



## Republicans, with obvious regrets, support Trump

Rory Ryan

January 26, 2016

After watching this evening's news with Bret Baier on the Special Report (yes, on Fox News), I'm as convinced as ever that the Republican's presidential savior, Donald Trump, is little more than a pompous buffoon on steroids.

Not that there ever was a helluva lot of doubt.

To begin with, Trump did his best pit bulldog impersonation by glaring at Baier throughout tonight's off-site interview. The Trumpeter said he'd been slighted by Fox news. (Maybe he should follow Hillary's lead and stick with the Clinton News Network from here on out.)

The Trumpet Player bristled when asked by Baier how, pray tell, he would accomplish his many promises without Congress. Would the Don-OLD be like OB1 and simply execute executive order after executive order, or would he follow the Constitution? (After all, once upon a time, Republicans cherished the Constitution, even if their brethren across the aisle did not.)

Trump said he would "negotiate" with Congress and – again, ad nauseam – he referenced the mythical goodwill between former GOP President Ronald Reagan and former liberal House Speaker Tip O'Neill.

Let's recall, too, that Trump just recently invoked the name of the late William F. Buckley in his public dressing down of his closest rival, U.S. Sen. Ted Cruz.

Trump may have heard of the great WFB. Maybe he even met WFB. But he certainly hasn't read or retained much from Buckley's famous fortnightly magazine, *National Review*.

Years ago, *NR* editor Jay Nordlinger put the myth of the Reagan/O'Neill "dealership" to rest.

"By and large, O'Neill was a nasty piece of work, who constantly slandered and defamed Reagan as a hater of the poor, a warmonger, and an idiot," Nordlinger said. "O'Neill may not have been a warmonger, but he was as ugly a class warrior as we've ever had. He was one of the most partisan men who ever lived."

Nordlinger should know. He was there. Trump wasn't.

By the way, as far back as 1986, Trump opposed President Reagan's tax reform because it eliminated corporate loopholes that benefited Trump.

Trump's repeated references to Reagan and O'Neill as a means to do business in 2016 and beyond are as futile and empty as John Kasich's repeated references to allegedly balancing the federal budget in the 1990s.

Stephen Moore explains the alleged balanced budget in a Cato Institute report at <http://www.cato.org/publications/commentary/no-bill-clinton-didnt-balance-budget>.

Another conservative, Craig Steiner, writing at <http://www.craigsteiner.us/articles/16>, said about the so-called balanced budget: "The only debt that matters is the total national debt. You can have a surplus and a debt at the same time, but you can't have a surplus if the amount of debt is going up each year. And the national debt went up every single year under Clinton. If we had a surplus, the national debt would have gone down. It didn't go down precisely because Clinton had a deficit every single year. The U.S. Treasury's historical record of the national debt verifies this. A balanced budget or a budget surplus is a great thing, but it's only relevant if the budget surplus turns into a real surplus at the end of the fiscal year. It never did."

Kasich knows this. He's gambling that enough voters don't know or don't care.

If you believe in Yetis, feel free to believe in Trump and Kasich. If forced to choose the lesser of the two evils, I'd vote for Kasich. But I wouldn't brag about it. I'd do it to get him out of Ohio, where he has outspent the supposedly liberal Strickland administration by billions. And just for fun, show up at any county commissioners' meeting or township trustees' meeting and ask how that state budget has affected local spending. You might want to ask for an "off the record" response if there's a Republican majority present.)

Now, back to the great one, who plays his own Trumpet.

Ryan Chittum, a former Wall Street Journal reporter, wrote in 2011: "First, we'd have never heard of Donald Trump if he hadn't inherited the \$250 million fortune his father built off government-subsidized housing. His first big Manhattan deal was to renovate the Hyatt at Grand Central Station. For that project, he got a 40-year full property tax incentive, which cost taxpayers \$60 million (presumably not adjusted for inflation) in the first 10 years alone."

So much for the "successful independent businessman" persona. It simply does not exist.

Trump didn't build it. Taxpayers did.

Chittum adds: "Donald Trump, the developer and would-be presidential candidate, portrays himself as a swashbuckling entrepreneur, shrewder and tougher than any politician, who would use his billionaire's skills to restore discipline to the federal government. In his disdain of big government, however, Trump glances over an expensive irony: He built his empire in part through government largesse and connections."

No, er, kidding.

Similarly, Jillian Kay Melchior wrote in the conservative *National Review* (yes, Bill Buckley's magazine) last year, that Trump received a \$163.775 million tax break on Trump Tower, his upscale midtown Manhattan building.

Melchior continues: "Of all the mystical qualities that Trump supporters attribute to their candidate, the one I find most curious is that Trump is the 'anti-corporatist' candidate. Trump? 'Anti-corporatist?' Really? If there were a corporatist hall of fame, Trump's name should be emblazoned across the front in huge red letters, the way it is on his casinos. We are, after all, talking about a candidate who has just finished attacking his leading rival, Ted Cruz, for insufficient devotion to ethanol subsidies. This is not an aberration. Trump has rarely met a proposal for corporate welfare that he didn't love."

Michael Tanner, a senior fellow at the Cato Institute, writes: "Too many Republicans believe that handouts to business are somehow less egregious than other forms of welfare. Trump's supporters should understand that their candidate is one of those Republicans.

"Trump may have flip-flopped on all sorts of issues, but when it comes to corporations feeding at the public trough, he's been steady as a rock."

Indeed, he has.

Now, all of these references about Trump, the king of corporate welfare, are from well-known conservative sources. Still, the once Grand Old Party continues its support for the sperm lucky recipient of others' efforts and others' sweat and others' taxes. Why?

Why are Republicans trying to convince themselves that a Trump presidency is acceptable even when they know in their heart of hearts it is not?

Possibly, it's because they are afraid to admit and accept that they are wrong. So many of the politically active go through each election cycle searching first for an R or a D. Nothing else enters into consideration.

As the saying goes, Trump may be a no-good so-and-so, but at least he's our no-good so-and-so.

We've heard that, locally, as well.

Now, we have at least 10 separate public entities (the Hillsboro Police Department, the Highland County Sheriff's Office, the Highland County Prosecutor's Office, Hillsboro Municipal Court, Highland County Probate Court, Highland County Common Pleas Court, Ohio BCI, the Ohio Attorney General's Office, the Ohio Auditor's Office and the Ohio Ethics Commission) involved in an alleged "witch hunt" because partisan politics is much more important than good government.

The real comedy of it all is that the vast majority of the “witch hunters” are Republicans as is their alleged prey.

Maybe there’s hope, after all.

Either way, it’s a good day to be a registered Libertarian.