at the Navy Yard yesterday—and they had weapons with them, but they didn’t have ammunition. And they said, ‘We were trained, and if we had the ammunition, we could’ve cleared that building.’ Only three people had been shot at that time, and they could’ve stopped the rest of it.” CNSNews notes, “Back in 1993, the Clinton administration virtually declared military establishments ‘gun-free zones.’ As a result, the policy banned military personnel from carrying their own personal firearms and mandates that ‘a credible and specific threat against [Department of the Army] personnel [exist] in that region’ before military personnel ‘may be authorized to carry firearms for personal protection.’ Indeed, most military bases have relatively few military police as they are in heavy demand to serve in Iraq and Afghanistan, according to economist John Lott. Additionally, Lott discovered that ‘every public shooting since at least 1950 in the U.S. in which more than three people have been killed has taken place where citizens are not allowed to carry guns.’” [48502]

FoxNews.com reports, “A Newport, Rhode Island police sergeant reported Navy Yard shooter Aaron Alexis to naval station police last month after the suspect told cops he was ‘hearing voices’ through his hotel room wall and that three people were following him and sending vibrations into his body, according to a police report obtained by FoxNews.com. In the document, the officer said that on August 7, he was sent to a local hotel to check out a suspicious person report involving Alexis, who told him he was a naval contractor and travelled often. The report said Alexis told the officer that while flying from Virginia to Rhode Island, he got into an argument with someone else at the

airport who he believed had sent three people to follow him and keep him awake by talking to him and sending vibrations into his body. He also said he thought he heard these three people—two black males and a black female—talking to him through a wall of his hotel room and through the walls, floors and ceiling of a hotel on the Navy base. Alexis told the officer the trio was using ‘some sort of microwave machine’ to keep him awake. The sergeant wrote in the report that based on what Alexis told him, ‘I made contact with on-duty Naval Station Police [officer name redacted.]’” [48503, 48512]

At Breitbart.com Lee Stranahan writes, “A prominent [illegal immigrant] ‘Dreamer’ activist named Alaa Mukahhal took to social media to laugh about her cynical use of the American flag as a prop for ‘messaging’ after her story was highlighted by Illinois Democrat Sen. Dick Durbin [D-IL]. In 2012, Sen. Durbin took to the floor of the Senate and held up a gigantic photograph of a smiling young woman wearing a Muslim hijab with an American flag in the background. He introduced her as Alaa Mukahhal, a Kuwaiti-born ‘Dreamer’ activist whom he described as being ‘of Palestinian descent,’ and who was brought to the country illegally at a young age by her parents, went on to become an honor student, get a degree in architecture and now needed a path to citizenship so, Durbin said, she could fulfill her American dream. Durbin even went so far as to feature Alaa on his own official webpage. ...A look [at] her Facebook page paints a different picture of Alaa than Sen. Durbin’s glowing ode: she’s a potty mouthed, politically correct, Israel hating radical activist who drops F bombs and politically correct buzzwords with equal acumen. After Sen. Durbin held up the photo of her with the US flag featured prominently, Alaa took to her Facebook page to chortle about how the flag wasn’t there to show any love for the United States—a country she said she hated when she came here—but a PR prop. ...The photo that Dick Durbin held up mocked patriotism. It was a completely cynical use of American iconography in order to serve a propaganda agenda. Alaa not only brags about it, she laughs about [it].” [48554, 48622]

In *The New York Times* Maureen Dowd, once one of Obama’s staunchest defenders, writes, “Just as with the address to the nation on Syria last week, [Obama] went ahead with a speech [about the economy] overtaken by events [the Navy Yard shootings]. It was out of joint, given that the Senate was put into lockdown and the Washington Nationals delayed a night game against the Atlanta Braves, noting on its Web site, ‘Postponed: Tragedy.’ The man who connected so electrically and facilely in 2008, causing Americans to overlook his thin résumé, cannot seem to connect anymore. With a shrinking circle of trust inside the White House, Obama is having trouble establishing trust outside with once reliable factions: grass-roots Democrats and liberals in Congress. As Peter Baker wrote in *The Times*, [Obama] is finding himself increasingly ‘frustrated’ by the defiance of Democrats who are despairing of his passive, reactive leadership. ...Top Democrats who used to consider Obama one cool cat now muse that he’s ‘one weird cat,’ as one big shot put it. ...Obama biographer Richard Wolffe [comments,] ‘I don’t know who they think they’re talking to or what they think they’re trying to say... [Obama] is a very muddled and entrenched figure who needs to get out of a defensive crouch and get some fresh ideas.’ ...Unlike Bill Clinton, who excels at boiling down complex arguments to simple ones, Obama prefers to wallow in the weeds, reminding

people that he's the smartest man in the room and expecting their support because he feels he is only doing what's complicated and right." [48520]

The James River Coal Company announces the closing of several Eastern Kentucky mines and the layoffs of 525 employees. Congressman Hal Rogers (R-KY) tells DailyCaller.com, "It is a downright dire and disastrous situation in Martin, Pike, Letcher and our surrounding coal counties, yet [Obama] is taking credit for [an economic] recovery! Deliberate anti-coal energy policies are sending thousands of families in my region to the unemployment line. I've talked to out of work miners struggling to put food on the table, find replacement work, and pay their bills. Over 500 Kentuckians are now wondering how they're going to feed their family and pay their bills, as a result of another shutdown at Kentucky coal mines. [Obama] is leading a war on coal and what that really means for Kentucky families is a war on jobs. ...There is no other way to say it; in two years, ...Obama's 'War on Coal' has resulted in 6,200 jobless Americans in the eastern Kentucky coal fields and untold thousands more in mining support businesses." According to DailyCaller.com, "The EPA is set to unveil carbon dioxide emissions limits for new power plants this week, which are expected to ban the construction of new coal-fired power plants unless they use carbon capture and storage technology—which the coal industry says are not commercially available." [48519]

In Lebanon, *The Daily Star* reports, "Al-Qaeda-linked gunmen with the Islamic State of Iraq and Greater Syria (ISIS) executed two men they said were members of President Bashar Assad's Alawite sect in the northern Syrian city of Raqqa Monday, according to activists and witnesses. ...In a video released by the Raqqa Media Center, the two men were shown bound and blindfolded, kneeling in the central Naim Square as a large crowd gathered. Two masked men armed with handguns then approach them from behind, shooting each twice—once in the upper back and once in the back of the head. ...The Syrian Observatory for Human Rights activist group confirmed the account..." (AtlasShrugs.com's Pamela Geller writes, "I have warned of this ethnic cleaning of religious minorities, this extermination in Syria by devout Muslims for well over a year. And Obama lifted the ban on arming terrorists yesterday so that he could give weapons to these savages.") [48509]

Brazilian President Dilma Rousseff cancels a scheduled October trip to the White House—including a state dinner—to protest NSA spying on her communications. (According to Reuters, Obama spent 20 minutes on the telephone with Rousseff in an unsuccessful attempt to persuade her to honor the commitment.) [48544, 48572]

On NBC's *Tonight Show*, Jay Leno says, "It's gotten so bad [Obama] is now calling it BidenCare." [48545]

On September 18 Speaker of the House John Boehner (R-OH) announces that the House will vote (probably on September 20) on a continuing resolution that continues the sequester spending levels but also defunds ObamaCare. Boehner says, "The [ObamaCare] law is a train wreck. Obama has protected American big business [with extensions and waivers of parts of the law]; it's time to protect American families from

this unworkable law.” Meanwhile, the media continues to incorrectly claim the Republicans want a complete government shutdown. Brian Phillips, communications director for Senator Mike Lee (R-UT), says, “There has never, ever, ever been any proposal from [Senators] Ted Cruz [R-TX] or Mike Lee to shut down the functions of government. That was just the media. ...If the House passes it, the only thing standing in the way of funding the government is [Senate Majority Leader] Harry Reid [D-NV]. If he doesn’t take it to a floor vote in the Senate, then he’s the one responsible for a shutdown scenario.” James Messina, Obama’s 2012 campaign manager who now heads the Obama propaganda arm, Organizing for Action, says in a fundraising email, “There are Republicans in the House so dead set on stopping Obamacare that they’re willing to sabotage our economy to do it. Really. Instead of passing a budget by the September 30th deadline. It’s time for them to cut the crap and get serious... Their latest plan is dangerous—we know that. They know it, too.” (Funding every aspect of the government *except* ObamaCare is, of course, not dangerous and will certainly not “sabotage the economy.” [48514, 48517, 48524, 48527, 48533, 48549, 48560, 48583])

Boehner adds, “You know, for decades, Congresses and presidents have used the debt limit for legislation to cut spending. And even ...Obama worked with us two years ago in the debt limit negotiations to put controls on spending. This year is not going to be any different.” House Majority Leader Eric Cantor (R-VA) states, “In the coming week, we will unveil a plan to extend our nation’s ability to borrow while delaying ObamaCare and protecting working middle class families from its horrific effects. [We Republicans] aim to put a stop to Obamacare before it costs one more job or raises a family’s out of pocket expenses one more dollar. And that fight will continue as we negotiate the debt limit with [Obama] and the Senate.” Congressman Kevin McCarthy (R-CA) says, “I think you’re going to see a very big excitement coming through this week and next week as well as we move legislation. The excitement is the united conference going after the battle we’ve always been willing to wage. But now we’re going to look forward to the Senate joining with us.” Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell (R-KY) tells reporters, “[I]t is quite common for requests... to raise the debt ceiling to be accompanied by significant legislation that addresses the question of the debt. I would be stunned if we raised the debt ceiling and didn’t do something about the debt. I think that’s the view of virtually every Republican. I think [Obama] ought to be concerned about the debt. It seems like the only time [Obama’s] ever willing to address the question of deficit and debt is when we have some opportunity and some leverage to bring him to the table. And the request to raise the debt ceiling is one of those opportunities.” (In 2006, then-Senator Obama voted against raising the debt limit, calling it “a sign of leadership failure... a sign that the U.S. government can’t pay its own bills.”) [48527, 48528, 48536, 48649])

FoxNews.com notes, “Effectively, Boehner and his deputies have backed off a compromise approach they earlier tried to sell to rank-and-file conservatives. Under that plan, the House would have sent two bills to the Senate—one to de-fund ObamaCare, the other to fund the government. The Senate, then, would have been able to easily bypass the ObamaCare bill and send the spending measure straight to the White House, in turn averting a government shutdown. But House conservatives revolted, and Boehner now plans to tie the two votes together. Under the plan, funding the government would be

conditional on de-funding ObamaCare. It is a concession to House conservatives as well as senators like Ted Cruz (R-TX), and outside groups like the Heritage Foundation that have demanded Congress use the must-pass budget bill as leverage to derail the health care law. But it is also undoubtedly risky. ...Obama and Senate Democratic Leader Harry Reid have warned Republicans not to go down that road, suggesting that they will bear the brunt of the blame if the gambit results in a government shutdown. Obama blasted Republicans during an interview Tuesday with Telemundo. ‘We’re hearing that a certain faction of Republicans, in the House of Representatives in particular are arguing for government shutdown or even a default for the United States of America... if they don’t get 100 percent of what they want,’ Obama said.” (Obama, of course, is blaming the Republicans for doing what he himself is doing: refusing to compromise. Obama has shown no willingness to cut spending or delay ObamaCare’s “individual mandate,” and has essentially insisted that it is “his way or the highway. Obama has demanded that Congress continue spending on ObamaCare and all other programs, raise the debt limit without any spending cuts, restore the spending levels reduced by the “sequester,” and raise taxes. On those issues he is unwilling to compromise—but on every one of those issues he expects Republican legislators to compromise.) [48524, 48526, 48528]

Townhall.com political editor Guy Benson comments on Boehner’s announcement: “Instant reaction reports suggest conservative House members are generally pleased with the new game plan. But what are the real-world implications of this decision? ...Boehner will embed the defunding provision directly into the temporary budget, pass it out of the House, and send it over to the Senate. [Senators] Ted Cruz [R-TX], Marco Rubio [R-FL], Mike Lee [R-UT] & Co. have been champing at the bit for an opportunity to engage this battle on the Senate floor, and they’ll have their chance, presumably with the blessing of [Senate Minority Leader] Mitch McConnell [R-KY]. Ultimately, though, the chances of [Senate Majority Leader Harry] Reid [D-NV], [Dick] Durbin [D-IL]and [Charles] Schumer [D-NY] allowing an Obamacare-defunding CR to emerge from their chamber are nil. Nada. Zero. So as the September 30 deadline approaches, Republicans will eventually circle back to the debate over whether to use the threat of government shutdown to apply further pressure on Democrats—who will *never* cave on this issue. What conservatives are ‘winning’ here is the opportunity to stand on principle and cast more (more or less symbolic) votes against Obamacare in the House while forcing a robust debate in the Senate. That’s better than nothing, I suppose.” [48562]

Benson continues, “Here’s how I roughly expect things to play out: (1) The House passes a temporary budget that defunds Obamacare. The Senate has an intense debate on the subject, but it ultimately goes nowhere, with Reid easily marshaling 60 votes to overcome any potential filibuster attempt. Leadership in the two chambers hammer out an alternative CR that continues funding for Obamacare, but accommodates a handful of Republican goals. The updated version passes the Senate, then Boehner breaks the so-called ‘Hastert Rule’ to move it out of the House. Done deal. (2) On the debt ceiling, Obama—who says he won’t negotiate, and won’t sign anything other than a ‘clean’ hike—caves on both of those positions. He’ll have no choice. Republicans negotiate themselves a few more (relatively minor) concessions, perhaps including tough Senate votes on Obamacare delays. The debt ceiling is increased, in return for some additional

spending cuts, one or two welcome (but small-ball) reforms, and without any tax increases. (3) Both parties declare partial victory, then charge toward the 2014 cycle, arguing that the other side is the problem in Washington. Ain't politics grand?" [48562, 48583]

Morning Jolt's Jim Geraghty notes that White House "statistics show that Senate Democrats voted with Mr. Obama more than 90 percent of the time over his first four years, compared with Mr. Clinton, who had support in the 80 percent range over a similar period and President Ronald Reagan, whose party voted with him in the 70 percent range."

Seven illegal immigrants chain themselves to a White House fence, protesting Obama's statement on the Spanish-language television program *Telemundo* that halting deportations was "not an option." [48543]

NBCNews.com reports that the Navy Yard killer, Aaron Alexis, "who served as a naval reservist from 2007 to 2011 and worked more recently as a civilian contractor, had a military disciplinary record that included disorderly conduct, insubordination and unexcused absences. Newport, R.I., police said he called them Aug. 7 to say he had changed hotels twice because he believed people were chasing him and sending vibrations through the walls to keep him from sleeping. Police said they had forwarded their report to police at the naval station in Newport. Military officials told NBC News on Wednesday that they had found no evidence that naval police forwarded the information to any higher command outside the base. ...Alexis also had run-ins with the law over gun violence. He was accused in 2004 of having shot out the tires of a car in Seattle and in 2010 of having fired a gun into an upstairs apartment in Fort Worth, Texas. ...Law enforcement officials told NBC News that Alexis created a webpage with the name 'Mohammed Salem,' but they said he never did anything with it. They said they had found nothing else that might indicate any interest in violent jihad or even in Islam." [48601, 48602, 48604, 48605, 48610, 48623]

In Toronto, Canada, off-duty firefighter Dominic Parker dies from head injuries after a knife-wielding Muslim attempts to behead him. (The police call it a "random act of violence" and say they know of "no motive." Obama has no comment.) [48620, 48621]

Addressing the Business Roundtable, Obama says the debt ceiling issue is "always a tough vote because the average person thinks raising the debt ceiling must mean that we're running up our debt." (Of course, it certainly does mean that.) "So people don't like to vote on it and typically there's some gamesmanship in terms of making the [other] party shoulder the burden. And if there is a budget package that includes the debt ceiling vote, it's not the debt ceiling that is driving the negotiations. It's stuck into the budget negotiations because if you're going to take a bunch of tough votes anyway, you might as well go ahead and stick that in there. You have never seen in the history of the United States the debt ceiling or the threat of not raising the debt being used to extort a president or a governing party and trying to force issues that have nothing to do with the budget and nothing to do with the debt." (Obama's statement is absurd, if not an outright lie.

Debt ceiling votes are routinely used for multiple purposes, and virtually every attempt to deal with the deficit over the last three decades has relied on the debt ceiling debate to force the issue. Additionally, for Obama to claim that ObamaCare has “nothing to do with the budget and nothing to do with the debt” is laughable. At Townhall.com Lawrence Kudlow writes, ‘According to ‘Fact Checker’ columnist Glenn Kessler of The Washington Post, [Obama’s] claim is completely wrong. Going back *decades*, the debt ceiling bills have been linked to campaign-finance reform, Social Security, ending the bombing in Cambodia, voluntary school prayer, banning bussing to achieve integration, and proposing a nuclear freeze. Way back in 1982, then-Senate Majority Leader Howard Baker unleashed a free for all, allowing 1,400 non-germane amendments to the debt ceiling legislation. Kessler rightly gives Obama four Pinocchios.’) [48589, 47647

Obama claims he is “happy to negotiate” with the Republicans—even though he has made it clear he has no intention of defunding ObamaCare or any other government program, and has demanded a “clean” debt ceiling bill with nothing attached to it. “What I will not do,” says Obama, “is create a habit, a pattern, where the full faith and credit of the United States ends up being a bargaining chip to set policy. It’s irresponsible.” (From Obama’s perspective, five consecutive years of deficits of at least \$1 trillion is not irresponsible, but trying to avoid more of them is.) Obama argues that he has “responsibilities, not just to the current generation but the future generations, and we’re not going to set up a situation where the full faith and credit of the United States is put on the table every year, or every year and a half, and we go through some sort of terrifying financial brinksmanship because of some ideological arguments people are having about some particular issue of the day. We’re not going to do that.” (He has done that for four consecutive years.) “So, the good news is that we can raise the debt ceiling tomorrow just by a simple vote in each chamber and set that aside and then we can have a serious argument about the budget.” (Obama has never had a serious argument about the budget—except to argue for increasing it. To believe he will suddenly become a deficit hawk because the debt limit has been increased again is absurd.) [48589]

Partly as a result of ObamaCare, the mammoth drugstore chain Walgreen’s announces that it will discontinue directly providing health insurance for its employees and instead shift them to a health care exchange. According to Bloomberg.com, “About 160,000 Walgreen employees now have to choose which coverage plan suits them best at a time of rising complexity in the health-care system. While Walgreen[’s] said it will provide funding in 2014 equal to what workers get now, the move curtails uncertainty on future outlays, and there’s no guarantee the company’s contribution will rise if premiums do.” (Walgreens will essentially give each employee a subsidy to cover their own purchase of health insurance, with the amount of the subsidy equivalent to what the company had been paying for previous coverage. Obama’s 2009 promise, “If you like your coverage you can keep it” is broken for Walgreen’s employees. They may be able to get equivalent coverage—but they might not. Additionally, the amount of the corporate subsidy may be insufficient to pay the full cost of the exchange plan the employee selects; and as health costs increase, the premiums may increase at a faster rate than any subsidy increase. Walgreen’s is therefore shifting the uncertainty of future health care costs to its



employees—and it will most certainly not be the only business to do so.) [48522, 48523, 48532, 48567]

PJMedia.com posts an ObamaCare warning from a reader: “Through serendipity I’ve ended up working in HIT (health information technology). I take 50 calls a day with independent insurance agents/brokers to navigate the hoops to qualify to sell on the FFM (Federal Facilitated Marketplaces). The Government websites they need to access to register are riddled with random error messages, and simply attempting to log in to complete this process routinely fails. The agents/brokers are, to a person, terrified. If they cannot complete this process by October 1st (the deadline) they are hosed. Nobody knows what to do, and this will only get worse when millions of consumers join the fray of the marketplace. It appears nobody scaled the back end to accommodate this exponential growth. And now?, It’s too late. It’s like the owner of the White Star line getting a telegram about the Titanic sinking and saying ‘We need to order more lifeboats.’ And these are the smartest guys in the room? For obvious reasons, don’t use my name please...” [48603]

CNSNews.com reports, “During the four years that marked ... Obama’s first term in office, the real median income of American households dropped by \$2,627 and the number of people in poverty increased by approximately 6,667,000, according to data released today by the Census Bureau. The record total of approximately 46,496,000 people in the United States who are now in poverty, according to the Census Bureau, is more than twice the population of Syria, which, according to the CIA, has 22,457,336 people. In 2008, the year Obama was elected, real median household income in the United States was \$53,644 according to the Census Bureau. In 2012, the last full year of Obama’s first term, median household income was \$51,017. Thus, real median household income dropped \$2,627—or 4.89 percent—from 2008 to 2012. In fact, real median household income dropped in every year of Obama’s first term. In 2008, when he was elected, it was \$53,644. In 2009, the year he was inaugurated, it dropped to 53,285. In 2010, his second year in office, it dropped to \$51,892. In 2011, his third year in office, it dropped to \$51,100. And, in 2012, his fourth year in office, it dropped to \$51,017. At the same time the number of people living in poverty in the United States increased. In 2008, according to the Census Bureau, there were approximately 39,829,000 people living in poverty in this country. In 2012, there were 46,496,000. That is an increase of approximately 6,667,000—of 16.73 percent—from 2008 to 2012.” [48525]

At FrontPageMagazine.com Daniel Greenfield explains “the roots of Obama’s indecision,” writing, “Given a clear political orientation to follow, Obama will try to see any program through, no matter how strong the opposition or how destructive the results. It is only when necessity is at odds with dogma that he is unable to reach a decision. Obama is dogma-ridden. Where [George W.] Bush was a pragmatist trying to do what worked; he [Obama] needs to follow a party line. Like the Chinese rocket scientist consulting Mao’s Little Red Book to decide what to do next; he needs the political guidance of the left to come to a decision on anything. He can pursue any course as long as he starts with a progressive political program and then does whatever is necessary to put it into action. What he has great difficulty doing is beginning with a necessary action

and working backward toward a political program. ...Obama had done the Muslim Brotherhood's bidding in the Middle East and was comfortable fusing the left's anti-colonialism with Islamism. But Syria was the first time that his commitments were truly tested. ...Liberals wanted him to bomb Syria, but the [far] left didn't. The UK and France wanted him to bomb. The Muslim Brotherhood wanted him to bomb Syria; but his advisers were uncertain that the 'moderate' movement's front men would be able to take the country back from Al Qaeda afterward. Once again, he couldn't make a decision. So he tried to make a decision without making a decision. ...What Obama lacked was ideological clarity. The old bubble of left-wing politics had not prepared him for the big chair [in the Oval Office]. There was no single Party organization to tell him what to do. No little red book he could read. On the domestic front, the decisions seemed clear. Raise taxes, ban carbon, pass amnesty. But internationally, there were no more right answers. The left's foreign politics are reflexively anti-American. And that meant that everything he did was wrong. ...That is the crippling factor behind Obama's indecisiveness in matters of war. To the Anti-American mind, there is no right decision he can make. And burdened with an Anti-American mind, Obama would rather outsource foreign policy to Putin than make another decision. Obama is caught in an ideological Catch 22. [In his view,] American power is illegitimate. The only moral use of it is to destroy it. But how can he use American power and destroy it at the same time? He has done his best elsewhere in the Middle East; but there is no way to do both in Syria which is a Russian client. The only way to destroy American power in Syria is by showing how powerless America is. And that is what he has done." [48531]

FreeBeacon.com reports, "A senior Muslim Brotherhood official who, until recently, had been employed by the William J. Clinton Foundation was arrested in Cairo on Tuesday and charged with inciting violence. Gehad el-Haddad served as one of the Muslim Brotherhood's top communications officials until Egyptian security forces seized him as part of a wider crackdown on officials loyal to ousted former President Mohamed Morsi. Before emerging as a top Brotherhood official and adviser to Morsi, el-Haddad served for five years as a top official at the Clinton Foundation, a nonprofit group founded by former President Bill Clinton. El-Haddad gained a reputation for pushing the Muslim Brotherhood's Islamist agenda in the foreign press, where he was often quoted defending the Brotherhood's crackdown on civil liberties in Egypt. ...The Clinton Foundation did not respond to multiple requests for comment on El-Haddad's employment and arrest." (Whether el-Haddad was a friend of Hillary Clinton aide Huma Abedin is not disclosed.) [48537, 48590, 48624]

According to Andrew McCarthy at PJMedia.com, "...Gehad el-Haddad's placement in the Morsi inner-circle was a natural because of family ties: el-Haddad's father was a top foreign policy adviser to Morsi, the Brotherhood leader, America-basher, anti-Semite, and now-ousted Egyptian president. ...Small world: Ms. Abedin's parents (her mother and late father) have also been prominent Brotherhood figures. In fact, besides running [an Islamist] journal founded by [al-Qaeda financier Abdullah Omar] Naseef, Ms. Abedin's mother, Saleha Mahmood Abedin, is reportedly a member of the Muslim Sisterhood ...as is Morsi's wife. Mrs. Abedin also runs a sharia promotion organization called the International Islamic Committee for Woman and Child (IICWC), which is part

of another group, the International Islamic Council for Dawa and Relief (IICDR), that has been banned in Israel for providing material support to Hamas (the Brotherhood's Palestinian terrorist branch). Both IICWC and IICDR operate under the umbrella of Sheikh Yusuf Qaradawi's Union of Good. Sheikh Qaradawi is the Brotherhood's chief jurist and has issued fatwas endorsing suicide bombings in Israel and the killing of American troops in Iraq—and his Union of Good is a designated terrorist organization under U.S. law.” [48537, 48590]

The Cleveland Clinic announces that an unspecified number of its 42,000 employees will be laid off in a cost-reduction program. According to WKYC.com, Clinic spokeswoman Eileen Sheil “denied circulating rumors that employees were told there would be 3,000 jobs cut,” but “said early retirement would be offered to 3,000 eligible employees. Most vacant jobs are not being filled. She attributed most of the budget reductions to looming changes accompanying the start of the Affordable Health Care Act [ObamaCare].” The Clinic's goal is to reduce costs by \$330 million in 2014. (Ironically, in July 2009 Obama mentioned the Cleveland Clinic as a model for others to follow: “And part of the reason it works well is because they've set up a system where patient care is the number-one concern, not bureaucracy, what forms have to be filled out, what do we get reimbursed for. Those are changes that I think the American people want to see.”) [48538, 48599]

Meanwhile, Vanderbilt University Medical Center (VUMC) is planning to cut as many as 1,000 jobs by the end of the year. The Tennessean.com reports, “This latest round of layoffs is part of the medical center's plan to cut \$250 million from its \$3.3 billion operating budget over the next two fiscal years.” [48539]

Senator Marco Rubio (R-FL) tells Newsmax.TV, “Every single member of the Republican conference agrees that ObamaCare should be stopped, but the disagreement is about the tactic[s]. I'm not in favor of shutting down the government. [Obama] appears now politically to be in favor of shutting down the government. I'm in favor of funding the government at the levels that were agreed to last year in the Budget Control Act and not spending a single penny more of hardworking taxpayer dollars on a disaster, which is ObamaCare. Actually, the administration has admitted it's a disaster because they've had to delay major portions of it. Labor unions that strongly supported ObamaCare are now asking to be exempted from it. So we should be doing anything and everything we can to prevent this law from going into effect, because once it starts to hurt people, it's going to hurt our economy in ways that are very difficult to undo later.” Rubio calls the House plan to pass legislation funding everything except ObamaCare “very positive news. It's now going to call attention to the fact that we can keep the government open, we can fund the government, but we don't have to shut down the government, and we don't have to fund ObamaCare. It's [Obama] who's threatening to shut down the government because he is saying, and it's the position his allies in the Senate so far have taken, that unless they fund ObamaCare, they won't fund the government. [Obama is] basically looking for a political win, and I guess his political people have told him that this is a political win: shut down the government and blame the Republicans. The problem is that's not the Republican position.” (Of course, media leftists will do their best to convince Americans that it is the GOP position.) [48574]

Chairman Ben Bernanke announces that the Federal Reserve will continue its monthly purchase of \$85 billion in debt and assets. (Not surprisingly, the stock market—apparently unconcerned about future hyperinflation—responds favorably to the news that money backed by nothing will continue to be printed to “infinity and beyond.” Also not surprisingly, the price of gold increased more than four percent and oil prices rose more than two percent—because printing more money reduces the value of the dollar.) [48569, 48570, 48579, 48582]

The House of Representatives votes 217–210 to reduce food stamp (“SNAP” program) spending by about \$4 billion per year—or \$40 billion over 10 years. (The program has ballooned from \$38 billion in 2008 to \$75 billion in 2012.) According to Katrina Trinko at NationalReview.com, “Since the recession, work requirements for able-bodied adults aged 18 to 50, who don’t have children and who are receiving food stamps for more than three months out of a three-year period, have mostly fallen by the wayside. Thanks to the stimulus package, the standards were waived for 2009–10, and since then, virtually all states have continued to waive the requirement. The Congressional Budget Office estimates that about 1.7 million adults would lose SNAP benefits if the House’s bill became law. Unemployment rates remain high in many states, so the House’s bill would allow the work requirements to be satisfied by doing community-service work, such as removing trash from roadways and serving in soup kitchens.” (Predictably, Democrats excoriate the Republicans over the vote, and Obama threatens a veto should the measure also pass in the Senate.) [48580, 48598, 48611, 48640]

The BBC reports, “One of the first teams of heavily armed police to respond to Monday’s shooting in Washington DC was ordered to stand down by superiors, the BBC can reveal. A tactical response team of the Capitol Police, a force that guards the US Capitol complex [and has a ‘heavily-armed four man Containment and Emergency Response Team’], was told to leave the scene by a supervisor instead of aiding municipal officers. The Capitol Police department has launched a review into the matter. ... ‘I don’t think it’s a far stretch to say that some lives may have been saved if we were allowed to intervene,’ a Capitol Police source familiar with the incident told the BBC.” RollCall.com then reports, “Capitol Police officers stationed around Capitol Hill reacted with shock to a BBC report that Capitol Police commanders told a team of their heavily armed officers to stand down when they arrived on the scene of Monday’s deadly Navy Yard shooting. ‘Stunned’ and ‘embarrassed’ were among the reactions overheard from officers posted around the Capitol complex discussing the allegations that one of the best-trained tactical units in the city was ordered to leave the scene of a mass shooting.” [48540, 48541, 48546, 48548]

