
NOTE: *The following article sought rejection of John Boehner's quest for a third term as RINO Speaker. Instead, House Republicans spurned the wishes, values and interests of the voters who elected them. The three articles after the first portray the grim consequences.*

THE LAST RESORT TO REPLACE JOHN BOEHNER: CALL THE RINO ESTABLISHMENT'S BLUFF

By Lester Jackson, January 2 and 4, 2015

It would be best if Speaker Boehner were replaced by Louie Gohmert. Failing that, true conservatives should give RINOs a taste of their own medicine. If there are not enough votes for Gohmert, here is a practical method for ousting the RINO Speaker by maximizing the leverage of a relatively few genuine conservatives.

Crominbus was the last straw. Conservatives are now absolutely [livid](#) at the RINO Establishment. Rarely, if ever, has such an unmistakable voter mandate been so brazenly nullified before the newly elected could even take office. Calls escalate to "[end](#)" the Republican Party because conservatives cannot change it. By contrast, Rush Limbaugh, while [lamenting](#) that "the losers in the last election [got] pretty much everything they want[ed]," nevertheless [rejects](#) the third party call: "taking over the Republican Party is better."

Sarah Palin [protests](#) that what House Speaker John Boehner and 162 Republican "yahoos" did "stinks to high heaven," for which Rep. Gohmert [expects](#) Boehner to be rewarded with Democrat votes for speaker. Palin declares open season on RINOs, including replacing Boehner. Conservatives find it especially galling — and intolerable — to have a Speaker who (a) shows utter contempt for the representatives whose election resulted in his ascension to power; and (b) does everything he can to subvert the wishes, interests and values of these representatives and their constituents.

It could take years to replace or seize control of the Republican Party, by which time everything this country has stood for could be destroyed. However, there is a clearly viable short term strategy. Oust Boehner from the speakership — now!

If the 2014 and 2010 elections are to have any meaning at all, if all the work and promises made to elect Republican majorities in both houses of Congress are not to be completely nullified, replacing Boehner must be considered *the* top priority. (Although Senate Republican Leader Mitch McConnell deserves recognition for his [zealous defense](#) of [freedom of speech](#), he too should be replaced because he is a RINO stooge, as [Andrew McCarthy](#) makes plain. Due to different House and Senate procedures, what follows is confined to Boehner. But replacing him would suffice to send a strong message to RINOs.)

RINO Methods

The RINO *modus operandi* is crystal clear. First, RINOs savagely and falsely smear conservatives who offer a choice in Republican primaries, even courting Democrat votes with [classic](#) shameless Democrat-style [race-baiting](#).

Second, after working and spending vast sums to defeat conservatives in primaries, the Establishment **demand**s that conservatives support RINOs in general elections because Democrats are allegedly worse and conservatives have no place else to go. After the lame-duck effrontery the country just suffered, defiant RINO nullification of an election won by candidates who campaigned on the appeal

and strength of conservative promises, the “lesser evil” siren song has lost its allure.

Third, and most important, while demanding conservative “lesser evil” support for RINO nominees, the Establishment often does not reciprocate. Nor are RINOs content to remain mute about their distaste for conservative nominees. Instead, RINOs feel free to trash conservative Republican nominees. Then Establishment “experts” pontificate that conservative candidates can’t win general elections because they are incompetent, too extreme and just plain nuts. Obviously, when a conservative primary winner has to fight not only a Democrat opponent but also malicious attacks by those supposed to be on his or her own side, it is grossly unfair to declare him or her unelectable.

The Lesson: Turnabout Is Fair Play

There is a lesson here. For RINOs, the “lesser evil” ploy is a one-way street. Many RINOs favor defeat of conservative Republicans by leftist Democrats, if that’s the choice. Turning the tables is long overdue.

Unarguably, it is best for conservatives to defeat RINOs in primaries. Yet primaries are for the long term. The clear and present danger is at hand – January 6. By 1988, Connecticut’s conservative icon William F. Buckley, Jr. had had enough of RINO Senator Lowell Weiker. So Buckley [endorsed](#) and helped elect Democrat Joseph Lieberman. Currently, no junior Democrats can do as much damage to conservatism as Boehner.

High Stakes Poker

If they have the stomach to engage Boehner and his RINO toadies in a game of chicken, there are now enough conservative House Republicans to produce a wholesale leadership change. They have enormous leverage. Remember, [67 Republican](#) representatives voted against Cromnibus. Although there were [only 16](#) Republicans who voted against the Rule that enabled a House vote on Cromnibus, many of those who voted for the Rule were [tricked](#) or [lied to](#) by their leaders on more than one bill.

If RINOs prefer defeat of conservative Republicans by leftist Democrats, conservatives should take a page out of the Establishment playbook. Make it clear to the Boehner gang that he should go gracefully or, if necessary and only as a last resort, at least 30 conservative Republicans will vote for Nancy Pelosi to be Speaker. If serious, they could convince Boehner to leave without a fight.

