

Most Wisconsinites are open and trusting.

When Tammy Baldwin was first elected to Congress in 1998, voters believed her promise to work with “both sides” to do what was best for our state—just like our heroic, *independent* Democrat Senator William Proxmire did for over 30 years! And there are others like him, from both parties, in Wisconsin’s long political history.

But after 26 years in office, it’s clear that Senator Tammy was talking to us *one way* at home but voting *another way* entirely—with *them*—in Washington.

This short book will tell you about “The Other Side of Tammy Baldwin”—her 95% Biden/Harris votes she has not told you about:

- Tammy’s critical role helping Biden and Harris unleash wild inflation
- How Tammy helped “Border Czar Kamala Harris” open our borders to rampant illegal immigration
- Tammy’s radical soft-on-crime votes and endorsements
- How Tammy has pushed to force high school girls to compete against boys in girls’ sports
- How \$15 million of *out-of-state* campaign contributions have made Tammy vote for what *strangers* want, *not what most Wisconsin voters want*.

What is revealed here about Senator Baldwin is really important for you to know—*before* you cast your vote this fall.

The OTHER SIDE of TAMMY BALDWIN

**WHAT
THE PRESS
ISN'T
TELLING YOU**

by
Dennis Byrne



THE OTHER SIDE OF TAMMY BALDWIN

What the Press Isn't Telling You

by Dennis Byrne

Jameson Books, Inc.
Ottawa, Illinois

DISCLAIMER

This book was written in the summer of 2024. It was finished only *just after* Joe Biden was forced to quit his re-election effort by the Democratic Party's national bosses, surrendering the presidential nomination he'd already won.

Vice President Kamala Harris then became Biden's replacement, because no other Democrat wanted to try to defend the Biden/Harris record.

As you will see from this little book's shocking revelations, *only one of every three Americans approve* of the Biden/Harris agenda—and this is *not just the result* of Biden's one bad night debating Donald Trump last June.

Instead, it is the result of *four years* of the Biden/Harris, New Democrat *ultra-liberal progressive policies*—which created today's rampant inflation, runaway crime, “Border Czar” Kamala's open borders for illegal immigrants, and other policies like the New Democrats' strange proposals trying to open our daughters' locker rooms to boys.

Copyright ©2024 by Jameson Books, Inc.

Permission is hereby granted by the publisher to reproduce any part, or all, of this book until November 30, 2024.

After that date all rights are reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced after November 30, 2024, in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or by any information storage and retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publisher.

Printed in the United States of America,

3 2 1 26 25 24

The New Democrat Party no longer represents the American working man and woman. *Almost all* U.S. Senators who voted with Biden/Harris—*nearly 100% of the time*—during the past four years are no longer *our* Senators. You will find out here why we can't afford *any of them*, anymore.

CONTENTS

- Introduction 1

- Chapter 1: Have You Seen the Price
of Tomatoes? 7

- Chapter 2: Boys and Girls
Together. 15

- Chapter 3: Meet Senator Baldwin's
Friends 25

- Chapter 4: Crime and
Non-Punishment. 31

- Chapter 5: Every Town Is Now
a Border Town 39

- Chapter 6: Baldwin on Abortion:
Fighting Back or Fear-Mongering?
. 49

- An Afterword 55

Introduction

Isn't it a bit much for someone like me who was born and raised in Illinois to write about Wisconsin politics? Fair question. The answer is: my roots go deep in Wisconsin, and I love this state.

I graduated from Marquette University with a bachelor's degree in journalism and a concentration in political science. I received my master's degree in urban affairs from the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee. I was a post-graduate Russell Sage Fellow in Social Science Writing at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. My master's thesis focused on Menomonee Falls. My first journalism job was with the *DePere Journal-Democrat* in suburban Green Bay.

We never vacationed in Illinois. It was always in Wisconsin, at Elkhart Lake, Eagle River, Delavan, Lake Geneva, and North Twin Lake. My father, a wholesale yarn salesman, had knitting mill customers in Neenah, Berlin, and other Wisconsin towns. My grandparents lived in Green

Lake, where we swam in the summer and skated in the winter. My great aunts and uncle owned a cottage in Herbster. An uncle attended Ripon College.

One thing that I observed about Wisconsin politics was its independence. William Proxmire, a Democratic senator, had an independent streak that flummoxed regular members of both parties. He issued the “Golden Fleece Award,” spotlighting wasteful government spending, 168 times—without regard for political party.

“Fighting Bob” La Follette was a Republican for most of his life, but dissatisfied with the party’s direction, he turned populist. As a congressman, U.S. Senator, and governor, he led reform movements on several fronts. Independent? He voted against the United States entering World War One. He opposed the military draft and the Espionage Act, which was a gross attack on freedom of speech. And he was the only Republican senator to vote for a federal income tax.

