

**December 26, 2016**

Now we see the president's true colors. We wrote March 3rd on the [Passive/Aggressive Prez](#); *"It's been more than a week since the refusal of the president to attend Scalia's (funeral) service and it still rankles. It was a perfect chance for a passive aggressive personality; without lifting a finger, he was able to flip the bird to millions of Americans."*

Tom Cotton, Senator from Arkansas, summed up the president's most recent betrayal of Israel;

*"President Obama is personally responsible for this anti-Israel resolution. His diplomats secretly coordinated the vote, yet he doesn't even have the courage of his own convictions to vote for it. This cowardly, disgraceful action cements President Obama's richly deserved legacy as the most anti-Israel president in American history. ..."*

*" President Obama vetoed a similar, but less anti-Israel resolution in 2011—back when he still needed pro-Israel voters for his reelection. ..."*

[Jonathan Tobin](#) in Commentary posts;

*... This lame duck stab in the back of America's only democratic ally in the Middle East should only further encourage President-elect Donald Trump to make good on his promise to move the U.S. embassy to Israel from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem and let the world know that the new administration not only repudiates his predecessor's betrayal but that the alliance is as strong as ever.*

*That will have to wait until January 20th and Obama's exit from the White House. In the meantime, this is a moment for Democratic friends of Israel to apologize for eight years of excusing and rationalizing Obama's growing hostility to the Jewish state. Though some will disingenuously argue that the president is trying to save Israel from itself, today's vote must be seen for what it is. Freed of political constraints, the president finally showed his true colors by throwing Israel to the wolves at a United Nations where anti-Semitism and anti-Israel bias is integral to the culture of the world body. ...*

[Ed Morrissey](#) at Hot Air posts on the Washington Post Editors calling the UN abstention a "dangerous parting shot." Morrissey goes into important, but mostly forgotten, background when the administration funded efforts to defeat Netanyahu in last year's Israeli elections.

*"... The stunt at Turtle Bay is all the more self-serving, because Obama and John Kerry torpedoed any chance of working with Netanyahu. Obama has spent a lot of time and effort decrying alleged Russian influence in our election, but almost two years ago, the State Department under Obama and Kerry actively attempted to do the same thing in Israel to force Netanyahu out of office. ..."*

*"... The media coverage of this UN vote has almost entirely missed this particular point. They have noted Netanyahu's defense of settlements and supposed intransigence on the peace process without ever noting that his US partner tried to push him out of office — the same*

partner who's currently in high dudgeon over hostile governments attempting to do the same thing here. The purpose of this interference was to get an Israeli prime minister who would adopt Obama's approach to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict rather than one who represents the Israelis.

Instead, Netanyahu won a surprise victory, and Obama ended up with egg on his face. **It's difficult to see this stunt at the UN as anything more than a final, impotent, petulant tantrum.** This was Obama's final opportunity to humiliate Netanyahu regardless of the danger it might present to Israelis. It's one last shameful act in a series from this administration, and it can't hit the exits fast enough.

**American Interest** notes how even the Dems are turning on the president.

*... Obama is truly the great uniter. First he united the Arabs and Israelis in a repudiation of his Middle East policies, now he's united Republicans and Democrats in a repudiation of his policies at home. Almost everywhere you look, the gap between Obama's stirring rhetoric and his underwhelming accomplishments is immense. One of the biggest failures was his inability to make the Democrats competitive in every state.*

*This stems from many things, but one is his apparent indifference to state government. He seems to think of the Federal government as the only level of government that really matters. It is especially telling that he has been missing in action while his home state of Illinois drifted into a state of advanced decay due to a worsening pension problem. Ditto his home city of Chicago, where racial polarization and financial decline have proceeded while the Obama White House was largely uninvolved. Great U.S. Presidents, and even good ones, are usually rooted in local politics. They are citizens of real places, and they carry the concerns and the insights of those places into office. Obama was a member of the New York Times tribe, people for whom an absence of local loyalties is a sign of enlightenment. ...*

Cartoons are good today.