At Intellihub.com, Andrew Pontbriand reports, “Officials involved in the investigation of the Navy Yard shooting, have come forward with new insights on the weapon that was used in the shooting. [Aaron] Alexis had carved the words ‘My ELF weapon’ on his Remington 870-Express-Tactical shotgun. ELF stands for ‘extremely low frequency’, and usually refers to communications or weather. For those who are familiar with this technology, it is well understood that this is used in programs such as H.A.A.R.P. It has

also been reported by several government whistle blowers, and even political activists that they suspected a ‘ELF weapon’ was being used on them. The report about the carvings is most interesting, because it seems to confirm the claim made by Alexis that 3 men were following him using an ELF weapon while he was in his hotel room. He even filed a report to the Newport, Rhode Island Police stating these claims. Aaron stated he had to change his hotel 3 different times because these people were using the microwave machine on him. ...The news about the etching on the stock of his rifle is incredible to say the least, as such information rarely reaches the public. The use of ELF waves on humans is usually thought to be science fiction to most, but to others it is very real. Researchers such as Fred Bell, who died after shooting an episode of ‘Conspiracy Theory’ with Jesse Ventura; spoke about said weapons.” (*The Obama Timeline* can neither confirm nor discredit the claim, but does not believe it is outside the realm of possibility that Alexis was brainwashed by unknown persons to engage in killings for an unknown reason.) CNN’s Anderson Cooper confirms that Alexis etched “my ELF gun” onto his weapon, “whatever that means.” (Cooper can apparently read a script placed in front of him, but is incapable of investigating the meaning of “ELF.”) [48551, 48566]

The Obama administration confirms that White House counsel Kathryn Ruemmler will leave her position by the end of the year. [48552, 48635]

According to USAToday.com, “Newly uncovered IRS documents show the agency flagged political groups based on the content of their literature, raising concerns specifically about ‘anti-Obama rhetoric,’ inflammatory language and ‘emotional’ statements made by non-profits seeking tax-exempt status. The internal 2011 documents, obtained by USA TODAY, list 162 groups by name, with comments by Internal Revenue Service lawyers in Washington raising issues about their political, lobbying and advocacy activities. In 21 cases, those activities were characterized as ‘propaganda.’ The list provides the most specific public accounting to date of which groups were targeted for extra scrutiny and why. The IRS has not publicly identified the groups, repeatedly citing a provision of the tax code prohibiting it from releasing tax return information. More than 80% of the organizations on the 2011 ‘political advocacy case’ list were conservative, but the effort to police political activity also ensnared at least 11 liberal groups as of November 2011, including Progressives United, Progress Texas and Delawareans for Social and Economic Justice. ...On Nov. 16, 2011, IRS lawyers in Washington sent a list of cases to front-line agents in Cincinnati, along with comments and guidance on how to handle political organizations.” (The Obama administration has claimed that “rogue employees” in a Cincinnati IRS office initiated the plan to deny, or delay approving, tax-exempt status for conservative groups. In fact, the Cincinnati office was ordered to follow the plan.) Jay Sekulow, chief counsel for the American Center for Law and Justice, states, “The political motivations of this are so patently obvious, but then to have a document that spells it out like this is very damaging to the IRS. I hope the FBI has seen these documents.” [48555, 48556, 48557, 48576]

Obama’s propaganda arm, Organizing for Action, wastes no time taking advantage of the Navy Yard shootings, sending an email seeking support for gun control legislation—and donations. [48571]

“House of Sunny’s” Sunny Lohmann posts a “presidential dating game” video at DailyCaller.com comparing Obama to Vladimir Putin. [48575]

On September 19 ABC’s Jonathan Karl questions White House press secretary Jay Carney on the debt ceiling. Karl notes that Obama’s “position is, you will not negotiate over the debt ceiling.” Carney: “Correct.” Karl: “How is that tenable? [Obama is] willing to risk default?” Carney: “The White House is not—here’s the thing...” Karl: “But you’re threatening default. ... You’re saying you won’t even negotiate with Republicans in this issue. How is that tenable?” Carney laughs. (Townhall.com’s Guy Benson writes, “Jay Carney can smirk, chortle, deny and deflect until the cows come home, but the party who stubbornly refuses to even sit down at the negotiating table is clearly the biggest impediment to achieving a productive compromise. If he sticks to his line in the sand, Barack Obama will be primarily responsible for a debt limit-driven crisis.” [48561]

The Obama administration files a 251-page appeal with the 10th Circuit Court in the Hobby Lobby lawsuit against ObamaCare’s demand that it provide employees with health insurance that includes abortifacients, birth control, and sterilization. At Townhla.com Sarah Jean Seman points out, “Two key laws are up for judicial interpretation in this case. One of these statutes is the glaringly-obvious First Amendment ‘free exercise clause’ which demands Congress make no law prohibiting the free exercise of religion. The second is the 1993 Religious Freedom Restoration Act which states the ‘government shall not substantially burden a person’s exercise of religion even if the burden results from a rule of general applicability.’ ...Hobby Lobby faces a fine of at least \$475 million per year if the Supreme Court rules to enforce the HHS mandate. To date, the abortion pill mandate is losing 30-5 in court, according to Alliance Defending Freedom.” [48656]

Retired Admiral Mike Mullen and former Ambassador Thomas R. Pickering, who served on the “independent” Benghazi review board, testify before the House Oversight and Government Affairs Committee. The committee questions why the board gave a chance to review their findings before their release, and why Mullen advised Hillary Clinton’s chief of staff, Cheryl Mills, not to send a particular witness to Congress. Congressman Jim Jordan (R-OH) asks, “If this is so independent, why are you giving the State Department a heads-up about a witness coming in front of this committee?” After hours of testimony, all but two Democrats walk out to avoid hearing from Patricia Smith and Charles Woods—whose sons Sean Smith and Tyrone Woods were killed in Benghazi. Patricia Smith tells the committee, “I was told a few things, and they were all lies. Every one of them [Obama, Clinton, Secretary of Defense Leon Panetta, et al] came up to me, gave me a big hug, and I asked them, ‘What happened. Please tell me.’ And every one of them said it was the video. And we all know that it wasn’t the video. Even at that time they knew it wasn’t the video. So they all lied to me.” Charles Woods states, “We need to ask the people that were there, not rely upon hearsay evidence as to whether or not there was an order to stand down. Ambassador Stevens was alive for a substantial period of time after he made that initial distress call. It’s very possible that there would have been no loss of life if that first order to stand down had not been given. We need to find that

out.” (The Obama administration has refused to allow several Benghazi witnesses to testify before Congress. Committee chairman Darrell Issa (R-CA) has signed subpoenas calling for their testimony.) It is worth noting that the review board neglected to interview Hillary Clinton and National Security Advisor Tom Donilon—as if they had nothing to do with U.S. embassy procedures and policies and were not at all involved with the events of September 11, 2012. Congressman John Mica (R-FL) comments, “If the secretary [of State, Clinton] wasn’t involved, I must be on another planet.” [48565, 48585, 48615, 48629, 48636, 48639, 48663, 48714]

The Democrat Congressmen who walk out of the hearing to avoid hearing from Mrs. Smith and Mr. Woods—and perhaps to make the point that Benghazi is a “phony scandal”—are: Carolyn Maloney (NY), Eleanor Holmes Norton (DC), John Tierney (MA), William Lacy Clay (MO), Stephen Lynch (MA), Jim Cooper (RN), Gerald Connolly (VA), Matt Cartwright (PA), Mark Pocan (WI), Tammy Duckworth (IL), Danny Davis (IL), Peter Welch (VT), Tony Cardenas (CA), Steve Horsford (NV), and Michelle Lujon Grisham (NM). (ABC, NBC, and CBS ignore the Democrat walk-out in their evening news broadcasts—but gush all over coverage of Caroline Kennedy’s appearance at her Senate confirmation. The Media Research Center reports, “ABC’s Martha Raddatz was awestruck over JFK’s daughter: ‘For one brief shining moment, senators from both sides of the aisle seemed to hearken back to the so-called Camelot days.’ NBC’s Harry Smith gushed that ‘history and legacy were more important this morning than party or partisanship. The daughter of a president said she wanted to fulfill her father’s wish.’ World News anchor Diane Sawyer trumpeted Kennedy’s testimony: ‘Today, we all watched as a president’s daughter stepped towards a new role in public service—questioned by the Senate, as she seeks to become the next U.S. ambassador to Japan.’” Raddatz says, “Caroline Kennedy is said to be looking forward to learning Japanese, living in Tokyo, where she can make her own history.” (Some might argue that Kennedy-Schlossberg should be named ambassador to Japan only if she already spoke Japanese, and that she should be looking forward to serving the best interests of the United States—not shopping in Tokyo and making her own history.) [48663, 48716]

Obama says, “Now, this debt ceiling—I just want to remind people in case you haven’t been keeping up—raising the debt ceiling, which has been done over a hundred times, does not increase our debt.” (Obama does not explain why, if raising the debt ceiling does not increase the nation’s debt, there is any point in raising the debt ceiling. Nor does he explain why he opposed raising the debt ceiling before he entered the White House but now believes it is a harmless bookkeeping technicality.) “What we now have,” says Obama, “is an ideological fight that’s been mounted in the House of Representatives that says, we’re not going to pass a budget and we will threaten a government shutdown unless we repeal the Affordable Care Act.” (Obama is incorrect. House Republicans have not threatened a government shutdown, and they intend to pass legislation authorizing continued spending for all budget items *except* ObamaCare. If the government is shut down, it will be because Obama and the Democrat-controlled Senate insist on “all or nothing at all.”) [48568]

It is worth noting that even if a continuation of federal spending is not approved by Congress, the consequences will not be as dire as some suggest. According to the Heritage Foundation's Hans A. von Spakovsky, "*crucial services will continue without interruption*. That includes all services essential for national security and public safety—such as the military and law enforcement—as well as mandatory government payments such as Social Security and veterans' benefits. The key fact, as the U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ) itself has said, is that when there is a short-term lapse in appropriations, 'the federal Government will not be truly 'shut down'...because Congress has itself provided that some activities of Government should continue.' In fact, any claims that not passing a CR will result in a 'shutting down' of the government 'is an entirely inaccurate description' according to the DOJ. ...Such a lapse in funding would be neither catastrophic nor unprecedented, but it would pare down government services to those most essential for 'the safety of human life or the protection of property.' That would not include the hundreds of billions of dollars in the federal budget that are constantly squandered and wasted on frivolous, unnecessary, and unneeded programs." (According to Politico, "Since 1976, there have been at least 17 federal government shutdowns ranging from 1 to 21 days." At no time did the world end, nor did retirees fail to receive Social Security benefits.) [48578, 48952]

According to MyWay.com, "[T]he world won't end if a dysfunctional Washington can't find a way to pass a funding bill before the new budget year begins on Oct. 1. Social Security checks will still go out. Troops will remain at their posts. Doctors and hospitals will get their Medicare and Medicaid reimbursements. In fact, virtually every essential government agency, like the FBI, the Border Patrol and the Coast Guard, will remain open. Furloughed federal workers probably would get paid, eventually. Transportation Security Administration officers would continue to man airport checkpoints. ...[F]ewer than half of the 2.1 million federal workers subject to [a shutdown] would be forced off the job if the Obama administration follows the rules followed by previous Presidents Ronald Reagan, George H.W. Bush and Clinton. That's not counting about 500,000 Postal Service employees or 1.4 million uniformed military personnel who would be exempt. The rules for who works and who doesn't date back to the early 1980s and haven't been significantly modified since. The Obama administration re-issued the guidance on Wednesday [September 18]. The air traffic control system, food inspection, Medicare, veterans' health care and many other essential government programs would run as usual. The Social Security Administration would not only send out benefits but would continue to take applications. The Postal Service, which is self-funded, would keep delivering the mail. The Federal Emergency Management Agency could continue to respond to disasters at the height of hurricane season. The Washington Monument would be closed. But it's been closed anyway since an earthquake in 2011. ...From a practical perspective, shutdowns usually aren't that big a deal. They happened every year when Jimmy Carter was president, averaging 11 days each. During President Reagan's two terms, there were six shutdowns, typically just one or two days apiece. Deals got cut. Everybody moved on." [48592]

Obama's 2009 pledge—"If you like your health care plan, you'll be able to keep your health care plan, period. No one will take it away, no matter what"—will not apply to the



20,000 part-time employees of Home Depot who are being transferred to the ObamaCare exchanges. Stephen Holmes, the company's director of corporate communications, states, "Unfortunately, the ACA [Affordable Care Act] precludes us from offering the limited liability medical plan we've been offering the part-time associates." According to DailyCaller.com, "The government-run exchange requires people to buy insurance for a government-designed set of health-care services, including services promoted by corporate lobbies. The insurance packages can be more expensive than sought by workers, especially younger workers, but the extra costs are partially offset by subsidies from other taxpayers. Home Depot's current limited liability plan allows part-timers to get critical health-care coverage at low cost. Home Depot's founder, Bernie Marcus, is a strong critic of the government network. 'Obamacare is going to kill off small business,' he said this year. ...The accelerating shift of workers to Obama's taxpayer-funded network will likely drive up costs to taxpayers, disadvantage companies that try to pay for their employees' health-care and make more voters dependent on health-care decisions made by Democratic officials and legislators." (One of ObamaCare's problems is that it essentially prohibits "no frills" health insurance policies—which currently cover millions of Americans. ObamaCare requires substantially expanded coverage, and that coverage is more expensive. Many employers will respond to that requirement by eliminating coverage altogether and dumping the employees on the tax-payer subsidized ObamaCare exchanges. As a result, the coverage Home Depot cannot afford to give its part-time workers will be paid for by the taxpayers. According to Townhall.com's Crista Huff, "Home Depot will continue to offer medical benefits to full-time employees, although the employees will now pay more for that coverage.") [48577, 48644, 48655, 49026]

In an interview with the *Daily Mail*, Bill Clinton's former lover, Gennifer Flowers, says, "We [Clinton and I] have some unresolved issues that it would be nice to sit down and talk about now. He was the love of my life and I was the love of his life and you don't get over those things. ...If we had the opportunity to sit down and visit with each other in person, I'm not saying the romance would be rekindled but we will always have something. Whatever you might call it. Bill and I would be together today if it wasn't for politics. It was me, Bill and Hillary. Then they had Chelsea and the stakes got too high." Flowers says she knows nothing of any relationship between Hillary Clinton and Huma Abedin, wife of former Congressman Anthony Weiner. "I don't know Huma or the Weiners. I just know what Bill told me and that was that he was aware that Hillary was bisexual and he didn't care. He should know. He said Hillary had eaten more p\*\*\*y than he had." Surprisingly, Flowers says she would support Hillary Clinton for president. "The support I would give Hillary is as a woman. I'm one of those women who in so many aspects of my professional and personal life I've been out there making strides for women and allowing them to go down roads in which they were not welcome. I would love to see a woman president. And she seems to be the only one that's getting close to it." Flowers suggests that Hillary remained with her husband because of her political aspirations. "Absolutely that was her reason for sticking by him and he's going to stick by her because he owes her that. I would have thrown his clothes out on the front lawn but that's just me." [48581, 48596, 48638]

Russian President Vladimir Putin tells reporters, “Will we manage to carry it through [removing chemical weapons from Syria]? I can’t say 100 percent, but all that we have seen recently, in the last few days, inspires confidence that it is possible and that it will be done.” (In other words, “Bashar al-Assad will not give up his weapons, I succeeded in keeping him in power, and Obama won’t be saber-rattling for a long time to come.”) It is almost guaranteed that Assad will miss the September 21 deadline to produce a full inventory of chemical weapons in Syria.) [48584, 48586]

According to Census Bureau data, more Americans receive health care from government programs than work for full-time. CNSNews.com notes, “approximately 101,493,000 people in the United States got health-insurance coverage through government-run programs, including Medicaid, Medicare, the Children’s Health Insurance Program, military-related health-care programs, the Indian Health Service, and state-government-run health plans. At the same time, ...there were only approximately 97,180,000 people who worked full-time in the private sector in 2012.” (In other words, the parasites outnumber the producers.) [48587]

House Speaker John Boehner (R-OH) tells reporters, “We’ll deliver a big victory in the House tomorrow [on a vote to fund all aspects of government *except* ObamaCare], and then this fight will move over to the Senate, where it belongs. I expect my Senate colleagues to be up for the battle. ...[W]e’re having the fight over here [in the House]—we’re going to win the fight over here. It’s time for them [in the Senate] to pick up the mantle and get the job done.” On raising the debt limit, Boehner says, “There’s a common-sense principal here. If we’re going to raise the debt ceiling, you should work to reduce the deficit and grow the economy at the same time. ...[Obama] has decided to just sit out this debate—he says he won’t engage. You know, most presidents refer to their bipartisan efforts to reduce the deficit as achievements—[but Obama] sees this quote-unquote as ‘extortion.’ So while [Obama] is happy to negotiate with Vladimir Putin, he won’t engage with the Congress on a plan that deals with the deficits that threaten our economy.” (Meanwhile, Boehner’s office releases a video ridiculing Obama for his willingness to negotiate with the Russians over Syria but refusal to negotiate with the Republicans over spending and the debt ceiling.) [48563, 48564, 48588, 48600]

On CNN, former Speaker of the House Newt Gingrich tells Wolf Blitzer, “...I think the [Republican] conference believes that this is not a dictatorship. We don’t have to automatically do exactly what [Obama] wants. ...Wolf, let me mention something that seems to shock a lot of people in the news business. The next election is November of 2014. My advice to the Speaker of the House is, ignore the polls, do what you think is right. Emphasize that you want to keep the government open. They’re going to pass the continuing resolution. They’re going to be in a position to keep the government open. And I think also emphasize to the country that [Obama] has an obligation to negotiate. This idea that Barack Obama somehow can sit in the White House, refuse to negotiate, demand what he wants and that the Congress has an obligation to obey him goes against everything we know about American history. I think [Obama] has as big an obligation to sit down and talk with the House as the House does to sit down and talk with [him]. ...Ronald Reagan signed debt ceilings that had Gramm-Rudman added to it which was a

huge spending cut. George H.W. Bush signed debt ceilings that had things added to them. William Jefferson Clinton had signed debt ceilings that had things added to them. Who is Barack Obama to dictate to the nation that he is not going to follow the precedent and negotiate? Presidents are supposed to negotiate with the Congress. They don't dictate to the Congress. They can't just swagger around and he doesn't get to set the terms of the debate. Both sides have to come to the table. Both sides have to find a common ground. But [Obama], in my judgment, makes it very hard to do so given his attitude." [48589]

Alliance Defending Freedom (ADF) files a petition with the U.S. Supreme Court calling for a review of the ObamaCare mandate that forces employers to provide employees with insurance that covers abortifacients, sterilizations, and birth control. According to Breitbart.com, "Over 60 lawsuits have been filed nationwide against this unprecedented government command. Many involve nonprofit entities, such as the University of Notre Dame. But roughly 35 of these lawsuits involve for-profit businesses which are wholly owned by a person or family with a religious belief against abortion, such as devout Christians. These lawsuits argue both that the... mandate violates the Free Exercise Clause of the First Amendment as well as a federal law called the Religious Freedom Restoration Act (RFRA). The federal appeals courts have split on whether a religiously-owned business can claim religious-liberty protections and whether requiring people to provide abortion-related services is a substantial burden on religious faith. ...It is almost certain the Supreme Court will take up this issue in the coming year... This ADF case could well be the next case involving Obama's namesake legislation considered by the Supreme Court, this time raising profound concerns regarding religious liberty impacting millions of Americans, especially observant Christians. ...The Obama administration now has 30 days to explain to the Supreme Court why the justices should not take this case and resolve the split between the federal appeals courts. The Court will likely vote in November whether to hear arguments in the case, which, if granted, would occur next spring." [48591]

Politico reports, "The Environmental Protection Agency will propose requiring future coal-burning plants to take unprecedented steps to limit their climate-changing emissions, with pollution levels that would force them to curb or capture 40 percent of their greenhouse gas output... The proposed rule, expected to be formally unveiled Friday morning, is EPA's first step in fulfilling ...Obama's promise to tackle climate change without waiting for Congress. Republican lawmakers and other coal industry supporters have already denounced the proposal, saying it would impose draconian and unrealistic restrictions on coal-burning power plants." (Politico does not mention that 30,000 scientists—including the founder of The Weather Channel—are suing Al Gore for fraud, claiming he made a fortune promoting his phony global warming theories.) [48597, 48775, 48776, 48777]

*The Wall Street Journal* reports, "Less than two weeks before the launch of insurance marketplaces created by the federal health overhaul, the government's software [which cost the taxpayers \$88 million] can't reliably determine how much people need to pay for coverage, according to insurance executives and people familiar with the program. ...Government officials and insurers were scrambling to iron out the pricing quirks

quickly, according to the people, to avoid alienating the initial wave of consumers. A failure by consumers to sign up online in the hotly anticipated early days of the 'exchanges' is worrisome to insurers, which are counting on enrollees for growth, and to the Obama administration, which made the exchanges a centerpiece of its sweeping health-care legislation. If not resolved by the Oct. 1 launch date, the problems could affect consumers in 36 states where the federal government is running all or part of the exchanges. About 32 million uninsured people live in those states, but only a fraction of them are expected to sign up in the next year. ...Four people familiar with the development of the software that determines how much people would pay for subsidized coverage on the federally run exchanges said it was still miscalculating prices. Tests on the calculator initially scheduled to begin months ago only started this week at some insurers, according to insurance executives and two people familiar with development efforts. 'There's a blanket acknowledgment that rates are being calculated incorrectly,' said one senior health-insurance executive who asked not to be named. 'Our tech and operations people are very concerned about the problems they're seeing and the potential of them to stick around.'" (ObamaCare official Joel Ario says, "Nobody is going to say we're not starting on October 1, but in some situations, you may see a redefinition of what 'start' means.") [48645, 48646, 48710, 48711]

House Minority Leader Nancy Pelosi (D-CA) tells reporters Republicans don't like Obama because "He's brilliant... he thinks in a strategic way in how to get something done... and he's completely eloquent. That's a package that they don't like. ...He has been ... open, practically apolitical, certainly non-partisan, in terms of welcoming every idea and solution. I think that's one of the reasons the Republicans want to take him down politically, because they know he is... nonpartisan... and that's something very hard for them to cope with." (Most reporters are too polite to laugh out loud at Pelosi's absurd comment.) [48631]

At AtlasShrugs.com Pamela Geller asks why, when the IRS has been delaying or blocking tax-exempt status for conservative groups, the IRS has granted tax-exempt status to the Council on American Islamic Relations (CAIR)—after it had been taken away. Geller asks, "Where are CAIR's tax returns? Who is giving them millions to fund their Islamic supremacist machine. Their mother organization, the Muslim Brotherhood? Al Qaeda? We want to see the jihad millions (billions, perhaps) and where their dirty dough is coming from. Before they stopped obeying US tax law and filing returns, we know that one Saudi wahhabi prince gave Hamas-CAIR 50 million dollars back in 2007. Today they released another ridiculous report concerning the pathetic islamophobia financial network here. ...The bottom line is, American needs to know who is funding these terror supporters. It's a national security issue. Release the returns. What is it that Hamas-CAIR is hiding and doesn't want us to see?" (CAIR, which is essentially a money-laundering group for Hamas and the Muslim Brotherhood, was an unindicted co-conspirator in the HolyLand Foundation Hamas funding trial. One of Obama's lawyers in *Berg v. Obama* has direct ties to CAIR.) Meanwhile, Congressman Frank Wolf (R-VA) writes the Director of the FBI, demanding punishment for agency employees who disregarded official policy against developing relationships with CAIR. Geller notes, "The Department of Justice has scrubbed its website of the Inspector General's report on

the violation of the ban with terror supporting Hamas-CAIR, but you can see it [at AtlasShrugs.com]. FBI Headquarters' 'instruction was not to allow CAIR personnel on FBI property'—but they did anyway. The Inspector General found repeated violations of the FBI's 'failure to comply with the requirement' to shun CAIR." [216, 226, 325, 368, 9117, 9133, 48614, 48616, 48617, 48618, 48619, 48745]

In *The Jerusalem Post* Caroline Glick asks, "Did ...Obama score a great victory for the United States by concluding a deal with Russia on Syria's chemical weapons or has he caused irreparable harm to the US's reputation and international position? By what standard can we judge his actions when the results will only be known next year?" Glick argues that the standard to be used can be North Korea, where U.S. eagerness to negotiate with a thug led only to giving legitimacy to that thug—while he continued to develop his nuclear program. "[O]nce the US accepted the notion of talks with North Korea, it necessarily accepted the regime's legitimacy. And as a consequence, both the Clinton and Bush administrations abandoned any thought of toppling the regime. Once Washington ensnared itself in negotiations that strengthened its enemy at America's expense, it became the effective guarantor of the regime's survival. After all, if the regime is credible enough to be trusted to keep its word, then it is legitimate no matter how many innocents it has enslaved and slaughtered. ...With the US's experience with North Korea clearly in mind, it is possible to assess US actions with regards to Syria and Iran. The first thing that becomes clear is that the Obama administration is implementing the North Korean model in its dealings with Syria and Iran. With regards to Syria, there is no conceivable way to peacefully enforce the US Russian agreement on the ground. Technically it is almost impossible to safely dispose of chemical weapons under the best of circumstances. Given that Syria is in the midst of a brutal civil war, the notion that it is possible for UN inspectors to remove or destroy the regime's chemical weapons is patently absurd. ...[L]ike his predecessors with regard to Pyongyang, Obama has effectively accepted the continued legitimacy of the regime of Bashar Assad, despite the fact that he is an acknowledged war criminal. ...The critics are correct. And the danger posed by Obama's decision to seek a false compromise rather than accept an unwanted confrontation following Syria's use of chemical weapons will only be removed when the US recognizes the folly of seeking to wish away the dangers of weapons of mass destruction through negotiations. Those talks lead only to the diminishment of US power and the endangerment of US national security as more US enemies develop and deploy weapons of mass destruction with the sure knowledge that the US would rather negotiate fecklessly than contend responsibly with the dangers they pose." [48657, 48658]

In *The Wall Street Journal*, Peggy Noonan writes, "This week I spoke to a few U.S. senators about the meaning of the Syria drama. They were a mix—some had given supportive soundings early on; all had been taken aback by the public reaction, the wave of calls and emails. There was gossip. Apparently some White House staffers have a new nickname for [Obama]: 'Obam-me,' because it's all about him and his big thoughts. I guess the second-term team is not quite as adoring as the first." [48627, 48628]

On September 20 Amanda Carpenter, senior communications advisor for Senator Ted Cruz (R-TYX), sends a Twitter message: "GOP beat gun control, changed Obama's mind

on Syria, is holding the line on amnesty. We can defund Obamacare, too!” Allan Brauer, the Communications Chair of the Democratic Party of Sacramento County, responds: “May your children all die from debilitating, painful and incurable diseases” and “Busy blocking the tapeworms that have slithered out of hellspawn amanda carpenter’s asshole. How’s your day so far?” Brauer—a gay-rights activist who is married to another man—then complains, “I’m being attacked on Twitter for wishing one of Ted Cruz’s pubic lice to experience the pain her boss is inflicting on Americans.” “Yes, your party takes bread from the mouths of starving children and medicine from the sick, and I’m the problem. Got it.” “And then the entire universe of hateful, child-starving, health-care deniers determines that I’m what’s wrong with America.” Brauer is then shamed into issuing a (clearly insincere) apology. (DailyCaller.com notes that Brauer maintains a blog called, “It Matters How You Say It.” *The Obama Timeline* has contacted the blog to advise the erudite Brauer that “hellspawn” should actually be written “hell spawn.”) Within a few days Brauer is forced to resign only because of his “choice of words.” The local party statement reads: “The problem with this kind of rhetoric, is that it lets fringe characters—those who are actively trying to shut down the government—like Ted Cruz, off the hook. It’s never acceptable to wish physical harm against political opponents, regardless of how objectionable their policy priorities are.” (In other words, “We agree with Brauer but he should not have been so obvious.”) [48612, 48613, 48642, 48666, 48667]

The House of Representatives votes 230–189 (with two Democrats joining the Republicans) to defund ObamaCare but continue funding for all other government operations. According to Newsmax.com, “The bill preserves across-the-board [sequester] spending cuts at an annual rate of \$986.3 billion and permanently defunds the Affordable Care Act. ...The spending measure now will be sent to the Senate where it will pass without defunding the healthcare law, Majority Leader Harry Reid [D-NV] said yesterday. Obama administration officials said [Obama] would veto the House bill if sent to him by Congress.” The House will likely then approve and “send to the Senate separate bills to fund the military and other key programs if the Senate strips out [ObamaCare] ‘defunding’ language.” Senator Ted Cruz (R-TX) states, “If Harry Reid thinks ObamaCare is so important that he is willing to shut down the government, then we will be standing firm. It will take 60 votes [to pass a Senate resolution with ObamaCare funding] and Mike Lee [R-UT] and I will be using any means we can to make sure Republicans stand side-by-side to stop this. ...We will keep giving [Reid] the mechanisms to keep government open.” (Although Obama and the Democrats believe they have a winning hand and can blame any government shutdown on the Republicans, if the Houses agree to fund everything except ObamaCare then there can be no shutdown unless Obama and the Democrats want it. The problem faced by the GOP is not the process, but the fact that the leftist media will most certainly slant the coverage in Obama’s favor—and not report that the Democrats would be responsible for any shutdown. Although the Republicans will lose in the end and have to support funding even with ObamaCare, their goal is to keep reminding voters that ObamaCare is a job-killing disaster. The GOP may lose the budget battle in 2013, but if it wins the elections in 2014 and 2016 ObamaCare can be repealed.) [48625, 48626, 48630, 48632, 48637, 48641]

Politico reports, “The Environmental Protection Agency is officially proposing the first-ever regulations limiting future power plants’ greenhouse gas emissions, including standards that will require coal-burning plants to capture about 40 percent of their carbon dioxide emissions. The proposed rule, which EPA Administrator Gina McCarthy is announcing this morning in a speech at the National Press Club, is the agency’s first step in fulfilling ...Obama’s promise to tackle climate change without waiting for Congress. Republican lawmakers and other coal industry supporters have already denounced the proposal, saying it’s part of an administration ‘war on coal.’” (The new rules make it virtually impossible to build a new coal-fired power plant in the United States. As older plants shut down, they will not be replaced—and that will cause higher utility bills at best, and electricity shortages at worst.) Congressman Fred Upton (R-MI), chairman of the House Energy and Commerce Committee, responds, “The consequences will be more job losses and a weaker economy. These stringent standards will actually discourage investment and the development of innovative new technologies.” Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell (R-KY) states that Obama “is leading a war on coal and what that really means for Kentucky families is a war on jobs.” Senator Joe Manchin (D-WV) states, “If these regulations go into effect, American jobs will be lost, electricity prices will soar and economic uncertainty will grow.” (By June 2014 the Obama administration is expected to issue more strict environmental regulations for all existing, rather than new, power plants.) Breitbart.com reminds readers that Terry McAuliffe, who is running for governor in Virginia, once said, “We have got to move past coal. I never want another coal plant built.” (Even the EPA admits it “does not anticipate that this proposed rule will result in notable CO2 emission change ...by 2022,” which should make people wonder why Obama is so eager to restrict the use of coal. One answer is that he may be working to please his Saudi Arabian benefactors, who profit handsomely from America’s dependence on foreign oil—and who also oppose the Keystone pipeline.) [48660, 48664, 48794]