Maximum Advantage; Minimal Risk

Advantages of Genuine Threat to Vote for Pelosi. First, this would get rid of Boehner, who has done incalculable harm. Second, a [credible](#) threat (not mere posturing) can compel a majority of Republicans to force Boehner out in favor of one of their own who will honor their pledges to voters. It would be a test of intestinal fortitude, a question of who blinks first. The final choice — and onus — of whether to have Pelosi would be placed squarely on her clone and his lackeys.

Why threaten to vote for Pelosi as a last resort? Why not just threaten to abstain or vote for anybody else just to deny Boehner a 218 vote majority?

Although the Constitution [specifies](#) that the House shall choose, i.e., elect, its Speaker, the number of votes required is not decreed. Contrary to [erroneous reports](#), an absolute majority of House members is *not* mandated. Under [recent practice](#) (1), always subject to change, a majority of those voting for named individuals is required. But in the past, a plurality — the most votes although not a majority — has been accepted (see [House Practice](#), page 645).

Representative Grimm having resigned, the next House will have 246 Republicans and 188 Democrats. If as many as 57 Republicans merely abstain, Boehner could be elected with 189 Republicans. If some Republicans vote for someone other than Boehner, a higher number would be needed for him to have a majority of those voting for individuals. But he could still become Speaker without a majority of all representatives. To avoid this, Republicans could keep their campaign promises by giving a true conservative, such as newly announced Speaker candidate Louie Gohmert, enough votes to provide a majority of those voting for individuals.

If unable to stomach Pelosi or Boehner, some Republicans may vote for alternatives, which could deny either candidate a majority of those naming candidates. But if Boehner still refuses to withdraw, Republicans might be tempted to elect him with only a plurality. In that event, if it appears that the only choice is Pelosi vs. Boehner and they lack the votes to replace Obama's [golf-buddy](#) and ally with a true conservative, at least 30 true conservatives should vote for Pelosi, giving her 218 if all Democrats vote for her. Again, that would only be as a last resort if all else fails.

Minimal Risk. Republicans voting for Pelosi is nowhere as dangerous as keeping Boehner, who, from day one, has prevented use of constitutional [powers Congress does have](#) in order to block a lawless president from abusing powers he does **not** have — and who now has nullified the clear results of an election. Boehner used his power to prevent defunding of Obamacare in January 2011. He now has enabled amnesty. In reality, a vote for Boehner is a vote to lock in forever what Pelosi and Obama have done and stand for. Moreover, Republican support for Pelosi in order to oust Boehner cannot compare to RINOs helping elect rabid leftist Democrats by attacking conservative Republicans.

More importantly, a threat to vote for Pelosi would be nearly risk-free because, like a RINO, she would become a Speaker “in name only” for three reasons. First, a Speaker still has to have the votes to pass anything. Without the support of a majority, a minority party Speaker is much less likely to have the muscle to round up votes. With substantial party majorities, Speaker Pelosi had a bare majority for Obamacare and Speaker Boehner had a bare majority for the Rule enabling the vote for Cromnibus. Both Speakers obtained their bare majorities by combinations of intimidation, bribery, trickery and outright deceit — unlikely to be available to a minority speaker. Second, rulings may be appealed. [House Practice](#) (page 63) provides that the “right to appeal from a decision ... which may be invoked by any Member, protects the House against arbitrary control by the speaker.” Third, a minority Speaker would have no control over House committees because their members are [separately elected](#) (pages H29-H30) and would be [under](#) Republican [domination](#).

The upshot is that a minority party Speaker would lack real power to intimidate, having far less capacity to do damage than one with the backing and powers authorized by the majority party.

Finally, most important and rendering the Pelosi threat almost risk-free, she can easily be removed ([House Practice](#), page 644) once conservatives show they are serious: “The Office of Speaker may be declared vacant by resolution, which may be offered as a matter of privilege. Manual Sec. 315; 6 Cannon Sec. 35.” While unlikely if they openly declare their resolve, were it necessary to actually vote for Pelosi to demonstrate conservative Republican seriousness, she would and could easily be removed simply because there will be more Republicans in the next House. By contrast, Boehner, if elected, would be stuck in cement. The tragic irony of Republicans who fear risk in voting for Pelosi is that, while she would lack real power to do damage and be removable, Boehner's future betrayals of conservatism would be guaranteed because unstoppable.

