

III. America's Future [Defund The Federal Beast](#) Articles

1. [House Republicans Must Starve The Government Beast](#) - April 27, 2023
2. [Congress Should Defund NGOs Transporting Illegal Aliens](#) - May 4, 2023
3. [Defund Deep State Censorship Of Social Media](#) - May 11, 2023
4. [Congress Must Defund Massive FBI Expansion](#) - May 18, 2023
5. [Let's Defund The Corporation For Public Broadcasting](#) - May 25, 2023
6. [Let's Defund "Transgender" Genital Mutilation](#) - June 1, 2023
7. [Time To Defund The ATF](#) - June 8, 2023
8. [Time To Defund Foreign Aid](#) - June 15, 2023
9. [Time To Defund FDA Trafficking In Aborted Baby Parts](#) - June 22, 2023
10. [Using The Holman Rule To Defund Leftist Programs And Rogue Bureaucrats](#) - June 29, 2023
11. [Bringing Back Impoundment To Defund Endless Wars](#) - July 6, 2023
12. [Using Appropriations Bills To Cut Spending Under "Continuing Resolutions"](#) July 13, 2023
13. [Ending Pork Barrel Spending By Ending Earmarks](#) - July 20, 2023
14. [Restricting Spending With The Hyde Amendment](#) - July 27, 2023
15. [Let's Cut Corrupt Spending With An IG For The Ukraine War](#) - August 3, 2023
16. [Defund The U.S. Agency For International Development](#) - August 10, 2023

House Republicans Must Starve the Government Beast

April 27, 2023

President Reagan said it 42 years ago in his first inaugural speech: “[G]overnment is not the solution to our problem; [government is the problem](#).” And while it is easy to blame big spending Democrats for the runaway federal budget and the nation’s staggering national deficit, that’s not really fair. While Democrats love to spend money on social programs, Republicans love to spend money on war. And, everyone in the swamp loves to bring home “pork” for their district.

With Republicans now in charge of the House, should there be reason to be optimistic? Maybe, but at the end of 1995, the [national debt](#) was just under **\$5.0 trillion**. At the end of 2022, that debt had increased to almost **\$31 trillion** — a six-fold increase in under two decades. Even if adjusted for inflation, the increase is staggering. We can blame that on the Democrats — right? Not so fast.

Who is to Blame for our \$31 Trillion Debt?

It may seem difficult to believe, but since 1995, Republicans have controlled the House of Representatives during [11 of the last 14 Congresses](#). Republicans controlled the House during six consecutive Congresses, from the 104th through the 109th under Clinton and George W. Bush. Then Democrats took over the House in the 110th and 111th Congresses during the end of the Bush Administration and the first two years of the Obama Administration. Power returned to the Republicans for four consecutive Congresses, from the 112th through 115th Congresses during the Obama Administration and the first half of the Trump Administration. Democrats took over during the 116th Congress for the second half of the Trump Administration, and the first half of the 117th Congress under Biden. And now, Republicans are in control of the House for the rest of the Biden Administration’s term.

To be sure, the nation has had a divided government during many of those years, with Democrats in charge of the Senate and in the White House, but as to taxing and spending issues, it is the House of Representatives that plays the dominant role.

The Constitution has two provisions about taxing and spending. Article I, section 7, cl. 1 states: “All Bills for raising Revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives....” Article I, section 8, cl. 7 states: “No money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by law....” To be sure, over the years, many procedural artifices have been designed to erode the dominant power of the House over taxing and spending, but not one dollar of federal money may be spent without the approval of the House.

Immediately before the Republicans took over the House in January, in December 2022, Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell and many Republicans joined Democrats to pass a nearly \$2 trillion “omnibus package.”

“[W]eak and compromised Republican leaders are choosing to actively help pass this terrible bill filled with Biden-Schumer-Pelosi priorities,” lamented Congressman Bob Good (R-VA):

The omnibus bill pumps over \$1.7 trillion out of American wallets.... Among the other provisions is millions in funding for radical gender ideology programs that seek to advance woke leftist messaging. Additionally, they propose massive funding “antiracist” initiatives, ... expanding welfare programs to compensate for President Joe Biden’s inflationary policies, pouring millions of dollars into broken government agencies such as the FBI that have caved to extreme ideology, and giving more money to the abortion mill, Planned Parenthood.

Cutting Overall Spending

The next fiscal year begins October 1, 2023 — just five short months from now. If spending continues in the future the way it has gone in the past, Republican voters will have no one to blame but their own elected officials — particularly those in the House.

It is impossible to understand how large our nation’s debt truly is. It ticks upward every second on the debt clock, and is **\$31,460,819,460,502** at this writing. The number defies imagination. (That translates into \$94,200 for every single person in America.) Consider that the U.S. gross domestic product (GDP) for 2022 — the total value of all goods and services produced in the United States — **was only \$25 trillion**. So, even if the value of everything manufactured, plus the value of all services provided in the United States in 2022, were devoted to paying off the debt, it could not do so.

Now the House GOP has passed a proposal to condition a \$1.5 trillion increase in the debt ceiling to some modest limits on the government’s spending. The bill would “reset the federal budget baseline to where it was last year —that is, before the December passage of the \$1.7 trillion omnibus bill... and would **limit future budget growth to one percent annually for the next decade**.” Even with such a limitation, government spending would continue to grow faster than the American economy.

Obviously, the GOP measure will not fix the problem. Overall cuts in spending remain essential if the nation is to fall off a financial cliff. But there is one more thing the House Republicans could do.

Defunding the Worst Programs and Agencies

In addition to cutting spending overall, House Republicans could defund the most dangerous and abusive agencies and programs. Ronald Reagan correctly observed that “a government

bureau is the [nearest thing to eternal life we'll ever see](#) on this earth.” But the Republicans could at least try to prove him wrong.

The House GOP debt limit bill included one provision to use the power of the purse to stop one runaway government agency. It would [end the funding for 87,000 new IRS agents](#) included in last year’s omnibus bill. That could be done, again and again, if the Republicans have the will to do so.

The ability to defund specific wasteful, and often evil, federal agencies and programs is one of the most powerful weapons that Republicans could use to slow the federal Leviathan. Bloated federal agencies, flush with money and abusive of the constitutional rights of Americans, must be hit where it hurts – their budgets. It is absolutely imperative that House Republicans begin to starve the worst aspects of the federal government – before the beast devours what remains of freedom.

<https://www.americasfuture.net/house-republicans-must-starve-the-government-beast/>

Congress Should Defund NGOs Transporting Illegal Aliens

May 4, 2023

There is an abundance of unnecessary and shameful federal programs and agencies which the Republicans now controlling the House of Representatives should stop funding. (Indeed, it would be an easier project to develop a list of federal programs and agencies which **should** be funded.) Today, we focus on how the House could cut off funding for just one program, which would help stem the tide of illegal aliens that is rolling over the nation.

There is no time to waste. By one estimate, [4.9 million immigrants](#) have entered the nation under the Biden Administration's Open Door policy – roughly the entire population of Ireland.

Also, Title 42 health restrictions on border crossings will expire next week, on May 11, 2023.

The Biden Administration recently announced that it was sending 1,500 active-duty troops to shore up the Southern Border, but those troops will be there for only 90 days and really will not be defending the border. A [Pentagon spokesman](#) described their role as to: “fill critical capability gaps, such as ground-based detection and monitoring, data entry, and warehouse support, until CBP can address these needs through contracted support.” He stressed: “Military personnel will not directly participate in law enforcement activities.” So, that sounds like the military will fill the role of government contractors until the contractors can be engaged – not exactly putting our troops on the border to defend our country. The truth may be more along the lines of a satirical story in *The Babylon Bee*: [“Biden Deploys 1,500 Troops At Border to Help Register New Voters.”](#)

The Biden Administration's refusal to enforce the nation's immigration laws is so blatant that many believe it should be the basis for a resolution of impeachment and removal of both President Biden and Homeland Security Secretary Mayorkas, but House Republicans have no stomach to fight that battle. However, there is a plan that just might work.

It seems obvious that the Biden Administration will not spend appropriated funds to enforce existing laws to protect our border, and the power of the purse cannot change that. However, the House could defund the Biden Administration transporting illegal aliens into cities and communities across America. Shipping illegal aliens away from the border gets the federal government off the hook for the consequences of its actions, as state and local governments are forced to shoulder the costs of housing, medical care, and criminal enforcement.

This will not be easy, for at the end of the last Congress in December 2022, the Biden Administration, Nancy Pelosi's House Democrats, and the Senate (where Mitch McConnell's troops refused to stage a filibuster) passed the massive “omnibus” bill, spending \$1.7 trillion. Nor was it just the bloated size of the bill that was such an affront to the taxpayers. Even more infuriating is where the dollars will go.

The omnibus bill contained [\\$1.5 billion for Border Patrol “border management” efforts](#), but the money expressly **cannot be used to improve border security**. The funds can be used, however, to **“to improve Border Patrol processing”** of illegals, who are often then released across America. The bill also quadrupled funding to reimburse **nongovernmental organizations (NGOs)** involved in transporting and releasing illegal immigrants across America.

To take one state as just an illustration, Tennessee Senator Marsha Blackburn and Governor Bill Lee, both Republicans, criticized the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) and Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) for sending busloads of illegal immigrants and [releasing them in Tennessee](#) under ICE’s **“Alternatives to Detention” (ATD)** program. The New Orleans ICE field office works in coordination with Tennessee Immigration and Refugee Rights Coalition (TIRRC), a left-wing immigration advocacy group, to bus these immigrants to Tennessee. Blackburn wrote to ICE director Tae Johnson: “We have learned that as many as 50 single-adult, detained illegal immigrants could be bused to Tennessee at a time, with the possibility of multiple busloads each week. Further, these individuals would be released into Tennessee while they await court proceedings.”

The same thing is happening elsewhere. The ICE ATD operates in over 300 locations around the nation, according to ICE. In December 2022, the Heritage Foundation announced the results of an investigation it conducted using geofencing data of illegal immigrants’ cell phones as the immigrants were transported and released across the country. A [former DHS official](#) explains it this way: “What we uncovered is a mass resettlement program in which the Biden administration works hand-in-hand with NGOs” and “NGOs that support these radical policies are facilitating it. The NGOs are happy to step into the breach and form the final link in the drug cartels’ human smuggling operation, ensuring these individuals make it all around the country.”

Not surprisingly, “Of the 52 congressional districts with the highest density of devices, 71% were Republican congressional districts.” Not content to use illegal immigration to turn Texas blue, the Biden administration, with the help of Senate Republicans, has targeted scores of red House districts for flipping as well. As Heritage puts it, “Biden’s border crisis has turned every state into a border state.”

If House Republicans are ever going to use the power of the purse to shut down Biden’s destructive war on America’s institutions, communities, and values, defunding the corrupt alliance between the federal government and leftwing NGOs would be a great place to start. And here, House Republicans would have an additional motive to defend the nation – protecting their own seats in Congress. It is a wonderful thing when the interests of the nation and the interests of politicians coincide – something just might get done.