---

---

---

## **Commentary**

### **Obama's Betrayal**

by Jonathan S. Tobin

It turned out that nothing could prevent President Obama from firing one last shot at Israel. Despite the pleas of the Israeli government and the warning from his successor that failing to veto a biased UN resolution on the Middle East conflict would be deeply unfair and soon repudiated, the administration broke with decades of U.S. policy, abstained from voting on a

[resolution that condemns Israeli settlements, and abandoned the Jewish state to its enemies at the United Nations Security Council.](#)

Today's resolution brands the Jewish presence in any part of the West Bank or in parts of Jerusalem that were occupied by Jordan from 1949 to 1967 as illegal. And it makes the hundreds of thousands of Jews who live in those parts of the ancient Jewish homeland international outlaws. The excuse given by the U.S. was that increased building in the territories and Jerusalem is endangering the chances of a two-state solution. But, [as I noted yesterday](#) when the vote on the resolution was postponed, this is a canard. The reason why a two-state solution has not been implemented to date is because the Palestinians have repeatedly refused offers of statehood even when such offers would put them in possession of almost all of the West Bank and a share of Jerusalem. The building of more homes in places even Obama admitted that Israel would keep in the event of a peace treaty is no obstacle to peace if the Palestinians wanted a state. Rather than encourage peace, this vote will merely encourage more Palestinian intransigence and their continued refusal to negotiate directly with Israel. It will also accelerate support for efforts to wage economic war on Israel via the BDS movement.

This lame duck stab in the back of America's only democratic ally in the Middle East should only further encourage President-elect Donald Trump to make good on his promise to move the U.S. embassy to Israel from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem and let the world know that the new administration not only repudiates his predecessor's betrayal but that the alliance is as strong as ever.

That will have to wait until January 20th and Obama's exit from the White House. In the meantime, this is a moment for Democratic friends of Israel to apologize for eight years of excusing and rationalizing Obama's growing hostility to the Jewish state. Though some will disingenuously argue that the president is trying to save Israel from itself, today's vote must be seen for what it is. Freed of political constraints, the president finally showed his true colors by throwing Israel to the wolves at a United Nations where anti-Semitism and anti-Israel bias is integral to the culture of the world body.

This is a moment when those who have been in denial about the harm the president has done to the U.S.-Israel alliance should admit their mistake. But for the pro-Israel community as a whole, a bipartisan coalition of Republicans and Democrats, conservatives and liberals, this is a moment of anger that will hopefully be followed by a determination to work with the next president to repair the grave damage Obama has caused.

## Hot Air

### [WaPo: Obama's abstention at UN was "a dangerous parting shot" at Israel](#)

by Ed Morrissey

President Obama has only four weeks left in office, but that was time enough to throw Israel under the bus one last time. By [abstaining at the UN](#), Obama allowed the Security Council to harshly condemn Israel via a one-sided resolution over settlement expansion, payback from Obama to Benjamin Netanyahu for balking at Obama's plans for an Israeli-Palestinian settlement. The editorial board of the Washington Post slapped Obama for his "[dangerous parting shot](#)," and predicted that the UN resolution will undermine both the peace process and the UN itself:

A lame-duck White House may feel a radical change in policy is justified by Israel's shift to the right under Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu; Israel's governing coalition is supporting legislation that would legalize dozens of settlements that Israel itself defines as illegal, because they were constructed on private Palestinian property. Mr. Netanyahu supported a partial settlement freeze for 10 months in 2009 and 2010 at Mr. Obama's behest, but has since allowed construction, including in some areas deep in the West Bank.

Nevertheless, settlements do not explain the administration's repeated failures to broker an Israeli-Palestinian peace. The Palestinian Authority under Mahmoud Abbas proved unwilling to negotiate seriously even during the settlement freeze, and it refused to accept a framework for negotiations painstakingly drawn up by Secretary of State John F. Kerry in 2014. In past negotiations, both sides have acknowledged that any deal will involve the annexation by Israel of settlements near its borders, where most of the current construction takes place — something the U.N. resolution, which was pressed by the Palestinians, did not acknowledge or take into account.

Israeli officials charged that the abstention represented a vindictive parting shot by Mr. Obama at Mr. Netanyahu, with whom he has feuded more bitterly than he did with most U.S. adversaries. The vote could also be seen as an attempt to preempt Mr. Trump, who appears ready to shift U.S. policy to the opposite extreme after naming a militant advocate of the settlements as his ambassador to Israel. Whatever the motivation, Mr. Obama's gesture is likely to do more harm than good.