It cannot be emphasized too strongly that the best option is replacing Boehner with a speaker who reflects the values and interests of voters who elected a Republican majority. (It speaks volumes that pressure might be required for this to happen.) But what if, even with expanded numbers, there are not enough Republicans willing to replace the speaker who just betrayed the trust of constituents

whose votes enabled him to become speaker? In that case, there are surely enough Republican representatives to replace him by voting for the Democrat alternative as a last resort. When Boehner gives Democrats everything they want anyway, it makes no difference if there is a Democrat speaker. Pelosi inflicted Obamacare; Boehner repeatedly saved it. Also, there will be a Republican majority to rein in a Democrat speaker.

Most importantly, if 30 or more Republicans make clear that they will replace Boehner with Pelosi if compelled, this might install spines in the spineless, forcing them to vote for a conservative Republican speaker.

“Desperate times call for desperate measures.” All that the United States has stood for cannot survive with Boehner continuing at the House helm. And it cannot survive unless RINOs are taught a clear lesson that conservatives can use RINO rules of unfair play.

Reactions to John Boehner’s re-election as Speaker included scant attention to its implications for representative democracy. There is now no way for a majority of voters to obtain representatives who will represent them; and no way to compel a purportedly representative government to comply with their clear wishes on matters they consider most crucial.

SPEAKER BOEHNER AND FRUSTRATED CONSERVATIVES

By Lester Jackson, February 14/March 20, 2015

As [Lincoln](#) noted, “unanimity is impossible; ... so that, rejecting the majority principle, anarchy or despotism ... is all that is left.” Yet Boehner’s continued Speakership demonstrates that there is now no way for a majority of voters to obtain representatives who will represent them; and no way to compel a purportedly representative government to comply with their clear wishes on matters they consider most crucial.

[Angelo Codevilla’s](#) contention has been confirmed again. America is now lorded over by an oligarchic [Ruling Class](#). Republicans are indistinguishable from Democrats. For voting *majorities*, who resoundingly rejected Obama Care in 2010 and [all](#) Obama policies in 2014, there is currently no place to go.

Due largely to Boehner, firmly and clearly stated campaign promises on the most important issues have been repeatedly and defiantly broken.

Not All Roll Call Votes Are Created Equal

Less than one month after he [rammed through](#) the infamous Cromnibus bill and two days after being re-elected, Boehner held a press conference that merits a prominent place in the museum of memorable denials, such as [Nixon’s](#) “I am not a crook” and [Clinton’s](#) “I did not have sexual relations with that woman.” The Speaker effectively [declared](#): “I am not a spineless establishment squish.”

Objecting to opposition from the right, he laid claim to “the [eighth most conservative voting record](#) [,]” illustrating how unreliable roll call votes are in assessing a legislator’s performance.

- First, a favorite device for legislators to deceive voters is reliance on lack of public

awareness of the importance of procedural votes, [critical](#) in determining actual policy but often not included by those who classify voting records as “liberal” or “conservative.” For example, the House has a Rules Committee that considers resolutions determining if, when and how controversial bills are considered. But the full House must approve a rule before a bill can be debated and voted on. Lying legislators often vote liberal on rules and conservative on bills. As will be explained, two blatant examples occurred when Boehner saved Obama Care and largely nullified the 2014 election.

- Second, raw numbers mask the vastly differing importance of issues and how strongly voters care about them. When polled, voters often express opinions, without much thought, on issues they care little about if they care at all. But other voters feel so strongly about the same issues that they will not only express opinions but cast votes based solely on them. A prime example of votes determined by one issue is ObamaCare. Countless polls have documented its unpopularity. Few would deny its transcendent importance or that the 2010 and 2014 Republican successes were based largely on promises to get rid of it. 2014 also included promises to block unconstitutional Obama amnesty for illegal aliens. *More than any other member of Congress, Boehner has been responsible for breaking these promises.*

2,813 recorded House votes occurred during the first four full years of Boehner’s reign ([here](#), [here](#), [here](#), [here](#)). A handful, perhaps four, mattered more than all the others: the Rule that saved Obama Care, the Rule that enabled the Cronibus 2014 election nullification, and the two votes that made Boehner Speaker.

Speaker-election votes matter more than most because the Speaker wields power over *all* other votes. Boehner has thwarted solemn promises that resulted in majorities that made him Speaker by blocking all serious efforts to halt Obama’s unconstitutional abuses of power, effectively approving and enabling these abuses. The American people now suffer a bizarre combination of rule over the House with an [iron fist](#) in order to kowtow to an iron-fisted president on the most critical issues.

The Rules Ruse: How Obama Care Became Obama-Boehner Care

It is now five years since Obama Care became law. Fewer than eight months after enactment, due largely to that law, the voters expressed their opposition by giving Republicans control of the House, resulting in Boehner becoming Speaker. Yet three months after the 2010 election and still less than a year had elapsed, he immediately used his new power to squelch promises to undo Obama Care, thereby taking co-ownership of that law for most of the period it has been on the books and responsibility for all the hardships and shocks it has caused and will cause to millions of Americans. Biased media will never use the truly descriptive term: Obama-Boehner Care. This policy, as well as Obama-imposed/[Boehner-approved](#) unconstitutional [amnesty for law-breaking](#) by millions of aliens, must be seen as two of the most critical oligarchical ruling class betrayals of the early 21st century.