DailyCaller.com reports on Obama’s likely choice to succeed Ben Bernanke as chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, Janet Yellen: “Yellen is a career academic and bureaucrat, having taught at Harvard and the University of California at Berkeley before taking on a job at the Fed. Some are concerned by this lack of private sector experience. ‘She’s spent her whole life as a monetary bureaucrat in the Fed system,’ said David Stockman, a former congressman and budget director to President Reagan. ‘[She] has no clue what honest capitalism, what genuine free markets are about.’ ...Yellen’s supporters hope that she will commit more seriously to debauchment of the currency [that is, printing money with reckless abandon], which they believe will help reduce unemployment. An economic theory called the ‘Phillips Curve,’ which posits an inverse correlation between unemployment and inflation, remains popular with the public policy community, though it has been abandoned by most others after failing to pan out in real-world conditions. [The leftist claim is that unemployment can be brought down by inflating the money supply.] Yellen is almost universally viewed as an inflation ‘dove,’ willing to accelerate the weakening of America’s purchasing power in the belief that this will produce jobs.” In 1995 Yellen said, “When the goals conflict and it comes to calling for tough trade-offs, to me, a wise and humane policy is occasionally to let inflation rise even when inflation is running above target.” (In other words, Yellen believes that it is acceptable to print

money, devalue the dollar, cause prices to increase, and lower the standard of living for everyone in order to create some jobs.) It is worth noting that the Federal Reserve holds about \$3.4 *trillion* in U.S. Treasury debt and mortgage-backed securities issued by Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac. That essentially means that the Federal Reserve created \$3.4 trillion out of thin air—because it “buys” the debt and securities with nothing more than bookkeeping entries. The Fed’s imaginary money props up the stock market, which leads people to believe the economy is doing well when it is not. As the newly-created money filters through the economy, prices increase—because there is more cash chasing the same amount of goods and services. (Inflation is technically *not* price increases, but the inflation of the money supply that *causes* price increases.) [48720, 48729, 49195]

It is worth noting that the Federal Reserve’s 100-year charter expires on December 23, 2013. Although it would be in the best interests of the American people to eliminate the Federal Reserve and put an end to its artificial expansion of the money supply, the charter will be renewed. But some may expect Senator Rand Paul (R-KY) and perhaps a few other legislators to have more than a few words to say in protest of its continuation. [49172]

Campaigning for his agenda at a Ford Motor Company plant in Liberty, Missouri, Obama complains, “Unfortunately right now, the debate going on in Congress is not meeting the test of helping middle class families. They’re not focused on you. They’re focused on politics. They’re focused on trying to mess with me. They’re not focused on you. ... The most basic constitutional duty Congress has is to pass a budget. That’s Congress 101.” (Obama does not mention that the GOP-controlled Congress has passed a budget every year; it is the Democrat-controlled Senate that has refused to do so.) Obama predictably whines about raising the debt ceiling, saying, “We are not a deadbeat nation. We don’t run out on our tab. We’re the world’s bedrock investment. The entire world looks to us to make sure the world economy is stable.” (Some might consider accumulating a \$17 trillion national debt and never paying back one cent of it is “running out on a tab.”) [48643, 48661]

A spokesman for House Speaker John Boehner (R-OH) tells reporters that Obama “called the speaker this evening to tell him he wouldn’t negotiate with him on the debt limit. Given the long history of using debt limit increases to achieve bipartisan deficit reduction and economic reforms, the speaker was disappointed, but told [Obama] that the two chambers of Congress will chart the path ahead. ... It was a brief call.” (The next day Obama will probably claim the Republicans are unwilling to compromise. Some might argue that if Boehner threatens to use chemical weapons Obama would be willing to negotiate—or have Vladimir Putin negotiate for him.) [48659]

On September 21 Russian President Vladimir Putin says, “Of course, we cannot calmly watch mass murder. But let’s be honest with each other: yes, there was an internal conflict in Syria, but it was immediately blown up from abroad [that is, by Obama administration], and weapons and rebels started coming into Syria. ... You [in the west] are helping them [radical Islamists] to come to power. And what will you do next? Will you take a newspaper and push them away from power? ... But if you don’t know, what is



the point of launching strikes that are to no avail and without knowing how they will end?” [48654]

Senator Rand Paul (R-KY) tells reporters, “We probably can’t defeat or get rid of ObamaCare.” [48665]

Addressing the Liberty Political Action Conference in Chantilly, Virginia, Paul says, “You can see the whole, entire youth vote could switch, if we [Republicans] know what we’re doing. ...If we want to get the youth vote, it’s not like we have to change our message. They don’t care so much about taxes or regulations—they don’t have much money to care about—but they’ve all got a cell phone. They’re all on the Internet, and they do care about whether the government should be looking at their every search on the Internet or listening to their phone calls or recording their phone records. If we want a transformational election where the Republicans become the dominant party, we could become the right to privacy party, the party that doesn’t believe in big government surveillance. ...I think there are all kinds of ways we can grow the party, and instead of the libertarian element being an impediment, it has come full circle and it really is the way the Republican party will grow.” Addressing the issue of winning black voters, Paul (who defeated New Jersey Governor Chris Christie with 36 percent of the votes in the 2016 Mackinac Presidential Straw Poll) says, “You can see how this cycle of poverty and the cycle caused by war on drugs is hurting a certain group in our society more than others. ...It’s ruining people’s lives, and it’s unjust and unfair. If we become the party of justice, the party that believes criminal laws should be just, that penalties should be proportionate to the crime, I think we can get people to come to our party, because I don’t think the Democrats have done anything on these issues for years.” (Although Obama owned the young adult vote in 2008 and 2012, young people are turning against him. A large number of them will not bother to vote in the 2014 mid-term elections. Whether the Republican Party can attract them remains to be seen. Attracting black voters would likely be even more difficult, but without Obama on the ticket many blacks will not bother to vote in 2014.) [48675, 48681]

Obama’s billionaire buddy and former Nazi sympathizer, George Soros, age 83, marries Tamiko Bolton, age 42. (Obama does not attend the ceremony or the 500-guest wedding reception, but House Minority Leader Nancy Pelosi (D-CA) does.) [48773]

In Nairobi, Kenya, Muslim terrorists from the al-Qaeda-linked militant group al-Shabab [also al-Shabaab], using guns and grenades, kill at least 68 people and wound at least 175 in the four-story Westgate Shopping Mall. According to the *Daily Mail*, “The attackers specifically targeted non-Muslims and included some women,” telling all Muslims to leave and making them recite an Islamic prayer to prove they were followers of Islam. (Obama has no comment, but the State Department condemns the “despicable massacre of innocent men, women and children,” and Secretary of State John Kerry says, “[W]e also pledge our commitment to do whatever we can to assist in bringing the perpetrators of this abhorrent violence to justice, and to continue our efforts to improve the lives of people across the globe.”) [48670, 48671, 48672, 48676, 48677, 48678, 48680, 48686, 48838]

At Breitbart.com former Alaska Governor Sarah Palin writes, “Americans who are fed up with Obamacare won a victory yesterday. The House voted to defund Obamacare while still funding the federal government to avoid a ‘devastating’ shutdown. (I shall not digress, but it’s beyond distressing to hear liberals try to convince Americans that any government slowdown is comparable to ‘terrorism.’) Now the battle goes to the Senate, and we’ll find out if Harry Reid [D-NV] is so committed to the horrendous ‘Un-affordable Care Act’ that he’ll be the one to shut down the government to fund the unworkable Obamacare. Let’s be clear. Republicans in Congress aren’t advocating a government shutdown. That’s why they voted in the House to fully fund our bureaucracy while defunding Obamacare. The conservatives in Congress are listening to the majority of Americans who do not want Obamacare. Following the will of the people is apparently a novel idea in D.C. these days. Just ask Senator Ted Cruz [R-TX] and his liberty-loving posse on Capitol Hill who have led the charge to defund Obama’s train wreck. Those of us who hang in there supporting a major political party with our energy, time, and contributions would like to believe that that party would praise principled conservatives like Ted Cruz and Mike Lee [R-UT] for following through on campaign promises. We’d like to believe that the GOP establishment would applaud the way these bold leaders have rallied the grassroots to their cause. But, no, such praise would require a commensurate level of guts and leadership, and the permanent political class in D.C. is nothing if not gutless and rudderless.” [48674, 48675]

“We’re now, once again, subjected to the ‘anonymous sources’ backstabbing game. The Capitol Hill cowards are rushing to anonymously denounce Senator Cruz to any reporter with a pad and pen. Welcome to our world, Ted. The same people have been denouncing conservatives like me for years (right after they ask for help fundraising for themselves or endorsing the latest candidate they’ve suckered into paying their exorbitant consulting fees). We can compare shiv marks next time we meet, my friend. If the Senate doesn’t get behind Ted Cruz’s efforts to defund Obamacare, it won’t be because of any failure on Ted’s part. It’ll be because there weren’t enough principled leaders to stand with him, and that would be a tragic loss, not for Ted, but for America. More and more Americans are waking up to the nightmare of Obamacare as its rollout continues. Hardworking families are losing their employer-provided health care coverage. Businesses are cutting back their employees’ hours to skirt Obamacare’s mandates. Americans barely scrapping by are discovering that Obamacare has made health care completely unaffordable. Those who aren’t part of a protected special interest group have been left in the cold. When you’re living on a fixed income, having to pay hundreds of dollars more each month for health care will cut into your ability to pay for basic necessities like food, electricity, or gas (which has increased 90% under Obama). Open your eyes, America. When the full reality of Obamacare strikes home, we’ll thank God that principled leaders like Ted Cruz and Mike Lee took a stand to stop it in its tracks.” [48674, 48675]

“But the permanent political class,” writes Palin, “is handwringing and howling that if there’s a government shutdown the media will blame Republicans for it. Here’s a little newsflash, GOP establishment: Whenever anything bad happens, the media blames Republicans for it. That’s not an excuse to roll over and play dead. It’s a call to follow the

advice I give my daughters: Woman up, stand your ground, and fight like a girl! I want no pity. I need no empathy. But use me as a barometer. Over the years, the leftwing media has falsely and irrationally accused me of everything from faking a pregnancy to abetting murder. They lie. Deal with it. Republicans in Congress support funding the government. If the Democrats block these funding measures, a government shutdown is on them. In the meantime, stop the ridiculous hysterics. Heck, about the most significant thing that happened during the last government shutdown was Clinton hooked up with Monica. As I said in my speech at CPAC this year, it's time for the Senate to put itself on Cruz Control. Ignore the peanut gallery pundits. They've written my political obituary so many times, I'm practically Lazarus. Now they're trying to destroy Ted Cruz. Good luck with that, you weasels. Texans are just as tough as Alaskans. Smaller, but just as tough. But here's the important thing that none of these establishment backstabbers understand. It's not the messenger that matters. It's the message. You can try to take out someone like Ted Cruz, but that won't stop the message from catching fire. The message is liberty, and it's been resounding ever since a band of patriots dumped tea in Boston harbor." [48674, 48675]

"The message only grows stronger. The grassroots is bigger than any one person. We the People will rise up, and we will make our voices heard. Right now, Ted Cruz is speaking for us in this Obamacare fight. God bless him for it. Hang in there, Ted and Mike. You have millions of supporters among ordinary hardworking Americans. We support you because you don't shy away from the fray. May your colleagues in the Senate gain the wisdom to support your excellent efforts so that you can see that the view is better from inside the bus than under it. Oh, and a little reminder to Republican senators up for re-election in 2014: Moose season ends soon, allowing more time on one's hands. So, we'll be watching your votes *very* carefully this week." [48674, 48675]

In his weekly Saturday radio/Internet address Obama relies on scare tactics to argue for Congressional approval to continue all federal spending, including ObamaCare. Obama says, "The government will shut down. So will many services the American people will expect. Military personnel, including those deployed overseas, won't get their paychecks on time. Some [Republicans] are actually willing to plunge America into default if they can't defund the Affordable Care Act. They would actually plunge this country back into recession all to deny the basic security of healthcare to millions of Americans. That's not happening and they know it's not happening. The United States is not a deadbeat nation. ...Raising the debt ceiling is not the same as approving more spending. It lets us pay for what Congress already spent." (That is nonsense, of course, unless Obama agrees to reduce spending to the level of federal tax receipts in exchange for raising the debt ceiling—something he is not about to do. Obama is not saying, "Raise the debt ceiling and I'll end all deficit spending." He is saying, "Raise the debt ceiling and carry on with deficit spending as usual—and raise the debt ceiling again next year.") Obama claims, "[R]ight now, our deficits are already falling at the fastest rate since World War II. And by the end of this year, we will have cut our deficits by more than half since I took office." (Obama neglects to mention that he *more than doubled* the deficits after he entered the White House. The final deficit under George W. Bush was about \$458 billion. Obama then increased spending and deficits more than doubled, to levels in excess of \$1

trillion in each of his first four in office. Obama is now bragging that he is cutting the deficits in half—but it is only *his own* deficits that are going down. They are not even being reduced to Bush’s \$458 billion amount, let alone half of that.) [48675]

Obama attends the annual Congressional Black Caucus dinner, where he uses his speech to criticize Republicans: “It is time for these folks to stop governing by crisis. Some want to shut down the government rather than provide people with health care!” He also calls for more gun control laws, saying, “Just two days ago [sic; yesterday] in my hometown [Chicago], 13 people were shot during a pickup basketball game. . . . We came up short [on passing gun legislation] and that means we’ve got to get back up and go back at it.” [48679]

On September 22 Muslims stage a suicide attack the All Saints [Christian] Church in Peshawar, Pakistan, killing at least 78. (Obama has no comment, but Pamela Geller writes at AtlasShrugs.com, “Relentless. Muslims murdering, persecuting, torturing Christians in Muslim countries, and the world says nothing. The same silence preceded the Nazi genocide of twelve million people. Instead, the world advances the savages’ narrative that opposition to jihad and sharia is ‘islamophobia.’ Vilified are the few who dare to speak out against this vicious anti-human system of oppression. And their dissemblers in the media and proxies in the West like CAIR, ICNA, ISNA, MSA, Aslan Media, etc., are lauded and loved. Where are the church leaders speaking out against Muslim genocide of Christians? Busy providing cover for the annihilationists by playing patsy in the interfaith dialogue ruse. Notice again that the media always employs Muslims to write this story (and all stories on jihad and sharia). This started about a year ago, and now AP, the NY Times, Reuters et al rarely have non-Muslims report on jihad slaughter. Sick.”) [48648, 48707]

In Nigeria, the Muslim group Boko Haram guns down at least 142 people, burn homes, and leave bodies along the roadside. (Obama has yet to designate Boko Haram a terrorist group.) [48668, 48669]

In Germany, Chancellor Angela Merkel wins an overwhelming third term re-election victory, with projections showing 42.4 percent of the vote for her center-right Christian Democrat Union party to 25.7 percent for Peer Steinbrueck and the leftist Social Democrats. Merkel says, “This is a super result. To the voters, I promise that we will handle it responsibly and with care. We will do everything we can in the next four years to ensure that they’re once again successful years for Germany.” Bloomberg.com notes, “With unemployment near a two-decade low and the budget deficit virtually eliminated, voters backed Merkel’s handling of the domestic economy, Europe’s largest, and her push for austerity in the euro zone in exchange for aid. They punished the Free Democrats after four years of bickering and failure to deliver on its tax-cutting pledges.” (Merkel’s win will not be received well in the White House, with Obama opposing her strict fiscal policies—and her success showing they are the proper path for economic recovery.) [48650, 48651, 48652, 48653, 48712, 48864, 48872]

Obama speaks at a memorial service for the victims of the Navy Yard shootings, turning it into a political event by calling for more gun control legislation. He states, “It ought to be a shock to us. It ought to lead us to some sort of transformation. ...Our hearts are broken again. ...We cannot accept this. There’s nothing normal about innocent people getting gunned down at work. ...If we really want to be a country where we can go to work, and go to school, and walk our streets free from senseless violence ...then we’re going to have to change. We’re going to have to change. ...As long as there are those who fight to make it as easy as possible for dangerous people to get their hands on a gun, then we’ve got to work as hard as possible for the sake of our children.” (No one wants to “make it easy” for dangerous people to get guns. Arguably, the problem is that current gun laws are not being adequately enforced—and some people have made it difficult to force insane people to get mental health treatment.) [48679, 48689, 48692, 48719, 48721, 48791]

With “moderate” Senate Republicans lacking the courage to defund ObamaCare, Tony Lee reports at Breitbart.com, “On Sunday, former Alaska Gov. Sarah Palin called on *Fox News Sunday* host Chris Wallace to release the names of the ‘top Republicans’ that sent him opposition research on Sen. Ted Cruz (R-TX) to ‘hammer’ Cruz before his appearance on the program to discuss defunding Obamacare. ‘Keep it TRULY fair & balanced,’ Palin tweeted. Release the GOP names encouraging you to trash SenTedCruz. No more anonymous sources.’ On Sunday, Wallace said that establishment Republicans are so worked up that Cruz is leading the defund Obamacare fight that he immediately got unsolicited questions and research on Cruz from ‘top Republicans’ before Cruz’s appearance.” [48683, 48684, 48725]

On *Fox News Sunday* Senator Claire McCaskill (D-MO) whines, “I don’t think in America we should throw tantrums when we lose elections and threaten to shut down the government and refuse to pay the bills. The American people had a choice last November. They had a choice between someone who said repeal ObamaCare, and ...Obama.” (The voters also elected Congressmen who promised to repeal ObamaCare, and gave Republicans control of the House of Representatives.) “I cannot believe that they [Republicans] are gonna [sic] throw a tantrum and throw the American people and our economic recovery under the bus. It is really gonna hurt real people. And this is just political point-making.” (If the effort to defund ObamaCare is nothing more than “political point-making,” it should not bother McCaskill or Obama. If it does succeed, it will not destroy jobs; it will arguably create jobs, as employers breathe a sigh of relief over the financial and regulatory burden that has been lifted from them.) [48691]

On CNN’s *State of the Union*, House Minority Leader Nancy Pelosi (D-CA) says, “The cupboard is bare. There’s [sic; There are] no more cuts to make. We all want to reduce the deficit. Put everything on the table, review it, but you cannot have any more cuts just for the sake of cuts. Right now you’re taking trophies.” [48727, 48789]

Newsmax.com reports, “Three of the attackers at the Westgate Mall [also referred to as the Westlands Shopping Centre] siege in Nairobi, Kenya, are from the United States, sources within the terror group that orchestrated the attack told CNN on Sunday.” (It is

later reported that six of the killers were Somalis from Minnesota (2), Missouri (1), Maine (1), Illinois (1), and Arizona (1). Others reportedly came from Canada, England, Somalia, Syria, Finland, Kenya, Sweden, and Dagestan.) "...Sources told CNN that other names linked to the account include two individuals from Somalia and one each from Canada, Finland, Kenya and the United Kingdom. They range in age from 20 to 27 years old. Two of the Americans are from Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minnesota, and the other is from Kansas City, Missouri. Minneapolis has a large Somali community that in the past has been linked to recruitment efforts by al-Shabab as well as al-Qaida." (According to the State Department, the United States is providing law enforcement help and military assistance in Kenya—as it arguably did not do in Benghazi.) [48687, 48690, 48701, 48702, 48741, 48746, 48782]

While their Muslims commit atrocities around the world in the name of their religion, New York City holds a Muslim Day Parade to honor "Islam's Contribution to Human Civilization." Al-Qaeda and other jihadist flags adorn the parade route. [48744, 49051]

Twitchy.com posts complaints from Americans whose health insurance has been canceled or is no longer available because of ObamaCare. One letter reads, "We're writing to provide notice that the individual and family plan that you are applying for will no longer be available after December 31, 2013. This is due to new requirements for health care coverage under the Affordable Care Act (ACA)." Another reads, "Due to changes handed down by the Federal Government and the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, some of our plans do not meet the minimum requirements outlined by Health Care Reform. ...In accordance with Florida statute, Section 627.6571, we are providing you with the required 90-day notice of non-renewal of your Health Insurance Plan." A Washington state resident states that the policy he has had for 15 years has been canceled—and its ObamaCare-compliant replacement will cost 63 percent more. (The "sticker shock" of premium increases and the cancellation of policies because they are "not good enough" to satisfy federal regulations will turn even more Americans against ObamaCare. Democrats may regret opposing efforts to defund ObamaCare—because it may cost them control of the Senate in the November 2014 elections. At some point they may realize they will be sacrificing their political careers for the sole purpose of feeding Obama's ego.) [48693, 48694, 48695]

*The New York Times* writes, "Federal officials often say that health insurance will cost consumers less than expected under ...Obama's health care law. But they rarely mention one big reason: many insurers are significantly limiting the choices of doctors and hospitals available to consumers. From California to Illinois to New Hampshire, and in many states in between, insurers are driving down premiums by restricting the number of providers who will treat patients in their new health plans. When insurance marketplaces open on Oct. 1, most of those shopping for coverage will be low- and moderate-income people for whom price is paramount. To hold down costs, insurers say, they have created smaller networks of doctors and hospitals than are typically found in commercial insurance. And those health care providers will, in many cases, be paid less than what they have been receiving from commercial insurers. Some consumer advocates and health care providers are increasingly concerned. Decades of experience with Medicaid,

the program for low-income people, show that having an insurance card does not guarantee access to specialists or other providers. Consumers should be prepared for ‘much tighter, narrower networks’” of doctors and hospitals, said Adam M. Linker, a health policy analyst at the North Carolina Justice Center, a statewide advocacy group. ... ‘The networks will be narrower than the networks typically offered to large groups of employees in the commercial market,’ said Joseph Mondy, a spokesman for Cigna.” [48722, 48752]

TheBlaze.com reports that Hillary Clinton aide Huma Abedin has been told to leave husband Anthony Weiner or “leave the Clinton camp.” (Abedin, Clinton’s top aide when she was Secretary of State and allegedly a “very close” companion, no doubt has her sights set on a key White House post if Clinton wins the presidency in 2016.) [48696]

In an interview with *New York* magazine, Hillary Clinton says, “I feel comfortable raising issues with [Obama]. I had a very positive set of interactions, even when I disagreed, which obviously occurred, because obviously I have my own opinions, my own views.” (In other words, “I am running for president in 2016, so I have to distance myself from the Obama disaster by saying I often disagreed with him, but I won’t say what our disagreements were about until the 2016 campaign and after we have poll-tested those answers.”) [48718, 48823]

According to FreedomOutpost.com, “It seems the individuals who are responsible for Facebook banned the administrators of the page ‘Truckers to Shut Down America.’ According to a recent post, the admins [administrators] were banned for using, ‘God Bless American.’” (Information about the proposed October 11–13 trucker strike remains available at RideForTheConstitution.org.) [48732, 48733, 48734, 48735]

On September 23 the tragedy continues at a shopping mall in Kenya, where Muslim terrorists hold as many as 15 shoppers hostage—after slaughtering at least 68 non-Muslims in cold blood. AtlasShrugs.com reports, “[Samantha Lewthwaite], A convert to Islam, the fugitive widow of one of the [July 7, 2005] bus bombers in London, led the attack on infidel civilians at the upscale Westgate mall and was shouting orders in Arabic to the mujahideen as they were gunning people down. Women and children were slaughtered if they could not recite the Koran or name the mother of the Prophet Mohammed. ‘Our mujahideen are prepared to die for our cause!’” (Pamela Geller asks, “So why didn’t even one Muslim scream out Muhammad’s mother’s name and give the answer to those being executed?”) The jihadists “cut the hands off the bodies of their victims and burned their faces.” Among the victims are a nephew of Kenyan President Uhuru Kenyatta and the nephew’s fiancé, a Canadian diplomat, a poet from Ghana, and citizens of Great Britain, Australia, and China. (Pamela Geller comments, “I pray these were not Obama provided weapons such as we have seen in Benghazi, Algeria, Egypt and Syria. Less we not forget, Obama supported and bankrolled a sharia constitution in Kenya in 2010.”) Haaretz.com writes, “Israeli forces reportedly join effort to end deadly siege at Kenya mall, though not clear in what capacity.” (It is later reported that Lewthwaite escaped the mall by smearing blood on her face and pretending to be a fleeing victim. Other terrorists reportedly escaped the mall via its sewage system.)

[48697, 48698, 48699, 48700, 48703, 48704, 48705, 48706, 48707, 48726, 48747, 48838, 48839, 48941, 48988, 49108]

Sheikh Abulaziz Abu Muscab, a spokesman for the Al-Shabab terrorist group, tells *Al-Jazeera*, “The place we attacked is Westgate shopping mall. It is a place where tourists from across the world come to shop, where diplomats gather. It is a place where Kenya’s decision-makers go to relax and enjoy themselves. Westgate is a place where there are Jewish and American shops. So we have to attack them.” [48742, 48743]

On *Fox & Friends*, Senator Rand Paul (R-KY) says, “I think we shouldn’t give [ObamaCare] a penny. I think it’s a disaster and it’s gonna [sic] hurt precisely the people... that it intended to help. So I’m against ObamaCare from top to bottom and I won’t vote to fund it at all. ...[Obama] has it exactly backwards. He says, ‘Oh, if Republicans don’t get 100 percent of what they want they’re gonna [sic] shut down government.’ It’s completely the opposite. He wants 100 percent of ObamaCare; he’s unwilling to compromise; if he doesn’t get 100 percent of ObamaCare [Obama’s] gonna[sic] shut down government. ...I think Congress should never exempt themselves from a law, but then again I think [Chief Justice of the Supreme Court] John Roberts... loves ObamaCare so much... he should get it. Right now he’s getting a federal employees’ subsidy; he’s not part of ObamaCare. So he makes the rest of America—through, I think, convoluted logic—he makes us get ObamaCare but he’s exempt. So I have an amendment that I will introduce... that says all the federal government gets ObamaCare, including federal employees ...including John Roberts.” [48708, 48717]

On *CBS This Morning*, *Face the Nation*’s leftist moderator Bob Schieffer calls GOP efforts to defund ObamaCare a kamikaze mission, and adds, “But even more apt... way on into the 1950s when they go [sic] into the jungles of the Philippines and they find these Japanese soldiers that thought World War II was still going on? [sic] ...The war over ObamaCare is over. You know?” (For the record, kamikaze pilots inflicted tremendous damage to the U.S. Navy, and ObamaCare could be repealed if American voters get upset and angry enough over its results to elect a Republican Congress and President.) More than a few viewers are angered by Schieffer’s “performance” on behalf of Obama. One writes, “Mr. Schieffer I find your attitude sad and pathetic. A more gentle person would liken your attitude to something like ‘The Stockholm Syndrome.’ Others, including yours truly, liken it to what it truly is: the attitude of a violent rapist; i.e. ‘This is going to happen to you so you might as well just lie back and enjoy it.’ Let me assure you Mr. Schieffer, We The People do not intend to ‘lie back and enjoy it.’ And when the full brunt of this insane legislation descends upon the majority of America, the ranks of We The People will swell exponentially and We The People will bury this abomination once and for all. And sadly Mr. Schieffer, if and when that does happen the cost may not be calculated and measured by the CBO or the GAO in the now near worthless U.S. Dollar, instead it may well be measured in the only currency that has ever purchased freedom from tyrants.” [48715, 49033]

The United Nations General Assembly meets in New York City, with many eyes focused on Obama’s new ambassador to the U.N. Samantha Power. Her major task will be



negotiating with Russia over Syria—a daunting task for anyone, and most critics assume she will not be tough enough. (She could probably persuade a university’s leftist faculty to agree with her on almost anything, but Vladimir Putin’s team hardly falls into that category.) Townhall.com’s Katie Pavlich notes, “...Obama is also in New York for high stakes meetings and will speak to the assembly tomorrow. It is rumored he might meet with Iran’s new President Hassan Rouhani. Luckily, this year we won’t have to listen to anti-Israeli rants from former Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad.” (Rouhani is of the same ideological stripe as Ahmadinejad, but has done a good job of tricking westerners—and the U.S. mainstream media—into believing he is “moderate.”) [48709]

The IRS announces that Lois “Plead the Fifth” Lerner retires from her position at the agency. (Despite her involvement in the efforts to discriminate against conservative groups seeking tax exempt status, Lerner will keep her taxpayer-funded pension—perhaps as much as \$102,600 per year—because she retired before the IRS fired her.) Congressman Darrell Issa (R-CA), chairman of the House Oversight and Government Reform Committee, states, “We still don’t know why Lois Lerner, as a senior IRS official, had such a personal interest in directing scrutiny and why she denied improper conduct to Congress. Her departure does not answer these questions or diminish the committee’s interest in hearing her testimony.” (The mainstream media ignores the story. CBS, NBC, and ABC all fail to mention Lerner’s retirement on their evening news broadcasts—but, according to the Media Research Center, ABC eagerly reports that Mick Jagger will soon be a great-grandfather.) [48730, 48736, 48751, 48799, 48800, 49007]

An Egyptian courts bans the Muslim Brotherhood and orders its assets confiscated. (The radical Islamist organization then moves its media offices from Egypt to London—where it already has a “research center.”) [48723, 48724, 48749, 48837]

The White House (on “Bisexual Visibility Day”) holds a roundtable discussion about problems facing bisexuals. Michael Cole-Schwartz, Washington, D.C. spokesman for the gay activist group Human Rights Campaign, says, “It’s a testament to this administration that they are focusing on all elements of the LGBT community and they should be applauded for hosting an event focused on some of the specific issues impacting bisexual people.” [48976]

Forbes.com notes that Obama’s 2008 pledge that his health care law would “lower premiums by up to \$2,500 per year” conflicts with Medicare’s actuary, who “reported that in its first 10 years, Obamacare will boost health spending by ‘roughly \$621 billion’ above the amounts Americans would have spent without this misguided law.” Forbes estimates that will mean a \$7,450 increase in health care costs between 2014 and 2022 for the average family of four. “As it turns out, the average family of 4 has only had to face a relatively modest burden from Obamacare over the past four years—a little over \$125. Unfortunately, this year’s average burden (\$66) will be 10 times as large in 2014 when Obamacare kicks in for earnest. And it will rise for two years after that, after which it [will] hit a steady-state level of just under \$800 a year. Of course, all these figures are in nominal dollars. In terms of today’s purchasing power, this annual amount will rise steadily.” [48731]

FoxNews.com reports, “A series of videos produced for the National Park Service shows American Muslim students blaming hatred against their faith on the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks. The videos also promoted Islam as a pioneer in women’s rights and addressed a ‘general ignorance about what Islam is.’ ‘Islam within itself, Islam itself means peace,’ the government video states. ‘Islam brings nothing but peace if you truly look into it.’ The video was posted on the website for the Women’s Rights National Historical Park. It was filmed at the AnNur Islamic School in Schenectady, N.Y. by a National Park Service intern. According to the park’s website, the three-part series features children as they ‘discuss their experiences and challenges with negative Muslim stereotypes and assumptions.’ ...The National Park Service did not respond to questions about whether they’ve produced videos promoting other religions—like Christianity or Judaism.” [48737, 48790]

At the United Nations, an open microphone catches Obama saying, “I haven’t had a cigarette in probably six years. That’s because I’m scared of [sic; afraid of] my wife.” (Although Obama may, in fact, be afraid of his wife, it is doubtful that he has not had a cigarette in six years. FoxNews.com notes that in 2009 Obama admitted he still had an occasional cigarette, and in February 2010 he was still smoking—according to the White House physician.) [48738, 48739, 48772]