<https://www.americasfuture.net/congress-should-defund-ngos-transporting-illegal-aliens/>

Defund Deep State Censorship of Social Media

May 11, 2023

Elon Musk's [purchase of Twitter](#) on October 28, 2022, has had consequences that continue to reverberate throughout America. One immediate benefit was the [reinstatement](#) of not just the Twitter accounts of government officials like Donald Trump and Marjorie Taylor Greene, but also the accounts of hundreds if not thousands of patriots whose voices had been silenced on vital matters including vaccines, the War in Ukraine, the Hunter Biden laptop, critical race theory, election integrity, and transgender castration of minors.

In response to Musk's liberation of Twitter, the mainstream media accused Musk of having caused a resurgence of online hate. Those accusations finally died down when [Musk counter-attacked a shallow BBC reporter James Clayton](#) for his baseless claims in a video that went viral (watch beginning at the 16:20 mark).

Another consequence of the Musk takeover was the result of his opening of confidential corporate files to a succession of independent journalists including [Matt Taibbi](#). These independent journalists posted long successions of Tweets, dubbed the "Twitter Files," which documented the sinister relationship between Twitter under its prior management and the Deep State. The Biden Deep State issued the censorship orders, and Twitter did the dirty work in censoring dissent.

Based on the Twitter files, Americans learned from journalist [Lee Fang](#) about a "censorship portal," where Big Tech companies like Twitter and Facebook allowed the FBI and Department of Homeland Security to police the speech of Americans, and "flag" speech with which the federal agencies disagreed as "disinformation" for Big Tech to take down or suppress. Big Tech was then "reimbursed" with taxpayer money for its trouble in spotting and removing dissident speech from the web. In December 2022, the [New York Post](#) reported that "[t]he FBI paid Twitter nearly \$3.5 million of taxpayer cash to ban accounts largely linked to conservative voices...."

But the taxpayer-money laundering has gone far beyond just the FBI. Other federal agencies have apparently also collaborated with non-governmental organizations (NGOs), [paying them taxpayer dollars for "disinformation"](#) efforts, which the NGOs have used to target online speech with which the administration disagrees, to then be silenced by the Big Tech companies.

Spending taxpayer money to censor taxpayers would seem to be among the most egregious activities of a federal government that is supposed to obey the First Amendment's promise: "Congress shall make no law ... abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press."

In December 2022, [Congressman Jim Jordan](#) (R-OH), while still the ranking member of the House Judiciary Committee, sent a letter to Twitter demanding "communications and details of FBI payments made to Twitter." In April, 2023, now-Judiciary Committee Chairman Jordan

sent subpoenas to multiple federal agencies demanding records to show the extent of collusion between government and Big Tech, including taxpayer payments to do the administration's political bidding. Subpoenas were sent to the CDC, the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency, and the Global Engagement Center (GEC), a State Department subsidiary. "[T]he GEC, which granted \$100,000 to the Global Disinformation Index in 2021, has reportedly also given money to the Atlantic Council's Digital Forensic Research Lab. That same lab flagged more than 40,000 accounts to Twitter in June 2021."

On March 9, 2023, journalist Michael Shellenberger testified before the Weaponization Committee about what he called the "Censorship Industrial Complex," and urged Congress to defund all such programs. Since January 2021, Shellenberger testified that much more money is being spent on censorship than just the few million dollars handed to Twitter. He explained that since January 2021:

the National Science Foundation (NSF) has made at least 64 government grants totaling \$31.8 million on the science of "countering" social media "mis/disinformation" and two government grants totaling \$7 million. Forty-two colleges and universities received 64 grants. NSF created a new research track, "Track F", for disinformation and censorship research called the "Trust and Authenticity in Communication Systems."

Shellenberger noted that "[t]he censorship complex employs various tactics" — including "the relentless demand for censorship, as we saw with the Twitter Files and the Facebook Files.... Another is directing government and philanthropic money toward research and advocacy for greater censorship of social media platforms." (Today, many have forgotten that in 2021, stories about the so-called "[Facebook Files](#)" were released which explained that the social media site used by some 2.9 billion people was manipulating its News Feed algorithm to suppress disfavored views.)

When the Biden Administration tried to institutionalize such government control over social media with its "[Disinformation Governance Board](#)," even the far-left [ACLU](#) criticized Twitter's former policies: "The First Amendment bars the government from deciding for us what is true or false, online or anywhere. Our government can't use private pressure to get around our constitutional rights."

I don't think that there's any way to do it other than to [treat it as an information war](#)," admitted Renee DiResta, a founder of the Stanford Internet Observatory (SIO), one of the top left-wing content censors receiving taxpayer dollars. "It's a constantly evolving arms race" to censor social media content, DiResta said. "This will require that social media platforms, independent researchers, and the government work together as partners in the fight" against conservative speech on social media.

As Shellenberger explained "[Censorship is a subsidized industry](#)," making freedom-loving taxpayers funding a war on their own freedoms. The Left recognizes that we are in an information war. If House Republicans fail to recognize that truth and fail to cut off federal

funds being used to censor speech in violation of the First Amendment, it will be difficult to regain the country. House Republicans hold the power of the purse, and must use it to defund all government efforts to influence speech – Now!

Postscript: Although Twitter has come a long way in freeing up speech, it is still censoring in some areas. For example, an effort to Tweet a story from Health Impact News entitled: “[**INFANTICIDE: 4,739 Dead Babies in VAERS Following COVID-19 Shots Injected Into Pregnant and Child-Bearing Aged Women**](#),” could not be Tweeted as this story was being finalized. Twitter responds: “Something went wrong, but don’t fret — let’s give it another shot,” as well as a message which appears briefly and disappears: “We can’t complete this request because this link has been identified by Twitter or our partners as being potentially harmful. Visit our Help Center to learn more.”

<https://www.americasfuture.net/defund-deep-state-censorship-of-social-media/>

Congress Must Defund Massive FBI Expansion

May 18, 2023

In August 2022, Joe Biden proposed to give the IRS \$80 billion over the next decade to hire 87,000 new IRS agents. When the IRS issued a job posting seeking agents to hire, it sought those who would “carry a firearm and [be willing to use deadly force if necessary](#),” conservatives exploded with justifiable outrage. In January, House Republicans acted to [defund those 87,000 new agents](#) in the debt ceiling increase bill passed by the House. We shall see what happens to that effort in the ongoing debt ceiling negotiations.

However, receiving considerably less notice is a huge appropriation to build a new FBI headquarters and more money which doubtless will be used to investigate and prosecute its political opponents. Amazingly, the new FBI building would be fully [twice the size of the Pentagon](#).

Aside from the sheer magnitude of the building, we have Biden Administration priorities baked into the construction: “Riveted into the colossal new project are woke regulations to ensure that the FBI center will comply with diversity, equity, LGBTQ+, and climate change political goals.” The government’s [General Services Administration](#):

set out five criteria for choosing the property.... Of those five criteria, cost to the taxpayer is viewed as least important. The **equity** criterion, to comply with **diversity** and **climate-change** executive orders signed by Joe Biden, is weighted as 50 percent **more important than the cost**. The site, design, and structure of the new FBI headquarters must “advance **racial equity** and support for underserved communities through the Federal Government,” GSA says.... [Emphasis added.]

Giving this rogue agency a vast new complex larger than the entire Kremlin complex in Moscow, while steeping it in woke ideology and Green New Deal nonsense, is the height of folly. (By the way, Wikipedia explains that the word “kremlin” means “fortress inside a city.”) House Republicans must use the power of the purse to stop the FBI’s runaway trajectory. There are a number of tactics the House should employ.

Congressman Matt Gaetz (R-FL) recently introduced the “FBI Washington Field Office House Arrest Act,” calling for the House to [halt all spending on the new FBI building](#). “The cancer at the Washington Field Office has metastasized so large that the entire body is in critical condition,” Gaetz said. “Gifting the FBI a new headquarters larger than the Pentagon would condone, reinforce, and enable their nefarious behavior to levels we have never seen before.”

The FBI budget in FY 2001 was [\\$3.33 billion](#). Today, it is [nearly \\$11 billion](#). There are some 37,000 FBI agents — enough, apparently, to raid former Presidents’ homes and to arrest pro-life protestors at gunpoint. And 37,000 agents are enough to launch a political hit on President Trump with the phony “Russia collusion” story that special counsel John Durham’s

report has now concluded never should have happened. Even CNN's Jake Tapper noted, "It is regardless [devastating to the FBI](#) and, to a degree, it does exonerate Donald Trump."

As the Gaetz' legislation notes, "constructing a new headquarters for the Federal Bureau of Investigation at this time would distract from critical oversight of this dangerous politicization ... [and] it is entirely inappropriate for a domestic law enforcement agency that employs 2.3 percent of the manpower of the United States military to receive a headquarters larger than the Pentagon...."

The estimated price tag for the new headquarters — before federal contractors start piling up cost overruns — is [\\$4 billion](#).

After the [Durham Report](#) was released on May 15, 2023, Gaetz tweeted, "The Durham report is [an absolutely DAMNING treatise](#) on the weaponization of the FBI against President Trump. This should be a clarion call for legislative reform. We need to defund and deauthorize government entities that are converted from the just cause of defending our nation into enforcement wings of political parties." Missouri GOP Senator Josh Hawley added, "There needs to be consequences. FBI leadership has clearly got to be changed.... I'm of the mind [we need to end the FBI as we know it](#). It needs to be broken up." House Judiciary Chairman Jim Jordan agreed: "The only way we can hold them accountable is to [go at the one thing that everybody cares about — the money](#).... We have to look at the appropriations. That's the only leverage we ultimately have in Congress."

Hawley, Jordan, and Gaetz are absolutely right. House Republicans must not be complicit in building a massive new complex to reward the FBI for its misdeeds and expand the FBI's capability to launch political persecution of political opponents. The FBI has openly declared war on conservative and Christian dissent in America. House Republicans can no longer play political games. They need to step up and stop the FBI's latest power and money grab, and defunding the woke new FBI headquarters boondoggle would be a great place to start.

<https://www.americasfuture.net/congress-must-defund-massive-fbi-expansion/>

Let's Defund the Corporation for Public Broadcasting

May 25, 2023

Who would have ever thought that creating and funding a massive government-owned media conglomerate to “create a more informed public” would be a good idea? Well, that was President Lyndon B. Johnson. He created the Corporation for Public Broadcasting (CPB) in 1967 as part of his [Great Society](#). After that, the monster grew. In 1969, the [CPB created the Public Broadcasting System](#) (PBS), and in 1970, National Public Radio (NPR).

NPR's mission statement is a high-sounding piece of prose: to help Americans achieve “a deeper understanding and appreciation of events, ideas and cultures [through] programming that meets the [highest standards of public service in journalism](#) and cultural expression...” PBS “empowers individuals to achieve their potential and [strengthen the social, democratic, and cultural health](#) of the U.S.”