With such a rich political history of independent-minded thinking, it is depressing to see a Wisconsin politician become a supporter of 95% of the “New

Democrat” Biden/Harris politics and lose touch with Wisconsin interests due to her *simply* gigantic out-of-state campaign contributions: *three times as much from other states* as the people of Wisconsin have donated to her campaign. Who is that?

That’s Senator Tammy Baldwin, whose votes against President Joe Biden and Vice President Kamala Harris’s policies are as rare as alligators in Lake Winnebago. As a senator, she can almost always be counted on to vote in lockstep with these New Biden/Harris Democrats and their radical programs.

Contrary to popular belief, not all members of Congress vote along pure party lines. Take the retiring leader of the Senate Republicans, Mitch McConnell of Kentucky. According to ABC’s affiliate 538, he surprisingly voted with Biden’s positions *about half the time*. He’s not alone; many others split their votes in an even fashion. That makes Sen. Baldwin an outlier.

As a journalist, I didn’t consider party loyalty to be a great virtue. I once considered myself a Democrat in the mode of John F. Kennedy. He never appeared to

be afraid to step away from his party's bad ideas and support the good ones. Most notable were his income tax cuts: up to 21% for individuals and 52% for corporations. He believed in the death penalty and opposed racial quotas. He was a committed anti-communist, as evidenced by his Bay of Pigs Invasion and Cuban Missile Crisis response. Today he would be drummed out of the Democratic Party for some of that. For Kennedy, party loyalty came in *far behind* what was best for the American people.

I experienced some of that opposition myself. When I was promoted to the *Chicago Sun-Times* editorial board and to be an op-ed columnist, I was a liberal. I voted for every Democratic presidential candidate from Lyndon Johnson to Michael Dukakis.

But over time, I witnessed the Democratic Party abandon the policies and principles that I supported. Farther and farther *to the left* it slid away from what it once stood for until it adopted the so-called unusual, "progressive" policies you and I see today. As I stuck to my own beliefs in my columns and in discussions

with the editorial board, I found myself being redefined by others as a "conservative," "neocon," and worst, a far-right extremist. I hadn't changed my positions. I hadn't left the party. The party had left me.

Do you identify as a political independent? A centrist? A moderate? If so, consider yourself a treasure, something so essential to successful self-government that your absence can plunge America into a quagmire of squabbling extremes—a failed democracy.

Unfortunately, a fog has descended over our political vocabulary, making accurate identification of your (or anyone else's) position difficult.

Which is why I have written this book.

As a matter of clarification, it is important that labels not be allowed to camouflage a politician's true beliefs. A label, any label, be it liberal or conservative, Democrat or Republican, should not provide cover for a politician's true agenda—especially during an election such as the one this November. Yet too many politicians are doing just that.

So, let's examine Baldwin's record.

It's one that independents, moderate Democrats, or centrist Republicans may not know.

That look will reveal to you a very different Sen. Baldwin, one who voted consistently for the New Biden/Harris Democrat progressive agenda 95% of the time—not as an independent or moderate.

Please take a look with me.

Chapter 1

Have You Seen the Price of Tomatoes?

Three economists walked into a grocery store.

One claimed that inflation is only temporary. The second said inflation is coming down. The third, from the heights of his ivy-covered office, had ginned up a complex mathematical formula proving that inflation is beneficial. For that he was awarded a Nobel Prize in Economics.

But once inside the store, Professor Number One was shocked, shocked at the high price of steaks. He decided on hamburgers instead. Again, shocked. He picked out the cheapest ground beef, pulled out his wallet, grumbled at the checkout lady, paid, and left disgusted.

Professor Number Two, seeing the extravagant price of caviar, foie gras, truffles, and sushi, bolted from the store, swearing that he'd find a grocery store where prices

were more reasonable. At last sighting, he was still searching.

Professor Number Three noticed families trying to figure out how to deal with the higher prices that he once thought were a good thing. So, he called a press conference to condemn grocers for trying to get rich by imposing artificially higher prices on the backs of the poor and minorities.

The problem, of course, is that with all their confusing talk about “core inflation,” “standard benchmarks,” and “CPI breadbaskets,” they ignore what American families already know from their own experience.

American families are wrestling with the frustrating reality of trying to keep up with rising prices. We laugh at the old saying that “what goes up must come down.” *We know firsthand that when it comes to inflation, what goes up, goes up again, and stays up!*

Orange juice, fresh vegetables, ice cream, bakery goods, potato chips, soft drinks, eggs—are just a few of the things that have gone up in price. And it’s not just in grocery stores. Gasoline and heating

oil. Clothing. Appliances and hardware. Automobiles. Even used cars.

First-time homebuyer? Forget it. Higher interest rates and zooming home prices make it all a distant dream. Rents are just as bad.