USAToday.com reports, “A ‘family glitch’ in the 2010 health care law threatens to cost some families thousands of dollars in health insurance costs and leave up to 500,000 children without coverage, insurance and health care analysts say. ...Congress defined ‘affordable’ as 9.5% or less of an employee’s household income, mostly to make sure people did not leave their workplace plans for subsidized coverage through the exchanges. But the ‘error’ was that it only applies to the employee—and not his or her family. So, if an employer offers a woman affordable insurance, but doesn’t provide it for her family, they cannot get subsidized help through the state health exchanges. That can make a huge difference; the Kaiser Family Foundation said an average plan for an individual is about \$5,600, but it goes up to \$15,700 for families.” [48740]

Sky News reports, “Some of the terrorists who targeted a shopping complex in Nairobi were dressed as women, according to a Kenyan minister.” (It is assumed that means, “Some of the terrorists were dressed in burkas.”) [48748]

According to the *Daily Mail*, “A former [British] marine emerged as a hero of the Nairobi siege yesterday after he was credited with saving up to 100 lives. The ex soldier was having coffee at the Westgate mall when it was attacked by Islamists on Saturday. With a gun tucked into his waistband, he was pictured helping two women from the complex. His story emerged as sporadic gunfire continued to ring out from inside the mall early today as Kenyan security forces battled Al Qaeda-linked terrorists into a fourth day. Despite Kenyan police assurances that they had taken control of the building, a security expert with contacts inside the mall said at least 10 hostages were still being held by a band of attackers, possibly as many as 13. ...Sources said the soldier was in the Royal Marines and now lives in Kenya. He cannot be named for security reasons. The British

military regularly train and operate out of Kenya, and have been involved in tracking UK citizens involved with hardline Islamists in Somalia and Yemen. Former members work with both the UK and Kenyan governments and security firms across East Africa.” [48750]

According to a Pew poll, 39 percent of Americans would blame Republicans if the government shuts down over a spending dispute and 36 percent would blame the Obama administration; 17 percent would blame both. [48755]

At PJMedia.com Tom Blumer notes the new online calculator from Kaiser that “illustrates health insurance premiums and subsidies for people purchasing insurance on their own in [the] new [October 1] health insurance exchanges,” and points out that “the Affordable Care Act will deeply discourage work and virtually any other attempt at financial improvement. It will also throw new obstacles in the way of couples wishing to get and stay married, even to the point of encouraging marital breakups of families with children. ... Those who enroll in Obamacare’s exchanges will be subjected to a brand new system of income-based federal taxation... over and above Uncle Sam’s existing income and FICA (Social Security and Medicare) tax regimes. This will include marginal rates for most enrollees ranging from 9.5 percent to 18 percent, along with myriad ‘cliffs’ where premiums—er, taxes—skyrocket when a person or couple earns just one dollar of additional income. ... Those looking for a Guinness Book of Records entry for the highest marginal tax rate ever imposed on a significant number of people will probably have to search far and wide to beat the 1,221,400% rate (\$12,214 on a \$1 income increase) a 64-year-old couple faces on dollar number 62,041 in annual income.” (That is, earning \$62,040 provides the individual with a \$12,214 taxpayer-funded insurance subsidy that disappears if he gets a \$1 salary increase and is paid \$62,041. There is, therefore, an ObamaCare incentive *not* to work hard to earn a promotion or a salary increase.) [48757]

CNSNews.com reports, “The House Oversight and Government Reform Committee—which is probing the Internal Revenue Service’s discriminatory treatment of Tea Party and conservative groups applying for tax-exempt status—says the IRS has thus far handed over to the committee only about 10 percent of the documents the IRS itself has said are responsive to the committee’s demands for documents. The committee subpoenaed the Treasury Department for relevant documents from the department and the IRS more than seven weeks ago at the beginning of August. ‘To date, the IRS has produced to the committee only about 10 percent of all responsive materials that it has identified,’ the committee’s majority staff said in a memo to committee members last Tuesday.” [48759]

In an interview with Alex Jones at InfoWars.com, author Jerome Corsi explains that the terrorist attack at the Nairobi shopping mall resulted in part from the ease with which Muslims from Somalia flooded into Kenya (a predominately Christian country) after its constitution was revised to give increased rights to Muslims. The pro-Shari’ah constitutional changes were the result of Raila Odinga (Obama’s Luo tribe cousin) being appointed the prime minister of Kenya—with the support of Obama and the United Nations. (Odinga had lost the Kenyan presidential election in 2007—after Obama

campaigned for him and raised \$950,000 on his behalf—and his Muslim supporters terrorized Christians in response. Odinga was then “paid off” with the prime minister position to reduce the tensions, after more than 1,500 people were massacred.) Corsi argues that the chemical weapons attack in Syria was a “false flag” event, staged by the jihadists in order to blame Bashar al-Assad and get the United States into a war to oust the Syrian president—at the behest of Saudi Arabia. Obama’s eagerness to go to war to please the Saudis was, however, thwarted by opposition from his Joint Chiefs of Staff—and the American people. [126, 127, 207, 208, 242, 271, 293, 294, 313, 329, 452, 591, 726, 1017, 1449, 1450, 1451, 48762]

On September 24 Brazilian President Dilma Rousseff addresses United Nations General Assembly and condemns the United States for its spying on her country—including the reading of her own emails: “Tampering in such a manner in the lives and affairs of other countries is a breach of international law and, as such, it is an affront to the principles that should otherwise govern relations among countries, especially among friendly nations. ... Information and telecommunication technologies cannot be the new battlefield between states. Time is ripe to create the conditions to prevent cyberspace from being used as a weapon of war, through espionage, sabotage, and attacks against systems and infrastructure of other countries.” [48756]

Obama delivers an uninspiring, even plodding, 42-minute speech to the General Assembly that is full of clichés and inconsistencies. Obama at times seems bored, while at other times he shows a hint of anger (when defending his policies against criticisms) or enthusiasm (when ridiculing others). Contradicting reality, Obama brags that the world is a less dangerous place than when he entered the White House in 2009. He barely mentions the problem of terrorism, without bothering to note that the perpetrators are almost always Islamists—and he ignores the tremendous amount of Muslim violence against Christians. He brings up the 1979 hostage crisis in Iran and how the United States is suspicious of Iran’s behavior—which is hardly a way to encourage the Iranians to engage in discussions about ending its nuclear weapons program. He refers to the “occupied West Bank” in Israel, essentially siding with the Palestinians over disputed territory that they insist be considered their before any peace talks with Israel can proceed—which is hardly a way to get Israel to negotiate. He condemns Iran and Russia for their support of the Bashar al-Assad regime in Syria—which is hardly a way to promote their cooperation in the effort to rid Syria of chemical weapons. The disjointed address is certain to draw criticism—and most certainly will not succeed in doing whatever it is Obama wanted it to do. [48760, 48764, 48765]

Iranian President Hassan “supposedly moderate” Rouhani declines to meet—or even shake hands—with Obama at the United Nations, even though he was repeatedly offered “an encounter” by the Obama regime. The White House states, “The Iranians have an internal dynamic that they have to manage and the relationship with the United States is clearly quite different than the relationship that Iran has with other Western nations.” (In other words, Rouhani brushed off Obama as largely irrelevant.) HotAir.com comments, “O would *love* to strike a sham deal on Iranian nukes a la Syria’s chemical weapons that lets him kinda sorta save face while avoiding a military attack, even if it ends up

achieving little by way of actual disarmament. ...That being so, of course Obama was eager to shake Rouhani's hand. *Of course he was.* In which case, if you're Iran, with [Obama] diminished [because of Syria] and less of a military threat than he's been in a long time, how do you resist a snub? ...So, once again, instead of keeping its cards close to the vest in order to minimize the risk of embarrassment if things go badly (see, e.g., the 'red line'), the White House chatted up the possibility of an earth-shaking face-to-face between O and Khamenei's new figurehead 'president' and now has to explain why Iran didn't feel like making it happen." [48770, 48778, 48779, 48813]

The Kenyan mall terrorist attack reportedly ends, with 72 dead (61 civilians, six security officers, and five terrorists) and as many as 240 injured. Eleven terrorists are reportedly in custody. Kenyan police state, "The West Gate Mall is under the full control of government forces and we are carrying out a sweep to ensure its safe for everyone." According to ABCNews.com, "The death toll is expected to rise, he said, because in the final hours of fighting, three of the mall's floors collapsed, resulting in 'several bodies still trapped in the rubble including the terrorists.'" (The jihadists reportedly started fires and set up explosive booby traps.) "The FBI is preparing to deploy a full team to Nairobi to investigate the attack, officials told ABC News. Agents are coming from a variety of places but the case is being led by the New York field office, which handles crimes against Americans that occur in Africa." (Some might ask why the FBI team did not do more in Benghazi.) [48753, 48754, 48780, 48887, 48888]

In the U.S. Senate, Senator Ted Cruz (R-TX) takes to the floor to denounce ObamaCare and drum up support for approval of House legislation funding the government but defunding ObamaCare. He is aided by Senator Mike Lee (R-UT), Marco Rubio (R-FL), and Rand Paul (R-KY), who ask him lengthy questions to allow him time to take breaks. Cruz allows a question from Senator Dick Durbin (D-IL), who claims health insurance premiums are going down under ObamaCare. Cruz responds, "You take the votes of people whose premiums have gone down, I'll take the others." Durbin also relates the story of a motel maid he knows, and says, "[T]he good news for Judy is that her income is so low that she now qualifies for Medicaid for the first time in her life." Cruz replies, "The best way for Judy or for anyone to have health insurance is to have an economy that is booming where people can get jobs and have opportunities." (Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid (D-NV) will certainly amend the bill to fund ObamaCare. The GOP does not have the votes to stop the Democrats—and Obama would veto any defunding legislation even if the Senate were to pass it. Nevertheless, the lengthy Republican discussion makes the evening news, and reminds voters who is on each side of the issue.) [48766, 48767, 48768, 48769, 48787, 48815, 48817, 48818]

Examiner.com reports, "The al-Qaeda Islamist ally in Somalia, Al-Shabaab, whose terrorists attacked the Westgate Shopping Mall in Nairobi, Kenya, this past weekend may have received assistance in avoiding law enforcement surveillance in the United States from the Council on American-Islamic Relations (CAIR), according to a public-interest organization's report on Monday. ...According to officials at Judicial Watch, an 'Inside the Beltway' group that investigates and exposes government and political corruption, the Islamist group Al-Shabaab 'has a powerful and influential advocate in the United

States—the Muslim ‘civil rights’ group known as the Council on American-Islamic Relations (CAIR).’ ‘It’s unlikely that the mainstream media will mention the connection, but it’s deep and it involves interfering in federal probes involving the radicalization of young Somali men in the U.S., like the ones carrying out the attack at the Westgate Shopping Mall in Northern Nairobi,’ according to the Judicial Watch report. ‘CAIR has also wielded its power to silence critics of the al-Qaeda offshoot—Somalia’s Al Shabaab—that stormed into the mall, murdered at least 68 and took dozens of hostages,’ the report stated.” (CAIR is a sham organization that illegally launders “charitable” contributions to fund Hamas and the Muslim Brotherhood. It should lose its tax-exempt status and be thoroughly investigated from top to bottom—but the Obama administration is not about to take any action against the Muslim organization.) [48758, 48781]

At FoxNews.com Katie Yoder reports, “On Monday, September 23, 90 percent of the top ten (via circulation numbers) daily newspapers’ headlines in the United States censored the words ‘Islam’ and ‘Muslim’ from Nairobi and Pakistan reports. One—the New York Daily News—didn’t even have a headline for the latest Islamic terrorist attacks.” (*The Wall Street Journal* called the shopping mall terrorists nothing more than “armed militants.”) [48840, 48841]

Ibrahim Hooper, communications director for the Council on American-Islamic Relations (CAIR), tells the *New York Post* the fact that some of the radical Islamists involved in the Kenyan shopping mall attack were from the United States: “It doesn’t matter who’s involved in it. Terrorism is terrorism, whether it is Americans involved or anyone from any nation or background. Who cares?” (Whether Hooper is a fan of Hillary “What difference does it make” Clinton is not known—but it is likely.) [48842, 48843]

In the October issue of *Playboy* magazine, actor Samuel L. Jackson says Obama should “stop trying to ‘relate’” to the public and “be fucking presidential.” [48761]

Obama’s approval/disapproval rating is 39/55 in an Ipsos national poll—even though the survey sampled 10 percent more Democrats than Republicans. Among Democrats, Obama’s ratings are 74/22; among Republicans, 12/88; among independents, 23/69. (The numbers, especially among independents, are terrible—and if they continue, suggest that the Democrats may have a difficult election night in November 2014.) [49357]

FoxNews.com reports, “Secretary of State John Kerry plans to sign a controversial U.N. treaty on arms regulation on Wednesday, a senior State Department official told Fox News—despite warnings from lawmakers that the Senate will not ratify the agreement. A State official said the treaty would ‘reduce the risk that international transfers of conventional arms will be used to carry out the world’s worst crimes,’ while protecting gun rights. ...U.S. lawmakers, though, have long claimed that the treaty could lead to new gun control measures. Sen. Jim Inhofe (R-OK), one of the most vocal opponents of the treaty, sent a letter to Kerry declaring it ‘dead in the water,’ since a majority of senators has gone on record against the agreement. ‘The administration is wasting precious time trying to sign away our laws to the global community and unelected U.N. bureaucrats,’ he wrote.” Chris W. Cox, Executive Director of the National Rifle

Association's Institute for Legislative Action, states, "The Obama administration is once again demonstrating its contempt for our fundamental, individual Right to Keep and Bear Arms. This treaty threatens individual firearm ownership with an invasive registration scheme. The NRA will continue working with the United States Senate to oppose ratification of the ATT [Arms Trade Treaty]." According to the NRA, the treaty "includes 'small arms and light weapons' within its scope, which covers firearms owned by law-abiding citizens. Further, the treaty urges recordkeeping of end users, directing importing countries to provide information to an exporting country regarding arms transfers, including 'end use or end user documentation' for a 'minimum of ten years.' Each country is to 'take measures, pursuant to its national laws, to regulate brokering taking place under its jurisdiction for conventional arms.' Data kept on the end users of imported firearms is a de-facto registry of law-abiding firearms owners, which is a violation of federal law. Even worse, the ATT could be construed to require such a registry to be made available to foreign governments." [48763, 48784, 48793, 48811]

Meanwhile, Senator Bob Corker (R-TN), ranking member of the Foreign Relations Committee, sends a letter to Obama warning him not to attempt to implement the Arms Trade Treaty without Senate ratification. Corker writes, in part, "The ATT raises significant legislative and constitutional questions. Any act to implement this treaty, provisionally or otherwise, before the Congress provides its advice and consent would be fundamentally inconsistent with the U.S. Constitution, law, and practice. ...The Senate has not yet provided its advice and consent, and may not provide such consent. As a result, the Executive Branch is not authorized to take any steps to implement the treaty." (In other words, "If you try to act in defiance of the U.S. Senate you risk impeachment.") [48814]

According to a Daily Mail analysis, Obama has 19.5 million fake Twitter followers who "don't really exist." (Oprah Winfrey has about 11.6 million fake followers.) [48771, 48792]

The Heritage Foundation reports that "Democrats in the House are demanding more discretionary spending and have openly stated that they would prefer a government shutdown over not getting higher spending. Their main target: getting rid of sequestration—which pushes discretionary spending down to \$967 billion in 2014. Instead, House Democrats want to spend well over a trillion dollars—\$1.058 trillion, to be exact—on discretionary programs next fiscal year. For taxpayers, this would mean an additional \$91 billion in deficit spending along with a cancellation of some of the savings put in place to offset a \$1.2 trillion increase in the debt limit from 2011. Adieu, Budget Control Act. House Minority Leader Nancy Pelosi (D-CA) says House Democrats are apparently ready 'almost across the board' to oppose any bill containing sequestration-level spending—even if it means a federal shutdown. Representative Jim Moran (D-VA) emphasized that 'a government shutdown is better than reverting to long-term sequester-level funding.' At the forefront of the movement is House Democratic Whip Steny Hoyer (D-MD), who openly stated that he would oppose any bill that would set spending at the sequestration level of \$986 billion. For those counting, that's \$19 billion above the sequestration-level spending allowance. But it's apparently not enough for liberals'

bottomless appetites. Are the domestic cuts really that bad to warrant such an extreme stance? Sequestration cuts reduce federal spending by a paltry 2.5 percent over the next 10 years. But eliminating them would drive up deficits by 12 percent.” [48802]

The United Nations releases its report on chemical weapons use in Syria. Secretary of State John Kerry claims it confirms the Assad regime was responsible: “And what did they [the UN inspectors] learn? They returned with several crucial details that confirmed that the Assad regime is guilty of carrying out that attack, even though that was not the mandate of the UN report. But anybody who reads the facts and puts the dots together, which is easy to do—and they made it easy to do—understands what those facts mean.” BareNakedIslam.com comments, “The problem is that the report does not confirm anything other than chemical weapons were used. I can’t give you a quote because the report simply does not say—anywhere—that the Syria Army, or the rebels, or anyone by name—used the weapons. ...It just isn’t there. No one is named as the culprit.” [48803, 48804]

Gallup reports that even among Democrats, Obama’s approval rating is “slipping.” In September, his approval rating averaged 78 percent—after more than 18 months at or above 80 percent. (Shortly after the November 2012 election his rating was 91 percent among Democrats.) Among all adults, regardless of party affiliation, Obama’s approval rating has fallen from 53 to 44 percent since late 2012. [48822]

DailyCaller.com reports, “IRS scandal figure Lois Lerner is negotiating through her lawyers with Rep. Darrell Issa’s House Oversight and Government Reform Committee about possibly gaining immunity to testify again in the committee’s investigative hearings. ‘The Chairman did not adjourn the hearing, he recessed it. Ms. Lerner remains under subpoena. The Committee has not made any offer of immunity to Ms. Lerner. The Committee has, however, indicated a willingness to listen to any offers from her attorney about what she would testify to if it was offered,’ Oversight Committee adviser Ali Ahmad told The Daily Caller. ‘I don’t have any update for you on timing,’ Ahmad said in regard to when Lerner will be called back before the committee.” (The clear implication is that Lerner has information and may be willing to talk. If she was a relative bystander in the chain of events and has little to reveal, there would be no need for her to seek immunity.) [48798, 48805]

Obama appears at the Clinton Global Initiative to push ObamaCare—and to get Bill Clinton and Hillary Clinton to add their support. (For Obama to need the Clintons to rescue him with an endorsement suggests he knows ObamaCare is losing popularity with the support. Hillary Clinton’s official words of support may cost her the presidency in 2016 if ObamaCare is a failure.) Conveniently for Hillary Clinton, the event also includes a panel discussion suggesting that more women are needed in roles of leadership. Bill Clinton states the obvious for the benefit of any ignoramuses who may be in his audience: “...I think it’s important for you to tell the people why we’re doing all this outreach, because this [ObamaCare] only works, for example, if young people show up, and even if they buy the cheapest plan, then they claim their tax credit so it won’t cost them much, 100 bucks a month or so. We’ve got to have them in the pools, because



otherwise all these projected low costs cannot be held if older people with preexisting conditions are disproportionately represented in any given state. You've got to have everybody lined up." (Clinton does not address one of the most illogical aspects of ObamaCare: It needs young people buying health insurance in order to subsidize older people, yet it allows those younger people to remain on their parents' insurance policies until they reach age 26. Thus, *no one under age 26 will buy insurance*, unless he or she has parents who do not have insurance.) [48788, 48810, 48819, 48860, 48865]

Obama tells the Clinton audience, "[B]ecause all the insurers who participate are required to, for example, provide free preventive care, free contraceptive care, that young woman, she may make up what she's spending on premiums just on her monthly use of health care." (According to CNSNews.com, "a person with a demographic profile approximating the hypothetical woman Obama described, would need to pay more than \$200 per month in Obamacare premiums. As CNSNews.com reported last year, the Target store in Northwest Washington, D.C., was selling a month's supply of birth control pills to people without health insurance for just \$9. According to an online advertisement, that Target still sells the same contraceptive... at \$9 for a month's supply.") [48816]

Obama refers to his health care law as providing "universal health care," but Jeffrey H. Anderson notes at NationalReview.com, "[T]he Congressional Budget Office (CBO) says... that there are currently 55 million uninsured people in America (not all of them citizens or even legal residents). The CBO projects that, by 2023, in the absence of Obamacare, that number would rise to 56 million. Far from saying that Obamacare would cover those 56 million uninsured people, however, the CBO projects that Obamacare would cover just 25 million of them—or a little under 45 percent. That's a far cry from 'universal coverage.' And that's after a full decade (2014–23) of Obamacare." The CBO also "projects that over the same decade, the gross cost of Obamacare's insurance-coverage provisions alone (which isn't remotely the entire cost of the legislation) would be \$1.8 trillion—with those costs rising by more than a quarter of a trillion dollars a year from there." Yet Obama insists the law will reduce the deficit. [48865]

Obama also attends a New York City fundraiser held in the Waldorf Astoria hotel, where he says, "I'm... going to be working as hard as I can to make sure that we have a [Democrat-controlled] Congress that is able in my last two years [in the White House] to get as much done as we got done in our first two years. ... The good news is that when you look at the country and the direction we're moving in, what you see is a country that's becoming more tolerant, a country that's becoming more inclusive, a country that understands there's no contradiction between growing the economy and conserving this planet for the next generation. I know why I fight for the things I fight for, because I want to make sure that the values that all of you stand for and that you're passing on to your kids, that those are the values that this whole country lives by." Obama also calls for even more government spending: "We could be doing a lot more... We could be rebuilding our roads and our bridges and our infrastructure... putting in place early-childhood education for every family in America... We could be doing so much more if we had a Congress that was focused on you and not focused on politics day-to-day." [48797]

Obama falsely claims in a Twitter message, “Not only are ‘[health insurance] premiums lower than they were, they’re lower than the most optimistic [ObamaCare] predictions.” (The “most optimistic predictions” came from Obama’s own mouth, when he famously promised that premiums would *fall* by \$2,500 per year. Nor, of course, are premiums lower than before the legislation was passed. Obama’s claim would be laughable if it were not such an outrageous lie.) [48852]

The fee to attend the Obama fundraiser is only \$5,000, even though he charged \$10,000 for the same event in 2011. Breitbart.com notes that Obama “is not the financial draw he used to be... One source attested, ‘He’s clearly not a cash cow (anymore)... He’s made his appointments overseas, the secretary positions. That’s what it is. Those high echelon jobs are gone.’ Obama and the Democratic National Committee (DNC) are attempting to pay off their \$20 million 2012 campaign debt, and to date have only raised \$2 million.” (According to Fortune.cnn.com, the DNC owes its creditors \$18.5 million, while the Republican National Committee has a \$12.5 million “cushion.” “Several executives at firms that contract to provide services to the party—speaking anonymously to avoid antagonizing what remains an important if troubled client—describe an organization playing for time as they raise alarms about past-due bills falling further behind. And senior strategists close to the DNC say they worry the organization appears to have no road map back to solvency. ‘They really thought they could get this money raised by the summer,’ one said, ‘but the fact is, from talking to people over there, they have no real plan for how to solve this.’” In addition to money problems, the DNC will also suffer if the labor unions, which are none too thrilled about the impact of ObamaCare, decide to sit out the 2014 mid-term elections.) [48825, 49024]

While Obama raises cash to refill DNC coffers, his Chicago neighbor, the Jew-hating head of the Nation of Islam, Louis Farrakhan, attends a United Nations dinner party hosted by Iranian President Hassan Rouhani. [48861]

On September 25 Senator Ted Cruz (R-TX) ends his 21-hour, anti-ObamaCare, talk-a-thon—the fourth longest speech in Senate history. (The Democrat-controlled Senate will vote to restore ObamaCare funding to the Continuing Resolution (CR) to authorize government spending, and then send the legislation back to the House of Representatives. The House will either cave in and approve the CR, or amend it to weaken ObamaCare in some other way—such as delaying the individual mandate that forces Americans to buy health insurance, or requiring that all Senators and Congressmen and their support staffs buy unsubsidized health insurance on the ObamaCare exchanges. (During his speech, Cruz said, “I believe that if Obamacare doesn’t apply to everyone, then it shouldn’t apply to anyone.”) The bill would then go back to the Senate. If the Senate refuses to approve the legislation or Obama vetoes it, the government “shuts down” effective October 1. (Actually, essential operations would continue: Social Security payments would still be made, the military would still be paid, etc.) [48785, 48786, 48812, 48817, 48818, 48827, 48895, 48986]

After Cruz stops speaking, the Senate votes 100–0 to advance the Continuing Resolution. (Democrats will then move to amend the bill to remove the ObamaCare de-funding language.)

Media leftists ridicule Cruz for his 21-hour speech, even though they enthusiastically praised an 11-hour speech by Texas state senator Wendy Davis earlier in the year, falling all over themselves as they called her courageous and promoted her for governor. (Davis may as well run for governor, as she has little chance of winning reelection to her state senate seat.) The difference in media coverage: Cruz argued in support of liberty and against Obama, while Davis argued in support of abortion. [48857, 48858, 48859, 48886, 48894, 48910]

In a letter to House Speaker John Boehner (R-OH), Treasury Secretary Jacob Lew warns that as of October 17 the government would have only \$30 billion available “to meet our country’s commitments. ...If we have insufficient cash on hand, it would be impossible for the United States of America to meet all of its obligations for the first time in our history.” (If the debt ceiling is not raised by October 17 the United States will not default on its debt—contrary to mainstream media reports. There is more than enough tax revenue collected by the government every month to pay interest on its debt and the basic functions of government, such as military pay and Social Security benefits, although it would not have enough cash to fund every aspect of government. But a default on the debt would occur *only* if the Obama administration chose to give interest payments on the debt a lower priority than other expenses.) According to a Bloomberg National Poll, 61 percent of Americans want spending cuts to be part of any deal to increase the debt limit, although Obama and many Democrats want no negotiations at all and simply want a “clean” bill to allow them to continue spending. (In fact, they also want the sequester cuts from 2012 reversed.) Since Obama entered the White House, each American family’s share of the national debt increased by about \$43,000. Adding an additional \$1.1 trillion to the debt limit will raise that amount to \$51,800. (When Obama says, “We need to raise the debt limit” he is essentially saying, “We need to burden every household in the United States with another \$8,800 in debt.”) [48856, 48866, 48935]

Michelle Malkin writes at Townhall.com, “Last week, our family received notice from Anthem BlueCross BlueShield of Colorado that we can no longer keep the plan we like because of ‘changes from health care reform (also called the Affordable Care Act or ACA).’ The letter informed us that ‘(t)o meet the requirements of the new laws, your current plan can no longer be continued beyond your 2014 renewal date.’ In short: Obama lied. My health plan died. Remember? [Obama] looked America straight in the eye and promised: ‘If you like your doctor, you will be able to keep your doctor. Period. If you like your health care plan, you will be able to keep your health care plan. Period. No one will take it away. No matter what.’ ...My family is not alone. Across the country, insurers are sending out Obamacare-induced health plan death notices to untold tens of thousands of other customers in the individual market. Twitter users are posting their Obamacare cancellation notices and accompanying rate increases...” Congressman Cory Gardner (R-CO) “points to recent analysis showing individual market rate increases of 23 percent to 25 percent in Colorado. ‘After my current plan is discontinued,’ he wrote last

week, ‘the closest comparable plan through our current provider will cost over 100 percent more, going from roughly \$650 a month to \$1,480 per month.’ He now carries his Obamacare cancellation notice with him as hardcore proof of the Democrats’ ultimate deception. ...Maryland announced that its post-Obamacare individual market rates could also rise by a whopping 25 percent. ...Thanks to Obama, access is down. Premiums and health care spending are up. Research and development on lifesaving drugs and medical devices are down. Hours and benefits have been cut because of Obamacare costs and regulatory burdens by at least 300 American companies, according to Investor’s Business Daily. And the Obamacare layoff bomb continues to claim victims. Obamacare is destroying the private individual market for health insurance by design, not accident. For hundreds of thousands, if not millions, of self-employed job creators, three fundamental Obamacare truths are becoming as clear as Obama’s growing nose: 1) You can’t keep it. 2) We’re screwed. 3) The do-gooders don’t care.” [48783]

While Obama’s Secretary of Health and Human Services Kathleen Sebelius claims health insurance premiums are being driven down across the country because of ObamaCare, Senator Lamar Alexander (R-TN) provides some reality from his state: “Today, a 27-year-old man in Memphis can buy a plan for as low as \$41 a month. On the [ObamaCare] exchange, the lowest state average is \$119 a month—a 190% increase. Today, a 27-year-old woman in Nashville can also buy a plan for as low as \$58 a month. On the exchange, the lowest-priced plan in Nashville is \$114 a month—a 97% increase. Even with a tax subsidy, that plan is \$104 a month, almost twice what she could pay today. Today, women in Nashville can choose from 30 insurance plans that cost less than the administration says insurance plans on the exchange will cost, even with the new tax subsidy. In Nashville, 105 insurance plans offered today will not be available in the exchange.” [48795, 48821]

The Heritage Foundation reports, “Today the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) released a report regarding premiums and plan offerings in Obamacare’s exchanges for next year. Despite the Administration’s claims, premiums are going up due to Obamacare—and the quality of the ‘coverage’ is, in many cases, going down. In both today’s report and an earlier report released in July, HHS claims that premiums are ‘lower than projected.’ HHS bases its claim on a March 2012 Congressional Budget Office (CBO) estimate stating that premiums for a family would average \$15,400 per year on the exchanges. The Administration report claims that weighted average premiums are ‘16 percent below projections’ based on that CBO report—therefore Obamacare is lowering premiums. What HHS *didn’t* mention is that CBO also estimated in a November 2009 analysis that individually purchased insurance premiums would go up by an average \$2,100 per family, due to the increased mandates and requirements included in Obamacare. So when HHS says that premiums are ‘below projections,’ it really means that premiums are still going up as a result of Obamacare—just by less than originally advertised. That’s a far cry from candidate Obama’s promise that his health plan would lower premiums by \$2,500 per year.” (In other words, the CBO anticipated that premiums would increase by \$2,100 per year but finds they are “only” going up by \$1,764 per year—and Obama is shamelessly taking credit for a 16 percent “drop.”) [48801, 48806]

Heritage continues, “The HHS report also makes claims about a wide variety of plan offerings. What the report *didn’t* mention is that many of these ‘new’ plans are Medicaid managed care plans, which insurance companies admit ‘will look a lot like the Medicaid plans we are currently administering.’ HHS also didn’t mention that patients object to being placed in a program with low physician reimbursements and poor health outcomes—even some Medicaid patients don’t call the program ‘real insurance.’ So instead of just raising premiums, Obamacare is inflicting a double whammy: forcing the American people to buy health plans costing more than what they paid previously, and providing such limited access to provider networks they may not be able to find a doctor that will treat them. It’s why Congress should act now to stop Obamacare before it starts.” [48801, 48806]