Boehner’s autocratic complicity in these unpopular policies renders irrelevant any overall roll call voting record he may cite to fool voters. Is it surprising that substantial majorities of the voters who produced a Republican Congress did not want Boehner

retained as Speaker? The [latest](#) poll came after one of the most important votes of Boehner's cowardly House suzerainty, in which he [begged](#) President Obama to round up Democratic votes for Cromnibus in defiance of opposed Republican voters. As described by Rep. Jim [Bridenstine](#), this *lameduck*

\$1.1 trillion spending bill ... funded the government for 10 months and blocked our newest elected Republicans from advancing conservative policy and delivering on campaign promises. [Boehner] gave away the best tool available to rein in our liberal activist President: the power of the purse[,] Congress' Constitutional strength.... Boehner went too far when he teamed with Obama to advance this legislation. He relinquished the power of the purse....

It is critical to emphasize the immensity of this renounced power. The U.S. Constitution clearly [states](#): "No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law." This is a grant of *absolute power*, not just to Congress but to each of its houses. Although two thirds of each house of Congress can override a presidential veto, if a simple majority one house *resolutely* refuses to appropriate money, there is nothing that the president or the other house can do about it. Period!

Significantly, Boehner's lameduck Cromnibus surrender required two recorded votes, illustrating the trap of relying on roll calls to assess legislative performance. Much was made of Boehner's begging Obama to corral Democrat support because [67 Republicans](#) voted [against](#) passage. Many of them were actually praised by gullible conservatives. However, prior to voting on the bill, there had to be a [vote on the Rule](#) allowing it to be even considered. Not one Democrat voted for that Rule and [only 16 Republicans](#) voted against it. If one more Republican had voted "No" on the Rule, the bill would never have been voted on, let alone passed. Thus, 51 Republicans had it both ways. They voted for the Rule allowing consideration and then against final passage. Doubtless, roll call voting analyses will list them as voting conservative when, in reality, they helped Boehner stab conservatives in the back.

Trey Gowdy, [inexplicably](#) touted for Speaker by such conservatives as [Sean Hannity](#), was among the both-ways Republicans and [supported](#) Boehner's re-election. Rep. Bridenstine was, regrettably, among Cromnibus' both-ways Republicans. Despite its central role in determining the content of legislation, his "Communications Director" [downplayed](#) the significance of the Rules vote, which made the difference between relinquishing the power of the purse and blocking that surrender. In sum, Bridenstine voted to approve voting on what he then voted against and professed to be his reason to vote against Boehner. Like [John Kerry](#), Bridenstine was for Cromnibus before he was against it. That does not mean his powerful quoted statement was wrong. What was wrong was his vote enabling a vote on Cromnibus in the first place.

Cromnibus is thus one classic illustration of the Rules Ruse. Another little noticed yet major use of Rules to deceive conservatives occurred February 15, 2011. The Rules Committee held a painful-to-watch [hearing](#) that prevented a House vote on Rep. Steve King's amendment to defund Obama-Boehner Care. When professed Obama-Boehner Care opponent and actual [Obama ally](#) Rep. Foxx, revealing or feigning ignorance of basic high school civics, triumphantly [asked](#) (1:38) King what the Senate would do to his amendment, he patiently explained: "there is not a dime that can be spent by the federal

government unless the House concurs" (2:01).

Compare King to would-be president [Jeb Bush](#), a stronger advocate of pre-emptive surrender than Foxx:

I'd just add a little dose of reality. If you control one-half of one-third of leverage in Washington, D.C., your ability to influence things are [sic] also relative to the fact that you have one-half of one-third of the government ... politically it's quite dicey for the Republican Party.

Note the fear of "dicey" reality "for the Republican Party." RINO reality is fear and appeasement. And the fear is for the welfare of the Republican Party, not that of the country.

Condescending lectures pretending to be "realistic" fail to note the *critical distinction* between *enacting and blocking* legislation. The Constitution was designed to impede the former and facilitate the latter. Blocking funds for Obama-Boehner Care does not require enacting anything. It simply requires refusal of 50.1% of "one half of one third of the federal government" to use its absolute power to refuse to appropriate money by law. RINOs live in fear (when not bullying professed conservatives who live in even greater fear). It tellingly illustrates this fear that the likes of Jeb Bush quake at hallucinations that the president or the senate could reject what a majority of voting representatives have not approved.

Disingenuous Rationalizations

Especially for House members, who have two-year terms, it is not enough to fool voters with false promises. The next step is to fool them about why — and even whether — promises were broken. Here are a few of the disingenuous explanations given by professed non-RINOs for voting to retain the worst RINO of them all.