In reality, NPR has long provided a taxpayer-funded megaphone for every leftist cause known to man, and generally for the Democratic Party. “The CPB [spreads the rejection of America's founding principles](#) through PBS, NPR, and the CPB's more than 1,500 local public radio and television affiliates.” [The Knight Foundation](#) did a review of 50 years under the Public Broadcasting Act and concluded that the CPB “all too often seeks not to elevate society but to tear down its existing institutions.”

A [Media Research Center \(MRC\) study](#) in 2007 showed a stunning disparity in the way the two parties were treated:

“NPR's ‘Morning Edition’ produced more stories about Democratic candidates than Republicans (41% vs. 24%). What was different was how little coverage Democrats received, especially compared with all other media. Stories about a Democratic candidate were seven times more positive than negative: 41% positive vs. 6% negative.” For Republicans, the comparable figures are 30 percent positive vs. 20 percent negative.

On May 17, 2023, a [new MRC study](#) was released which reviewed the first four months of the current Congress, confirming that PBS news still has a hard pro-Democrat slant.

By a 5-to-1 margin, the “NewsHour” promoted controversies involving congressional Republicans over those involving congressional Democrats.... Republicans were often (20 times) branded as extremists (“far right,” “hard right,” etc.) by “NewsHour” correspondents or commentators. Left-wing Democrats were never “far left” or “hard left,” not even socialists like Sen. Bernie Sanders, I-Vt....

Leftist bias is not the only misuse of taxpayer money by the CPB. In 2017, no less than seven prominent (and liberal) CPB-funded TV and radio personalities were [fired from their jobs](#)

[after sexual harassment allegations](#). These included Charlie Rose, Garrison Keillor, Tavis Smiley, Tom Ashbrook, David Sweeney, John Hockenberry, and Michael Oreskes.

For decades, [a few conservatives have called for an end](#) to taxpayer funding of the CPB.

PBS wasn't yet a year old in 1971 when a 35-year-old White House lawyer warned President Nixon that they were being "confronted with a long-range problem of significant social consequences — that is, the development of a government-funded broadcast system similar to the BBC." That lawyer was future Supreme Court Justice Antonin Scalia.

President [Reagan tried to eliminate CPB funding](#). Senator Jesse Helms (R-NC) tried. Even George W. Bush tried. It has never happened.

In 2019, Rep. [Doug Lamborn \(R-CO\) sponsored legislation to defund the CPB](#). He cited numerous examples of the CPB's leftist slant on cultural battles. PBS had recently aired an episode of the children's show "Arthur," featuring a homosexual "wedding." And in May of 2019, [NPR issued a guideline reminder](#) for talent when discussing abortion, stating:

"The term 'unborn' implies that there is a baby inside a pregnant woman, not a fetus. **Babies are not babies until they are born.** They're fetuses. **Incorrectly calling a fetus a 'baby' or 'the unborn'** is part of the strategy used by antiabortion groups to shift language/legality/public opinion." [Emphasis added.]

Lamborn's bill was roundly criticized by fans of Garrison Keillor who apparently thought they would never hear from him unless the government funded him.

Then to "celebrate" Independence Day in 2021, NPR tweeted that our Declaration of Independence was "a [document with flaws](#) and deeply ingrained hypocrisies."

Again, [conservative activists called for defunding NPR](#), but again, Congress took no action.

The CPB's liberal slant has sometimes progressed to the completely cartoonish. NPR was blasted after suggesting that Biden's nominee for Transportation Secretary Pete Buttigieg was qualified because he "said he has '[a personal love of transportation](#),' recounting train trips on Amtrak while in college, and said he proposed to his now-husband, Chasten, in an airport terminal."

But the cost to the American taxpayer of funding CPB's propaganda is no laughing matter. Its budget was [nearly half a billion dollars](#), \$465,000,000, in fiscal year 2022 alone. With a national debt approaching \$31 trillion, something must be cut. If they think about the national debt, they would defund CPB. If they think constitutionally, House Republicans would defund CPB. And, if they think politically (how congressional Republicans faced [85% negative coverage, compared to 54% positive coverage](#) of congressional Democrats) they would

defund CPB which works to defeat them — even if they must take some heat from the “brie-and-Chablais” set who would never vote for them anyway.

If Republicans refuse to defund the CPB, their plaintive cries about “the liberal media” will drown in their own hypocrisy of having just funded a big part of that liberal media. So Republicans, no more talking. Defund the CPB now!

<https://www.americasfuture.net/lets-defund-the-corporation-for-public-broadcasting/>

Time to Defund the ATF

June 1, 2023

One of the most astonishing signs of the moral collapse of the West is its embrace of the fantasy that a person can change his or her sex. It is one thing for this delusion to affect children through what is often called “social contagion,” a phenomenon brilliantly described by Abigail Shrier in her book *Irreversible Damage: The Transgender Craze Seducing Our Daughters* (Regnery: 2021). But the delusion does not end there. Adults seek to “transition” as well. All this raises the question of who is paying for the hormone treatments or surgical procedures required to make a person “transition”? Well, for an increasing number of people suffering from “gender dysphoria,” the taxpayers are required to pay for gruesome treatments that only enrich doctors and pharmaceutical companies who have lost their way, elevating profits over people.

Military Service Members and Veterans

One of President Biden’s first acts as president, on January 25, 2021, was issuing an [Executive Order](#) encouraging transgender persons to serve in the U.S. military by ensuring that taxpayers would pay for “gender reassignment surgery” for [active duty military and veterans](#). A high-ranking former Army officer concluded: “Biden’s order currently reads like anyone in a war zone can suddenly take leave to undergo reassignment surgery.”

Federal Prisoners. Although there appears to be no policy of the Federal Bureau of Prisons ensuring inmates may receive transgender surgery, in April 2023, the [first transgender prisoner had such surgery](#) at the [order of a federal district judge](#) in the Southern District of Illinois. That surgery was the first, but almost certainly will not be the last, as, according to one estimate: “About 1,200 transgender individuals are estimated to be in the federal prison system, or less than 1% of the overall inmate population of about 159,000.”

Medicare

One does not ordinarily think of senior citizens on Medicare as having “gender dysphoria” and seeking treatment, but the federal government funds [“medically necessary” genital reassignment surgery](#) through Medicare.

Medicaid

Some states attempted to fight back to end use of [Medicaid funds](#) for gender reassignment surgery, provoking Biden’s Assistant Attorney General for Civil Rights, Kristen Clarke, to send a [letter to the attorneys general of the 50 states](#), threatening that states would be in violation of the U.S. Constitution and federal law if they refused to fund such surgery. The letter threatened consequences if a state tries to “criminalize[] or even restrict[] a type of medical care predominantly sought by transgender persons....”

Federal Employees

The [federal government](#) has ensured that health plans available to federal employees provide coverage for transgender surgery. A [fact sheet](#) issued by the Office of Personnel Management states that all Federal Employee Health Benefits plans must offer “access to medications and provide coverage of medically necessary hormonal therapies for gender transition care.” Although surgery is not expressly mentioned, the general requirement to provide care for trans-people would seem to require its coverage.

With the federal government’s vast funding of anything healthcare related, there is no doubt other programs exist that we have not yet identified, but there is no question that the Biden Administration is committed to maximizing hormonal and surgical care to trans-people. Fortunately, there has been some pushback at both state and federal levels.

A few states have begun to resist such surgery. In April, 2021, [Arkansas became the first state to ban the practice](#) of permitting transgender genital mutilation, although the legislature had to override the veto of [Republican Governor Asa Hutchinson](#), now a candidate for the Republican nomination for President, to do so. On October 4, 2022, [Oklahoma also decided to withhold funding](#) from state hospitals that perform the practice on children. Other states have been developing other ways to protect their citizens.

At the federal level, in the last (117th) Congress, two bills were introduced. Senator Roger Marshall (R-KS) introduced the “[End Taxpayer Funding of Gender Experimentation Act of 2021](#).” Predictably, the bill was buried in the Finance Committee by Democrats in control of the Senate. In August 2022, Representative Marjorie Taylor Greene (R-GA) got no further when she introduced the “[Protect Children’s Innocence Act](#)” in the House to ban the practice on minors, and prohibit federal funding for it in all cases. Greene reintroduced her bill in the current (118th) Congress on March 7, 2023, as [H.R. 1399](#) and that bill has been referred to four separate House committees for consideration.

But for the current mania over transgenderism, such a ban on taxpayer funded transgender surgery would not seem all that radical.

In 1996, Congress realized that female genital mutilation, a common practice in some Muslim nations, was becoming an exploding problem in the United States, banning it for minor girls. That law was struck down by a federal judge in Michigan in 2018. Congress responded by criminalizing the procedure in 2021, with a bill signed by President Trump. Representative Scott Perry (R-PA), explained the bill, “We must be abundantly clear that [this cultural practice has no medical benefit](#) and won’t be tolerated in the United States of America.” Scott Berkowitz, president of the Rape, Abuse & Incest National Network, stated, “This bill will help protect girls from this awful, and often overlooked, [form of sexual assault](#).” Designated as HR 6100, the “[Stop FGM Act of 2020](#),” found that “[f]emale genital mutilation is a heinous practice that often inflicts excruciating pain on its victims and causes them to [suffer grave physical and psychological harm](#).” Codified as 18 U.S.C. § 116, the law provides for a 10-year prison sentence for attempting or conspiring to commit female genital mutilation.

Congress got it right in 2020, finding that genital mutilation caused its victims “grave physical and psychological harm.” Similarly, it is inexcusable for the federal government to compel taxpayers to pay for destructive transgender surgery for adults or children. House Republicans can and should act as quickly as possible to stop any and all funding for such perverse medical and surgical treatments.

<https://www.americasfuture.net/lets-defund-transgender-genital-mutilation/>

Time to Defund the ATF

June 8, 2023

For decades, the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms & Explosives (ATF) has acted in a lawless fashion, including engaging in acts of violence against American citizens. For most of its existence, ATF was [situated in the U.S. Department of the Treasury](#) because federal control of alcohol and tobacco centered on the collection of federal excise taxes. However, in 2003, ATF was moved to the U.S. Department of Justice, demonstrating that it was a full-fledged law enforcement organization. It didn't deserve to be transferred and elevated — it should have been abolished. The list of reasons that ATF has been one of the most despised and distrusted federal agencies is long, and only a few of its most disgraceful actions are discussed here.

The Assault on Ruby Ridge

Beginning in late August 1992, ATF was at the center of an [11-day assault](#) on the remote Idaho cabin of survivalist Randy Weaver and his family. Weaver allegedly had sold a sawed-off shotgun to an ATF informant and then failed to appear in court to address those charges. That was enough for federal agents to launch a full-scale assault on the Weaver property.