At Forbes.com Avik Roy writes, “Based on a Manhattan Institute analysis of the HHS numbers, Obamacare will increase underlying insurance rates for younger men by an average of 97 to 99 percent, and for younger women by an average of 55 to 62 percent. Worst off is North Carolina, which will see individual-market rates triple for women, and quadruple for men. ‘Premiums nationwide will also be around 16 percent lower than originally expected,’ HHS cheerfully announces in its press release. But that’s a ruse. HHS compared what the Congressional Budget Office projected rates might look like—in 2016—to its own findings. Neither of those numbers tells you the stat that really matters: how much rates will go up next year, under Obamacare, relative to this year, prior to the law taking effect. Former Congressional Budget Office director Douglas Holtz-Eakin agrees. ‘There are literally no comparisons to current rates. That is, HHS has chosen to dodge the question of whose rates are going up, and how much. Instead they try to distract with a comparison to a hypothetical number that has nothing to do with the actual experience of real people.’” Roy claims that HHS “release[d] a trickle of data and a load of spin.” According to Roy, a 27-year-old non-smoker in Philadelphia who currently pays \$75 per month for an individual health insurance policy would pay \$195 per month at the ObamaCare exchange—and that would be for coverage under its least expensive “bronze” plan. [48806, 48807, 48947, 48948, 50057]

The Obama administration notifies Hispanic organizations that the Spanish version of its HealthCare.gov website will not be working in time for the October 1 opening of the ObamaCare health care exchanges. [48903, 48906]

In Colorado, the Little Sisters of the Poor charity files a lawsuit against the ObamaCare rule forcing it to provide insurance coverage for abortifacients, birth control, and sterilizations for its employees. Sister Loraine Marie states, “We cannot violate our vows by participating in the government’s program to provide access to abortion-inducing drugs.” (The Obama administration claims the Catholic charity is not religious enough to qualify for the ObamaCare religious exemption—because services are given to non-Catholics as well as Catholics.) [48808, 48809]

At PJMedia.com Tom Blumer further explores the cost of health insurance on the ObamaCare exchanges, the amounts of taxpayer-funded subsidies, and the law’s work

and marriage disincentives. Blumer points out that “the gradual expiration” of ObamaCare subsidies “as income increases... will raise the portion of income taken by the government for each additional dollar of earnings to between one-third and one-half, effectively taxing most American workers at marginal rates usually limited to the planet’s highest income earners.” Additionally, the “subsidy ‘cliffs’ will cause middle-aged single people and married couples making as little as \$45,960 and \$62,040, respectively, to lose over \$10,000 in subsidies—or ‘tax credits,’ in the preferred language of OFA [Obama’s Organizing for Action] and the U.S. Supreme Court’s—when they earn just one additional dollar. These bugs, which jubilant ‘progressives’ ... apparently believe are features, will crush incentives to work and to otherwise pursue financial self-improvement. The third tragic outcome of Obamacare is what it will do to marriages and families” because getting divorced and still living together will be an obvious way to keep ObamaCare subsidies, depending on income levels. For a 60-year-old married couple, “Instead of facing an exorbitant premium increase once their combined earnings hits \$62,041 if they were to stay married, each cohabiting adult can earn up to \$45,960 before Obamacare’s ‘tax credit’-free premiums kick in. Their annual after-tax savings at age 60 if they shack up and keep their individual earnings between \$31,021 and \$45,960 will range from \$7,650 to over \$11,000. The annual savings will slightly increase every year until Medicare kicks in at age 65. That kind of money can buy a lot of gifts for the grandkids. ... There may be contrary examples, but in all of my research into the inner workings of Obamacare as embodied in Kaiser’s model, I was unable to find a single instance where staying married led to a lower net healthcare premium compared to divorcing and living together.” [48820]

The unnamed “Republican insider” tells The Ulsterman Report, “Long night. [Senate Majority Leader Harry] Reid [D-NV] wanting to cut off Senator [Ted] Cruz [R-TX] with procedural action later in the afternoon. By staying up all night and having America wake to the fact he is still standing is putting the Obamacare issue front and center. That is the last thing Democrats want because it is a monstrosity that does not hold up in any way to public scrutiny and they know it. Technically, we won’t win this battle. [But] We finally have people in the party who understand the war. This is the beginning of the era of the new Republicans. It is an era that is finally putting America and Americans first. America and Americans now. Had two Senate Democrats quietly let us know they supported what we were doing. They fear back home backlash on the Obamacare issue, and have seen the cost estimates. Tsunami of debt and regulations [that] will lead to millions of very upset citizens. One of them made a comment about how Harry Reid was ‘way past his expiration date.’ [But] Not one single member of the Republican leadership has given us any words of support. Nice to know some of ‘them’ [Democrats] are finally admitting it. That wouldn’t happen without the work of Senator Cruz and some others, and all the other people out there who have been really paying attention to what is going on here. Glad to be a part of all this. Not too often you can actually feel pride when you are walking around this place. This is one of those times.” [48824]

WSJ.com compares health insurance premiums for a 27-year-old single person from the ObamaCare exchange “lowest-cost bronze plan” with “current lowest-cost premiums.” In all 36 metropolitan areas listed, the ObamaCare rates will be significantly higher than the

pre-ObamaCare rate—in some cases more than three or four times higher. In Atlanta, Georgia, the rate jumps from \$43 per month to \$166 per month. In Chicago, Illinois, from \$74 to \$125 per month. In Omaha, Nebraska, from \$26 per month to a whopping \$126 per month. (The dramatic increases are the result of ObamaCare’s prohibition of low-priced, basic plans with high deductibles and high out-of-pocket expense limits. Under ObamaCare, it is essentially illegal for insurers to provide low-priced, basic plans—even if that is what the customers want.) [48826]

At HumanEvents.com Ann Coulter writes, “If I could briefly interrupt the Republican firing squad aiming at Ted Cruz, let’s talk about something we all agree on. And by ‘we all,’ I mean a majority of the American people, the Teamsters, many Democrats and every single last Republican. Obamacare is an unmitigated disaster. ... Unfortunately, most Republicans are too stupid to notice that Democrats are walking around with a gigantic glass jaw. Democrats must not be able to believe their dumb luck. *Instead of hitting our glass jaw, Republicans have decided to attack Ted Cruz!* ... Among the amendments Republicans might want to introduce is one requiring members of Congress and their staffs to live under Obamacare. Or an amendment delaying the law’s implementation for the whole country—and not just the big employers favored by Obama. And also an amendment taking the administration of Obamacare out of the hands of the utterly corrupt IRS. Can we at least get Senate Democrats to vote on these urgent reforms? I’d especially like to see the votes of red state Democrats, such as Mary Landrieu [D-LA], Mark Begich [D-AK] and Mark Pryor [D-AR]. I bet their Republican opponents in the midterm elections next year would, too. ... But instead of attacking Obamacare and the breathtaking hypocrisy of the Democrats over this massively unpopular law, far too many Republicans have been spending their time attacking Ted Cruz. (Why didn’t we see one-tenth as much venom directed at Sen. Marco Rubio [R-FL] for trying to give the Democrats 30 million new voters with amnesty as we have toward Cruz for trying to defund Obamacare?) ... Whether or not Cruz succeeds, we wouldn’t be talking about Obamacare this week without his efforts to defund it—at least those of us who are talking about this disastrous law, rather than attacking Cruz.” [48828]

WashingtonPost.com reports, “Just days away from launch, the District of Columbia’s [ObamaCare] health marketplace is announcing a pretty significant delay. While the D.C. Health Link will launch a Web site on October 1, shoppers will not have access to the their premium prices until mid-November. The delay comes after the District marketplace discovered ‘a high error rate’ in calculating the tax credits that low- and middle-income people will use to purchase insurance on the marketplace.” (The media was clearly wrong in its prior reports that the D.C. exchange was “ahead of the curve” relative to other exchanges. Whether it was wrong about other aspects of ObamaCare remains to be seen.) [48829, 48905]

Reuters adds, “The District of Columbia’s online health insurance exchange—one of 51 set up under ... Obama’s healthcare reform law—will be unable to perform two key functions when it opens on Oct. 1, exchange officials announced on Wednesday. The District joins Colorado and Oregon on the list of ‘Obamacare’ exchanges hobbled by problems with information technology (IT), contributing to expectations that Obama’s

signature domestic achievement will get off to a slow start when the exchanges go live next Tuesday. The ‘DC Health Link’ web-based marketplace, where residents of the nation’s capital who do not have other coverage will be able to purchase policies, will lack the ability to calculate whether someone is eligible for Medicaid. It will also be unable to calculate the size of federal subsidies, if any, that a customer qualifies for.” [48862, 48871]

Former Speaker of the House Newt Gingrich writes, “Tuesday [September 24] was supposed to be about [Obama’s] big visit to the United Nations. He gave what was supposed to be an important foreign policy speech in the morning. His administration broadcast that he might finally meet face-to-face with Iran’s president. Then he stepped all over it with his appearance at the Clinton Foundation (actually a Hillary warm-up rally for 2016). The Iranians, meanwhile, blew off the pathetic White House hopes for a ‘casual encounter’ (a handshake, photo-op, etc.) with the new president. The dictatorship of course is continuing its tradition of seemingly-moderate hard liners as president alternating with obviously hard-line hard liners. The Ayatollah remains in charge of the dictatorship and the regime keeps working on nuclear weapons while pretending to reach out to reassure the West that they have ‘matured.’ [Obama’s] incompetence on Syria is now beginning to be matched by parallel incompetence on Iran.” [48830]

“At the same time,” continues Gingrich, “Senator Cruz was highlighting the decay of Obamacare. Every day there are new stories of Americans who’ve had their work hours cut to below 30 hours a week, stories of people with sky-rocketing insurance rates, and stories of government incompetence at administering a massive national bureaucracy. ...After four years of preaching to us the joys and virtues of Obamacare, the failure of that effort is so great that by nearly two to one Americans believe it will make their healthcare worse. A majority of Americans has consistently failed to support Obamacare for four years now. Senator Cruz’s filibuster is merely the most recent example of the intensity of opposition to Obamacare which is building up. [Obama] can shut the government, stare down the Republicans, and make his 3,000th speech on health reform, but none of it will save Obamacare. Obamacare will eventually be repealed, and the fact that Obama, one week away from its official date of implementation, has to call on the Clintons to sing its praises is just more proof that it can’t be explained, it can’t be understood, and in the end it can’t be saved.” [48830]

Keith Kakugawa, Obama’s best friend in high school in Honolulu, is arrested in Arcata, California and charged with raping and beating a woman on September 13. On May 7 he was arrested for unrelated assault charges. (As noted previously in *The Obama Timeline*, Kakugawa has said that Obama “...made everything out like it was all racial.” After Obama complained about being picked on at the basketball court because of his race, Kakugawa’s father told Obama, “No, Barry, it’s not because you’re black, it’s because you missed two shots in a row.” Kakugawa denied Obama’s claims that they often had heated discussions about race. The talks, Kakugawa said, were not about race. “Barry’s biggest struggles then were missing his parents. His biggest struggles were his feelings of abandonment. The idea that his biggest struggle was race is bull shit.”) [20, 2288, 48831]



It is worth noting that another Punahou School pal of Obama, Robert Titcomb, has been in trouble with the law. On April 6, 2011 HawaiiNewsNow.com reported that one of Obama's "closest friends is scheduled to appear at Honolulu District Court next month, after he allegedly solicited sex from an undercover officer. Police arrested Robert 'Bobby' Titcomb, 49, of Waiialua on suspicion of prostitution Monday night. Bobby Titcomb and ...Obama have been close friends since their childhood days at Punahou School. The two are frequently seen on the news golfing, playing basketball and dining together when the Obama family vacations in Hawaii." According to ThePostEmail.com, "Today through his attorney, Titcomb reportedly pleaded 'no contest' to the charge [of soliciting a prostitute] and paid a \$500 fine plus \$30 for court costs." Titcomb reportedly never graduated from Punahou, having been expelled. By his own admission, Obama experimented with drugs at Punahou and let his grades slip, yet he was not expelled. One Hawaii resident whose son also attended Punahou has stated, "Titcomb lives on the North Shore. On one occasion when Obama visited here, he stayed a few houses from us. The last time it was four or five blocks. However, on both occasions Obama had a 20-car motorcade that went from here to the North Shore to visit this guy Titcomb at his house. Now how much did that cost? He could have given Titcomb \$10.00 for gas to come down here. The question for me is, 'Who was your dealer?' Obama said that he used marijuana and cocaine in high school. Now, cocaine is pretty serious. If he used cocaine, who was his dealer? I know from that friend in the same grade as Titcomb that Titcomb was expelled. He was definitely expelled. I just spoke to the friend last night. The other information I got about him was from a fellow who is older. Titcomb lived on a street near Punahou School, and my friend here was like a neighbor, so he knew him when he was a little kid. He said, 'Anything to get in trouble, that was him: Titcomb. He always got in trouble.' He was the one who told me that Titcomb was expelled for selling drugs, although that is not confirmed." (The unstated and unproven implication is that Titcomb was Obama's drug supplier at Punahou School.) [20, 2288, 19439, 19458, 20294, 26385, 26389, 38003, 38014, 48831]

At HillBuzz.org, Kevin DuJan wrote, "Here in Chicago, word on the street for the last month [October 2012] has been that Valerie Jarrett was specifically tasked with getting Obama off coke and other drugs before the debates [with Mitt Romney] so that he would not embarrass himself on stage for an hour and a half. So, word is that Obama's been detoxing since at least September. This explains how haggard he's looked and how prickly he's acted for a while now... it's what addicts look and act like when they're cut off from their drugs. Remember that [Obama] can have whatever drugs he wants. The Secret Service [agents] are not there to keep [Obama] from breaking the law, they are just there to keep him alive. Obama's main drug suppliers are the junior staffers who work in the White House who go to Lafayette Park and buy him whatever he wants... and he also gets special deliveries from his friend Bobby Titcomb in Hawaii, who brings him 'fish and poi' to the White House (that's Hawaiian slang for 'weed and coke'). To get through the almost two hours of being on TV, Obama looks like he needed a big injection of beta-blockers and/or amphetamines. If you noticed at the beginning of the debate he was talking fast, acting erratic, and blinking like CRAZY he was still jazzed up by whatever they gave him. [Obama's blink rate was 70.8 per minute during the 42 minutes and 40 seconds he spoke.] About twenty minutes later, it seems like the adrenaline in his system

from being in front of the crowd might have caused the uppers to wear off... and his energy levels collapsed after that. By the end of the debate, Obama looked like he was aching for a new fix. This could be the reason Michelle Obama rushed him off stage and skipped the traditional 'let's wave to the crowd for a while' schtick. She could tell he needed to get out of sight because he totally lost it out there." (*The Obama Timeline* has no way of confirming DuJan's claim, but it is not inconsistent with reports that Obama was under the influence of drugs the night of his acceptance speech in Denver in 2008 and had to be "brought down" for the occasion.) [20, 2288, 19439, 19458, 20294, 26385, 26389, 38003, 38014, 48831]

Reuters reports, "Powerful Syrian insurgent units have rejected the authority of the opposition Syrian National Coalition (SNC), badly damaging efforts by Western-backed political exiles to forge a moderate rebel military force on the ground. Thirteen groups, including at least three previously considered part of the coalition's military wing, the [Obama- and John McCain-backed] Free Syrian Army (FSA), signed a statement calling for the opposition to President Bashar al-Assad to be reorganised under an Islamic framework and to be run only by groups fighting inside Syria. The signatories range from hardliners such as the al Qaeda-linked Nusra Front and Ahrar al-Sham battalions to more moderate Islamist groups such as the Tawheed Brigade and Islam Brigade." (This is additional confirmation that the rebels Obama and McCain claim are "moderate" are not.) [48832]

Investors.com writes, "In the interest of an informed debate, we've compiled a list of job actions with strong proof that ObamaCare's employer mandate is behind cuts to work hours or staffing levels. As of Sept. 25, our ObamaCare scorecard included 313 employers [including 200 colleges]." (The article includes a list of the 313 employers and the actions they are taking to escape the hassles and costs of ObamaCare.) [48960, 48961]

Breitbart.com reports that Obama's long-time friend William Ayers, "a co-founder of the Weather Underground terrorist organization that was responsible for several bombings, including the U.S. Capitol in the 1970's, is scheduled to lecture on 'Democracy and Education: Teaching for Liberation,' at Elgin Community College (ECC) in Illinois on Thursday September 26. According to the ECC communication director, Ayers will receive a taxpayer funded stipend for his time. Ayers has been accused by leaders of the San Francisco police officers union of participating in a 1970 police station bombing that killed Sergeant Brian McDonnell, after being hit by flying shrapnel, metal nails, and lead bullets planted in the bomb. After 42 years, the crime has never been resolved. Investigators at the time said the Weather Underground and the Black Liberation Army were likely responsible for the bombing. Eight other police officers were wounded in the attack, including Brian Fogarty, whose face and legs were severely injured and was partially blinded." [48833]

A number of newspapers that endorsed Obama and ObamaCare face charges of hypocrisy, as they make health plan changes in response to the health care legislation. TheBlaze.com reports, "McClatchy Co., which owns 30 local daily newspapers in the

U.S., will end its retiree health care insurance program at the end of 2014, according to Bloomberg. The company decision was made in anticipation of ...Obama's new health care law. ...The Sacramento Bee, McClatchy's flagship paper, endorsed ...Obama for reelection in 2012. 'While there still is much work ahead to implement health care reform and hold down medical costs, this law holds the promise of extending health care coverage to 36 million Americans,' the publication editorialized at the time. 'Obama has good reason to be proud of 'Obamacare.' The Rock Hill Herald, also a McClatchy paper... endorsed Obama in 2012 as well. 'Once fully in place,' the paper wrote, 'this landmark program [Obamacare] would provide access to health insurance for 45 million Americans who now are without it and, according to projections by the Government Accountability Office, significantly reduce the cost of health care over time.'" (ObamaCare was considered good enough for the newspapers to support for *others*—but not something it wants applied to their own operations.) [48834]

In *The Wall Street Journal*, Daniel Henninger writes, "[T]here is one thing that can kill an established political idea. It will die if the public that embraced it abandons it. Six months ago, that didn't seem likely. Now it does. The public's dislike of ObamaCare isn't growing with every new poll for reasons of philosophical attachment to notions of liberty and choice. Fear of ObamaCare is growing because a cascade of news suggests that ObamaCare is an impending catastrophe. ...ObamaCare's Achilles' heel is technology. The software glitches are going to drive people insane. Creating really large software for institutions is hard. Creating big software that can communicate across unrelated institutions is unimaginably hard. ObamaCare's software has to communicate—accurately—across a mind-boggling array of institutions: HHS, the IRS, Medicare, the state-run exchanges, and a whole galaxy of private insurers' and employers' software systems. ...The odds of ObamaCare's eventual self-collapse look stronger every day. After that happens, then what? Try truly universal health insurance? Not bloody likely if the aghast U.S. public has any say. Enacted with zero Republican votes, ObamaCare is the solely owned creation of the Democrats' belief in their own limitless powers to fashion goodness out of legislated entitlements. Sometimes social experiments go wrong. In the end, the only one who supported Frankenstein was Dr. Frankenstein. The Democrats in 2014 should by all means be asked relentlessly to defend their monster." [48904]

Obama's approval rating drops to 43 percent in a CBS News/New York Times poll. His disapproval rating increases to 49 percent. [48847]

At Forbes.com J. T. Young writes that an "aimless" Obama is "starting to alienate his most die-hard... supporters. Five years in, [Obama] appears more divisive than decisive. There is a high irony in this outcome for a candidate elected on promises of unity and change. Yet the increasingly obvious pattern is that Obama is unwilling to make a tough decision and as a result, he not only alienates a growing number of voters, but an increasing number of his supporters. ...Still in only his second term's first year, his disapproval rating routinely exceeds his approval rating. His signature policy achievement fares worse. Obamacare's disapproval margin is in double-digits in virtually every poll. And Obama's lowest job performance ratings come on Americans' biggest

concern: the economy. ...Recently, it has been the administration's lack of decisiveness that has been noteworthy. Despite assuming the ability to take actions unilaterally without enabling legislative action, the administration is increasingly demonstrating an unwillingness, or inability, to make tough decisions. ...Tough decisions do not get easier with time, instead just the reverse occurs. The effect of this indecision has been to have choices second-, third- and fourth-guessed in public. Far from inspiring confidence, it instead inspires in-fighting among those—particularly damaging one's supporters—seeking to make the decision in Obama's place. ...An absence of will is increasingly coming to define [Obama]. It has gone from the pledge of 'Yes we can,' to the reality of 'No we won't.' For an administration so consciously focused on its legacy, it may have inadvertently created it. And its non-decisions are beginning to eclipse the bad decisions that brought them to these tough decisions in the first place." [48882]

*The Washington Post* reports, "Of the more than 8,000 physicians licensed to work in the nation's capital, only 453 of them are primary-care doctors who spend more than 20 hours a week seeing patients, according to a report released Wednesday by the D.C. Board of Medicine. ...Health-care experts have long bemoaned the looming shortage of physicians, particularly in primary care. Primary-care doctors will be especially important as a critical phase of ...Obama's health-care law gets underway Tuesday [October 1]. That's when Americans who lack medical insurance have their first chance to sign up for coverage under the new health insurance marketplaces that are supposed to open for business. ...'It's likely that will put the squeeze on, and being able to see a primary-care doctor is going to get worse,' said Janis Orłowski, head of the board." (The problem will not be unique to Washington, D.C. Across the country, many communities do not have enough physicians to care for millions more patients. ObamaCare will worsen the situation, as increasing numbers of doctors retire—to escape the burdensome bureaucracy and reduced reimbursement fees—and fewer young people entering the profession.) [48850, 48851]

According to HealthPolicySolutions.org, Colorado's ObamaCare online exchange will also not be up and running on October 1. "Colorado exchange managers revealed Monday during a board meeting that customers who want tax credits to make health insurance more affordable will have to call for help, rather than navigating the multi-million dollar computer system on their own. ...'It's not as seamless as we would like,' said Ben Davis, a communications consultant for the exchange. 'You have to use a customer service representative during the month of October.'" (At HotgAir.com Mary Katherine Ham comments, "Even customers working with in-person navigators in Colorado (the ones with 20 hours of training and no background checks) will have to call into a customer service line, where another bureaucrat will walk them through an application on the phone. This sounds like a process perfectly tailored to entice young invincibles into the system, amirite [am I right], Millenials? And, surprise, the various databases and government and private online entities required to work together are not marrying up smoothly. ...Along with limited choices, cut employee hours, and rate shock, the predicted 'pricing glitch' is now a reality." [48868]

DailyCaller.com reports that Obama follows porn star Farrah Abraham on Twitter. (Whether Reggie Love is jealous is not known.) [48854]

At WND.com Garth Kant reports, “Following the epic, 21-hour speech by Senator Ted Cruz (R-TX) supporting the defunding of Obamacare, either voters made so many calls to establishment Republicans that their phone lines melted, or those GOP leaders took their phones off the hook. Even in this age of digital wizardry and limitless voicemail, callers could not get through at all to Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell (R-KY). ...It was the same story with the man who was the face of the GOP in the 2008 elections, former GOP presidential candidate Senator John McCain (R-AZ). His phone was off the hook, too. Callers got a message stating his voicemail box was full. The Arizona senator apparently had other matters on his mind during the Cruz speech, tweeting, ‘Final episode of Broadchurch tonight—one of the most entertaining shows on TV right now.’ That prompted conservative commentator Michelle Malkin to tweet, ‘Meanwhile, McCain is tweeting about a TV show. See the problem here, America?’ Callers to Minority Whip Senator John Cornyn (R-TX) also got a message saying the line was busy, but at least those callers were sent to voicemail.” Congressman Peter King (R-NY) whines that he received “vile” phone calls—which probably had a lot to do with his calling Cruz a “fraud.” [48876]

According to WhiteHouseDossier.com, Obama’s September 26 schedule consists of only two tasks: 10:55 a.m. - “Delivers remarks on Obamacare” and 4:25 p.m. - “Attends a DNC fundraiser.”

On September 26 Nakoula Basseley Nakoula, the Egyptian-American Coptic Christian who produced the *Innocence of Muslims* video that the Obama administration wrongly and shamelessly blamed for the Benghazi attack that killed four Americans, is released from jail after serving time for parole violations. (AtlasShrugs.com’s Pamela Geller writes, “Whatever the pretense, he was a political prisoner, jailed for blasphemy. This is Obama sharia enforcement in America. Obama brought down the gavel on free speech at the UN when he said, ‘the future must not belong to those who slander the prophet of Islam.’ If Nakoula hadn’t made the video, he wouldn’t be in jail.”) [48835, 48836, 48867]

DCClothesline.com reports, “A new wave of camouflage is underway at the Pentagon and the CIA. The [Osama] bin Laden ‘death files’ contained in the Pentagon’s data bank have become the object of controversy. Navy Vice Admiral William McRaven has been entrusted in removing these secret military files concerning the May 2011 Navy SEAL raid on Osama bin Laden’s alleged hideout in Abbotabad, Pakistan from the Pentagon’s data banks. The files of the bin Laden SEAL operation had to be removed to sustain the Big Lie. Osama was allegedly killed on the orders of the US government, despite ample evidence that he was already dead at the time of the attack... The files are no longer at the Pentagon, they have been sent to the CIA, in violation of the Freedom of Information Act. ...According to the official statement, the record transfer from the Pentagon to the CIA has nothing to do with Freedom of Information. Its objective was ‘to protect the

names of the personnel involved in the raid, according to the inspector general's draft report.” [48978]

Obama travels to a community college in Maryland to push support for ObamaCare, and claims, “Once it's working really well, I guarantee you they will not call it ‘ObamaCare.’” His whopper repertoire includes: “There's no widespread evidence the Affordable Care Act is hurting jobs.” (FoxNews.com reports, “According to an April survey conducted by the Society for Human Resource Management, 41% of 603 small business owners said they have delayed hiring because of the federal healthcare law. One in five already cut hours, while 20% have reduced payroll. Mercer, a human resources consulting company, said its own survey found that 12% of all U.S. employers reported plans to reduce workers' hours as a direct result of the Affordable Care Act. The impact was more pronounced in the retail and hospitality industries, with 20% of employers saying they will cut part-time hours. Most recently, theme-park operator SeaWorld Entertainment revealed that it reduced its cap on weekly hours for part-timers to 28 from 32.” How Obama defines “widespread” is not known.) [48844, 48853, 48855, 48863, 48870, 48880, 48917, 48933]

Obama says, “Let's say... let's say you're a young woman—I'm interested in this because I've got two daughters, right? Let's say you just turned 26. Let's say you can't stay on your parents' plan anymore. If you buy health care through the [ObamaCare] marketplace, your plan has to cover free checkups, flu shots, contraceptive care—so you might end up getting more health care each month than you're paying for the premiums. ...Knowing you can offer your family the security of health care—that's priceless. Now you can do it for the cost of your cable [television] bill—probably less than your cell phone bill. Think about that—good health insurance for the price of your cell phone bill—or less.” (The remarks are ludicrous—unless one's cell phone bill runs into the hundreds of dollars each month, in which case some would argue the taxpayers should not have to subsidize that person's health insurance. Additionally, if everyone “end[s] up getting more health care each month than you're paying for the premiums,” the health insurance company will lose money and go out of business.) Obama's remarks are so outrageous that they are certain to draw criticism—and perhaps even questions of his mental stability. [48875]

Obama tells the mostly black audience of college students, “And the closer we get [to ObamaCare implementation], the more desperate they [Republicans] get. Over the last few weeks, the rhetoric has just been cranked up to a place I've never seen before. One congressman said that Obamacare is the most dangerous piece of legislation ever passed—ever, in the history of America, this is the most dangerous piece of legislation... You had a state representative somewhere say that it's as destructive to personal and individual liberty as the Fugitive Slave Act. Think about that. Affordable health care is worse than a law that lets slave owners get their runaway slaves back. I mean, these are quotes. I'm not making this stuff up. And here's one more that I've heard. I like this one. We have to—and I'm quoting here, ‘We have to repeal this failure before it literally kills women, kills children, kills senior citizens.’ Now, I have to say, that one was from six months ago. I just want to point out we still have women, we still have children, we still

have senior citizens. All this would be funny if it wasn't so crazy. ...So Maryland, I'm asking for your help. I need your help. We may have some very well-funded opponents. We may have some very talkative opponents. But you're going to be the best, most credible messengers to spread the word about this law and all the benefits that the American people stand to get and have earned. So tell your friends, tell your family, get covered, get on that website. Answer the questions of folks who don't know what this is all about, point them to [healthcare.gov](http://healthcare.gov). Teach them how to use the website. Make sure they sign up. Let's help our fellow Americans get covered." [48921]

The Obama administration—which has had more than three years to prepare for the implementation of its health care legislation—postpones enrollment in the ObamaCare exchanges for small businesses from October 1 to November. Politico observes, “The one-month delay is not a major blow to the health care law—the exchanges for individuals are still expected to open on time. [Actually, some of them probably will not open on time.] But it's yet another PR [public relations] headache for the White House as it ramps up a major Obamacare sales pitch just five days before open enrollment is scheduled to begin.” Senator Orrin Hatch (R-UT) states, “This law is a disaster, but the exchanges—the heart of the law—are supposed to go live in just five days. Give me a break. This law will never be ready for primetime because this is what happens when Washington takes over health care.” [48845, 48846, 48871, 48903, 48906]

White House press secretary Jay Carney tells reporters, “I would absolutely enroll” in the ObamaCare exchanges—“if I did not have employer-provided health insurance.” [48919]

Meanwhile, Senator David Vitter (R-LA) states on the floor of the Senate that the Obama administration's exception allowing members of Congress and their staff to receive taxpayer-funded subsidies for ObamaCare insurance is “clearly, unequivocally illegal because it's in conflict with the language of the statute. The rule does two things. First of all, even though the statute says clearly that every member of Congress and all official congressional staff go to the exchange, the draft rule says, ‘Well, we don't know what ‘official staff’ is, so we're gonna leave that up to every individual member of Congress to decide who on his or her staff is official staff for purposes of this provision. We're never gonna second guess them.’ So in theory, a member of Congress can say, ‘Well, my committee staff isn't official staff, my leadership staff isn't official staff.’ In fact, in theory, under this proposed rule, a member of Congress can say nobody on my staff is, quote, ‘official staff’ for purposes of this provision, and OPM [Office of Personnel and Management] has made clear, ‘We're not gonna second guess that.’ That's ridiculous on its face. And second, Mr. [Senate] President, the rule says for members and any staff who do go to the exchange, they get to take a big fat taxpayer-funded subsidy with them, a subsidy that's completely unavailable to any other American at that income level going to the exchange. That's not in the statute at all; that's contrary to the statute, the letter, the law, the spirit, that's contrary to it completely.” [48920]

Senator Joe Manchin (D-WV) announces he would support a continuing resolution to fund the government even if it includes a one-year delay in the implementation of the ObamaCare individual mandate. Manchin says, “There's no way I could not vote for it.