The stunt at Turtle Bay is all the more self-serving, because Obama and John Kerry torpedoed any chance of working with Netanyahu. Obama has spent a lot of time and effort decrying alleged Russian influence in our election, but almost two years ago, the State Department under Obama and Kerry actively [attempted to do the same thing in Israel](#) to force Netanyahu out of office. A [Senate probe](#) concluded this summer that [the State Department funneled cash through OneVoice to Victory 15](#), an Israeli group committed to defeating Netanyahu in the March 2015 elections.

It's not as if OneVoice made a mistake. They actively worked to defeat Netanyahu, and still got State Department funding anyway:

All three of the State Department officials that the Subcommittee interviewed stated they first learned of OneVoice's planned political activity when they read news accounts concerning its "partnership" with V15.109 The Subcommittee asked two State Department officials—a senior official with the NEA Bureau and former Consul General Ratney—what the State Department would have done if, during the grant period, OneVoice had informed State officials that it was planning to launch an anti-Netanyahu campaign to coincide with the next election. Consul General Ratney initially responded that it would have been a "red flag" and State would have stopped the grant if it had known OneVoice was making such plans during the grant period. To do otherwise would have been "crazy," Mr. Ratney explained, given the State Department's sensitivities about "messaging."<sup>110</sup> The senior official in the NEA Bureau responded that State likely would have ended the grant and the decision would have "gone up the chain, likely to the Ambassador."<sup>111</sup>

**The record is clear, however, that OneVoice did inform at least two State Department officials of its political plans, and it did so during the grant period.** The Department took no action in response, although it is unclear whether the officials in receipt of the plans reviewed them. In September 2014, three months before the grant period was scheduled to end but after the final payment of U.S. funds to OneVoice Israel on August 25, 2014, Mr. Ginsberg

exchanged a number of emails with Consul General Ratney, then the second-highest-ranking American diplomat in the region.<sup>112</sup> In that exchange, Mr. Ginsberg said he was in the process of obtaining final PeaceWorks board approval of a "major strategy directed at centrist Israelis" after "quietly bouncing ideas off a lot of folks, including Martin [Indyk] in its preparation."<sup>113</sup> Mr. Ginsberg indicated that he did not "expect much help from the USG [United States Government] in its final phase," but offered to share the strategy "for friendship sake."<sup>114</sup> Mr. Ratney responded that he would "love to take a look at the strategy."<sup>115</sup>

The proposal sent to Mr. Ratney, "A Strategic Plan to Mobilize Centrist Israeli & Palestinian," was the culmination of months of work and presented a "bold and definable" political option to "[l]aunch a major strategic campaign that could shift a key portion of the Israeli and Palestinian electorates in a direction that would marginalize the extremists on either side," according to Mr. Ginsberg's email.<sup>116</sup> The proposal outlined the political goals of OneVoice in the next Israeli election, which was yet to be scheduled: "The [center-left] bloc has not been able to unify around a common message, a common agenda, or a strong leader. **Our aim is to strengthen the bloc, rather than any one party, [and] in tandem weaken Netanyahu and his right wing parties.**"<sup>117</sup> Additionally, the proposal listed seven "Specific Israeli Tactical Objectives."<sup>118</sup> The second objective was clear: "Shift support within the Knesset from a Likud-centric coalition to a center left coalition through public education and grassroots mobilization initiatives."<sup>119</sup>

The media coverage of this UN vote has almost entirely missed this particular point. They have noted Netanyahu's defense of settlements and supposed intransigence on the peace process without ever noting that his US partner tried to push him out of office — the same partner who's currently in high dudgeon over hostile governments attempting to do the same thing here. The purpose of this interference was to get an Israeli prime minister who would adopt Obama's approach to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict rather than one who represents the Israelis.

Instead, Netanyahu won a surprise victory, and Obama ended up with egg on his face. It's difficult to see this stunt at the UN as anything more than a final, impotent, petulant tantrum. This was Obama's final opportunity to humiliate Netanyahu regardless of the danger it might present to Israelis. It's one last shameful act in a series from this administration, and it can't hit the exits fast enough.