During the assault, FBI sniper Lon Horiuchi wounded Weaver family friend Kevin Harris as well as shot and killed Randy's wife Vicky (who when shot was holding their 10-month-old child). Randy's teenage son Sammy was shot and killed by a U.S. Marshall while firing back at those federal agents who had shot and killed his dog. Conservative author and commentator [William Norman Grigg](#) pointed out the irony of Horiuchi serving as a sniper on what was called the FBI's "Hostage Rescue Team," an Orwellian designation for a unit that functioned as a death squad at Ruby Ridge in 1992 and Waco in 1993." A U.S. Marshall was also shot and killed during the attack.

FBI Sniper Horiuchi was [charged with involuntary manslaughter](#) in Idaho state court, after which the case was removed to federal court, where the charges were dismissed based on claimed immunity of federal officers acting in the scope of their employment. *Idaho v. Horiuchi*, 1998 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 7667, at *31. The [Ninth Circuit reversed](#), but [state charges were eventually dropped](#), apparently under pressure from the federal law enforcement. Civil litigation resulted in a [\\$3.1 million settlement](#) paid by the federal government. "[A] U.S. Senate panel accused the federal agencies involved of '[substantial failures](#)' in their handling of the Ruby Ridge operation" — a mild rebuke to be sure.

The Assault on Branch Davidians

About a year later, after Bill Clinton assumed office, ATF was at the center of the standoff at the "Branch Davidian" compound of cult leader David Koresh in Waco, Texas, leading to the

death of 76 civilians as their [building went up in flames](#) after an attack by ATF and the FBI using tanks and tear gas against Americans.

The House Government Reform & Oversight Committee issued a blistering follow-up [report on ATF's multitude of mistakes](#) in the operation from its inception onward. The report found that the original “affidavit filed in support of the warrants [to search the compound for alleged illegal weapons] contained numerous false statements.” (It seems that in government reports any false statement made by an American Citizen is described as a “lie,” but any lie told by federal law enforcement is merely a “false statement.”)

The report found that “Koresh could have been arrested outside the Davidian compound. The ATF deliberately chose not to arrest Koresh outside the Davidian residence and instead determined to use a dynamic entry approach,” the “most hazardous of the options.” In making this decision, “ATF agents exercised extremely poor judgment, made erroneous assumptions, and ignored the perils of this course of action which they should have foreseen.”

The report shredded ATF for its “propensity to engage in aggressive law enforcement,” noting that “planning for a military style raid began more than 2 months before undercover and infiltration efforts even began.” The House Committee found that the ATF chose “the most hazardous of the options [to arrest Koresh], despite its recognition that a violent confrontation was predictable.” This was not an innocent choice of “tactics” — ATF’s enthusiasm to use siege tactics and employ weapons of war against American citizens led to the death of 76 human beings, including many women and children.

Fast & Furious Gun Walking

In 2009, the Phoenix ATF office began to allow “[g]un-buyers, many of whom the feds suspected were criminals ... to [take firearms purchased in the U.S. and walk into Mexico](#) ...; the [alleged] intention was that once the guns were sold to powerful drug cartels, the ATF would later trace the firearms.” Undermining the honesty of that claimed purpose, “[w]histleblowers and investigators, however, found no attempt [was made] to trace the guns.” More than 2,000 guns were trafficked. Predictably, the program led to an explosion in the number of guns illegally in the hands of Mexican drug cartels and terrorists. By June 2010, “the ATF were aware of over [300 of these weapons being found at crime scenes](#), 179 in Mexico and 130 in the United States.”

If the motive to let the guns “walk” to Mexico was not to track their movements, what might it have been? One commentator explained the Obama Administration’s plan. “Politically motivated officials who wanted to find an [excuse to crack down on Second Amendment rights](#) joined with inept bureaucrats to create a toxic brew.”

Tragically, this Fast and Furious ATF program led directly to the murder of Border Patrol agent Brian Terry by gunmen whose “Fast and Furious” trafficked rifles were left at the scene. The sordid story of ATF arming Mexican terrorists was brilliantly exposed in Katie

Pavlich's 2012 book *Fast and Furious: Barack Obama's Bloodiest Scandal and the Shameless Cover-Up*.

National Gun Registry

Now fast forward to 2021. [Gun Owners of America's](#) research uncovered the fact that the ATF was violating federal law by [beginning to compile a national gun registry](#), in violation of an explicit prohibition in the federal Firearms Owners Protection Act ("FOPA"). In November 2021, [Congressman Michael Cloud](#) (R-TX) and 51 other House Republicans followed up with a [letter to Marvin Richardson](#), acting director of ATF. The letter explained that ATF's proposed regulation that would violate FOPA as it would "require [licensed firearms dealers] to preserve all firearm transaction records. This means that 100% of all lawful commercial firearm transfers would eventually end up in an ATF computer system, thereby [creating a permanent database](#)." The letter reminded the ATF that Congress had made it crystal clear in FOPA that "the federal government shall not create a federal gun registry and has prohibited ATF from creating any centralized databases with its funding."

Congressman Cloud also introduced in the House, along with Senator Ted Cruz (R-TX) in the Senate, the "No Registry Rights Act," to [require the ATF to destroy all firearm purchase records](#) in its possession and to require licensed dealers to destroy purchase records as well, instead of turning them over to the ATF. "Governments should not have a list, in any country, of the people who possess the firearms meant to keep those very governments in check. [Gun registries are precursors to gun confiscation](#) and should not exist," said Congressman Thomas Massie (R-KY).

It is difficult to imagine an agency with a worse track record than ATF — although the FBI does give ATF a run for its money. This is a rogue agency that has acted in a lawless and reckless fashion, unwilling to be constrained by federal law or common decency. It should not be allowed to continue to cause the death of even more Americans, to say nothing of its work to deprive Americans of their firearms liberties. There are enough [state gun laws](#) on the books to meet the nation's needs, so we can let the states prosecute all gun crimes, and [save the taxpayers nearly \\$2 billion a year](#) by simply abolishing the ATF — or at least its authority over guns, as a start.

<https://www.americasfuture.net/time-to-defund-the-atf/>

Time to Defund Foreign Aid

June 15, 2023

As of this writing (June 15, 2023), the national debt is approaching **\$32 Trillion**. The actual number is about \$31,912,753,000,000, but it is hard to be more specific as the amount of debt grows so fast, you cannot even discern the actual number at any point. If you want to see for yourself how fast it grows, take a look at the digital display at [U.S. Debt Clock](#). As President Ronald Reagan once said: “We could say the government spends like drunken sailors, but that would be unfair to drunken sailors, because the sailors are spending their own money.”

A comparison of our national debt with our Gross Domestic Product reveals the growth is not just due to inflated dollars. While in 1960, America owed about **53 percent** of our GDP, now we owe about **121 percent** of all the goods and services produced each year. Everyone concedes we are heading off a cliff. The founder of The Conservative Caucus, Howard Phillips, frequently observed: “The only difference between the two parties is that Democrats are driving the country over the cliff at 100 miles an hour, while the Republicans want to slow down to 60 miles an hour.”

When a nation owes this much money, so that it cannot even afford to pay its basic obligations, one would think that it might stop — or at least cut back — on giving away money to other countries. However, that kind of logic has no appeal to a politician. After all, it’s not their money — it’s the taxpayer’s! Actually, much of it is not really from taxpayers — it comes from borrowing!!

In 2021, the website [OpenTheBooks](#) issued a report on U.S. Foreign Aid showing that the U.S. spent at least **\$282.6 billion** on foreign aid between 2013-2018 — almost **\$47 billion** on foreign aid in FY2018, alone. The biggest government distributors of foreign aid were: USAID, the Department of Defense, and the State Department. The top two recipients in FY2018 were Afghanistan (\$56 billion) and Israel (\$53 billion). Other big beneficiaries included, in descending order: Jordan, Egypt, Iraq, Ethiopia, Syria, Kenya, Nigeria, South Sudan, Somalia, Uganda, Lebanon, D.R. Congo, and Yemen. And, the nation spent an additional \$12.2 billion on international organizations in FY 2019. American taxpayers spent more on foreign aid than was spent in [any state other than California and New York](#).

A recent Congressional Research Service report on [U.S. Foreign Aid to Israel](#) demonstrated that since World War II, Israel has been the biggest beneficiary of foreign aid — **\$158 billion** in non-inflation-adjusted dollars. The population of Israel is only about 9 million people, so that means every year we are subsidizing every Israeli man, woman, and child to the tune of almost \$5,000.

Is foreign aid accomplishing anything? A 2011 Cato Institute report noted that “[t]he international dole has [created long term dependency](#) and discouraged reform. Even

humanitarian aid has a disappointing record.” “Most Third World nations are tangential at best to American or allied security,” Cato noted.

In the Biden Administration, foreign aid is used to advance a political agenda. A 2022 Heritage Foundation report demonstrated that the foreign aid budget under Joe Biden has become just a means of exporting Leftist ideology and cultural perversion to foreign nations.

“U.S. foreign aid has become an appendage of one political party seeking to advance its [radical global agenda](#) of ideological indoctrination while simultaneously expanding a domestic political patronage system.” Biden has “dramatically expanded the scope of programs that are now authorized to pay for abortion services.” Also, “the U.S. government [has] explicitly endorsed Marxism as the guiding principle for foreign assistance. Specific topics for funding under USAID’s forthcoming program include ‘Climate Justice,’ and ‘Promoting Gender and Social Inclusion in Movement Building.’” Under Joe Biden, the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) has “established Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) advisers and DEI committees ‘in all of its bureaus, offices, and [overseas] missions.’”

The forces supporting spending are strong. One Establishment Think Tank that employs former government officials waiting for their next opportunity to “serve,” [Brookings Institute](#), argues that the United States spends less than 1 percent of its budget on foreign aid, and really should be doing much more to cover our “fair share.”

[Gordon Tullock](#) and other economists in the “Public Choice Theory” school have explained why there is always a strong lobby for spending on every program, but usually little opposition. The reason is that the burden of spending is spread broadly on taxpayers, while the benefits of spending are narrowly focused on a few. Thus, taxpayers do not have the economic motive to research and lobby against spending, and they need to fight against an array of forces, including:

special-interest demanders those who desire favors and privileges from the government at the expense of consumers, competitors and taxpayers; there are **politician suppliers** who offer government-bestowed favors and privileges in return for campaign contributions and votes; and there are the **bureaucratic managers** of the regulatory, interventionist, and redistributive system, who are constantly on the lookout for ways and means to expand their authority and increase their budgets as avenues to more power and opportunities for promotion and higher salaries. [Emphasis added.]

President Trump tried, but failed, to cut foreign aid. In 2019, [Trump proposed to cut aid to Honduras, Guatemala, and El Salvador](#), as those countries flooded our southern border with illegal immigrants. Again in 2020, Trump’s budget director [Russ Vought proposed a 21 percent cut in foreign aid](#). But the uniparty in Congress wasn’t interested.

As the Future of Freedom Foundation has noted, “Doling out foreign aid is one of the most blatantly unconstitutional things that Congress does. The list of powers granted to the federal government in Article I, Section 8, of the Constitution includes nothing remotely related to foreign assistance.”