- Displaying abysmal ignorance, Mia Love initially [claimed](#), but later [retracted](#), that a vote for a Republican other than Boehner would make Nancy Pelosi Speaker.
- Rep. Mulvaney's [statement](#) had so many lies that an outraged [Mark Levin](#) easily smashed it to smithereens. Especially noteworthy is that, in implying that he had been fooled into voting against Boehner in 2013, this liar accused his colleagues of being liars. In 2013, he abstained.
- Many representatives claimed to be bound by November's House Republican Conference vote for Boehner, and that there had not been a long campaign for an alternative. In fact, the conference was well before Boehner's unanticipated deceitful and high-handed mid-December antics that so outraged conservatives weeks before the Speaker election. These antics included [amnesty trickery](#) and [begging Obama for help](#) in [recruiting Democrat](#) Cromnibus final passage votes.
- The claim that there was no viable alternative is belied by the fact that Boehner's opponents only sought to block a majority, so that there would be a second vote. If it became clear that Boehner could not get a majority, Republicans would then have had another conference to select an alternative (True conservatives would

take offense at the idea that Louie Gohmert was unacceptable).

Make no mistake about it. A major priority of the Republican majorities in the 114th Congress will be to con voters into believing that broken promises were kept or that failure to keep them was not their fault.

"I won," declared Barack Obama, adding what is now a cliché: "Elections have consequences." But, due to endless RINO lying to voters, Boehner and his henchmen have proven that is only partly true. Lying has been central to this country's decay. First and foremost, campaign lying and liars must be stopped. This is an absolute prerequisite to any conservative success.

THE FAITHLESS ELECTED: BOEHNER AND THE HOUSE DONS

By Lester Jackson, February 15/March 21, 2015

More than any other member of Congress, John Boehner has been responsible for violating critical Republican campaign promises essential to his becoming Speaker. To use a *Wall Street Journal* characterization of the first President Bush (July 2, 1990, A8), Boehner has "emerge[d] as the leader of the people whose ... policies [his party] defeated."

Broken promises are far worse than a mere source of unhappiness on the part of those with particular policy interests. Jude Wanniski succinctly articulated the [harm](#) caused by "promis[ing] the voters sunshine before the elections [and] delivering moonshine afterward. Democracy cannot work if politicians do not keep most of their promises ..."

"People expect politicians to lie," James Taranto recently [wrote](#). With a boys-will-be-boys attitude, jaded "sophisticates" wink at campaign lying. However, for those in a frustrated majority, who consider Obama-Boehner Care to be the most gargantuan and harmful fraud ever perpetrated in this country, it is long overdue to stop expecting and accepting campaign lying. It is time to understand that this pernicious practice vitiates representative government, whose essence is that voters *choose* who represents them.

In his opinion, on behalf of the Supreme Court, rescuing Obama-Boehner Care and the [multiple lies](#) essential to its [passage](#), Chief Justice Roberts declared: "our Nation's elected leaders ... can be thrown out of office if the people disagree with them. [Therefore, it] is not our job to protect the people from the consequences of their political choices." But, when election results are produced by blatant lies by unscrupulous candidates who have no intention of keeping their word, Roberts' opinion is arguably a libel against the American people. (In legitimizing lies, Roberts was dishonest himself. See [here](#) and [here](#).)

As is true of other decisions (e.g., doctor or product selection), information is essential to "political choices." Obviously, decisions based on faulty information are often wrong, harmful or disastrous. That is why laws, with stiff criminal penalties, have been passed requiring truthful corporate reports to investors and accurate manufacturers' package labels.

The most important political campaign information is a candidate's positions, at least regarding matters of most concern. When campaigning becomes an exercise in lying about, rather than trying to justify the merits of, where candidates stand, voting becomes a pointless charade. Voters get the satisfaction of having complied with preaching to do their "civic duty," while really buying a pig in a poke.

Voters are *consumers*, consumers of the government they choose. Congress has enacted countless laws, with criminal penalties, against false advertising (e.g., [here](#), [here](#), [here](#), [here](#)) precisely to protect consumer choices. This is one reason products contain numerous [warning labels](#), [many absurd](#). [As with many other laws](#), members of Congress do not apply truth-in-labeling requirements to themselves. But given recent experience, perhaps, at campaign appearances, candidates should be required to wear warning labels listing the dangers they pose. If manufacturers are required to provide labels warning about dangers, what could be more dangerous than a member of Congress? As [Mark Twain](#) famously quoted [Judge Tucker](#) (249): "No man's life, liberty or property are safe while the legislature is in session." Add an exclamation point while Boehner is Speaker.