The Biden/Harris administration’s response is something grossly mislabeled the “Inflation Reduction Act” (or Bidenomics), a grab-bag of hundreds of billions, nay trillions, of dollars of pork projects that only add to inflation since they were paid for with borrowed money. Biden and Harris brag about how Bidenomics has dramatically cut inflation. They attempt to explain that their policies have lowered the inflation rate—*an inflation caused by their party’s deficit spending*—from a high of 9.1% in June 2022 to 3.2% at this writing. Wow! Bravo!

But wait. That doesn’t mean that inflation has come *down* to 3.2%; that means it was 3.2% *higher than the previous month*. Biden and Harris are shamelessly deceptive here to those who don’t know the economic lingo. A more realistic number to consider is the *total* increase during Biden/Harris’s three-plus years in office:

18%! And even if inflation comes down to zero—highly unlikely—the Biden/Harris Democrat 18% is baked into the economy now; it will stay there year after year after year.

Meanwhile, wages haven't kept up with inflation. Wages and welfare payments must increase for people to afford the new higher cost of living. Wages haven't. People have been forced to borrow from their savings or retirement or rely on credit to simply get by. But you can't just raise wages across the board by law—as was recently done in California, leading to massive layoffs and closed restaurants—without consequences. Businesses are forced to shut down or replace their workers with artificial intelligence machines when their costs go up. How does that help anyone?

Another comparison may help explain our dire situation. John F. Kennedy's *average* inflation rate was 1.1%. Obama's was 1.4%. So far, Biden/Harris's has been 5.7%, exceeded only by Jimmy Carter's 9.9% and Gerald Ford's 8%.

To explain all this, we get fed a diet of hogwash, drivel, and rubbish. *The Washington Post*, for example, pontificated:

“Grocery prices remain elevated due to a mixture of labor shortages tied to the pandemic, ongoing supply chain disruptions, droughts, avian flu and other factors far beyond the administration’s control.” Blah, blah, and blah. They and the “experts,” with their charts and graphs, their threadbare predictions, and malarkey (to borrow a Biden phrase) have created an unending jobs program—for academics, not regular Americans.

On a larger scale, in the past few years, trillions of “new” dollars have flooded America. The Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security (CARES) Act of 2020 created \$2 trillion out of thin air—not paid for by legitimate economic growth in income or other taxes. The “American Rescue Plan Act” of 2021 magically created another \$1.9 trillion. The “Consolidated Appropriations Act” of 2022 tossed another \$1.5 trillion onto the fire for good measure. Tax-free student loan forgiveness and more give-away-your-tax-money programs have kept the U.S. Treasury printing press spewing out money like never before—all of which increased inflation dramatically.

So, the Inflation Reduction Act should have been called the Inflation *Acceleration* Act. After the truth about the law became evident, even Joe Biden said he regretted that it was called the Inflation Reduction Act.

Back to the grocery store:

Sen. Tammy Baldwin walks in. Maybe she doesn't see the higher prices. Or maybe she sees them and doesn't care. Instead, she starts to lecture shoppers about the fantastic stuff she has done for them.

"Attention, grocery shoppers! Gather around, and I'll instruct you on how the wonderful Inflation Reduction Act has made your lives so much better!"

With that she launches into what the supposedly copious benefits are that she has spelled out on her website: a record investment in renewable and clean energy at some time in the future and solar panels that are so expensive they require a government subsidy, an additional \$19.5 billion in "oversubscribed climate-smart agriculture programs," taking on the climate crisis. Lots of tax credits, subsidies, and other gifts but nothing to actually reduce inflation.

She draws incredulous stares from shoppers trying to figure out how to pay for just two-thirds of the things on their grocery lists—"crazy lady in the fresh produce aisle."

Baldwin has slavishly voted during Biden and Harris's term for trillions and trillions of handouts to groups who might support her in the future. Had she and maybe a few other Democrats *not* voted for all this wasteful spending, we might not be facing the highest and most persistent inflation in forty years.

Instead, she falls in line as if she is owned by the New "progressive" Democratic Party bosses, *not* by the people of Wisconsin.

Chapter 2

Boys and Girls Together

Coming soon to a girls' locker room in a high school near you: biological boys who say they are girls.

That's if Wisconsin Senator Tammy Baldwin has her way. She is sponsoring a bill—the “Equality Act”—that would force every school in America to throw open wide the door to the girls' locker room for any biological boy who wants in because he identifies himself as a girl.

That means he dresses and undresses with the girls. Showers with them. Shares bathrooms with them. Out on the basketball court or soccer field the girls could find themselves competing against a 6-foot, 5-inch, 220-pound behemoth. In the gym, we've already seen such outsized male players injuring smaller females. Just go to YouTube and search “transgender athlete injures female player.”