What the Cato Institute concluded in 2011 is exponentially more true today. “With America drowning in red ink, Washington must cut unnecessary programs...Misnamed foreign aid is a good place to start.”

It was encouraging to see that in its FY2023 budget proposal, the conservative House Republican Study Committee at least talked about [cutting U.S. aid to the United Nations](#), Lebanon, and Iraq, and “cut off funds that allow the Biden administration to implement a new nuclear deal with Iran.” But despite some encouraging words, the transfer of wealth from American families to foreign governments thus far has gone largely unchallenged in the Republican House of Representatives.

<https://www.americasfuture.net/time-to-defund-foreign-aid/>

Time to Defund FDA Trafficking in Aborted Baby Parts

June 22, 2023

House Republicans have the opportunity to end funding for the Biden Administration's trafficking in the body parts of aborted babies for "scientific" research. Use of these body parts is said to be justified because: (i) the bodies of these babies would have been discarded anyway; and (ii) their use facilitates, or is essential for, some "scientific" experiments. Medical "science" seems to have less and less concern about morality or decency, and more and more about getting federal funding to conduct gruesome experiments. It is one thing to use the body of a person who died naturally to study the complexity of God's creation with the purpose of training health care professions for the benefit of the living. It is quite another for the federal government to facilitate "scientists" using parts of babies that were deliberately killed by abortionist physicians.

In April 2021, Judicial Watch released nearly [600 pages of emails and other records](#) obtained from the FDA in a Freedom of Information Act request that irrefutably prove that the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) has been buying and selling "fresh" baby body parts for its horrifying "experiments." These emails show that during the period 2012 to 2018, the FDA was engaged in these transactions with a California entity exempt from federal income taxes under Internal Revenue Code section 501(c)(3) — [Advanced Bioscience Resources, Inc.](#) (ABR). These babies can be up to 24 weeks old when a baby is about [12 inches long and weighs about 2 pounds](#). These aborted babies have been used for "scientific" experiments, such as creating "[humanized mice](#)." Some of these experiments have included surgically grafting portions of [baby scalps onto the backs of mice](#). Additional government [records detailing FDA's purchases](#) were released in September 2021.

According to one report, "Records indicate [ABR was paid \\$12,000 upfront per box of babies](#), some survivable out of the womb, between the gestational age of 16-24 weeks. Most purchases are for intact thymuses and livers shipped 'Fresh; on wet ice.'" "With the callousness of picking a cut of meat from a butcher shop, an FDA doctor requests tissue samples be procured from a baby boy, as they claim 'It is preferred to have a male fetus if at all possible ... [but] undetermined sex or female is better than no tissue.'"

These experiments using aborted babies were made more difficult by President Trump in July 2019, through changes made to the National Institute of Health's rules regarding "[Human Fetal Tissue Research](#)." However, even President Trump [did not completely ban use of aborted fetal tissue](#). First, he delayed the rule change for several months, and then only required scientists applying for grants to explain in detail why they need to use fetal tissue and how it will be obtained.

Shortly after Biden took office, extremist leftwing lawmakers demanded that the Trump ban be lifted and the lucrative trafficking in human body parts be allowed to resume. "Fetal tissue is an irreplaceable resource for research," [wrote 26 Democrat representatives](#), led by Rep.

Suzan DelBene (D-WA), in an April 13, 2021 letter to new Health and Human Services Secretary Xavier Becerra. “The Trump Administration’s policy was politically motivated and unnecessary.” The letter from these Democrat luminaries — such as Jerry Nadler, Barbara Lee, and Jamie Raskin — dehumanizes these baby parts by calling them “Fetal tissue.”

As demanded by Big Pharma and Congressional Democrats, even the weak Trump Administration rules were withdrawn by the [Biden Administration](#) which disbanded an advisory board that reviewed applications for federal funding.

The “informed consent” of the mother is supposed to be required to use their aborted babies for this kind of research. Whether or not this requirement is met does not reflect well on the morality of Americans. If consent is obtained, mothers — and pregnant women are “mothers” whether they want to admit that or not — who want their babies to be killed may be assuaging their conscience in the belief that at least their baby’s parts might be used to help others. If their consent is not obtained, the abortion mills are simply taking the babies and selling parts to the highest bidder to increase their profits.

This is not the first time Americans have heard of trafficking in baby parts. In recent years, this practice was exposed by undercover videos captured in recent years by David Daleiden’s [Center for Medical Progress](#). Executives of Planned Parenthood and other Big Abortion industry mills were caught on film speaking cold-bloodedly, and sometimes laughing and chuckling, about their efforts to deliver babies as late as 24 weeks “intact,” so as to [capture livers, hearts and brains to resell](#) on the secondary market.

Daleiden and Sandra Merritt, who obtained some of the videos, faced prosecution by California authorities. At their preliminary hearing, Dr. Theresa Deisher, an expert in adult stem cell research with a Ph.D. in Molecular and Cellular Physiology from Stanford University School of Medicine,” testified horrifyingly that to obtain a functional heart, it must be [cut out of the unborn baby alive, and anesthesia is not even used](#). Yet it was the pro-lifers, not those harming and selling the babies, who faced prosecution.

As sure as there is a God in heaven, this butchery cannot go unpunished. House Republicans have a moral obligation to stop it through the power of the purse. There were a handful of [calls for defunding the bloodshed in 2015 and 2016](#), when the Daleiden videos were first released. But House Republicans have been painfully silent since regaining the majority in the 2022 election. Republicans in [Pennsylvania’s state House of Representatives](#) did attempt to condition funding for the University of Pittsburgh on an agreement to stop fetal cell tissue “research” in 2022, but were unsuccessful. The University has been conducting [“experiments” on unborn babies for decades](#), with credible eyewitness reports that some experiments were performed on babies born alive.

On September 23, 2021, 17 Senators and 42 Representatives [signed a letter to Becerra](#) demanding answers on the University of Pittsburgh’s program, but there has been no concerted effort among House Republicans to stop making taxpayers financially responsible for

the barbarism at Biden's FDA. A series of House hearings exposing this horror, followed by a legislative ban on use of appropriated funds, should be the next step.

<https://www.americasfuture.net/time-to-defund-fda-trafficking-in-aborted-baby-parts/>

Using The Holman Rule To Defund Leftist Programs And Rogue Bureaucrats

June 29, 2023

One of the many benefits of the members of The House Freedom Caucus having challenged Kevin McCarthy for Speaker was incorporating [The Holman Rule](#) into the House Rules for the 118th Congress (2023-2025). Very few have heard of The Holman rule, and even fewer could explain what it is, but this Rule could prove to be one of the most useful tools for House Republicans to defund terrible government programs and personnel.

Relying on The Holman Rule, Representatives Matt Gaetz (R-FL) and Marjorie Taylor-Greene (R-GA) have proposed [cutting the salary of ATF director Steve Dettelbach](#) — a particularly dangerous Biden Administration official who has been waging a war against gun owners and gun dealers in every way he can. The Holman Rule, named after Congressman William S. Holman of Indiana, originated in 1876 and gives a powerful tool to accomplish this and many other Conservative objectives.

In Congress, there is natural rivalry between the authorizing committees, which write the laws implemented by government agencies, and appropriating committees which determine how much money bureaucrats are given to spend. Appropriations bills determine how much money departments may spend, but ordinarily, they may not change the statutory scheme for the departments and agencies being funded.

Under The Holman Rule, however, appropriations bills may include “germane provisions that retrench expenditures by the reduction of amounts of money covered by the bill.” In other words, an appropriations bill may make changes in law to defund a particular program or even a particular employee. There are some limits to this Rule. For example, not just any program or government official can be defunded — it must be related (*i.e.*, germane) to the appropriations bill. Since rules have been interpreted over the years by the House and its House parliamentarians, exactly what those limits are is a complex issue.

The Holman Rule was first in effect for a period at the end of the 19th Century, and for a while at the beginning of the 20th Century, but fell into disuse. It was revived by the Republicans in the 115th Congress (2017-2019), dropped by the Democrats in the 116th and 117th Congresses (2019-2023), but now has been reinstated by the Republicans for the 118th Congress (2023-2025).

Generally, The Holman Rule is supported by conservatives who want to cut spending for particularly bad programs and bureaucrats and is opposed by liberals who never seem to have a problem with spending and always want to protect bureaucrats from accountability. Former Speaker [Tip O’Neill opposed The Rule](#) to prevent spending cuts proposed by Republicans and

conservative Democrats. Speaker Nancy [Pelosi opposed The Rule](#) when Democrats took charge in 2019 “because conservatives had held it over past Republican speakers as a threat.”

The federal employee unions hate The Holman Rule. “It [takes the power and authority away from the President’s Cabinet secretaries](#) and administrators to determine how to run agencies, and gives it solely to a member of Congress,” said J. David Cox, president of the American Federation of Government Employees. “It’s a dangerous rule, it’s a reckless rule....” In opposing the Rule, Cox inadvertently explained why The Holman Rule is needed when he argued that it strips power from our unelected, unaccountable bureaucracy.

Since federal employees oppose the Rule, Congressmen representing areas around the D.C. Swamp oppose it. Rep. Gerry Connolly (D-VA) calls The Holman Rule “a backdoor way for MAGA Republicans to [dismantle the federal workforce](#) and carry out political vendettas at the expense of career civil servants...House Democrats will stand up for our brave, professional and experienced federal employees,” he said. Rep. Don Beyer (D-VA) called it a “House Republican effort[] to vilify and [punish hardworking federal civil servants](#) for doing their jobs.” Rep. John Sarbanes (D-MD) called it an “assault on our nation’s civil servants.”

Nine [hard-left representatives](#) from the Washington metro area, including January 6 Committee fraudster Jamie Raskin (D-MD), called the Rule a tool of “the extreme right wing” and the “hard right MAGA fringe.”

The Rule has already been suggested for use to achieve these important objectives:

- Rep. Taylor-Greene proposed using the Holman Rule to defund Attorney General “Garland’s [politically weaponized Special Counsel](#)” investigating former President Trump.
- Rep. Andy Biggs (R-AZ) proposed using the Rule to “[cleanse” the FBI and Justice Department.](#)
- Before he retired, the House Freedom Caucus proposed using the Rule to [cut Anthony Fauci’s salary.](#)

Consider other ways The Holman Rule could be used:

- to defund Biden’s new 87,000 IRS agents.
- to defund prosecution of January 6 protestors.
- to reduce to \$1 the salaries of deadbeat Cabinet members such as Homeland Security Secretary Alejandro Mayorkas.
- to cut federal funding for divisive and hateful programs masquerading under the label of “diversity, equity and inclusion.”
- to cut federal government collaboration with Big Tech companies to suppress conservative speech and promote leftist ideology.

The Holman Rule’s most prominent Congressional proponent, Rep. Morgan Griffith (R-VA) has explained that Republicans can use The Holman Rule [like a rifle rather than a shotgun](#). The federal budget is a target-rich environment, and Republicans have a very useful

weapon in The Holman Rule. As always, the question is, will House Republicans have the courage and character to use it?