It's very reasonable and sensible." (HotAir.com observes, "Unlike many other red-state Democrats, [Manchin is] not up for reelection next year. He's safe in West Virginia until 2018. Either he supports delay on the merits (he ran an ad three years ago in which he literally shot a hole through a copy of the bill) or he thinks the political fallout of backing O-Care will be so gruesome that it'll still be a liability for him in five years. Either way, this is just the sort of political cover that Democrats who are up for reelection in conservative states need to vote with the GOP. [Mark] Pryor [D-AR], [Mary] Landrieu [D-LA], [Mark] Begich [D-AK], [Kay] Hagan [D-NC]—Republicans could conceivably have 50 votes or more for delay headed into debt-ceiling negotiations. That won't break a filibuster but it does complicate the White House's message of blaming everything on those darned wingnuts and their anti-ObamaCare monomania.") [48848, 48905]

Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid (D-NV) tells reporters, "Listen, I know you have been listening, but we want a clean CR [continuing resolution]—that's what we're gonna [sic; going to] get. If they want to shut down the government, here's how much time they have to figure it out: 4 days, 11 hours, 22 minutes, and 15 seconds. No! They can play around all they want. Some of the biggest supporters for doing away with the, uh, stupid tax—I, I'm sorry, I shouldn't have said that—doing away with that tax, uh, have told me they will not support that on CR." (By "stupid tax" Reid means the job-killing, 2.3 percent medical device tax in ObamaCare—a tax that is applied to manufactures of medical devices *even if they make no profit.*) [48918]

The "True the Vote" organization files a motion in an Obama administration lawsuit against the Texas voter identification legislation. True the Vote president Catherine Engelbrecht states, "The [Eric] Holder Justice Department has made clear its litigation against Texas will serve as a warning that other states should not pursue election integrity measures. True the Vote stands ready to fight their effort to dilute voters' rights. Over 80 percent of Americans favor laws changing to require photo voter identification at the polls. When the DOJ [Department of Justice] makes baseless claims to obscure the integrity of the voting process, we will not stand idly by. If Texas is to be labeled a political prize by the Plaintiffs and their Interveners, attacking election integrity will not be an acceptable strategy." The motion states, "The Plaintiff [DOJ] is attempting to obtain a remedy which this Court does not have the jurisdiction to grant. This Court does not have the authority to impose statewide mandates on Texas to submit all future state, county and local election law changes to the Plaintiff for approval under Section 3 of the Voting Rights Act." [48849]

House Speaker John Boehner (R-OH) tells reporters, "On the debt limit, we're going to introduce a plan that ties important spending cuts and pro-growth reforms to a debt limit increase. We're not going to ignore Washington's spending problem and we're not going to accept this new normal of a weak economy, no new jobs and shrinking wages. ... We have a spending problem that has to be addressed. If you really want to begin to solve this problem, we not only have to control spending but we also have to have real economic growth that allows Americans a better shot at a better job with better wages—and more hours [rather than reduced working hours because of ObamaCare]. ... Now [Obama] says, 'I'm not going to negotiate.' Well, I'm sorry, but it just doesn't work that way." House



Majority Whip Kevin McCarthy (R-CA) adds, “You know, it’s kind of interesting—you read the stories of different things that different people do... I read a headline that the speaker gets a phone call from [Obama]. I first think that’s a very positive thing that’s gonna [sic] happen. We’re going to see movement. [But Obama] didn’t call to say, ‘Let’s work together.’ He just called to say, ‘I will not negotiate.’ That’s not the same message he gives to world leaders. ...This is a time that one, we’re Americans first. We ask [Obama] to call again, but this time, don’t call to say you won’t talk. Do exactly what the American people ask—sit down and work together so we can get this country moving one more time.” [48873]

FoxNews.com reports that the last of 22 saw mills in Josephine County, Oregon has closed, “signaling the end of an era. ...Many in [the county’s] decimated small towns blame The Endangered Species Act, which paved the way for a flood of lawsuits blocking federal timber sales, because of an endangered species in the region. ...In the last two decades since the spotted owl was listed as an endangered species, more than 200 sawmills have closed in the Pacific Northwest directly killing 40,000 good-paying jobs. It has turned Josephine County, once Oregon’s fastest growing, into its poorest with 30 percent of the residents using food stamps.” The House of Representatives has passed the “Restoring Healthy Forests for Healthy Communities Act” by a bi-partisan vote of 249–166. The legislation “would take 1.8 million acres of federal land in Oregon currently being managed by the Bureau of Land Management and put it into a trust to be managed under Oregon’s environmental laws for timber harvest. ...But if the bill were to pass in the Senate, it could face [an Obama] veto. Senior advisers signaled they would recommend ...Obama veto it. The Statement of Administration Policy, issued last week, says the bill would ‘accelerate commercial timber harvests without appropriate environmental review and public involvement.’ In other words, it would be far tougher for environmental groups to sue to block future timber sales on those 1.8 million acres.” [48878]

According to a CNBC All-America Economic Survey, “nearly one in five Americans believe their health insurance costs have gone up because of Obamacare. ...Premiums have risen for many years and 43 percent of respondents report higher premiums in the poll for any reason, including the health care law.” [48879]

Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid (D-NV) says, “We’re not going to bow to Tea Party anarchists who deny the mere fact that ObamaCare is the law. We will not bow to Tea Party anarchists who refuse to accept that the Supreme Court ruled that ObamaCare is constitutional.” (Reid’s complaint is nonsensical. Conservatives certainly understand that ObamaCare was passed into law and ruled constitutional by the Supreme Court—but that does not mean Americans cannot demand that the law be repealed. Additionally, wanting to get rid of ObamaCare certainly does not make one anarchist. Reid’s comments are broadcast by the mainstream media without criticism—even though a conservative calling Democrats “anarchists” would be subject to a media crucifixion.) At Townhall.com Jonah Goldberg comments, “Reid is a dim and sallow man whose tin ear long ago started to rust. But it’s worth pointing out that ‘anarchy’ is not defined in any textbook or dictionary I can find as ‘the absence of Obamacare.’ While, yes, it’s true,

most ‘Mad Max,’ zombie and other post-apocalyptic films are set in worlds without Obamacare, that’s really not the most salient factor. More to the point, petitioning Congress to repeal a bad law through formal procedures is not the kind of behavior educated people normally associate with anarchism.”) [48897]

According to a YouGov poll, 49 percent of Americans believe Russian President Vladimir Putin was more effective than Obama in dealing with the Syrian chemical weapons issue; only 25 percent credited Obama with being effective. [48881]

WashingtonExaminer.com reports that “Members of the Chicago-based Service Employees International Union Local 1 have gone on strike over recent job cuts by a janitorial company called Professional Maintenance. The reason for the cuts? The employer says it is because of the Affordable Care Act, also known as Obamacare. This is ironic since SEIU is a major supporter of the law. Tyler French, Local 1’s organizing director, told Mediatrackers Ohio the company claimed it had to cut its employees’ hours due to Obamacare mandates.” [48883, 48884, 48958]

At WND.com Pat Buchanan writes that Senator] Ted Cruz (R-TX) “may have, as Richard Nixon used to say, ‘broken his pick’ in the Republican caucus. Yet, on Obamacare, his analysis is right, his instincts are right, his disposition to fight is right. These are more important matters than the news that he is out of the running for the Mr. Congeniality award on Capitol Hill. If Obamacare is funded, the subsidies starting in January will constitute a morphine drip from which America’s health-care system will not recover. If not stopped now, Obamacare is forever. Senate Republicans should be asking themselves why Cruz and Rand Paul, two newcomers to the Senate of decidedly different temperaments, are being talked of as credible candidates in the presidential primaries of 2016. Answer: Both are clear in their convictions, unapologetic about them and willing to break some china to achieve them. And that part of America upon which the GOP depends most is increasingly frustrated and angry with those who run the national party. Americans don’t want a dignified surrender on Obamacare. They want someone to drive a stake through Obamacare. ...The law authorizing ...Obama to spend more money for Obamacare expires Sept. 30. If the House refuses to vote for any bill that contains new Obamacare funding, Obamacare is dead. Thus the Republican House controls the fate of Obamacare. ...What House Republicans have lacked is not courage, but a political and communications strategy. Having provided a continuing resolution [CR] to fund the government, except Obamacare, the House should next begin passing CRs—one for each department. A CR to fund defense and veterans affairs. A CR to fund state, the CIA and Homeland Security. A CR for justice, transportation, energy, etc. One every day. Would Harry Reid refuse to fund the U.S. Army and Navy unless John Boehner’s House stuffs Obamacare into the defense budget? Do Republicans really feel incapable of winning this argument? ...Two weeks ago, a brave Congress, listening to America, stood up and told Obama: Your red lines be damned; we’re not voting for war on Syria. Now House Republicans need to tell the country: Come hell or high water, we’re not voting to fund Obamacare. We will pass a CR on everything else in the budget, but Obamacare is not coming out of this House alive.” [48885]

At AmericanThinker.com Pamela Geller writes, “Does the extinguished candle care about the darkness? Ask the huddled masses who are yearning to be free. America was once thought of as a light unto nations. Obama has single-handedly extinguished that light. ...Obama seems bound and determined to drive America over a cliff and make [author Fareed] Zakaria’s vision of the future [with a diminished America] a self-fulfilling prophecy. Obama went to work from his first day in office to make Zakaria’s wishful thinking about America’s decline a reality. As the most powerful man in the world, he would level the playing field, even if it meant cutting America off at the knees. Good and evil would be made equivalent, with evil sanctioned by the world’s only remaining superpower. He turned against our allies (particularly Israel) and showed them that America could not be relied on. He taxed us into poverty and stirred up racial strife to make us all less safe. He has enabled Russia to re-emerge as a world power, and the Islamic jihadists are bolder than ever.” [48889]

“[D]uring the Muslim massacre at a Nairobi mall, whom did Kenyan officials call for help? They called Israel. Obama is Kenyan, with close relatives in the country. It is his native land, the country where his father was born. So you might think he would have sent help, but his father (and stepfather) were Muslim; perhaps that is why he always comes down on the side of the jihad. ...Egypt, in a fierce rebuke of Obama and his patronage of the Muslim Brotherhood, on Monday banned the Brotherhood. Here in America the Muslim Brotherhood should be designated a terrorist organization like Hamas (an MB group), along with its proxies in the U.S. such as CAIR, ISNA, MSA, and MAS. Despite Egypt’s massive rejection of Islamic supremacism, and despite the recent rash of Muslim on non-Muslim attacks, the jihad-aligned media is digging in and whitewashing Islam and jihad, while doing everything they can to make Obama look good. But despite their best efforts, that task is getting harder and harder. And the absence of America acting in the defense of freedom across the world is proof that Ayn Rand was right when she said that ‘the spread of evil is the symptom of a vacuum. Whenever evil wins, it is only by default: by the moral failure of those who evade the fact that there can be no compromise on basic principles.’ And the Obama presidency is an epic moral failure.” [48889]

DailyCaller.com reports, “A leaked State Department email indicates that officials were worried about the safety of House Oversight Committee chairman Rep. Darrell Issa after Democrats [i.e., Congressman Elijah Cummings (D-MD)] revealed his plans for a secret trip to Libya this week. Issa, a Republican from California, has safely returned from his fact-finding trip to the country as his committee continues to investigate the terrorist attacks that killed America’s ambassador and three others in Benghazi on Sept. 11, 2012. CBS News reported Thursday on an email that quoted a Libyan national sharing ‘his concern and his opinion that Representative Issa should not come to Libya for his own safety.’” Issa spokesman Frederick Hill states, “Ranking Member Elijah Cummings’ reckless release of information was not going to deter Chairman Issa from conducting his oversight responsibilities in the wake of the Benghazi tragedy. Fortunately, despite the media attention and resulting threat, no security incident occurred during Rep. Issa’s time in Libya.” (Whether Cummings intentionally released information about the secret trip in order to jeopardize the safety of Issa—an Obama critic—is not known.) [48899]

Congresswoman Renee Ellmers (R-NC) warns that ObamaCare will be creating health insurance monopolies in several areas of the country. Ellmers states, “Although seven insurance companies currently operate in North Carolina, under the new Obamacare exchanges, those options will dwindle down to one in the majority of counties.” (Blue Cross Blue Shield will be the only insurer operating in more than 60 percent of the state’s counties.) “The whole point of an online marketplace was to provide options, so North Carolinians could go online, compare prices, and choose plans from different companies. That is how competition is supposed to work.” (According to DailyCaller.com, “At least five Blue Cross Blue Shield executives joined ...Obama for a closed White House conference in April on Obamacare implementation, accounting for approximately half of the executives present. No Aetna executives were at the meeting.”) [48900]

Obama political advisor Dan Pfeiffer says the White House “is for cutting spending. We’re for reforming our tax code, we’re for reforming entitlements. What we’re not for is negotiating with people with a bomb strapped to their chest. ...It is not a negotiation if I show up at your house and say, ‘Give me everything inside or I’m going to burn it down.’ The Republicans have provided a laundry list of essentially ransom demands.” (On the other hand, of course, Obama has essentially said, “Give me everything I want, and I refuse to negotiate on anything.” Pfeiffer’s comment raises a few eyebrows, but if an advisor to George W. Bush had called Democrats suicide bombers the media would have called for an immediate resignation.) It is worth noting that Obama, and every other Senate Democrat, voted against raising the debt ceiling in 2006. [48907, 48966]

NationalJournal.com claims that ObamaCare is creating jobs—and then goes on to explain what those jobs are: “[C]all centers set up to answer questions about the law and in-person navigators and ‘assisters’ who will help sign people up for insurance coverage.” “[T]echnology jobs needed to launch insurance exchanges, manage the federal data hub, and provide better digital performance measures for health care providers.” “[T]he lawyers, consultants, and former administration and congressional staffers who are now advising companies on how to deal with the new rules and regulations.” (In other words, the new jobs are positions that manufacture nothing, create nothing, and do nothing but administer a bloated bureaucracy. ObamaCare could just as easily have “created jobs” by calling for millions of holes to be dug and then re-filled.) [48911, 48912]

Obama’s ambassador to the United Nations, Samantha Power, brags via Twitter, “Agreement reached w/Russia on UNSC [U.N. Security Council] Resolution legally obligating Syria to give up CW [chemical weapons] they used on their people. Going to full UNSC tonight.” “The draft UNSCR establishes that Syria’s use of CW is threat to international peace & security & creates a new norm against the use of CW.” “Wrapping up meeting of UNSC, which is finally ready to impose measures under Chapter VII if Syria does not comply.” HotAir.com’s Ed Morrissey comments, “That depends on the definition of ‘ready.’ The actual UNSC resolution does not include an option to resort to force under Chapter VII...” it merely states that the Security Council is authorized to consider force. Russia has veto power on the Security Council—which means the use of

force might never be agreed to. Morrissey: “An even clearer translation: the US lost. Despite Power’s claims, the UN isn’t ‘ready’ to impose anything under Chapter VII. Russia made sure of that. It will take at least one vote at the UNSC and possibly two for the UN to be ‘ready’ to act under Chapter VII, and it’s a safe bet that Russia will exercise its vetoes in either or both cases to make sure no one attacks Syria—at least not under the auspices of the UN. ...The bluster about military strikes ended up netting the US nothing... except egg on our faces. Now we have the Russians leading Western diplomacy, Assad as an essential player in securing chemical weapons, and all the incentives for both to string this out as long as possible. This must be what’s known as *smart power*.” [48913]

Although Obama claims, “There’s no widespread evidence the Affordable Care Act is hurting jobs,” the Fall 2013 Keystone Business Climate Survey, conducted by the Lincoln Institute of Public Opinion Research, Inc., suggests otherwise: “Confusion and concern surrounding implementation of Obamacare have 78% of the business leaders responding expecting an increase in employee health care costs. Conversely, only three percent actually expect the Affordable Health Care Act to be more affordable. *As a result of Obamacare* [emphasis added], 21% of the companies participating in the poll said they have increased employee co-pay[s]; 15% have reduced their number of employees; 15% have raised their prices; 11% have cut staff hours and 7% have discontinued providing employees with health care coverage. Three-quarters of the respondents say Obamacare should be entirely repealed, while another 10% support delaying implementation. Eleven percent said the act should be implemented as scheduled. The intensity of opinion surrounding Obamacare is so strong that 69% of the CEOs/owners support congress voting to defund the Affordable Health Care Act even if it triggers a general shut-down of the federal government. ...Not only is the economy not improving, the Lincoln Institute survey found by over a two-to-one margin the business chieftains said [Pennsylvania’s] business climate has gotten worse over the past six months. Thirty-one percent indicated business conditions are worse, while 14% say it has improved; 55% say the economic climate has remained about the same. Looking ahead six months 30% expect business conditions to continue deteriorating; 15% expect conditions to improve. ...Scoring the highest disapproval rating was ...Obama who got a thumbs down from 86% of the CEOs/owners polled; only 9% gave [him] a positive job approval rating. Fifty-two percent disapprove of the job being done by outgoing Federal Reserve Chairman Ben Bernanke; 23% approve. U.S. Senator Robert P. Casey, Jr.’s positive job approval among the business leaders stands at 14%; 62% disapprove. As for U.S. Senator Patrick J. Toomey, 45% approve of the job he is doing while 26% disapprove. However, Toomey’s positive rating is down 13% since the Spring survey when 58% approved of the job he is doing in Washington, D.C.” [48844, 48853, 48855, 48863, 48870, 48880, 48917, 48933, 48934]

On September 27 Senate conservatives round up only 19 votes in an effort to stop debate on the continuing resolution. The Senate then votes 54–44, along party lines, to restore ObamaCare funding and continue government operations through November 15. The legislation returns to the Republican-controlled House, either for approval or revision—and another trip back to the Senate. [48890, 48891, 48901]

Senator Heidi Heitkamp (D-ND) states, “We know that we have the votes here in the Senate [to call for approval of the Keystone XL pipeline]. We certainly have the votes in the House. In fact, I think we could build enough votes to override [an expected Obama] veto. ... The Keystone Pipeline decision has taken longer than it took us to defeat Hitler. There’s just something wrong with this process.” Heitkamp observes that Obama “got himself painted into the corner” by unreasonable environmentalists. “He’s having a very difficult time to find a real, factual, legal reason to deny the permit.” [48892, 48893]

Secretary of State John Kerry says terrorism could be reduced if only “more economic opportunities [could be provided] for marginalized youth at risk of recruitment. In country after country, you look at the demographics—Egypt, the West Bank—60 percent of the young people either under the age of 30 or under the age of 25, 50 percent under the age of 21, 40 percent under the age of 18, all of them wanting jobs, opportunity, education, and a future.” (Some might argue that the Obama administration should first worry about creating jobs for Americans before it loses sleep over Egyptians and Palestinians.) [49006]

In a Public Policy Polling survey, Senator Ted Cruz (R-TX) leads all other GOP 2016 presidential hopefuls with 20 percent. The numbers “also suggest that Cruz is now viewed more broadly as the leader of the Republican Party. When asked whether they trust Cruz or GOP leader Mitch McConnell [R-KY] more, Cruz wins out 49/13. When it comes to who’s more trusted between Cruz and Speaker John Boehner [R-OH], Cruz has a 51/20 advantage. And when it comes to Cruz and 2008 GOP nominee and Senate colleague John McCain [R-AZ], Cruz wins out 52/31. He now has more credibility with the GOP base than the folks who have been leading the party for years.” [48898]

Obama’s approval/disapproval rating is 39/55 in a Reuters/Ipsos poll; among independent voters, Obama’s number are an even more terrible 23/69; 64 percent of those polled say the nation is “on the wrong track.” [48908, 48909]

Prior to an Obama press conference, Iranian President Hassan Rouhani sends a Twitter message stating that he had a telephone conversation with Obama. (Obama reportedly initiated the call.) At the press conference, Obama confirms the discussion. (HotAir.com: “Having snubbed O at the UN a few days ago, evidently Tehran decided it was time for some sugar to keep him on the hook. Expect that pattern to recur over the next six months or year or 10 years or however much longer the endless nuke kabuki plays out. A little obstinance for domestic consumption, then a little outreach to the west to keep hopes of a deal alive to buy more time for bomb-making.”) Obama, who calls ObamaCare a “done deal,” tells reporters he will not negotiate with the Republicans over the debt ceiling and spending cuts. (He will apparently deal with Hassan Rouhani, but not with House Speaker John Boehner or Senator Ted Cruz.) Obama says, “Nobody [that is, Republicans] gets to hurt our economy, and millions of innocent people, just because there are a couple of laws you do not like. ... [You] do not threaten to burn the house down just because you haven’t gotten 100 percent of your way.” (But Obama demands 100 percent of *his* way.) [48914, 48915, 48937, 48940, 48943, 48944, 49013]

The next day, ynetnews.com reports, “‘Have a nice day’—this is how Iranian President Hassan Rouhani concluded his phone conversation with ...Obama, the first direct contact between leaders of the two nations in over three decades. A message on Rouhani’s Twitter page, which has since been deleted, stated that Obama answered in Farsi by saying ‘khodahafez’ to indicate goodbye, whose literal meaning is ‘may God be with you.’” [49111]

Brendan Buck, spokesman for House Speaker John Boehner (R-OH), responds to Obama’s demands: “The House will take action that reflects the fundamental fact that Americans don’t want a government shutdown and they don’t want the train wreck that is Obamacare. Grandstanding from [Obama], who refuses to even be a part of the process, won’t bring Congress any closer to a resolution.” [48902]

Author and radio talk show host Mark Levin tells his listeners, “Obama has been in full, nut-job mode today... I actually think the man is unstable. I really do. ...I’m watching him. He’s angry. He’s petulant. ‘I, I, I, me me, me.’ He’s threatening. He’s out of control. I think the man is unstable. ...We know about the pathological, serial lying that goes on, about his programs, about the economy, about health care, about his administration, about the Republicans. But now, he just seems unstable to me.” (*The Obama Timeline* agrees with Levin that Obama shows increasing signs of mental instability, and believes that he may “crack” if he loses a major political battle. Obama is barely able to handle criticism, let alone defeat.) [48927]

Senator John McCain (R-AZ) hires Elizabeth O’Bagy, the controversial Syria analyst who opposes calling al-Qaeda a terrorist group and who was fired for lying about her education credentials, falsely claiming she had a combined master’s/PhD. O’Bagy has laughably claimed that it is possible to provide Syrian rebels with weapons without the risk of radical Islamists getting them. [48916, 48939]

At AmericanThinker.com Matthew Vadum writes, “It matters next to nothing if current Republican efforts succeed in immediately defunding Obamacare. That’s because this is just the opening round of what promises to be a protracted struggle to restore sanity to the American health care system. A temporary defeat at one juncture on the road to repeal isn’t really a defeat at all, provided that it serves a larger purpose. Obamacare, after all, wasn’t enacted in a day and it won’t be repealed in a day. Both the Ted Cruz talkathon and the brinkmanship over the stop-gap government funding measure (called a ‘continuing resolution’) epitomize purposeful political theater. Ignore the blatherskite spewing from GOP establishment talking heads like Karl Rove: there is absolutely nothing wrong with doing political things strictly for public consumption even when there is a less-than-direct or less-than-obvious relationship between the things done and the desired results. ...Right now the public is receptive to anti-Obamacare overtures. A new Rasmussen poll says a bare majority of Americans is now okay with at least a ‘partial’ government shutdown. An ABC/Washington Post poll shows 9 of 10 Americans don’t believe the federal government, their state governments, and the health insurance industry are fully prepared to implement Obamacare. Headline after headline brings news

of government bureaucracy's inability to get health insurance exchanges up and running. In 16 ABC/Post polls since August 2009, Obamacare has never received majority support and 6 in 10 Americans now believe the federal government has too much power, according to Gallup polls. ...So the question arises, if not now, when? ... We know with absolute certainty that the program, which is even more centralizing than Britain's disastrous national health care system, will fail, harming health outcomes, causing huge lineups and backlogs, stifling medical and pharmaceutical innovations, and bankrupting the up-till-now greatest nation on earth. We are in uncharted territory and the normal rules Republicans like to honor simply don't apply here. This is not just another law. This is an America-killer. It's time to stop worrying about the Republican Party and go to war for America's sake." [48922]

In an interview with *The Guardian*, Seymour Hersh—who was awarded the Pulitzer Prize for exposing the My Lai massacre in Vietnam—excoriates the American news media. Hersh says *The New York Times* spends “so much more time carrying water for Obama than I ever thought they would” and claims “Nothing's been done about that story [the killing of Osama bin Laden], it's one big lie, not one word of it is true. ...The Pakistanis put out a report, don't get me going on it. Let's put it this way, it was done with considerable American input. It's a bullshit report.” (In a Pakistani National TV interview, Muhammad Bashir, who lives next door to the alleged bin Laden compound in Abbotabad, stated that everyone in the Navy SEAL landing party died when the helicopter exploded on lift-off. Bashir states that he and other neighbors saw the dead bodies and body parts in and around the wreckage. It may be that the subsequent helicopter that reportedly took the lives of the Navy SEALs involved in the operation was a ruse to cover up the fact that they had already been killed.) The media, says Hersh, is “pathetic, they are more than obsequious, they are afraid to pick on this guy [Obama]. ...It used to be when you were in a situation when something very dramatic happened, the president and the minions around the president had control of the narrative, you would pretty much know they [in the media] would do the best they could to tell the story straight [despite the White House propaganda]. Now that doesn't happen any more. Now they take advantage of something like that and they work out how to re-elect the president. ...[During] The Bush era, I felt it was much easier to be critical than it is [of] Obama. Much more difficult in the Obama era. ...I'll tell you the solution, get rid of 90 percent of the editors that now exist and start promoting editors that you can't control. I saw it in the New York Times, I see [that the] people who get promoted are the ones on the desk who are more amenable to the publisher and what the senior editors want and the trouble makers don't get promoted. Start promoting better people who look you in the eye and say 'I don't care what you say.' ...I would close down the news bureaus of the networks and [say], 'Let's start all over, tabula rasa. The majors, NBCs, ABCs, they won't like this—just do something different, do something that gets people mad at you, that's what we're supposed to be doing. ...The republic's in trouble, we lie about everything, lying has become the staple.” [48923, 48924, 48955, 48956, 48980]

WBUR.org reports that Massachusetts' “largest employer group says it may sue the federal government over a provision in Obamacare that will hike premiums for some small businesses. The federal health care law changes the way individual and small



business insurance rates are calculated. The Obama administration agreed to let Massachusetts phase in the new system, but said in a letter today that the state must eventually comply. Under the changes, some employers will see their rates drop, but others may see dramatic increases.” [48925]

At ClashDaily.com Michael Walsh comments, “After his disgraceful attacks on [Senator Ted] Cruz [R-TX], including his reach-across-the-aisle, dog-in-the-manger response today, this should be the end of Senator John McCain [R-AZ] as a voice of influence in the Republican party. Ditto his mini-me, Senator Lindsey Graham [R-SC]. Indeed, the entire Old Guard of business-as-usual ‘comity’ fans passeth. When you care more about what the other side thinks, it’s probably time either to switch teams or step down. There is new leadership in the GOP, whether the party wants to admit it or not: Cruz, Rand Paul [R-KY], Mike Lee [R-UT], Jeff Sessions [R-AL], and the others who stepped into the breach to spell the senator from Texas. The popular reaction to Cruz will be immediate and noticeable; the more the old bulls carp, the more the public will rally to Cruz’s side. The country has been spoiling for a real fight since the election of 2008, and now it has one. ...The Cruz faction in the Senate, and its allies in the House (whose leadership is now up for grabs) must now press their advantage. The louder the Democrats squawk, the more they are wounded; the one thing they’ve long feared is a direct assault on their core beliefs *as translated into actions*, and the deleterious effects of Obamacare, just now being felt by the population, are the most vivid proof of the failure of Progressivism that conservatives could wish for. Win or lose, the battle is now joined: First the struggle for the GOP and then the battle for control of Congress and the presidency. Cruz just struck at the kings he could reach—the Republican ‘leadership’—and has most likely dealt them a fatal blow. Now the Tea Party hordes must back him up by eliminating his opponents (who tend to be geriatrics, and thus ‘leaders’ by longevity rather than talent or commitment) through the primary process wherever possible. If he can carry off this coup, he and Senator Paul will very quickly find themselves elevated from back-benchers to commanders.” [48926]

WashingtonExaminer.com reports, “A unique new survey of health care professionals finds that 56 percent oppose Obamacare, with more than nine in 10 believing that there could be major negative impacts such as a drop in quality care. A shocking 19 percent believe Americans will die earlier. In its 2013 Health Care Survey of 200 top health care professionals nationally, Coupa Software [learned] that health care professionals are worried about a number of setbacks that the health law could result in [sic]. Asked to list the ‘negative impacts,’ of which they could pick several, here’s what Coupa found: 53 percent, ‘Quality of health insurance policies will suffer.’ 51 percent, ‘Quality of care will go down.’ 49 percent, ‘The law is overly complicated.’ 42 percent, ‘Insurance exchanges will be poorly managed.’ 37 percent, ‘The law still allows insurance companies to be the middleman.’ 32 percent, ‘Too complex for businesses.’ 19 percent, ‘Americans will die earlier.’” [48928]

According to Politico, “A longtime adviser and confidante of Hillary Clinton had ‘special government status’ while the former Secretary of State was at [the State Department], allowing her to work on a targeted project about women’s issues while she maintained

her own business... Maggie Williams, who has been in Hillary Clinton's orbit for years and who took over her campaign after a shakeup in the 2008 presidential race, was granted 'SGE status' to work with the Global Women's Issues office, officials said. ...The subject of SGE status during Clinton's tenure has gained attention since Politico first reported that Clinton's top aide, Huma Abedin, had received the status after working as the Secretary's deputy chief-of-staff. It allowed the New York City-based Abedin... to consult for outside clients and simultaneously work at State." (In other words, while the taxpayers were paying Abedin and Williams to perform work for the government, they were actually earning money on the side—with Clinton's blessings.) [48929]

The Florida Supreme Court denies a writ of mandamus in *Michael Voeltz v. Barack Hussein Obama*, a lawsuit charging that Obama perpetrated identity fraud. [48930, 48931]

In Montana, a state law goes into effect October 1 that will prohibit health care providers from refusing to provide service because the person declines to answer questions related to the ownership, possession, or use of firearms. The law will prohibit health care providers from inquiring about the possession of firearms. According to GOPtheDailyDose.com, "Governor Steve Bullock, a Democrat, signed the legislation into law to address concerns of gun owners that questioning by health care providers might be used as a collection tool and become the information might be centralized. This would then open the patient's privacy up to anti-gun bias by those same providers. The Montana law affects not only medical practitioners, but also psychological practitioners as well." (ObamaCare encourages physicians to ask patients about gun ownership.) [48932]

KCNC-TV reports that approximately \$600,000 in stimulus funds was used to plant trees in high-scale Denver neighborhoods, at no cost to the wealthy homeowners. [48936]