Numerous voters might be unaware that [lies to Congress](#) are a crime but lies **by** legislators to voters are not. Members of Congress seem oblivious to the irony of their own virulent campaign-lying at a time when non-members can be punished for [anything](#) including failure to provide very [vaguely defined](#) (2) "honest services."

The Consequence of Consequences

"I won," [declared](#) Barack Obama, adding what is now a cliché: "Elections have consequences." Well, Boehner and his henchmen have proven that that is only partly true. There are certainly consequences when a community organizer, longtime friend of [unrepentant terrorist](#) Bill Ayers and disciple of [Saul Alinsky](#) runs with a deceptively non-threatening vague message giving few clues as to what he really intends to do. But there are no significant consequences, when Republicans win complete congressional control by campaigning in unison on an unmistakably strong message to undo the consequences of the community organizer.

Well, these Republicans must be sent a clear message. Failing to deliver promised electoral consequences will have consequences. Broken campaign promises must, or should, result in election removal.

The Insignificance of Significant Issues.

It is a mistake to focus upon particular critical issues such as taxes, abortion, spending, illegal immigration, Obama-Boehner Care. On these issues, President Obama has been the driving force but John Boehner has been the sustaining force. In turn, what has empowered and sustained Boehner has been a malignant cancer afflicting the body politic: campaign lying. The worst lying is done by the worst promise-breakers: those who make promises on specific matters and then disingenuously vote to retain a Speaker determined to block carrying out those promises. Instead of trying to keep their promises on matters most important to the voters who elected them, these people devote themselves to the task of trying to convince the voters that they tried – despite having put in place a Speaker who would make "trying" futile.

While it would be delusional for conservatives to expect anything from Obama, they have every right to expect a Republican Speaker to be on their side. Instead, he works against them with fancy footwork. In 2010, Boehner protested that Pelosi violated House Rules to impose ObamaCare. But in 2014, in order to steamroll Cromnibus, the Boehner bunch had [no trouble violating](#) the rules they professed to worship.

To be precise, at a time of Democrat contempt for law as well as rules, Boehner pretended the rules were sacred in order to prevent exercise of power of the purse to defund Obama-Boehner Care; and he completely disregarded the rules in order to needlessly surrender the same power of the purse and thereby reject the 2014 election results before the new Congress took office. This is dishonesty of the most damaging and serious magnitude on the gravest issues of the day. (Incidentally, Rules Committee members who profess fealty to the rules above all else disingenuously disregard that one of their functions is to [grant waivers](#) of rules.)

To Boehner and his toadies, truth means little or nothing. But, if representative government, now on life support, is to be saved, truth must be made to mean everything. Just as cancers must be removed to save people, lying legislators must be defeated to save the Framers' republican legacy.

For the most part, political campaign lying is a one-way street. Rarely, if ever, do conservatives pretend to be liberal. Instead, because their ideas and goals are unpopular, liberals – especially RINOs – pretend to be conservative. Thus, there can be no success on any issue important to conservatives unless they first elect candidates who tell the truth about what they have done and will do. That cannot occur unless lying is elevated to the top or sole campaign issue.

Dishonest campaigners must be defeated as often as it takes, by doing whatever it takes. It is not enough for conservatives to sit out elections and cease giving funds to dishonest Republicans. Conservatives must vote against these Republicans, first in primaries and, however painful, if necessary in the worst cases, by voting for Democrats in general elections. The gravest specific issues will not be addressed without prior removal of representatives who promise, but refuse, to take them on.

A liar is a liar is a liar! Republican liars are no better than Democrat liars. Although Chief Justice Roberts disavows responsibility to “protect the voters from the consequences of their political choices,” this is especially inapplicable to choices based on lies (unless Roberts does not think accurate information is necessary for voter choices). As Roberts well knows, “fraud” is legally defined as knowing misrepresentation of material facts to the detriment of anyone relying on such misrepresentation. It is simply untrue and – yes – a lie to say that a majority of voters ever chose the worst policies of the last five years – policies that John Boehner and representatives who elected him Speaker have ratified, while denying any responsibility.

William Buckley's Wisdom

Ideally, it is tempting to “throw [all](#) the bums out.” But, obviously, that is very unlikely. At the outset, it would be best to concentrate on selected worst bums. We don't give up trying to catch and punish criminals because many of them, likely a majority, get away with their crimes. But they must be on notice that they can't always succeed. Similarly,

whenever possible, lying to the voters must be punished too.

When conservatives fail to defeat RINOs in primaries, there is an alternative. By 1988, realizing that no new Democrat could do as much damage as senior RINO Senator Lowell Weiker, William F. Buckley, Jr., Connecticut's conservative icon, [endorsed](#) and helped elect Democrat Joseph Lieberman.