<https://www.americasfuture.net/using-the-holman-rule-to-defund-leftist-programs-and-rogue-bureaucrats/>

Bringing Back Impoundment to Defund Endless Wars

July 6, 2023

The Constitution vests in Congress the power to **appropriate** funds. U.S. CONST. [Art. I, Section 9, cl. 7](#). This provision clearly **limits** the amount of money the Executive Branch may expend each year, but it raises an interesting question: Does the amount of money appropriated operate only a cap on expenditures, or does it carry with it the requirement that the money be spent, making it both a floor and a cap on spending? Simply put, is the Executive Branch obligated to expend all the funds appropriated by Congress?

That constitutional issue has been in dispute for almost as long as we have had our Constitution. The term used to describe a decision by the President not to spend all funds appropriated is “**impoundment**.” And, there are two types of “impoundments”: (i) “**deferrals**,” which only delay when appropriated funds are spent; and (ii) “**rescissions**,” when Presidents refuse to spend appropriated funds. In general, Presidents like the impoundment power; Congressmen and Senators (especially on the Appropriations Committees) don’t.

Congress limited the power of the President to impound appropriated funds with the Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (ICA). That law severely restricts how and when appropriated funds can be left unexpended. Some believe that law to be unconstitutional because it restricts Executive authority by forcing Presidents to spend whatever is appropriated, regardless of whether they believe it wise to spend.

While President, Donald Trump only once attempted to defer spending in this manner. The Trump Administration’s Office of Management and Budget [deferred disbursement of \\$250 million in aid to Ukraine](#) from July 2019 until September 2019, at which time it released the money. The Democrat Congress reacted savagely, including this “impoundment” among the many charges in Trump’s first House impeachment proceeding. Now as a candidate, Trump has announced that, if elected again, he will [resurrect the presidential power of “impoundment](#).” Since Congress seems unable to stop spending on endless wars like Ukraine, it may be that Trump will need to bring back impoundment to restore peace to that part of the world.

Impoundment has been used by Presidents since Jefferson to stop unnecessary federal spending. Some excellent illustrations of the use of impoundment are in a law review article entitled “[Checking the Purse: The President’s Limited Impoundment Power](#).”

President Jefferson first exercised impoundment in 1803. After France closed the port of New Orleans, closing off the Mississippi River to American shipping, Congress appropriated funds to construct 15 gunboats. Fearing that this expenditure would antagonize France while negotiations were underway, Jefferson refused to spend the money. After the Louisiana Purchase was concluded and America obtained possession of New Orleans, Jefferson released the funds. Thus, Jefferson’s impoundment was a deferral, not a rescission. President James

Buchanan impounded funds for an Illinois post office to punish the state's congressional delegation.

There are other illustrations as well. In 1876, President Grant rescinded funds for a rivers and harbors bill he believed was "for works of purely private or local interest, in no sense national." Presidents Roosevelt, Truman, Eisenhower, and Kennedy all refused to make certain military expenditures approved by Congress, under their role as Commander in Chief of the military. In 1966, even big-spending Lyndon Johnson impounded some \$5.3 billion in funds for highways, housing, and other domestic programs.

But the most significant use of impoundment came under President Nixon. Frustrated by a runaway Congress with no fiscal discipline, Nixon proclaimed in 1973 that "he would 'not spend money if the Congress overspends [nor support] programs that will raise the taxes and put a bigger burden on the already overburdened American taxpayer.'" He impounded an estimated **\$18 billion in fiscal year 1973**, asserting that Presidents have the Constitutional power to ensure preservation of the nation's fiscal integrity, and therefore have the authority to refuse to spend funds if necessary to protect that fiscal integrity, and Congress may not mandate spending which jeopardizes it.

In the weeks before Nixon's resignation, the Democrat-controlled Congress struck back against Nixon's assertion of executive power, and overwhelmingly passed the ICA's restrictions, which the damaged Nixon reluctantly signed. The Act allows a President to **delay spending on a given appropriation for 45 days** and must ask Congress to approve the rescission. But if Congress does not approve, the money must be expended after 45 days. In other words, there is limited power for deferrals, with the ultimate decision being up to Congress.

In 2010, Barack Obama proposed a bill to Congress entitled the "**Reduce Unnecessary Spending Act of 2010**." Obama's bill would have allowed the President to propose specific cuts in a congressionally passed bill, send the proposal to Congress, and be ensured an up-or-down vote on the proposed cuts without amendment. The bill never received a floor vote.

Now President Trump is campaigning against the Impoundment Control Act. "This constitutional power of the President should never have been curtailed, but I will get it back and will use it to stop inflation and **bring federal spending under control**," Trump told **Real Clear Politics** in June. President Trump described his plans to challenge the ICA in court if he is re-elected, and if unsuccessful, seek reversal in Congress.

A President probably could make his strongest case for exercising an impoundment power with respect to his role as Commander in Chief. Given that Congress is hopelessly addicted to spending on endless wars, and still is beholden to "the Military-Industrial Complex" that **President Eisenhower warned against**, it may be time to consider giving the President the authority to do what Congress will not do — cut spending.

<https://www.americasfuture.net/bringing-back-impoundment-to-defund-endless-wars/>

Using Appropriations Bills to Cut Spending Under “Continuing Resolutions”

July 13, 2023

The Constitution’s [Appropriations Clause](#) provides: “No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law...” This text clearly requires the enactment of a “law” — which requires the cooperation of the House, Senate, and President — to spend federal money. However, beyond that, the Constitution leaves to Congress how that appropriations process actually works.

The traditional method of appropriating funds was by passing separate “appropriations bills” to fund different sectors of government. Sadly, Congress has all but abandoned that historic practice in favor of adopting “Continuing Resolutions” (CRs). This change is one of the reasons that congressional spending has been and still is out of control.

First, [here’s how it’s supposed to work](#) — by using a process often referred to as “regular order.” The President is supposed to submit a budget proposal for the entire government in April of each year. Then, each of the 12 subcommittees of the House and Senate Appropriations Committees is supposed to draft an appropriations bill covering the sector of the federal budget for which they are responsible.

[The 12 appropriations bills](#) Congress is supposed to address separately are: Agriculture, Rural Development and FDA; Commerce, Justice, and Science; the Department of Defense; Energy and Water Development; Financial Services and General Government; Department of Homeland Security; Department of the Interior and Environment; Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education; the Legislative Branch; Military Construction and Veterans Affairs; Department of State and Foreign Operations; Department of Transportation and Housing and Urban Development.

At least in theory, each Senator and Representative then would have time to read each appropriations bill. (Yes, we realize that they really don’t actually read the bills.) Then, each appropriations bill is supposed to be separately debated on the floor of the House and Senate and then voted on separately. All 12 bills are supposed to be passed and signed into law by October 1 — which is the first day of the government’s new fiscal year. That system worked well for decades, but it has largely been abandoned by both parties.

In recent years, “regular order” never actually happens. [Only once](#) has Congress actually done its appropriating work on time since 1996, and only [four times since 1977](#). To cover this failure, Congress has for decades passed CRs that include all government spending in one bill. Sometimes a CR just kicks the can down the road for a few weeks or months, but they can completely substitute for appropriations bills, which then are never separately

considered. These CRs are massive, bloated “omnibus” bills that no one could possibly read, and in which Congressmen and Senators are able to hide endless pork barrel spending no one has time to notice. Congressmen are forced to vote for many and sometimes [all 12 spending bills as a block](#).

In a year where none of the Appropriations bills are passed, Congress is then faced with either voting for the CR, or being blamed for shutting down the government. This has happened so often that there are rules in place which operate when there is a “shutdown,” which ensure that certain spending never stops. However, the media hypes the claims about the horrible consequences of a shutdown made by big-spending Democrats, and the pressure builds to vote “YES” no matter what is in the bill. Thus, “[t]he current annual appropriations system is ... particularly [disastrous for fiscal conservatives](#). Lawmakers wary of shutdowns ... inevitably reach rushed agreements that almost always raise government spending. As a result, discretionary spending, and thus annual deficits and the national debt, continue to rise.”

The most recent CR was a December 2022 “omnibus” bill, passed with the support of Senate GOP leader Mitch McConnell, only days before the newly elected Republican majority took over the House when they could have stopped it. This one bill brought the national debt to over \$31 trillion. “This omnibus spending bill is a prime example of [Washington at its absolute worst](#),” said Brandon Arnold, executive vice president of the National Taxpayers Union.

Rep. Bob Good (R-VA) blasted “[weak and compromised \[Senate\] Republicans](#).” “[T]he American people are getting a bad backroom deal that is a Christmas present only the special interests in Washington will love,” Good said. “The omnibus bill pumps over \$1.7 trillion out of American wallets, with \$15 billion going directly into more than 7,200 pet projects for Congressmen known as earmarks. In New York, there is \$3 million allocated to fund an LGBTQ+ museum. There is \$3.6 million for the ‘Michelle Obama Trail.’”

Good noted that the omnibus included “massive funding [of] ‘antiracist’ initiatives, giving more to ‘green’ infrastructure ... pouring millions of dollars into broken government agencies such as the FBI that have caved to extreme ideology, and giving more money to the abortion mill, Planned Parenthood.”

The bill was a [massive 4,155 pages](#). Infuriatingly, it included [\\$410 million for border security](#) in Middle Eastern Arab states Jordan, Lebanon, Egypt, Tunisia, and Oman, while leaving our southern border wide open.

The CR was supported by [18 “Republican” Senators](#): Roy Blunt (MO), John Boozman (AR), Shelley Moore Capito (WV), Susan Collins (ME), John Cornyn (TX), Tom Cotton (AR), Lindsey Graham (SC), Jim Inhofe (OK), Mitch McConnell (KY), Jerry Moran (KS), Lisa Murkowski (AK), Robert Portman (OH), Mitt Romney (UT), Mike Rounds (SD), Richard Shelby (AL), John Thune (SD), Roger Wicker (MS) and Todd Young (IN).

“I never want to hear any of the Republicans who voted for this monstrosity [pretend that they’re for fiscal sanity or border security](#) ever again,” said Congressman Dan Bishop (R-NC).

In January 2023, Congressmen Good, Bishop, and 18 others [battled for 15 historic rounds of voting](#), refusing to allow Kevin McCarthy to be elected as Speaker of the House – at least until he agreed to certain reforms. One of those reforms was a promise to consider the 12 appropriations bills individually, to give representatives at least 72 hours to read them, and to allow more amendments from the floor.

It’s time to end the farce. No more CRs. End the insanity. Shut down the government, if you need to. Before the nation goes careening off a cliff, we have one more chance this summer to see if the McCarthy promises are kept. If not, our supposed “leaders” will again fail to do their job, using CRs to bankrupt us and future generations as well.