TimesOfIsrael.com reports, "Some Israeli government analysts believe Iran already has at least one nuclear bomb, an Israeli journalist wrote in an article published Friday. Shalom Yerushalmi, writing in the national daily Maariv, said that 'government security sources up to date on development in Iran,' told him recently that Tehran has crossed all points of no return and already has its first nuclear weapon, and maybe more." (AtlasShrugs.com's Pamela Geller writes, "You have to wonder if Obama didn't call Rouhani today to congratulate Iran" for the success of its nuclear program.) Whether Iran already has one or more nuclear weapons or is close to creating them is largely irrelevant—the Iranian leaders know Obama will not stop them. (Upon his return to the airport in Tehran, Iran, Rouhani is greeted by a crowd of about 100 that throws eggs and shoes at him in protest of his discussion with Obama. PJMedia's Michael Ledeen suggests that the "spontaneous" protest is a phony event designed to make it appear that Rouhani is a "moderate" whose telephone discussion with Obama upset the hardliners.) [48937, 48938, 48957, 49013]

England's *Daily Mail* reports on some of the sadistic actions by the Muslim jihadists in their Kenyan shopping center killing spree: "Soldiers told of the horrific torture meted

out by terrorists in the Nairobi mall massacre yesterday with claims hostages were dismembered, had their eyes gouged out and were left hanging from hooks in the ceiling. Men were said to have been castrated and had fingers removed with pliers before being blinded and hanged. Children were found dead in the food court fridges with knives still embedded in their bodies, it was claimed. Most of the defeated terrorists, meanwhile, were reportedly discovered ‘burnt to ashes,’ set alight by the last extremist standing to try to protect their identities.” One Kenyan doctor states [grammar not corrected], “You find people with hooks hanging from the roof. They removed eyes, ears, nose. They get your hand and sharpen it like a pencil then they tell you to write your name with the blood. They drive knives inside a child’s body. Actually if you look at all the bodies, unless those ones that were escaping, fingers are cut by pliers, the noses are ripped by pliers. Here it was pain.” The *Daily Mail*: “One girl at the event, 16-year-old Nehal Vekariya, was shot through the eye, according to The Sunday Times. The paper reports her father’s final phone conversation with her. He said: ‘She said ‘I’m okay, I’m with friends, call Mummy fast and tell her I’m okay.’ When her mother called her she heard yelling and then gunshots, then the line went dead. She had been cut down at close range.” (The U.S. media does its best to avoid reporting the gruesome nature of the killings—just as it has avoided using the words “Muslim” and “jihadist” to describe the terrorists.) [48942, 48987]

In *The Wall Street Journal* Peggy Noonan writes that at the United Nations General Assembly meeting, “a member of a diplomatic delegation of a major U.S. ally” said, “We want American leadership.” According to Noonan, “He said it softly, as if confiding he missed an old friend.” A prime minister “of a Western democracy” commented, “In the past we have seen some America overreach. Now I think we are seeing America underreach. ...The biggest risk is not political but social. Wealthy societies with people who think wealth is a given, a birthright—they do not understand that we are in the fight of our lives with countries and nations set on displacing us. Wealth is *earned*. It is far from being a given. It cannot be taken for granted. The recession reminded us how quickly circumstances can change.” Noonan observes, “Barack Obama’s reputation among his fellow international players has deflated, his stature almost collapsed. In diplomatic circles, attitudes toward his leadership have been declining for some time, but this week you could hear the disappointment, and something more dangerous: the sense that he is no longer, perhaps, all that relevant. Part of this is due, obviously, to his handling of the Syria crisis. If you draw a line and it is crossed and then you dodge, deflect, disappear and call it diplomacy, the world will notice, and not think better of you. Some of it is connected to the historical moment America is in. But some of it, surely, is just five years of Mr. Obama. World leaders do not understand what his higher strategic aims are, have doubts about his seriousness and judgment, and read him as unsure and covering up his unsureness with ringing words.” One “former senior U.S. diplomat” says, “World leaders are very negative about Obama” and are “disappointed, feeling he’s not really in charge. ...The Western Europeans don’t pay that much attention to him anymore.” [48949]

Noonan continues, “This reminded me of a talk a few weeks ago, with another veteran diplomat who often confers with leaders with whom Mr. Obama meets. I had asked:

When Obama enters a room with other leaders, is there a sense that America has entered the room? I mentioned [the late French President Charles] de Gaulle—when he was there, France was there. When Reagan came into a room, people stood: America just walked in. Does Mr. Obama bring that kind of mystique? ‘No,’ he said. ‘It’s not like that.’ When [Obama] spoke to the General Assembly, his speech was dignified and had, at certain points, a certain sternness of tone. But after a while, as he spoke, it took on the flavor of re-enactment. He had impressed these men and women once. In the cutaways on C-Span, some delegates in attendance seemed distracted, not alert, not sitting as if they were witnessing something important. One delegate seemed to be scrolling down on a BlackBerry, one rifled through notes. Two officials seated behind the president as he spoke seemed engaged in humorous banter. At the end, the applause was polite, appropriate and brief.” (Although Noonan’s words are mild, her message is brutal.) [48949]

Newsmax.com reports that the Obama administration is giving the bankrupt city of Detroit \$320 million in taxpayer funds to “fight crime, improve mass transport and eradicate blight.” (Many Americans will be enraged by the decision, for a variety of reasons. Some will argue that it is only “throwing good money after bad.” Others will simply say that Detroit should be razed. A frequent argument will likely be, “It sets a bad precedent. Now every city in the country will want bailout cash if it runs into financial problems.”) [48950]

At WND.com Aaron Klein reports that Mohamed Elibiary, a Muslim Brotherhood member who was appointed in 2010 to the Department of Homeland Security Advisory Council by then-secretary Janet Napolitano, “has used his Twitter profile to defend the Muslim Brotherhood while accusing Egypt’s persecuted Christian minority of inciting against Islam.” Elibiary essentially argues that the Coptic Christians “have it coming” because of their “Islamophobia.” (Fear of Muslims apparently justifies having one’s head cut off by a Muslim.) As noted previously in this *Timeline*, Elibiary had been given access to a “For Official Use” database and attempted to get the media to use some of the information to discredit Texas Governor Rick Perry. Napolitano pleaded ignorance and told Congress she knew nothing about his actions. In December 2004 Elibiary spoke at a conference honoring Iran’s Ayatollah Ruhollah Khomeini. In 2008, Mr. Elibiary denounced the terrorist-funding conviction of Hamas-connected members of the Holy Land Foundation. Elibiary is also an admirer of Sayyid Qutb, the “godfather of modern jihadism,” and he supports Shukri Abu Baker, the former CEO of the Holy Land Foundation who was convicted of funneling money from the charity to the terrorist group Hamas. [25810, 25811, 25812, 25815, 25818, 25819, 25826, 25856, 26075, 26076, 48962, 48963, 49394]

Doing its best to help Obama, NBC announces a week of programming to push ObamaCare. NBC issues a press release that reads in part, “The Affordable Care Act [ObamaCare] goes into effect on October 1st, but what does this mean for you and your family? During the week of September 30th, NBC News will devote special coverage across all of its platforms to ‘Ready or Not, the New Healthcare Law,’ an extensive series aimed at explaining the complexities of the ACA and its impact on consumers. Coverage

will span multiple screens—on air, across digital and through social media, and also provide users with interactive tools and resources, available on [NBCNews.com/Healthcare](http://NBCNews.com/Healthcare), to help shed light on what the healthcare act means for them and explain how to enroll.” [48965]

On September 28 the House Rules Committee meets to discuss changes to the continuing resolution to fund the government. Congressman Jim McGovern (D-MA) is asked by Congressman Hal Rogers (R-KY), “You say [Obama] has threatened to veto the bill?” McGovern responds, “No, he hasn’t threatened. He’s, uh, he said he absolutely will veto.” Rogers: “He’s drawn a red line?” McGovern: “Yep.” After considerable laughter, a flustered McGovern says, “And I, and I, I, I, I... you know what, I, I think, I think he’s very serious about this.” [48981, 49005]

House Speaker John Boehner (R-OH) and other House GOP leaders issue a statement announcing that House Republicans will amend the continuing resolution (CR) to delay ObamaCare’s implementation for one year and permanently repeal its 2.8 percent medical device tax: “Both of these amendments will change the date of the Senate CR to December 15th. We will also vote on a measure that ensures our troops get paid, no matter what. We will do our job and send this bill over, and then it’s up to the Senate to pass it and stop a government shutdown. ...The American people don’t want a government shut down and they don’t want ObamaCare. That’s why, later today, the House will vote on two amendments to the Senate-passed continuing resolution that will keep the government open and stop as much of [Obama’s] health care law as possible. ...The first amendment delays the ...health care law by one year, and the second permanently repeals ObamaCare’s medical device tax that is sending jobs overseas.” Congressman Mo Brooks (R-AL) states, “When people understand what the House of Representatives is doing, in that we are willing to fund 99 percent of the federal government that all parties agree of funding, then the American people are going to see that we’re not the obstructionists—the Senate is. If they continue to hold that 99 percent that we’re in agreement on in order to try to coerce the House of Representatives into spending money we don’t have on a socialized medicine people don’t want [sic].” (The Democrat-controlled Senate adjourned on September 27 and many Senators have left town for the weekend—which suggests they do not seem to care as much about funding the government as do the House Republicans.) [48945, 48946, 48947]

Although Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid (D-NV) insists he will only allow a “clean” continuing resolution bill that gives him and Obama everything they want, some Senate Democrats who did not have the courage to vote to completely defund ObamaCare may be willing to agree to a one-year postponement of the unpopular law—enabling them to get past the November 2014 mid-term elections. (Senator Joe Manchin (D-WV) has already indicated he would support a one-year delay.) Additionally, there is widespread bi-partisan support for the elimination of the medical device tax. The amended House proposal also has the advantage of showing that the Republicans are willing to compromise. If Senate Democrats reject the second House proposal, they run the risk of an increasing number of Americans holding them accountable for a government shutdown. At some point, Reid’s and Obama’s arrogant “We will not negotiate” stance

will overwhelm their “The Republicans are holding us hostage” argument. [48848, 48905, 48947]

During the House debate on the continuing resolution, Congresswoman Gwen Moore (D-WI) says, “This whole debate is a subterfuge and a proxy for a strong desire to bring this nation to its knees to punish the people for electing Barack Obama...” (In other words, Republicans are racists. Moore is black.) [49012]

Obama plays golf—which is apparently more important to him than negotiating with Republicans over a spending agreement that would avoid a government shutdown. (According to WhiteHouseDossier.com, “Obama as of Saturday has played golf 35 times in 2013, eclipsing the previous mark of 34 he set in 2011. And there’s still plenty of golf weather left in Washington. Meanwhile, he may well hit the links several times more once he gets to Hawaii for the Christmas holiday. Last year, with an election to be won, Obama only played 19 times. He golfed 28 times in 2009 and 30 times in 2010.”) [48967, 48972, 48992, 49004]

Bloomberg.com reports, “A U.S. government shutdown means ...Obama will have fewer people to cook meals, do the laundry, clean the floors or change the light bulbs, according to a White House contingency plan. About three-fourths of [Obama’s] 1,701-person staff would be sent home.” The Obama family would have to survive with only 15 maids and butlers, rather than 90. (In other words, a government shutdown would be considered a good thing by many Americans.) [48971]

DailyCaller.com lists the 10 states where the greatest number of residents may lose their existing health coverage as a result of ObamaCare: California: where “58,000 will lose their plans under Obamacare. The first bomb dropped in California with a mass exodus from the most populated state’s Obamacare exchange. Aetna, the country’s largest insurer, left first in July and was closely followed by UnitedHealth. Anthem Blue Cross pulled out of California’s Obamacare exchange for small businesses as well.” Missouri, where Anthem BlueCross BlueShield will not include 13 of the state’s hospitals in its ObamaCare exchange plans; Connecticut, where Aetna will not participate in the exchanges; Maryland, where “individuals covered by Aetna and its recently-purchased Coventry Health Care won’t be able to keep their insurance plans if they want Obamacare subsidies on the exchanges. Aetna and Coventry canceled plans to offer insurance in the exchange when state officials wouldn’t allow them to charge premiums high enough to cover costs.” South Carolina, where Medical Mutual of Ohio “decided to leave the state entirely in July due to Obamacare’s ‘vast and quite complex’ new regulations.” New York, where “Aetna pulled out of [the] exchange in late August in an effort to keep their plans ‘financially viable.’” New Jersey, where “1.1 million Aetna customers are at risk [because] the leading insurer also won’t be a part of the exchange.” Iowa, where “Wellmark Blue Cross and Blue Shield, Iowa’s largest health insurer, decided not to offer plans in the Obamacare exchange. It sells 86 percent of Iowa’s individual health insurance plans.” Wisconsin, where “Two of the three largest insurers in the state [United HealthCare and Humana] won’t offer plans on the exchange.” Georgia, where “Medical Mutual of Ohio left Georgia and Indiana as well as South Carolina, due to Obamacare

regulations. Aetna, along with Coventry, also decided against participating in the George health exchange.” [48974, 48994]

The office of House Speaker John Boehner (R-OH) releases a video with clips of Obama and other Democrats making statements and promises about ObamaCare that have turned out not to be true. (Among the statements: House Minority Leader Nancy Pelosi (D-CA) saying in 2012, “Everybody will have lower [insurance] rates.” In 2013 Pelosi stated, “I don’t remember saying that everybody in the country would have a lower premium.”) [48999]

DCClothesline.com posts “20 Obama Quotes About Islam Contrasted With 20 Obama Quotes About Christianity.” They are repeated here in their entirety:

### 20 Quotes By Barack Obama About Islam

- #1 “The future must not belong to those who slander the Prophet of Islam”
- #2 “The sweetest sound I know is the Muslim call to prayer”
- #3 “We will convey our deep appreciation for the Islamic faith, which has done so much over the centuries to shape the world—including in my own country.”
- #4 “As a student of history, I also know civilization’s debt to Islam.”
- #5 “Islam has a proud tradition of tolerance.”
- #6 “Islam has always been part of America”
- #7 “we will encourage more Americans to study in Muslim communities”
- #8 “These rituals remind us of the principles that we hold in common, and Islam’s role in advancing justice, progress, tolerance, and the dignity of all human beings.”
- #9 “America and Islam are not exclusive and need not be in competition. Instead, they overlap, and share common principles of justice and progress, tolerance and the dignity of all human beings.”
- #10 “I made clear that America is not—and never will be—at war with Islam.”
- #11 “Islam is not part of the problem in combating violent extremism—it is an important part of promoting peace.”
- #12 “So I have known Islam on three continents before coming to the region where it was first revealed”
- #13 “In ancient times and in our times, Muslim communities have been at the forefront of innovation and education.”
- #14 “throughout history, Islam has demonstrated through words and deeds the possibilities of religious tolerance and racial equality.”
- #15 “Ramadan is a celebration of a faith known for great diversity and racial equality”
- #16 “The Holy Koran tells us, ‘O mankind! We have created you male and a female; and we have made you into nations and tribes so that you may know one another.’”
- #17 “I look forward to hosting an Iftar dinner celebrating Ramadan here at the White House later this week, and wish you a blessed month.”
- #18 “We’ve seen those results in generations of Muslim immigrants – farmers and factory workers, helping to lay the railroads and build our cities, the Muslim innovators

who helped build some of our highest skyscrapers and who helped unlock the secrets of our universe.”

#19 “That experience guides my conviction that partnership between America and Islam must be based on what Islam is, not what it isn’t. And I consider it part of my responsibility as president of the United States to fight against negative stereotypes of Islam wherever they appear.”

#20 “I also know that Islam has always been a part of America’s story.”

## 20 Quotes By Barack Obama About Christianity

#1 “Whatever we once were, we are no longer a Christian nation”

#2 “We do not consider ourselves a Christian nation.”

#3 “Which passages of scripture should guide our public policy? Should we go with Leviticus, which suggests slavery is OK and that eating shellfish is an abomination? Or we could go with Deuteronomy, which suggests stoning your child if he strays from the faith?”

#4 “Even those who claim the Bible’s inerrancy make distinctions between Scriptural edicts, sensing that some passages—the Ten Commandments, say, or a belief in Christ’s divinity—are central to Christian faith, while others are more culturally specific and may be modified to accommodate modern life.”

#5 “The American people intuitively understand this, which is why the majority of Catholics practice birth control and some of those opposed to gay marriage nevertheless are opposed to a Constitutional amendment to ban it. Religious leadership need not accept such wisdom in counseling their flocks, but they should recognize this wisdom in their politics.”

#6 From Obama’s book, *The Audacity of Hope*: “I am not willing to have the state deny American citizens a civil union that confers equivalent rights on such basic matters as hospital visitation or health insurance coverage simply because the people they love are of the same sex—nor am I willing to accept a reading of the Bible that considers an obscure line in Romans to be more defining of Christianity than the Sermon on the Mount.”

#7 Obama’s response when asked what his definition of sin is: “Being out of alignment with my values.”

#8 “If all it took was someone proclaiming I believe Jesus Christ and that he died for my sins, and that was all there was to it, people wouldn’t have to keep coming to church, would they?”

#9 “This is something that I’m sure I’d have serious debates with my fellow Christians about. I think that the difficult thing about any religion, including Christianity, is that at some level there is a call to evangelize and proselytize. There’s the belief, certainly in some quarters, that people haven’t embraced Jesus Christ as their personal savior that they’re going to hell.”

#10 “I find it hard to believe that my God would consign four-fifths of the world to hell. I can’t imagine that my God would allow some little Hindu kid in India who never interacts with the Christian faith to somehow burn for all eternity. That’s just not part of my religious makeup.”



#11 “I don’t presume to have knowledge of what happens after I die. But I feel very strongly that whether the reward is in the here and now or in the hereafter, the aligning myself to my faith and my values is a good thing.”

#12 “I’ve said this before, and I know this raises questions in the minds of some evangelicals. I do not believe that my mother, who never formally embraced Christianity as far as I know... I do not believe she went to hell.”

#13 “Those opposed to abortion cannot simply invoke God’s will—they have to explain why abortion violates some principle that is accessible to people of all faiths.”

#14 On his support for civil unions for gay couples: “If people find that controversial then I would just refer them to the Sermon on the Mount.”

#15 “You got into these small towns in Pennsylvania and, like a lot of small towns in the Midwest, the jobs have been gone now for 25 years and nothing’s replaced them. And they fell through the Clinton Administration, and the Bush Administration, and each successive administration has said that somehow these communities are gonna regenerate and they have not. And it’s not surprising then they get bitter, they cling to guns or religion or antipathy to people who aren’t like them or anti-immigrant sentiment or anti-trade sentiment as a way to explain their frustrations.”

#16 “In our household, the Bible, the Koran and the Bhagavad Gita sat on the shelf alongside books of Greek and Norse and African mythology”

#17 “On Easter or Christmas Day, my mother might drag me to church, just as she dragged me to the Buddhist temple, the Chinese New Year celebration, the Shinto shrine, and ancient Hawaiian burial sites.”

#18 “we have Jews, Muslims, Hindus, atheists, agnostics, Buddhists, and their own path to grace is one that we have to revere and respect as much as our own”

#19 “All of us have a responsibility to work for the day when the mothers of Israelis and Palestinians can see their children grow up without fear; when the Holy Land of the three great faiths is the place of peace that God intended it to be; when Jerusalem is a secure and lasting home for Jews and Christians and Muslims, and a place for all of the children of Abraham to mingle peacefully together as in the story of Isra—as in the story of Isra, when Moses, Jesus, and Mohammed, peace be upon them, joined in prayer.”

#20 “I believe that there are many paths to the same place, and that is a belief that there is a higher power, a belief that we are connected as a people.” [49350]

*Saturday Night Live* mocks ObamaCare in a seven-minute comedy skit. [48975, 49000, 49008]

On September 29 the Republican-controlled House of Representatives votes 231–192 to approve legislation to authorize continued funding of government operations through December 15 but to postpone the implementation of ObamaCare for one year, and (by a vote of 248–174) to permanently repeal the medical device tax. (Two nervous Democrats, no doubt worried about their 2014 re-election battles, vote with the Republicans: Tim Matheson of Utah and Mike McIntyre of North Carolina.) The House also votes unanimously to fund military pay even if there is a government shutdown. According to RollCall.com, “House leaders made the bill even more unpalatable to Senate Democrats by including a ‘conscience clause’ allowing employers and insurers to opt out of providing coverage for contraception if they have moral or religious objections.” White

House press secretary Jay Carney issues a statement: “Today Republicans in the House of Representatives moved to shut down the government. Republicans in Congress had the opportunity to pass a routine, simple continuing resolution that keeps the government running for a few more weeks. But instead, Republicans decided they would rather make an ideological point by demanding the sabotage of the health care law. Any member of the Republican Party who votes for this bill is voting for a shutdown.” The White House declares that Obama “would veto the bill” if it passed the Senate. (Some might argue that it would then be Obama who would be responsible for shutting down the government.) [48954, 48959]

Obama-backed rebels in Ma'loula, Syria destroy the 4th-century Christian Church of Holy Martyrs and Bacchus. According to Pravoslavie.ru, “A unique icon of Sts. Sergius and Bacchus painted in the 13th century, which was situated just at the entrance, has been lost forever. The iconostasis and its central icon, painted in the 13th century, have been destroyed together with the icons of the Mother of God and Christ ‘the Archpastor.’ The latter always evoked the surprise of researchers because it depicted Christ in a long robe of silk with golden threads which is more typical to Damascus of the 18th century than to the period of the beginnings of Christianity. There is no altar of Sts. Sergius and Bacchus any more. It was semicircular with a low edge—the legacy of pagan altars. Now only debris remains of it. ...The main cross fell from the dome, wall paintings were destroyed, shot down and slashed by debris, while the walls themselves were either destroyed or disfigured by holes of shells. At the same time, the militants are continuing to shoot down the remaining church walls with mortar.” [49121, 49122]

WashingtonTimes.com reports, “After an outcry, the House has dropped a \$174,000 payment to the widow of the late Sen. Frank Lautenberg [D-NJ] from its stopgap spending bill. Paying a death gratuity to the spouses of lawmakers who passed away while in office has been a common practice, and both the House and Senate had included the money in previous versions of their year-end spending bills. But an ethics group questioned the payout to Bonnie Englehardt Lautenberg, wife of the late Democratic senator, who was worth an estimated \$56.8 million, according to Roll Call’s 2012 survey of lawmakers’ wealth. As a gift, the money would have been tax free.” [49019]

Investigator Doug Hagmann relates conversations with two unnamed intelligence community and Department of Homeland Security (DHS) insiders. Hagmann writes, “Within the last 24 hours, I had two separate conversations with two different sources, each saying nearly the same thing: Expect the unexpected. Wake up. Understand that everything we’re being told is a lie. We are at the epicenter of a ‘perfect storm.’ The opening words coming from my source inside the intelligence community tell much. ‘These people [the Obama regime and his handlers] are ‘pissed.’ They did not get what they wanted with Syria because we put them behind schedule by exposing Benghazi. The ‘alternative media’ put them behind, but that doesn’t mean they’ve given up. Far from it. What it means is that they have the same objective, but are switching plans.’” Their “end-game objective,” according to one insider, is “The takedown of America as a viable global power, economically and militarily. They are counting on people’s attention being diverted to political theater, which is exactly what’s happening right now with the budget

showdown. But no one is looking beyond the stage act and if they are, very few are understanding what they are seeing. They are thinking too small and are still clinging to the right-left paradigm of political theater. The objective is to create a new global economic and power structure by removing the U.S. dollar as the world's reserve currency. By making the U.S. subservient to a global power structure. Why isn't anyone in the media talking about this? Because they are complicit. Why aren't the majority of those in the 'alternative media' talking about this? Because they are not looking at the bigger picture. The lie is bigger than they realize." [48953]

Hagmann's source continues, "Thanks to the policies of the Federal Reserve and this regime of economic psychopaths, the U.S. is in very deep financial trouble. Yet, you have politicians and talking heads on the news telling everyone that everything is okay. It's far from okay, and we'll be experiencing the same that is happening in Europe, with bank runs and bank holidays, in addition to the looting of our pensions and retirement accounts. It's just a matter of when, not if. ... We're in one of the most dangerous times in our history. Think about this, and I mean really think about it. If we believe that the real power masters were behind some of the most historic, life-altering and bloodiest events in history, whether it's Benghazi, the military overthrows of sovereign countries, or even elements of 9/11 and going back even further to the assassination of JFK, what are they capable of now? It's the same groups, the same families, but different generations. Their objectives have not changed. Look at D-Day as a classic example of the art of deception in wartime. And make no mistake, we are at war being waged by the globalists. Based on elaborate deceptions that convinced Hitler that Patton would lead an attack at Calais, the real invasion happened at Normandy. They are using the same principals. They want to take us out from being politically, militarily and economically viable to implement their plans for a new global power structure. While we think the trigger event could happen in the Middle East, maybe it will happen in the U.S. instead. While we expected Syria to be the causative factor to usher in an economic collapse, perhaps the sequence of events have been changed." [48953]

At Townhall.com Derek Hunter observes, "While the media has been fixated on Republican infighting over how to deal with Obamacare, it has completely ignored the panic-induced irrational rhetoric coming from Democrats on the same subject. ... [T]hey are worried because, while Obamacare was built to fail, it wasn't expected to fail so early. That failure puts at risk the progressive dream of single-payer health care in the United States. ... With this growing pressure and increasing public realization of the failures of Obamacare, its proponents are getting desperate. The plan is in motion. The law is in place. No matter how much spin they put on it, this lemon seems ready to collapse at the starting line. This is leading to some unhinged behavior." Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid (D-NV) "called opponents of Obamacare 'anarchists' for working within the normal functions of government to defund it. [An Obama] senior advisor, Dan Pfeiffer, said the White House is 'not for negotiating with people with a bomb strapped to their chest.' Ironically, he said this... the day before [Obama] announced he'd spoken to the president of Iran, and while he is in the midst of negotiating with Syria over chemical weapons. No to talking with Republicans, yes to Iran and Syria. ... As more of the [ObamaCare] train derails the rhetoric will become more desperate. That's why a one-

year delay, the strategy being discussed now by Republicans, shouldn't be pursued. A delay gives Obamacare time, and time is life. That's why [Obama] has delayed as many of the most egregious parts of the law. The further away from launch it collapses the more likely their plan to blame the private market is to work. Republicans should be doing what they can to speed up the inevitable collapse and suing to force the administration to have Obamacare implemented as it is written, as they wrote and passed it. After all, as they've been constantly reminding everyone, 'It's the law,' not 'mostly the law.' What Senator Ted Cruz (R-TX) did this week was invaluable in that it forced the problems the government created to the top of the consciousness of the American public (though the media is trying to undo that damage). But the collective attention span of the American people is short. In a year or two it will be forgotten. The best chance to destroy Obamacare is to get out of its way and let nature take its course." [48964, 48966]

On *Fox News Sunday*, Congressman Kevin McCarthy (R-CA) states that even if the Senate rejects its latest proposal to avoid a government shutdown, "We will pass a bill... that will keep the government open, that will reflect the House [wishes], that I believe the Senate can accept, that will have fundamental changes to ObamaCare that can protect the economy for America." (The House may pass a continuing resolution that funds ObamaCare and does not delay it, but requires that members of Congress and their aides buy health insurance on the ObamaCare exchanges *without* taxpayer subsidies.) McCarthy adds, "We are not shutting the government down. While [Obama] was out playing golf [September 28], we were here until 1 a.m. We will pass a bill that reflects this House... I think they'll be additions that Democrats can support." [48967, 48979]

McCarthy says ObamaCare is creating a part-time America: "Look, when you look at what has transpired since ObamaCare has moved forward, we've created more than 840,000 jobs in this country, more than 90 percent of them have been part-time, because of ObamaCare. That creates a part-time economy, part-time opportunities, and in the end, it creates a part-time America. That is why you find that we will fund the government and still ask for delaying the movement of Obamacare." [49011]

On *Meet the Press*, Senator Ted Cruz (R-TX) says, "It is the Democrats who have taken an absolutist position" and are willing to see the government shut down. "Even now what the House of Representatives has done is a step removed from defunding [ObamaCare]—it's delaying it. Now that's the essence of a compromise. For all of us who want to see [ObamaCare] repealed, simply delaying it for American families on the same terms as has been done for American corporations—that's a compromise." (Arguably, Obama and Congressional Democrats don't want ObamaCare either; what they want is what it will ultimately lead to: a fully nationalized health care system.) [48967, 48985]

Also appearing on *Meet the Press*, Congressman Raul Labrador (R-ID) says, "I think everybody agrees that this is a loser for us [Republicans] if the government shuts down, and that's why I think [Obama] and the Democrats want to shut down the government. There wasn't a single Republican on Twitter who was saying, 'Let's shut down the government,' but every single Democrat was saying, 'The Republicans want to shut down the government.'" Labrador tells leftist host David Gregory, "The politics are

coming from the other side as well, so let's be really honest about this, and the other side would like to see Republicans in to rule in 2014. ...They're not even willing to meet us half way. ...[Obama] will not meet with [House Speaker] John Boehner." [48982]

On *Face the Nation*, Senator Rand Paul (R-KY) is asked by host Bob Schieffer, "Are you willing to take the blame if the government shuts down?" Paul responds, "You know, I've said all along it's not a good idea to shut down government; I've been saying that for months. But I also think that it's not a good idea to give [Obama] 100 percent of what he wants on ObamaCare without compromise. We've been offering him compromises; many on his side say there are problems. The Teamsters said there are problems, Warren Buffett said there are problems, even former President Bill Clinton says there are problems with ObamaCare. So why won't [Obama] negotiate and come to a compromise on trying to make ObamaCare less bad?" The leftist Schieffer—who falsely states, "Polls say that most people favor [ObamaCare]," asks, "[H]ow can you hold the entire federal government hostage...?" Paul: "[Obama] already, by executive fiat, has delayed the employer mandate, which is a key component of this. We think that is going outside the Constitution and that [Obama] is not allowed to write legislation, so all we're asking is, if he thinks it's so messed up that he's gonna delay a big part of ObamaCare on his own, and it looks like maybe he's gonna do some special favors for the union[s], why don't we actually bring it to Congress and try to figure out how to meet somewhere in the middle. But, see, he's saying a hundred percent of ObamaCare or the highway. [Obama] is the one saying I will shut down government if you don't give me everything I want on ObamaCare. That to me is [Obama] being intransigent and being unwilling to compromise." [48983, 48984]

Schieffer condescendingly reminds Paul, "But the law has already been passed, Senator..." (Schieffer and other Democrats sing a different tune when it comes to the Supreme Court's Citizens United decision, and are eager to overturn that with legislation.) Paul reminds Schieffer, "[O]nce things are passed doesn't mean they're set in stone and no future Congress will look at them. ...ObamaCare was passed, but the public has a great deal of misgivings. I have a lot of misgivings. I'm worried that there won't be many choices left, that you're going to destroy the individual market [in health insurance]. If I want to go out and buy a high-deductible plan, ObamaCare is making that illegal. So I think there's really a problem with limiting people's choices, and we should continue to have this debate, but it's [Obama] who's refusing to come to the negotiating table. ...[Obama's] saying, 'I will not compromise, I will not touch ObamaCare.' But the interesting thing is, he's amended ObamaCare probably 15 times already, but he does it without any legislative approval—which we think is unconstitutional. But it's also showing that he's gonna fix the law on his own, without any approval of Congress. We think he should come to Congress, we should negotiate how to fix or make ObamaCare less bad. We are the party that's willing to compromise. They're the party that says, 'No way, we're not gonna touch ObamaCare.'" (At FreedomOutpost.com, Tim Brown notes that former British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher said, "If you set out to be liked, you would be prepared to compromise on anything at any time, and you would achieve nothing," and Andrew Carnegie once said "The 'morality of compromise' sounds contradictory. Compromise is usually a sign of weakness, or an admission of defeat.