Now, as then, the worst RINOs are indistinguishable from the worst Democrats. In 2016, these people should be punished for their duplicity. If at all possible, they should be defeated by conservative Republicans in primaries or, if not, conservative voters must swallow the bitter pill of voting for Democrat opponents of the most dangerous Republicans. These surely include Boehner, Kevin McCarthy, Steve Scalise, and Pete Sessions. Their recent perfidy shows beyond question that they must be replaced. Because colleagues refuse to remove the current House Republican Dons from House leadership, they must be removed from the House altogether. They should be defeated in their home districts.

In murder cases, some argue that capital punishment should be reserved for the "worst of the worst." Well, the worst of the worst Republicans must be subjected to political capital punishment. In 2016, if conservatives are really serious, they at least must vote against the worst. If the only way to remove current House leaders – who act like Democrats anyway – is to vote for their Democrat opponents, so be it.

In addition, examples should be made of other conservative heart-breakers, e.g.: [Alex Mooney](#) and others who dishonored [signed pledges](#) to vote against Boehner; and [Virginia Foxx](#), Mia Love, Renee Elmers and Jim Bridenstine. No new Democrats can do as much to damage conservatives as these frauds. Just as many Democrats could not explain away their original votes for Obama Care, even four years later, no Republican should ever be allowed to live down voting for a Speaker who can't resist [kissing Nancy Pelosi](#) or, more seriously, surrendering the very power they were elected exercise: power of the purse.

Because campaign lying renders almost impossible any action supported by majority voters on particular issues, this lying is and must be the central issue if the today's children are to enjoy, as adults, freedom and self-government in the United States.

And because betrayed conservatives have counted on Republicans to provide a viable alternative, defeating Republican campaign liars is paramount. Political cancer cells must be removed. When they break their word, that should be the main, perhaps the only, issue in ensuing campaigns.

What if voting for Democrats causes Republicans to lose their majority in the Senate or the House? The short answer: so what! Just look at what the current crop of Republicans have done to maintain Obama-Pelosi dictatorial policies. They must be defeated in order to be replaced.

Lying has been central to this country's decay. For example, multiple lies were essential to the infliction of the affliction of Obama Care. Republicans lied to gain control of the House to cure the affliction. They did not, instead electing John Boehner Speaker. Without Boehner, Obama Care would not have been saved; but, instead, it was

converted into Obama-Boehner Care. In turn, Boehner would not be Speaker without lies.

First and foremost, campaign lying and liars must be stopped. This is an absolute prerequisite to everything else conservatives desire.

In ratifying law-breaking by both President Obama and millions of aliens, Boehner removed any lingering doubt that he is the Democrat-preferred Obama-Pelosi House Speaker. After the amnesty debacle, there can be no doubt that he is not even a RINO; he is the next-best-to-Pelosi front-man for the far left Democrats.

SPEAKER BOEHNER: DEMOCRAT DISSENTER

By Lester Jackson, on March 16 and 22, 2015

In ratifying law-breaking by both President Obama and millions of aliens, Boehner removed any lingering doubt that he is the Democrat-preferred Obama-Pelosi House Speaker. After the amnesty debacle, there can be no doubt that he is not even a RINO; he is the next-best-to-Pelosi front-man for the far left Democrats.

On March 3, after repeatedly [huffing](#) and [puffing](#) in [support](#) of the Republican position on one of the major issues of the 2014 election, John Boehner predictably went back on his word, betraying conservatives on a signature campaign promise: to rein in President Obama's unconstitutional and lawless actions in support of lawlessness. This was Boehner's final surrender, ceding the last vestige of the immense power of the purse that a majority of voters sent Republicans to Washington to exercise. In ratifying law-breaking by both the president and millions of aliens, he removed any lingering doubt that he is the Democrat-preferred Obama-Pelosi House Speaker.

A [headline](#) in *The Hill*, said it all: "Dems vow to protect Boehner from conservative coup." This headline and the accompanying Mike Lillis story validate and vindicate articles recently published [here](#), [here](#) and [here](#). Democrats now consider Boehner to be their puppet in a one-party leftist dictatorship ruling against a conservative country. So it was no surprise that, when conservatives protested this latest Boehner betrayal, Democrats rallied to reciprocate the vast aid and comfort he had given them.

Reflecting media bias, Lillis echoed a longstanding and oft-repeated distortion of reality:

Boehner, who has grappled with dissent from the Tea Party wing since he took the Speaker's gavel in 2011, has seen opposition to his reign grow this year, even as he commands the largest GOP majority since the Hoover administration.

This remarkable statement must leave Tea Partiers tearing their hair out. It was only through the efforts of the Tea Party that Boehner became Speaker at all. He owes his position to *them*; they are not there by his sufferance. It was their reinforcements arriving after the 2010 election that provided the Republicans with their majority. By default, Boehner happened to be the senior RINO party hack already there.