<https://www.americasfuture.net/using-appropriations-bills-to-cut-spending-under-continuing-resolutions/>

Ending Pork Barrel Spending By Ending Earmarks

July 20, 2023

Article I of the U.S. Constitution lists Congress's enumerated powers, and then concludes with a final provision specifying that Congress has the power:

To make all Laws which shall be **necessary and proper** for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof. [[Article I, Sec. 8, cl. 18.](#)]

This clause generally is interpreted to **enhance** Congress's authority to include implied powers incidental to exercising its enumerated powers. In [McCulloch v. Maryland](#), 17 U.S. 316 (1819), the Supreme Court relied on this Clause to uphold the power of the federal government to create a national bank — the First Bank of the United States — without an express constitutional grant of power to do so.

However, there is reason to believe that the “Necessary and Proper Clause” had another, quite different purpose — to **limit** the power of Congress to only enact those laws which met the twin tests of being both (i) necessary and (ii) proper. How much Congressional spending would pass such a test?

In addition to appropriating funds to keep the departments and agencies of government operational, Congress spends a great amount of money to fund “**earmarks**” for special projects requested by individual Congressmen. The examples are too numerous to list, but [here are a few](#), compiled by Citizens Against Government Waste:

- \$3 million for aquariums in Massachusetts;
- \$61 million to combat “underwater pests”;
- \$7 million for the Jimmy Carter presidential library;
- \$6 million for the Ulysses. S. Grant presidential library;
- \$828,000 for a Federal Emergency Management Agency operations center in Monte Vista, Colorado (population 4,194);
- \$500,000 for the Birthplace of Country Music Preservation Project in Bristol, Virginia;
- \$500,000 for the Bethlehem Museum in Pennsylvania; and
- \$99,000,000 for a physical fitness center annex at Fort Wainwright in Fairbanks, Alaska.

In a country running an annual deficit north of \$1.3 trillion, and with a national debt of over \$32 trillion, how many of these earmarks for spending could be said to be both **Necessary AND Proper**?

In a 2021 Politico/Morning Consult poll, [Americans opposed earmarks](#) by a 43% to 19% margin — but the results might be different if the persons surveyed were told the spending would occur in their district.

The great [Noah Webster](#) — whose name has become immortalized as the father of Webster’s dictionary — warned:

if the citizens neglect their duty and place **unprincipled men** in office, the government will soon be corrupted; laws will be made ... for selfish or local purposes ... the **public revenues will be squandered on unworthy men**; and the rights of the citizens will be violated or disregarded. [Emphasis added.]

By any standard, America has more than its share of unprincipled men in office, and her revenues are being squandered by those unworthy men who are bankrupting the country — while finding ways to enrich themselves. Earmarks are one of the most egregious ways that Congress robs the public fisc.

Everything that Americans hate about Congress is encapsulated in earmarking. When one thinks of “the swamp,” or “pork barrel spending” or “waste and abuse,” earmarks are the most glaring example. In reality, earmarks are the ultimate *quid pro quo*, “you scratch my back, I’ll scratch yours.” Senators and representatives earmark specific funds for specific projects in their districts, and attach them to Continuing Resolutions or bills that may have nothing to do with the project that must be passed — that “everyone has to vote for.” That technique allows members to decry “pork barrel spending” while still getting their share of the pig.

Since there is little public scrutiny of earmarks, they can be used for disturbing purposes.

Rep. Alan Mollohan (D-WV) poured hundreds of millions of dollars in earmarks into his district. Some of those millions were directed towards West Virginian non-profits that he helped start and that are run by his former staff, while millions more federal dollars were [directed to his landowner partner](#), CEO Dale R. McBride of FMW Composite Systems Inc. Ironically, or for this Congress maybe appropriately, while Mollohan was benefiting unscrupulously by hiding massive real estate assets and financial transactions, he was the ranking member on the House Ethics Committee.

In 2010, Republicans banned earmarks when they won control of the House in the Tea Party wave that year. But Democrats brought earmarks back when they took both houses of Congress in 2020. Infuriatingly to advocates of limited government, House [Republicans joined Democrats — in a secret ballot](#) — to bring back the practice in 2021.

Even now, the number of Republicans who oppose earmarks is tiny. On March 17, 2021, 28 House Republicans led by Rep. Chip Roy (R-TX) sent a letter to Nancy Pelosi [pledging not to request earmarks](#) for their districts. **Out of 215 Republicans, only 13 percent signed the letter.** In fact, under the GOP House majority, House Republicans received far more

earmarks than Democrats. “Democrats requested 279 projects and were given a total of \$246 million for them. Republicans, on the other hand, sought fewer projects — 256 — but **were given a whopping \$706.43 million** for theirs.”

“No Republican should be for earmarks,” said Congressman Bob Good (R-VA). “Earmarks is a way to buy votes, **earmarks simply is buying votes**, and no Republican should do that.” While no member of Congress should ask for earmarks, as Noah Webster warned — when unprincipled men are in office, public revenues will be squandered.

<https://www.americasfuture.net/ending-pork-barrel-spending-by-ending-earmarks/>

Restricting Spending With the Hyde Amendment

July 27, 2023

Most members of Congress seem to want to be known for the way they spend the taxpayer's money. They routinely issue press releases claiming credit for obtaining funding for their favorite projects. [Pell grants](#) (named after Senator Claiborne Pell (D-RI)) fund undergraduate students with financial needs. FEMA spends money for disaster relief under the [Stafford Act](#) (named after Senator Robert Stafford (R-VT)). Countless federal office buildings and roads are named after Congressmen and Senators. But there is at least one federal law that is named after a very different kind of Congressman — one who wanted to stop spending for one particularly evil purpose.

In 1976, in his first term in Congress, a World War II Navy veteran from Chicago named Henry Hyde (R-IL) sponsored a restriction on federal spending that would long outlive him. The idea was to stop federal spending on abortion. Known as the [Hyde Amendment](#), this restriction was first enacted on September 30, 1976, as a rider to the appropriations bill. In its original form, it only had an exception for the life of the mother:

None of the funds contained in this Act shall be used to perform abortions except where the life of the mother would be endangered if the fetus were carried to term. [Pub. L. 94-439, section 209 (1976).]

Its main function is to prevent the use of federal Medicaid dollars to pay for abortions but also applies to certain other health programs. “Hyde-like restrictions have also been [enacted into permanent law in various statutes](#) that apply to TRICARE (the military health care program), Veterans Affairs, CHIP, Medicare, and more.” The Hyde Amendment has been included in some appropriations bills in some form every year since. In all likelihood, it was Hyde's three decades of leading pro-life forces in the House of Representatives that caused George W. Bush to award him the [Presidential Medal of Freedom](#), which he received in his hospital room on November 5, 2007, at the age of 83, only three weeks before his death.

The idea for the Amendment was brought to Hyde's attention through the work of three young conservative leaders. The strategy was devised by [Robert “Bob” Marshall](#) who had seen documents obtained under the Freedom of Information Act by John MacKey (of the [Ad Hoc Committee in Defense of Life](#)) showing that the [Department of Health, Education and Welfare](#) (“HEW”) had funded about 280,000 abortions. Marshall went to Congressman [Bob Bauman](#) (R-MD) to locate a House Member who could offer an Amendment to the HEW Appropriations bill to ban funding. Bauman found a freshman Republican — Henry Hyde — who agreed to take on the cause. Later, working as a Legislative Assistant to Congressman [Bob Dornan](#), Marshall continued to draft Hyde-type restrictions for other federal spending programs, and then lead pro-life and pro-family forces during 13 terms in the Virginia House of Delegates.

In a [speech on the House floor](#) in support of his amendment, Hyde declared:

we who seek to protect that most defenseless and innocent of human lives, the unborn — seek to inhibit the use of Federal funds to pay for and thus encourage abortion.... An innocent, defenseless human life, in a caring and humane society deserves better than to be flushed down a toilet or burned in an incinerator. The promise of America is that life is not just for the privileged, the planned, or the perfect.

Pro-life laws never go unchallenged, and so it was with the Hyde Amendment. Medicaid recipients and even a component of the United Methodist Church filed suit. A [district court judge in New York](#) ruled that the Hyde Amendment violated the Fifth Amendment's Due Process Clause as well as the First Amendment's Establishment Clause.

Fortunately, the U.S. Supreme Court disagreed, and in 1980 the Hyde Amendment was upheld in [Harris v. McRae](#), 448 U.S. 297 (1980) on a 5-to-4 vote, with an opinion written by Justice Potter Stewart. Predictably supporting government-funded abortion were Justices Brennan, Marshall, Stevens, and, of course, Blackmun, who seven years before had written the court's opinion in [Roe v. Wade](#), 432 U.S. 113 (1973). The High Court rejected the argument that the Hyde Amendment constituted an unconstitutional establishment of religion because its pro-life position was consistent with Roman Catholic doctrine. (If the Constitution struck down all laws with a religious foundation, few good laws would remain.)

Has the Hyde Amendment worked? A study by [Michael J. New, Ph.D.](#) estimated the number of abortions that have been avoided by the Hyde Amendment removing federal funding. The number is staggering:

From its first enactment in 1976 until 2020, New finds that the Hyde Amendment saved 2,444,181 lives. From that time forward, the law saved 60,588 lives in 2021; 47,069 lives in 2022, and 15,130 lives so far in 2023. Overall, the Hyde Amendment is responsible for the lives of **2,566,968** of our fellow Americans. It is also responsible for the lives of their children and grandchildren. Few acts of Congress can claim such fruit.

As a historical footnote, when a Senator, Joe Biden always supported the Hyde Amendment, only [reversing course in June 2019](#), on the Democratic campaign trail. Biden worked to eliminate the Hyde Amendment in 2021, causing [200 House Republicans to sign a letter](#) pledging to “vote against any government funding bill that eliminates or weakens the Hyde Amendment or other current-law, pro-life appropriations provisions.” At least on the home front, the Hyde amendment continues to be enshrined in appropriations bills, [continuing to block federal spending to take innocent life](#), to this day.

What lesson can be learned from The Hyde Amendment? Following its pattern, Congress can add language to any appropriations bills to state “none of the funds appropriated hereunder

may be used....” and then identify a program to defund. How about, for starters, providing that no funds may be used for:

- chemical or surgical castration of minors;
- teaching Critical Race Theory; and
- including pornographic books in school libraries.

America needs more men and women with the conscience and tenacity of Henry Hyde, not just on abortion, but also the other great moral struggles of our time. The tool Hyde developed can be used to keep American taxpayer dollars from paying for the wasteful, the immoral, and the inhumane.

<https://www.americasfuture.net/restricting-spending-with-the-hyde-amendment/>

Let's Cut Corrupt Spending With an IG for the Ukraine War

August 3, 2023

For the last 18 months, the United States has been shoveling money to one of the most corrupt governments in the world — Ukraine — with no end in sight. At President Biden's request, and with the support of the Uniparty in Congress, [our country has handed the Ukraine government about \\$115 billion](#), or over \$200 million of taxpayer money every day since the war began.