Strong men don't compromise, it is said, and principles should never be compromised." Brown writes, "This is the mindset of many in the Republican leadership. They are more concerned with being liked and the media not beating them up than they are with actually achieving what they say their goal is. My advice to Republicans is, let Obama and the Democrats shut the government down. Stand your ground and you will be rewarded for it by your constituents. If you don't stand your ground, you will face your constituents' wrath.") [48983, 48984]

While Congressional Republicans try to stop ObamaCare, Cortney O'Brien reports at Townhall.com that physicians nationwide are struggling with a requirement to computerize all their patient records by 2015. O'Brien notes that one software vendor, Allscripts, "is currently being sued by several physicians for selling them faulty healthcare information technology. The details: Allscripts sold one of their software products, called 'MyWay' to 5,000 physicians for the price of \$40,000 per user. The product turned out to be defective. Then, instead of trying to fix the product, Allscripts removed it from the market, leaving the doctors to deal with the damages." Allan Joseph, a lead counsel for the plaintiffs, states, "There has been a tremendous loss of productivity due to the training and learning curve associated with the implementation of the software. In many instances, [medical] practices have been forced to endure huge losses due to billing errors generated by a software malfunction. We have heard many instances where administrative staff simply quit due to the aggravation of the implementation and operational difficulties of certain manufactures. Many practices, even with the receipt of federal subsidies, have suffered huge losses." [48968, 48969, 48970]

O'Brien points out a possibly life-threatening problem: "The American College of Emergency Physicians has found that poorly designed EHR systems in use at hospital emergency departments are leading to 'communication failure, wrong order—wrong patient errors, poor data display, and alert fatigue.'" According to Bloomberg.com, "Dangerous doses of drugs have been given because of confusing drop-down menus; patients have undergone unnecessary surgeries because their electronic records displayed incorrect information; and computer-network delays in sending medical images have resulted in serious injury or death..." ObamaCare's electronic records mandate is also expensive. According to HealthAffairs.org, "We found that the average physician would lose \$43,743 over five years..." Dr. Eugene Sussman warns of another problem: "Doctors who are my age, in their early 60s, maybe will retire out. They may think, 'I don't need this bother; it's going to cost more money and cost more time.'" (Obama can hardly guarantee that patients can keep their doctors under ObamaCare if the law encourages those doctors to retire.) [48968, 48969, 48970]

Newsmax.com reports, "While Congress is working overtime to spent [sic; spend] billions of dollars to fund the government and avoid a shutdown, federal agencies are on a freewheeling spending spree to burn through all of their money before the fiscal year ends Monday night. The Washington Post reports that the Veterans Affairs Department spent more than a half million dollars for artwork, the Coast Guard spent nearly \$200,000 on 'cubicle furniture rehab,' and the Agriculture Department spent \$140,000 on toner cartridges in just one day. The spending spree was prompted by fears that if an agency

ends the fiscal year with money left in the bank, Congress might cut their funding in future years.” [48977]

According to Politico, “When [Obama] considered sitting down with the four congressional leaders in the White House ahead of the deadline to avert a government shutdown, [Senate Majority Leader Harry] Reid [D-NV] privately urged Obama to call off the meeting, according to several people familiar with the situation. Reid believed that it would amount to nothing more than a photo-op that would give the false impression that a serious negotiation was occurring, even warning he wouldn’t attend such a session. Obama scrapped it. ...Reid’s no-compromise stance is not without its own risks. With Washington held in such low regard, politicians of all stripes are certain to incur fury from constituents once government services are suspended, parks are closed and hundreds of thousands of federal workers are furloughed. And Reid now is protecting a fragile Democratic Senate majority, with Republicans just six seats away from returning to power—so any misstep by the Nevada Democrat could hurt vulnerable senators in red states. ...Reid’s strategy boils down to a few factors: If Democrats give even a few small concessions on a short-term stopgap funding measure, Republicans will demand even bigger concessions to avoid a debt default in mid-October. Since Republicans have been engulfed in an intraparty war over how far to take a shutdown threat, Reid and his top lieutenants are convinced that the political backlash from a shutdown would be devastating to the GOP, potentially costing them their majority in the House.” [48990, 48991]

At WashingtonPost.com Chris Cillizza notes Public Opinion Strategies poll results that may cause Obama and his fellow Democrats some concern: “On the question of congressional preference—Which political party would you prefer controlled Congress?—independent voters in 2013 lean more heavily toward the GOP than they did in 2010, when Republicans picked up 63 seats to retake control of the House. In 2010, 40 percent of independents said they wanted a GOP-controlled Congress, while 26 percent said they wanted a Democratic-led one. In an NBC-WSJ survey from July to September of this year, 43 percent of independents said they wanted GOP control, while 25 percent preferred a Democratic House majority. ...By contrast, in 2012, when Democrats picked up eight House seats, independents were split—35 percent Democrats, 34 percent GOP—when it came to which party they wanted to control Congress. ...Republicans are well positioned among electorally critical independent voters heading into the 2014 election if—and this is a major if—the party can keep the focus on Obama and off its internal rifts, which have been on full display over the past week. Independent voters want to vote for Republicans—if only the GOP could get out of its own way.” [49016, 49017]

DailyCaller.com reports, “A top climate scientist from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology lambasted a new report by the UN’s climate bureaucracy that blamed mankind as the main cause of global warming and whitewashed the fact that there has been a hiatus in warming for the last 15 years. ‘I think that the latest IPCC report has truly sunk to level of hilarious incoherence,’ Dr. Richard Lindzen told Climate Depot, a global warming skeptic news site. ‘They are proclaiming increased confidence in their models as the discrepancies between their models and observations increase.’ The

Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change claimed it was 95 percent sure that global warming was mainly driven by human burning of fossil fuels that produce greenhouse gases. The I.P.C.C. also glossed over the fact that the Earth has not warmed in the past 15 years, arguing that the heat was absorbed by the ocean. ‘Their excuse for the absence of warming over the past 17 years is that the heat is hiding in the deep ocean,’ Lindzen added. ‘However, this is simply an admission that the models fail to simulate the exchanges of heat between the surface layers and the deeper oceans. However, it is this heat transport that plays a major role in natural internal variability of climate, and the IPCC assertions that observed warming can be attributed to man depend crucially on their assertion that these models accurately simulate natural internal variability,’ Lindzen continued. ‘Thus, they now, somewhat obscurely, admit that their crucial assumption was totally unjustified.’” (Despite the increasing evidence that the computer models are seriously flawed, Obama continues to claim that massive, expensive schemes must be implemented to combat “global warming.”) [49080]

On September 30, veteran journalist Bob Woodward says on MSNBC that Obama’s unwillingness to negotiate with Republicans may cause him significant damage: “He said he will not negotiate on the debt ceiling—a reasonable position. ‘I will not be blackmailed,’ he said. But they should be talking. They should be meeting. They should be discussing this, because... the American economy is at stake. And [Obama], if there is a downturn or a collapse or whatever could happen here that’s bad, it’s going to be on his head. The history books are going to say, we had an economic calamity [during the administration] of Barack Obama. Speaker [John] Boehner, indeed, is playing a role on this. [But] Go back to the Great Depression in the 1930s. I’ll bet no one can name who was the speaker of the House at the time: Henry Thomas Rainey. He’s not in the history book. It’s on [Obama’s] head. He’s got to lead. He’s got to talk. And the absence of discussion here, I think, is a baffling element.” [48992, 49018]

On *Morning Joe*, *Time* magazine’s Mark Halperin says, “Here’s what the White House and the [Congress] will monitor: One is how the press covers the shutdown and does it go back into 1990s mode of saying, ‘Obstructionist Republicans are causing a shutdown, and real people are hurting?’ Then they’re going to watch the polls and see whether—it’s not just partisan—whether by the end of the week there’s [sic] surveys that show—both public and private—that people are blaming Republicans. And that’s going to put pressure on [House Speaker John] Boehner to come to the floor and force some members of his own conference—beyond the handful that will never be with him on this—to come to have a compromise. So, The White House does not have much incentive [to compromise] because they think the trends are going to go in their direction by the end of the week or early next week at the latest, because again, the press is largely sympathetic to their argument on this—that it’s the Republicans fault.” (In other words, Halperin agrees that the mainstream media will carry Obama’s water.) [49054]

CainTV.com writes, “As if to confirm Halperin’s claim, CNN released a ridiculous poll which actually used the phrase ‘spoiled children’ in its questions. ...According to the numbers, [Obama] is acting like a ‘Responsible adult’ while Congress is acting like ‘spoiled children’ by a margin of 49/47. Despite the very narrow two point victory, CNN



is presenting this as proof positive that America is fed up with the GOP, and that U.S. citizens want the Republicans to fund the Affordable Care act. ...By a margin of 57 to 38, America disapproves of Obamacare, and that disdain is present in virtually every key demo. Men disapprove at 60%, women at 55%, and independents at 67%. So, Americans may not like Congressional Republicans, but they also hate Obama's train wreck law. All of this indicates that—if the GOP members would just get out there and fight—they'd stand a good chance of turning their fortunes. Of course CNN isn't doing much to dig into these numbers. They're too busy pushing the 'spoiled children' line..." [49054]

In an NPR interview, Obama is asked what he could offer in budget negotiations. He arrogantly replies, "[W]hen you say what can I offer, I shouldn't have to offer anything. They're not doing me a favor by paying for things that they have already approved for the government to do. That's part of their basic function of government; that's not doing me a favor. That's doing what the American people sent them here to do, carrying out their responsibilities. I have said consistently that I'm always happy to talk to Republicans and Democrats about how we shape a budget that is investing in things like early childhood education, rebuilding our roads and bridges and putting people back to work, growing our economy, making sure that we have the research and development to stay at the cutting edge and that deals with some of our long-term debt issues. But we're not going to accomplish those things if one party to this conversation says that the only way that they come to the table is if they get 100 percent of what they want and if they don't, they threaten to burn down the house." (Obama is accurate when he says, "I have said consistently that I'm always happy to talk to Republicans..." although he never does actually agree to deal with them honestly. He merely consistently *says* he is willing to talk with them.) Republicans would be wise to—repeatedly—run ads showing Obama saying, "I shouldn't have to offer anything." At Townhall.com Hugh Hewitt comments, "Thus did the American public get a very candid glimpse of [a man] whose contempt for duly elected Republican opponents is exceeded only by his fecklessness in the face of America's enemies abroad. To Putin and the Iranians come offers of all sorts. To the Speaker of the House, only ultimatums. Harry Reid and Nancy Pelosi also had spectacularly bad days for anyone who was watching. Some pundits don't think Harry's gracelessness and Nancy's strident incoherence don't matter, but they are wrong. Americans notice everything, even if they say very little. They are consumers, making up their minds over time." [49058, 49065, 49086]

New Jersey Governor Chris Christie comments on the shutdown situation: "No matter where the partisanship is, the failure is in people not bringing people together to get it done. My approach would be, as the executive, is to call in the leaders of the Congress, the legislature, whatever you're dealing with and say that we're not leaving this room until we fix this problem. Because I'm the boss, I'm in charge. When you're the executive, if you're waiting for leadership from the legislative branch of government... you're going to be waiting forever. While there's blame to go around for the Republicans in the House for not coming to consensus even amongst themselves... and the Democrats in the Senate for not looking for ways to try to compromise with the Republicans in the House, there's also blame that goes onto [Obama] as well." [49087]

Imminent government shutdown notwithstanding, the Senate takes the morning off and convenes in the afternoon to reject the House continuing resolution to continue government spending. The vote is 54–46 to reject the legislation. Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid (D-NV) says, “As we said Friday, nothing has changed. If they [House Republicans] try to send us something back, they’re spinning their wheels. ... We are not going to negotiate on this. We are not going to mess around with Obamacare, no matter what they do. ... Understand we are dealing with anarchists. They hate government.” FoxNews.com reports, “Republicans are huddling to plot their next move. Party leaders already have their counterproposal at the ready—a bill that would delay the so-called individual mandate by a year while ensuring that high-level administration officials, members of Congress and their staff must get their health insurance through ObamaCare.” [48989, 49009]

At Townhall.com Sarah Jean Seman advises readers that a “government shutdown” is not really a “government shutdown.” Although “Some federal employees, those deemed non-essential, would not go to work,” Obama, “presidential appointees, members of Congress and judges, for better or for worse, all continue per usual. Nearly 800,000 federal employees went on furlough during the last shutdown, yet all were paid retroactively, according to a report by the Congressional Research Service.” (Some might question why the government even has “non-essential” employees on the federal payroll.) “Museums, monuments and nearly 401 national parks would shut their doors to visitors,” but, according to the Associated Press, “Prison guards, FBI agents and the Border Patrol will be at their posts. Air traffic controllers and airport security screeners will keep planes moving. The military’s 1.4 million active-duty personnel will stay on duty. College students can relax: Student loans and Pell Grants aren’t affected. Social Security payments and veteran’s benefits will go out. Food-stamp dollars should continue to flow. Doctors will see Medicare and Medicaid patients; veteran’s hospitals stay open. The National Weather Service will make forecasts and issue storm warnings. NASA will man Mission Control in Houston to support the International Space Station and the two Americans among six people living aboard. But aside from that, only about 3 percent of NASA’s 18,000 workers will be on the job. The White House will stay open. It’s exempted from the federal law that requires many government employees to stop working if congressionally approved funding for their jobs expires. Obama could still take his scheduled trip to Asia the week of Oct. 6, if he chose to. The post office will keep delivering; its budget isn’t affected because it comes from selling stamps and delivering packages. Workers in programs funded by user fees—such as immigration service employees who process green card applications and people who oversee truck and bus safety—also will stay on the job.” [48993]

Obama meets with Israeli Prime Minister Binyamin Netanyahu. Obama says, “The Iranians, it appears, are now prepared to negotiate.” Netanyahu knows better than to trust Iran, and warns that no one should be fooled by President Hassan Rouhani’s seemingly charming overtures. PJMedia.com’s Michael Ledeen reports, “Even before Rouhani deigned to take Obama’s call, we had given the Islamic Republic an ancient treasure, a cup crafted two millenia before Mohammed, said to be worth at least a million dollars. Remember that Obama gave the Brits a collection of his favorite speeches.” (It is later

reported that the “2,700-year-old artifact” was made in 1999—and as crude a forgery as Obama’s birth certificate.) [48997, 49013, 49783, 49784]

The Obama administration files a lawsuit in an attempt to block North Carolina’s new voter photo identification law. (Attorney General Eric Holder is also trying to block the photo ID law. Obama and his fellow Democrats claim ObamaCare is the law and Republicans should simply learn to live with it, yet they seem unwilling to live with photo ID laws—or the Supreme Court’s decision in *Citizens United*.) [48995, 48996]

Obama gives a brief statement to tout the October 1 opening of the ObamaCare exchanges and blame Republicans for the impasse over the continuing resolution. Obama says a government shutdown “is entirely preventable if the House chooses to do what the Senate has already done, and that’s the simple act of funding our government without making extraneous and controversial demands in the process. . . . One faction of one party in one house of Congress in one branch of government doesn’t get to shut down the entire government just to refight the results of the election. You don’t get to exact a ransom just for doing your job.” Obama refuses to take reporters’ questions—but does manage to use holiday scare tactics, asking, “Does anyone truly believe that we won’t have this fight again in a couple of months, even at Christmas?” [49001]

House Republicans meet to discuss strategy, and some conservatives leave the meeting saying they will not support more watering-down of their demands in the next vote of a continuing spending resolution. (House Speaker John Boehner may ultimately cave in to Obama and the Democrats and call for a vote on a “no strings attached” resolution, getting it passed with Democrat support but losing quite a few Republicans. The risk for Boehner is that such a collapse will almost certainly result in a challenge to his Speaker position in January 2014.) [49002]

At HotAir.com Ed Morrissey reports, “According to a poll last week from Pepperdine University, 48% of small-business owners back a government shutdown—some for as long as three months.” Republicans would be blamed for a shutdown by 27 percent of those polled; 28 percent would blame Democrats; 43 percent would blame both parties. [48998]

According to a CNN poll, Obama and the Democrats will not escape blame if the government shuts down: 46 percent of Americans would blame Republicans, 36 percent would blame Obama, and 13 percent would blame both—meaning that 49 percent would blame Obama. John Nolte writes at Breitbart.com, “The media are attempting to spin these numbers in a way that makes it look as though the GOP will ‘bear the brunt of shutdown blame,’ but once you are at or over the 50% mark, it is all semantics. No one looks good and both sides are going to get hurt. There is no question that the media’s mission is to shape a reality that declares Obama a winner and the GOP a loser in the event of a shutdown. But both are looking like losers, which means a draw. Moreover, and this is the most important point, [Obama] is going to be the real loser in a draw. How much lower can congressional approval ratings go? Not much. That institution is already in the toilet. Obama’s approval now sits in the low forties. A shutdown could drop him

into the thirties, where [he] becomes the lamest of ducks. Obama has much, much more to lose in the event of a shutdown. Another thing the media should keep in mind is that there are two other issues that distinguish what [is] happening today from the 1990s: First, this shutdown is over ObamaCare, something substantial the American people can easily understand. ObamaCare is a BIG issue and increasingly unpopular. Finally, the media landscape is completely different today. Clinton enjoyed a monopoly of media that sided with him. There was no Fox News and no [Internet] New Media.” [49020]

CNN’s Jake Tapper interviews author and talk show host Mark Levin and, surprisingly, gives Levin nine minutes to excoriate Obama over his disastrous foreign policy and domestic policy incompetence. [49037]

*The Guardian* reports, “The Oscar-winning film director Charles Ferguson has cancelled his CNN documentary on Hillary Clinton after what he described as a private campaign against the film by prominent Democrats. Ferguson said he had decided to pull the plug after being met with a wall of silence from more than a hundred people who refused to be interviewed for the documentary. He claimed that aides to the former secretary of state put pressure on CNN behind the scenes, and made clear that Clinton would only co-operate ‘over my dead body.’ He also blamed a public campaign by Republicans, who claimed the film would be biased in favour of Clinton. ‘Neither political party wanted the film made,’ said Ferguson in an article for the Huffington Post. ‘After painful reflection, I decided that I couldn’t make a film of which I would be proud. And so I’m cancelling.’” (Rush Limbaugh remarks, “Do you know why CNN has decided to drop their documentary on Hillary? No, it’s not that they couldn’t find a 75-year-old actress. That’s not it at all. They claim at CNN that they were pressured by top Hillary advisers to drop it. They said that they were met with a stonewall when it came to getting information. So apparently the Clintons can dictate to any news organization what will and will not be said about them.”) [49003, 49022, 49023, 49070, 49110]

NBC also announces that it is canceling a planned Clinton movie, stating, “After reviewing and prioritizing our slate of movie/miniseries development, we’ve decided that we will no longer continue developing the Hillary Clinton miniseries.” FoxNews.com reports, “The announcement of both Clinton projects earlier this year sparked immediate political outrage, with many concerned that the projects would function as puff pieces for Clinton’s presidential aspirations. The RNC [Republican National Committee] voted in August to boycott both NBC and CNN during the 2016 presidential primary debates, which then also raised concerns from Democrat supporters and political figures at NBC as to whether it could harm the potential candidate in the end. ‘Nobody in Hollywood expected RNC chairman (Reince) Priebus to flex his muscles like this and threaten CNN and NBC over these two movies. This is a clear result of that. The networks simply cannot countenance being excluded from debates and no single project is worth that access being cut off,’ noted Hollywood producer, Mark Joseph. ‘Priebus is part of a new generation of GOP leaders who are playing by a different set of rules than their predecessors. He played hardball and he won big time.’ ...A source with connections to the Clinton camp said that Hillary doesn’t have any ‘secrets’ to hide and likely didn’t block the projects for fear of scandals being rehashed, but she probably didn’t want to be

in the middle of a media and political firestorm. There was apparently also mounting concern that if the film and/or series were Clinton ‘infomercials’—as worded by the RNC—then filmmakers from the other side of the political spectrum could come out with a ‘counter piece’ that would trash the high-profile figure.” (Comedian Dennis Miller quips that NBC “didn’t want their miniseries bias for Hillary to get in the way of their regular nightly news bias for Hillary.”) [49003, 49022, 49023, 49070, 49110]

According to a Gallup poll, 25 percent of uninsured Americans are willing to pay the ObamaCare fine rather than buy health insurance. [49010]

Obama telephones House Speaker John Boehner (R-OH) in an effort to make it appear as though he is being “cooperative” in the continuing resolution showdown. Both Obama and Boehner reportedly say they will not budge. (Obama has no intention of compromising and welcomes a government shutdown he can blame on the GOP—with the eager and willing cooperation of the mainstream media. The phone call is for public relations purposes only.)

Breitbart.com reports, “A novice Republican running in a rural state has shattered fundraising records campaigning as the ‘anti-Obamacare candidate.’ In his first race for public office, [U.S. Senate candidate] Ben Sasse has raised nearly \$750,000 in just eight weeks of the first quarter of his nascent candidacy, according to records being filed with the Federal Election Commission. The massive haul highlights how lucrative campaigning against Obamacare can be for Republicans. It also underscores how deeply motivated conservative voters are to see that the sprawling healthcare law be killed.” [49015]

TheHill.com reports, “Nearly three-quarters of White House employees would be furloughed during a government shutdown, according to a contingency plan created by the administration. According to a letter prepared for the Office of Management and Budget, some 1,265 White House employees would be sent home if lawmakers are unable to strike an agreement Monday to keep the government open. Approximately 436 presidential staffers would be designated as exempt and continue working despite a shutdown.” [49021]

WeeklyStandard.com reports that the Obama administration has “quietly” changed the Healthcare.gov web site to remove a reference to “free” health care: “From at least June 26, 2013 to as recently as September 15, under the topic, ‘Where can I get free or low-cost care in my community?’ the following statement appeared: ‘If you can’t afford any health plan, you can get free or low-cost health and dental care at a nearby community health center.’ ... However, sometime between September 16 and September 23, the reference to ‘free’ care was dropped. The title of the topic was changed as well, and now reads: ‘Where can I get low-cost care in my community?’ ... ‘If you can’t afford any health plan, you can get free or low-cost health and dental care at a nearby community health center.’” [49025]

Vanderbilt University Medical Center announces it is slashing more than 1,000 jobs.  
[49032]

At DailyKos.com, leftist Tirge Caps wakes up to the reality of ObamaCare, writing, “My wife and I just got our updates from Kaiser telling us what our 2014 rates will be. Her monthly [premium] has been \$168 this year, mine \$150. We have a high deductible. We are generally healthy people who don’t go to the doctor often. I barely ever go. The insurance is in case of a major catastrophe. Well, now, because of ObamaCare, my wife’s rate is gong [sic; going] to \$302 per month and mine is jumping to \$284. I am canceling insurance for us and I am not paying any fucking penalty. What the hell kind of reform is this? Oh, ok, if we qualify, we can get some government assistance. Great. So now I have to jump through another hoop to just chisel some of this off. And we don’t qualify, anyway, so what’s the point? I never felt too good about how this was passed and what it entailed, but I figured if it saved Americans money, I could go along with it. I don’t know what to think now. This appears, in my experience, to not be a reform for the people. What am I missing?” (What Caps missed was three years of warnings from conservatives.) [49864, 49865, 49884]

Milwaukee’s *Journal Sentinel* reports, “Milwaukee County would end health insurance coverage for some or all of its 4,400 employees and instead provide a subsidy toward individual coverage purchased through the new federal exchanges, under an idea floated in County Executive Chris Abele’s 2014 budget. The shift could save the county at least \$10 million a year, according to an estimate included in Abele’s budget, which must be approved by the County Board.” (In other words, county employees would be dumped on the ObamaCare exchanges—and their health insurance would then be subsidized by taxpayers from all 50 states. For the record, Abele is a Democrat.) [49149, 49150]

Twitchy.com reports an Obama-appointed federal judge “has ruled in favor of the House Oversight Committee in its fight with [Attorney General] Eric Holder and the Justice Department over [Operation] Fast and Furious documents. In her decision, United States District Judge Amy Berman Jackson wrote: ‘The fact that this case arises out of a dispute between two branches of government does not make it non-justiciable; Supreme Court precedent establishes that the third branch has an equally fundamental role to play, and that judges not only may, but sometimes must, exercise their responsibility to interpret the Constitution and determine whether another branch has exceeded its power. In the Court’s view, endorsing the proposition that the executive may assert an unreviewable right to withhold materials from the legislature would offend the Constitution more than undertaking to resolve the specific dispute that has been presented here.’ Holder had stonewalled on the release of Fast and Furious documents for months, asking ...Obama to assert executive privilege. The House then voted to hold the attorney general in contempt. That didn’t produce the documents that have been subpoenaed, though.” (The court decision does not force Holder to turn over documents; it merely declares that Holder cannot have the lawsuit against him dismissed.) [49027, 49036, 49088]

White House press secretary Jay Carney tells reporters Obama plans to travel to Asia at the end of the week, regardless of the budget standoff: “We don’t have any changes to

announce. We plan to make this trip. [Obama] ...looks forward to and believes it is important to travel to Asia in order to promote our economic interests in Asia and our strategic interests in Asia. There are American jobs that can be created through our engagement with Asia, this fastest-growing region of the world and an enormously important region when it comes to our trading relationships and partnerships. So we have this trip scheduled and we intend to take it. We'll see, obviously, what happens as the week unfolds.” (The next day Politico reports, “A White House official said Tuesday that discussions are ongoing about whether Obama should go on the trip—though Obama isn't likely to make a decision to cancel until the last possible moment. Making things more difficult: much of the White House advance team has been deemed non-essential and is furloughed during the shutdown. The press staff is without the wranglers who handle the movements of journalists who travel with [Obama].”) Obama's planned trip includes a stop in Indonesia, which has the world's largest population of Muslims, and a visit with the Sultan of Brunei. [49091, 49100]

MSNBC.com reports, “U.S. intelligence received reports of a serious threat in Kenya before last week's terrorist attack at a Nairobi mall that left 62 dead and more than 150 injured, NBC News reported. Officials said that NSA reviewed intelligence of a 'credible' threat.” (MSNBC does not explain why the Obama administration did not issue a warning to Americans traveling in Kenya.) [49052, 49053]

Bloomberg.com reports that Siemens “will eliminate 15,000 posts, representing 4 percent of its 370,000 workers worldwide, and a third of the reduction will come in the German home market...” [49083]

At WashingtonPost.com columnist Petula Dvorak generously offers “9 ways to punish Congress for a shutdown,” including “Line 'em up and shoot 'em.” (If a conservative columnist suggested doing that to Obama, of course, he would be fired and investigated by the Secret Service—but Dvorak probably need not worry about consequences for her words.) [49039]

The Ulsterman Report writes, “When the defacto President of the United States [Obama advisor Valerie Jarrett] sends out two messages within hours of each other, you can be certain Democratic Party leaders are taking note and falling in line. The message this morning was clear—no compromise with Republicans. No compromise with the majority of Americans. Obamacare now and Obamacare forever... It was Valerie Jarrett who decreed throughout the summer that Obamacare was going to be implemented this year—no matter what. She made clear there was ZERO interest in compromising with Republicans on any part of the bill. The only ones who received said compromise were those who were supporters of the administration, which of course brings us to this promise by Jarrett [“After we win this election, it's our turn. Payback time.”] first published on this blog weeks prior to the 2012 Election, and later confirmed as a factual quote by political operatives on such news agencies as CNN and FOX. (A quote which came to us via information obtained by [Ulsterman's White House insider].) I would also remind readers that it was at a time when even Democratic Party leaders and media figures were openly calling for the resignation of Eric Holder after numerous scandals,

that Valerie Jarrett issued one public statement on the matter saying Holder was going to be staying on as Attorney General ‘for some time.’ Once Jarrett made that declaration, there was no more talk of Holder’s resignation from ANY Democratic Party leaders, or high profile liberal media figures. Born in Iran—and current leader of the United States. That is Valerie Jarrett.” [49049]

House Republicans may start passing bills funding government operations one department at a time—daring the Senate Democrats to vote against them. Senator Mike Lee (R-UT) suggests just that: “Late Saturday night, the House of Representatives passed a bill to ensure that all active duty military personnel, the brave men and women in uniform, will continue to get paid. Yesterday, the Senate took up that measure and passed it unanimously. It did so in a matter of minutes, in a seemingly effortless legislative act. I think we can do the exact same thing with a number of noncontroversial spending bills that fund aspects of government that Americans overwhelmingly support, Americans acknowledge that we need, and that are completely unrelated to Obamacare. My plan, in other words, would involve setting up segmented continuing resolutions, appropriations measures that would keep the funding going at current levels to various areas within government, including the Department of Defense, the Department of Homeland Security, military construction, C.J.S., which includes funding for the Department of Justice, the federal court system, the F.B.I., NASA, and the national weather service, for example.” (The problem with Lee’s proposal is that it gives Obama and the Senate Democrats exactly what they want: the continued full operations of government, and no stop to ObamaCare.) [49050]

The House of Representatives votes 228–201 to approve a third continuing funding resolution. The legislation delays ObamaCare’s individual mandate for one year and calls for members of Congress and their aides to buy unsubsidized insurance on the exchanges. [49028, 49029, 49063]

The Senate votes 54–46 to reject the House continuing resolution, ensuring that the government will shut down at midnight—unless the Republicans in the House cave in completely. (The Senate does approve a separate House bill ensuring military pay continues in the event of a shutdown.) [49030,49031]

Congresswoman Ann Wagner (R-MO) asks that she not be paid during the government shutdown. Senator Ted Cruz (R-TX) states that he will donate to charity the salary he receives during the shutdown. Congressman Bill Flores (R-WY) pledges his salary to debt reduction. [49034, 49035]

With a partial government shutdown taking place in just hours, key Democrats attend a party at Hillary Clinton’s Washington, D.C. home to raise money for the campaign of longtime Clinton political operative Terry McAuliffe. [49076, 49079]

Congressman Alan Grayson (D-FL) sends a Twitter message: “We fight and we win. Contribute \$25 by tonight’s FEC [Federal Election Commission] deadline & together,



we'll keep winning.” (Not surprisingly, Grayson is roundly criticized for his call for campaign contributions on the eve of the shutdown.) [49139]