As for growing opposition “even as [Boehner] commands the largest GOP majority since the Hoover Administration,” that majority was obtained because victorious Republicans campaigned on a message of opposition to President Obama’s abuse of power, especially on two critical issues: the Obama-Pelosi takeover of the health care system and the legalization of law-breaking by millions of aliens. It would be stunning if Boehner, Pelosi or Obama could cite a single Republican Representative who campaigned in support of illegal immigration or what swiftly became Obama-Boehner Care.

The painful truth is not that Boehner must “grapple with dissent” but that those who elected him must confront *his* relentlessly dishonest and dictatorial dissent from the issue positions on which they campaigned.

Even worse, this is not a just Speaker with an “R” after his name who does the bidding of Democrats. This is the *de facto* Democrat Speaker, using the Pelosi-type high-handed and duplicitous tactics to further policies of the Democrats. Indeed, Pelosi actively [collaborated](#) with Boehner on the latest betrayal of Republican voters.

Consider the [key roll call vote](#) surrendering to Obama/Pelosi on amnesty for massive law-breaking. As “proof of the discontent,” Lillis notes that 167 Republicans opposed Boehner. This does not do justice to what really happened. That was 167 out of 242 voting Republicans – an astonishing 69%.

When 69% of Republicans vote against 31%, just who is dissenting from whom? This is not “discontent” on the part of a fringe rump group; it is wholesale disapproval by the Republican Party mainstream — a mainstream that somehow has managed not to control its own party.

In addition, 182 of the 257 House votes for the surrender were provided by Democrats. That’s 71% of the total — an astounding 100% of voting Democrats! When a recorded vote on one of the major issues of the last election gives a Speaker 71% support from the opposition party and a mere 29% from his own, just which party does he lead? Does he lead at all, or is he led by the nose? After all, Boehner did the bidding of every single ecstatic voting Democrat. Pelosi “[proudly](#)” celebrated!

The Boehner House majority is now overwhelmingly Democrat, with the difference supplied by a RINO minority of all Republicans.

We have come a long way from the days of House Republican Speaker Dennis Hastert, who promised to prevent a vote any matter opposed by a majority of his caucus, a promise [renewed](#) by Boehner himself. According to Hastert: “If you ... rely on the minority to get the majority of your votes, then ...you’re not running the shop.” He added that it was best to “make sure your people are on board on any major piece of legislation ...” Hastert applied this rule if his party’s division was 51% to 49%. Boehner, by contrast, used unanimous Democrats to defy a 69%-31% Republican vote against him.

One reading Lillis might be tempted to feel sorry for Boehner. Poor John Boehner. Those whose votes resulted in his becoming *Republican* Speaker won’t even stay silent while he defies their wishes, views, and interests by transmogrifying himself into leader of the *Democrats*.

Before shedding too many tears, however, remember that this is the same man who, when possible, [ruthlessly disciplines](#) Republicans who defy his wishes, stripping them of chairmanships and exiling them to House Siberia. This is the same man who not only broke his pledge to honor the Hastert Rule but also [approved](#) use of a very [rarely used rule](#) in order to ram through a bill that an overwhelming majority of Republican colleagues and voters opposed.

Finally, as Lillis makes clear, without Democrat support, no attempt to oust Boehner can succeed at this time. Now, [as before](#), the main goal of the loudest protesters is to protect themselves against their own votes to make Boehner Speaker in the first place.

For example, Lillis quotes Matt Salmon and Jim Jordan. Salmon: "sad day for America ... If we aren't going to fight now, when are we going to fight?" Jordan: "The point is to do what we told the voters we were going to do." Also, Rep. David Schweikert pronounced himself [heartbroken](#).

Can the protests of these and other representatives be taken seriously if they actually voted for instead of against Boehner when their votes really would have counted? Just look at the [roll call vote](#). Any claim of surprise proves either dishonesty or incompetence. Conspicuously absent from all the whining were any expressions of regret for having voted for Boehner or any promises never to do so again in the future.

In 2016, apart from the presidential election, no single contest will have greater impact than the one in the Ohio 8th congressional district. If conservatives are really serious, shouldn't they immediately start a campaign to defeat Boehner in his home district? First, a true conservative should announce a primary against him. But if that fails, what alternative is there but to vote for his Democrat opponent? Conservatives could descend *en masse* upon Boehner's district to persuade voters there that, no matter what Boehner may say or do from now on, he must be defeated — either by a genuine conservative Republican or by a junior Democrat who can do little harm.

After the amnesty debacle, there can be no doubt that Boehner is not even a RINO; he is the next-best-to-Pelosi front-man for the far left Democrats.

Above articles originally in American Thinker; slightly modified.

[Lester Jackson](#), Ph.D., a former college Political Science teacher, views mainstream media suppression of the truth as essential to harmful judicial activism. His recent articles are collected [here](#) and [here](#). His recent radio interview is [here](#).