## **The American Interest**

### **The Democrats Turn on Obama**

The rising stars of the Democratic Party have been airing criticisms of President Obama lately, covering them with only the thinnest of veils. The *Wall Street Journal* reports:

Though they rarely mention the president by name or address his policies, Labor Secretary Tom Perez and Minnesota Rep. Keith Ellison have sent a clear message that Mr. Obama has left the party in a weakened state.

Messrs. Perez and Ellison—along with state chairmen Jaime Harrison of South Carolina and Ray Buckley of New Hampshire, who are also candidates for chairman of the DNC—are seeking a mandate to reverse Obama-era tactics that cut funding and attention to local parties

and left Democrats with far less power in Congress, governorships and state legislatures than when his presidency began.

"This needs to be the very last cycle in which the presidential candidate takes over the DNC," said Mr. Harrison, speaking at a forum for candidates earlier this month. "The DNC is not just about winning the presidency. Amen?"

The audience, mostly Democratic state party chairs, responded "Amen."

Obama is truly the great uniter. First he united the Arabs and Israelis in a repudiation of his Middle East policies, now he's united Republicans and Democrats in a repudiation of his policies at home. Almost everywhere you look, the gap between Obama's stirring rhetoric and his underwhelming accomplishments is immense. One of the biggest failures was his inability to make the Democrats competitive in every state.

This stems from many things, but one is his apparent indifference to state government. He seems to think of the Federal government as the only level of government that really matters. It is especially telling that he has been missing in action while his home state of Illinois drifted into a state of advanced decay due to a worsening pension problem. Ditto his home city of Chicago, where racial polarization and financial decline have proceeded while the Obama White House was largely uninvolved. Great U.S. Presidents, and even good ones, are usually rooted in local politics. They are citizens of real places, and they carry the concerns and the insights of those places into office. Obama was a member of the *New York Times* tribe, people for whom an absence of local loyalties is a sign of enlightenment. One sometimes gets the sense that Albany can rot as far as the *New York Times* is concerned; its allegiance isn't to the Bronx or upstate, but to the world. State party organizations can only wither when led by people who think like this.

President Obama will no doubt have a lucrative and high-profile retirement. He's younger than most Presidents, and he will be staying in Washington for the time being. But his immediate legacy is clearly a disaster for Democrats: in early 2017, the Party will control a minority of state houses and no branch of Federal government. With so little, it's very difficult to regenerate and develop a farm system. The Democrats' bench is already extremely shallow; it probably won't get much more crowded over the next few years.

Meanwhile, President Obama's signature policy initiatives are withering on the vine. The Iran Deal looks unlikely to survive the next four years. Obamacare will likely be gutted early next year. The President's international climate change frameworks aren't supported by the incoming administration or the incoming Congress. His nuclear non-proliferation efforts failed. Dodd-Frank's regulations may be repealed. His free trade agenda has stalled. His immigration reform efforts have led to a backlash that will make life even harder for the people he tried to help. The list goes on...

A President's job is not simply to make good on his promises; it is also to ensure that his policies stick. Increasingly, it looks like Obama's won't. Somewhere between rhetoric and reality, they seem to have been sucked into the void.

The president addresses West Wing troops after the election;

**TFW** - The Feeling When



**EducatedHillbilly™**  
@RobProvince



Following

TFW you spend 8 years weaponizing the Federal Government only to hand it over to Donald Trump....





# CANADIAN BORDER PATROL



**WATCHING FOR ILLEGAL  
AMERICANS.**

## DEMOCRATS IN THE OBAMA YEARS

	<u>2009</u>	<u>NOW (DEC. 2016)</u>
# OF DEMOCRATS IN THE HOUSE	256	188 (-68)
# OF DEMOCRATS IN THE SENATE	58	46 (-12)
# OF DEMOCRATIC GOVERNORS	28	18 (-10)

LIVE  
MSNBC

THEM AND THAT HE HAS NOT HEARD FROM THE FBI SINCE FORMER DE 6:11AM ET

WE CAN NOT ALLOW ANOTHER COUNTRY TO INFLUENCE OUR ELECTIONS!



THAT'S WHY WE'RE BUILDING THE WALL



tinder

GENDER IDENTITY OPTIONS

The dating app Tinder announced a new feature this week which gives users 37 different gender identity options.

tinder

GENDER IDENTITY OPTIONS

It's called "Why Democrats lost the election."





# THE DAY AFTER CALIFORNIA LEGALIZES MARIJUANA