In Fiscal Year (FY) 2022, Congress passed two bills to provide \$13.6 billion and \$41.6 billion in military and humanitarian funding. That was just the start. In FY 2023, Congress passed two more bills providing an additional \$12.3 billion and \$47.4 billion. And, on top of those, President Biden signed the [Ukraine Democracy Defense Lend-Lease Act of 2022](#), sponsored by nominal Republican Senator John Cornyn (R-TX), authorizing Biden to “lend” additional military equipment to Ukraine. In the House, no Democrats, and only 10 Republicans were brave enough to vote no on that bill, including Congressman Andy Biggs (R-AZ), Matt Gaetz (R-FL), and Tom Massie (R-KY).

Beginning well before the war began, Ukraine was often described as “[the most corrupt nation in Europe](#).” One measure of public corruption termed the “[Corruption Perceptions Index](#)” ranked Ukraine as having the same level of corruption as Algeria, Angola, and Zambia. If the United States wanted to spend that money honestly and efficiently, you would think that it would do all it could to track and trace the money sent into that type of country. The most obvious way would be to task an independent officer of the United States with the responsibility and authority to see where the money is spent — an Inspector General. But “the powers that be” do not want the money tracked, and we can only speculate as to why they so vigorously oppose spending accountability to the taxpayers.

Certainly not all the money appropriated is just handed over to the Ukrainian government — much of it is paid out to what President Eisenhower warned against — “[the Military-Industrial Complex](#).”

Our major defense contractors are so tied to the Ukrainian government that when the Ukrainian Ambassador held a reception last December at the Ronald Reagan Building, the event was sponsored by: [Northrop Grumman, Raytheon Technologies, and Lockheed Martin](#). “Each of their stocks has climbed since Russia's invasion, with Lockheed up about 38 percent” last year. So it's not just about tracing money, it's about tracing military equipment. One would think we would want to know where arms go. After all, the United States has strict laws governing the commercial export of arms, and the International Traffic in Arms Regulations are administered by the [Department of State](#). But we do not really know what rules are being followed on these weapons shipped to the Ukraine.

Last year, officials admitted to “[t]he Wall Street Journal that they have ‘[little direct knowledge’ of where equipment goes](#) once it reaches the Ukrainian government.” Two proposals were considered in the Senate to have greater Congressional oversight. The more meaningful of the proposals was offered by Senator Rand Paul (R-KY) to empower the **Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction (SIGAR)** to handle oversight of Ukraine funding as well, which failed.

Just last month, the U.S. Senate overwhelmingly passed a nearly trillion-dollar defense spending bill called the [National Defense Authorization Act for FY 2024](#) (NDAA). Republican senators proposed to create an **Inspector General for Ukraine**, but the amendment required 60 votes to cut off debate, and died with a vote of 50-49 in favor. Senator Paul [proposed essentially the same amendment](#) as he did last year to empower SIGAR to track Ukraine spending, which [failed 20-78](#).

Is oversight on Ukraine spending really a waste of time and money? Not if past is prologue:

In the recent history of conflicts involving the US, there has been an increasing number of incidents of war material diversion, with [US weapons falling into the “wrong hands”](#).... The result is that terrorist organizations, extremist militias, paramilitary groups and drug traffickers around the world benefit from this, purchasing such weapons illegally.... Ukraine is home to one of the largest black arms markets on the European continent. In short, trafficking networks operate freely in the country ... which is certainly a consequence of the widespread corruption of Ukrainian public agents.

What have American taxpayers received for this colossal investment? Where has the money gone? We are told, “[tracking every dollar of appropriated funds is difficult](#).” On the other hand, misspending every dollar of appropriated funds is easy.

Recent U.S. spending in Afghanistan shows how easily money can be lost. The SIGAR office reviewed the U.S.’s funding of \$134 billion to the Afghan government since overthrowing the Taliban, and found that **one-third** of the funds reviewed (\$19 billion out of \$63 billion reviewed) had been [lost to waste, fraud, and abuse](#). This does not count the colossal losses when U.S. equipment was abandoned to Taliban forces at Biden’s botched scramble to withdraw from the country, which “delivered roughly [\\$24 billion worth of American equipment](#) — including almost 600,000 small arms and artillery pieces, 75,898 vehicles, and 208 aircraft — to the Taliban.”

If having an Inspector General (IG) review spending is really a waste of time, as many in the Uniparty seem to believe, why do we have them at all? The U.S. government recently was reported to have [72 statutory IGs](#) tasked with combating waste, fraud, and abuse across most departments and agencies. But war spending is apparently different.

As Senator Paul fruitlessly argued to his fellow senators, “Given the fast-evolving situation on the ground in Ukraine and the significant sums already committed, the American taxpayers

deserve the oversight experience of tried-and-true investigatory personnel to detect and prevent waste, fraud, and abuse.”

In funding the Ukraine war, Congress lives by one rule: “if you don’t want to find corruption, you certainly don’t want to look for it.” Each Senator or Congressman who has opposed Senator Paul’s amendment should be held to account.

<https://www.americasfuture.net/lets-cut-corrupt-spending-with-an-ig-for-the-ukraine-war/>

Defund the U.S. Agency for International Development

August 10, 2023

On August 1, 2023, Congressman Matt Gaetz (R-FL), joined by five other Representatives, [announced](#) they would be co-sponsoring a [bill](#) to defund and abolish the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID). That bill has now been officially introduced, designated as [H.R. 5108](#), and referred to the House Foreign Affairs and Appropriations Committees. In this noble effort, Mr. Gaetz has been joined by Representatives Andy Biggs (R-AZ), Eli Crane (R-AZ), Paul Gosar (R-AZ), Marjorie Taylor Greene (R-GA), and Anna Paulina Luna (R-FL). Bravo, to these courageous ladies and gentlemen.

USAID is not often in the news, so some [background](#) is useful. It was created when President John F. Kennedy issued an Executive Order after the passage of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, to coordinate U.S. civilian foreign assistance aid. The Biden budget requests USAID be given an 10 percent increase, giving USAID [\\$32 billion](#) to spend around the world for seemingly laudable goals, such as fighting poverty and famine, providing disaster relief, and assisting with economic development projects.

Before discussing how USAID went off track, there are some threshold questions about foreign aid that should be asked. First, why does Congress believe it has the money to give away to countries when our federal government is running an annual deficit of approximately [\\$1.4 trillion](#), and domestic problems such as homelessness expanding? Second, when was the last time Congress carefully analyzed whether the hundreds of billions spent by USAID were well spent? Third, where in the U.S. Constitution does Congress find the power to engage in acts of international charity? But for now, we will put aside those rarely-asked, thorny questions to focus on what USAID actually does.

By now, we all know that we should never assume that spending decisions being made by government are made for selfless purposes – and USAID shows this point clearly. As just one example, USAID subsidizes countries to use [Genetically Modified seeds](#) that create plants termed Genetically Modified Organisms (GMO). While plants from those genetically engineered seeds can repel insects leading to greater crop yield, many scientists believe that GMO plants are a long-term [danger to health](#). Also, GMO plants do not generate seeds that can be saved and used the next season, making farmers dependent on companies like Monsanto to buy their seeds each year. In our Crony Capitalist Controlled Administration, U.S. corporate interests ensure USAID funds are spent to help their business interests, even if they impoverish foreign farmers. But we should not worry because [Bill Gates](#) is a big proponent of GMO experiments in Africa, and he says they are safe and effective.

Last year, the Heritage Foundation released a devastating report entitled: “[Congress Must Stop Biden’s Misuse of U.S. Foreign Aid to Impose His Radical Social Agenda on the World.](#)” If anything, the title understates the case to abolish USAID. The report explains how the Biden Administration has turned USAID away from focusing on food, clean water,

and disaster relief, to exporting the most radical left-wing agenda imaginable. According to the Report, USAID now has become “a global platform from which to implement overseas a rigidly ideological and domestically divisive agenda to promote **abortion, climate action, ‘gender equity,’ and ‘racial justice,’** goals that are likely to undermine the economic prospects and self-reliance of USAID’s beneficiaries.” (Emphasis added.)

To advance the Biden Administration goal to increase “sexual and reproductive health rights,” America now pays to facilitate abortion overseas through partnerships with the UN and the World Health Organization (WHO). Heritage explains that Biden’s USAID has reduced religious freedom to the same level as LGBTQI+ and abortion rights. As a result of the Biden Administration’s 2021 National Gender Strategy, taxpayer-funded foreign aid now uses “‘an intersectional approach that considers barriers and ‘oppressed’ identities confer greater victimhood to select categories of people.” It is, as Heritage Foundation, notes, “**the first time the U.S. government explicitly endorsed Marxism as the guiding principle for foreign assistance.**” (Emphasis added.)

USAID has also become a hub for promoting so-called “diversity, equity, and inclusion” (DEI) dogma across the world. As Heritage notes, “Applying this domestic DEI obsession globally is absurd. Most beneficiaries of U.S. foreign aid are ‘people of color’ (mis)governed and mistreated by other ‘people of color.’” “As a condition for aid, USAID is requiring ‘communities of color’ to accept an alien value system that runs counter to their firmly held values and belief systems ..., the antithesis of the Administration’s progressive theology.”

USAID pushes the Biden climate agenda, prioritizing a theoretical future climate problem over today’s poverty and hunger. Heritage reports that many Africans understand that agenda to be harmful to underdeveloped nations:

An African civil society leader denounced Western NGOs (which stand to receive billions in donor funding to execute “climate” programs) for lobbying against the use and production of fossil fuels in Africa, highlighting that “more than seven percent of children in sub-Sahara die before they turn five years old” due to poverty,” and adding that while Africa is sympathetic to global efforts to curb the negative effects of climate change, they should not be forced “to pay [for it] with our lives.”

Gaetz’ bill chronicles a long list of other USAID misdeeds.

- “USAID has provided a \$3.7 million grant ... to ‘provide support for gender equity programs’ in Pakistan.”
- “Eighty-five grants totaling \$138.1 million have been provided through USAID ... for ‘humanitarian assistance’ to support open borders policy around the globe.”
- “USAID has provided a \$1 million grant to the United Nations Development Programme for supporting ‘LGBTI human rights advocacy in Asia.’” “The international affairs budget for the fiscal year 2022, passed by the House of Representatives in July 2021 ... undid historical precedent by repealing the Helms

Amendment that previously restricted United States foreign aid from paying for abortions.”

Gaetz convincingly argues that “USAID does not serve a meaningful purpose. It is used as a **slush fund for international wokeism**.

Over the **Arch at Washington Square Park** in New York City is engraved a quotation from George Washington: **“Let Us Raise a Standard to Which the Wise and Honest Can Repair. The event is in the hand of God.”** Matt Gaetz has done just that with his bill. Now we will see how many Republicans will rally to that banner in the hope that God will give us a victory in this continuing war against atheistic Marxism.

<https://www.americasfuture.net/defund-the-u-s-agency-for-international-development/>