The schools would have no choice. Nor would the parents. Here's the bill's

language: no individual shall be “denied access to a shared facility, including a restroom, a locker room, and a dressing room, that is in accordance with the individual’s *gender identity*.” [Emphasis added.]

But the bill goes way beyond schools. It would apply to “any establishment that provides a good, service, or program, including a store, shopping center, online retailer or service provider, salon, bank, gas station, food bank, service or care center, shelter, travel agency, or funeral parlor, or establishment that provides health care, accounting, or legal services. . . .” Also train, bus, car, taxi, and airline services. Have I forgotten anything?

In short, it adds “sexual orientation” and “gender identity” to all persons protected against discrimination under the Civil Rights Act of 1964. It proclaims, for example, that gender identity has the same protections as race and religion.

That might *seem* reasonable and fair to some, but the consequences are far reaching and game changing.

Take, for example, transgender swimmer Lia Thomas, who deployed his/her

male muscles to trounce female competitors who’d trained all their lives in hopes of college scholarships, Olympic medals, or just the satisfaction of a job well done. Thomas’s case was a one-off. But Baldwin’s bill would vastly expand the reach. Colleges, the NCAA, sport’s governing bodies, and sporting institutions of all kinds would be affected. Everyone would have to fall in line to allow Thomas-like-athletes to compete against real girls and young women.

If Baldwin’s bill is passed, this no longer would be a state issue where people work through complicated topics on a state or local level. Because the bill would become a federal law, it would apply everywhere. If you send your kids to camp, they might have a counselor or fellow camper of the opposite sex in their cabin. If your daughters go on an overnight school field trip, they may be required to share a room or even a bed with a male student who claims to be a girl—yes, this happened to a Colorado middle school student in December 2023.

If you read the fine print in the bill, if you “discriminate” against anyone’s

appearance or self-identified gender expression, *you're* the one in trouble. Don't want a man in a battered women's shelter? Too bad. Don't want a biological male in your fitness club's female locker room? Don't complain.

Public opposition to transgender rules was evident as far back as 2015 when the Obama administration bludgeoned Township High School District 211 in Palatine, Illinois, to allow a transgender "girl" (biological boy) into the girls' locker room. There was no law requiring it, but the Civil Rights Office of the Department of Education said if the district didn't follow its "guidance," it would lose \$6 million in federal aid. The school district caved—but not until after a packed public hearing, loaded with fathers and mothers who passionately objected to allowing a biological boy to gawk at their daughters in the buff. One daughter rose to say courageously, passionately, and eloquently:

We too have been bullied for our views. We know the [transgendered student] and she's a friend. We have never bullied her, and we respect

her own brave fight for what she believes are her rights. But please, also consider our privacy rights. We are concerned about our modesty. Seeing the male genitalia is not our problem. We are self-conscious of our bodies: this is a difficult time for us.

This debate has been mostly about transgender feelings and rights. Hardly ever has it been about anyone else's feelings or rights—as in the right to privacy. Doesn't a girl, on the verge of womanhood, have a right to say who may or may not see her undressed? To control her body in a most fundamental way? What about women or girls who have been the victims of sexual abuse by a male? Can you imagine the trauma of being forced again into an unwanted intimate situation?

I asked a woman who had lettered in three high school sports how she would have felt if a boy, claiming to be a girl, had shown up in her locker room when she was in high school. Let's just say her answer was powerful. She also said she would have expected her dad to raise Cain.

As the mother of three teen girl athletes, she does not want the school to brainwash them into thinking that biological males have a right to see them unclothed.

Teaching religion in schools was forbidden years ago. But training children in the gender fluid doctrine apparently is not.

Let's not ignore the speech impact of a transgender-approval mandate from this so-called Equality Act on, say, classmates and teachers. Will "cisgender" boys and girls be required under threat of being sent to the principal's office to say "they" or "him" or "she" when actually speaking of a her/he? How are young students still making sense of the world supposed to learn biology when they are forced to accept and promote a biological inaccuracy as fact?

Will teachers be required to do the same or be fired? It's already happened: Peter Vlaming, a teacher in West Point, Virginia, was fired for using the "wrong" pronoun. He argued that he cannot be required to use speech that violates his religious and philosophical beliefs (and let's not forget scientific fact). The state

supreme court ruled that Vlaming can pursue his lawsuit against the school, but the story is far from finished.

And what about children, who aren't even old enough to legally vote or drink, considering permanent life-changing surgery that makes them sterile and dependent on prescription drugs for the rest of their lives? A legal battle is raging over whether parents should have any say at all—while some think the authority should belong to a teacher, student counselor, or a health care provider.

Gender identity is a controversial and far-from-settled issue. Beyond locker rooms and girls' sports issues, debate is passionate over things like hormone blockers and medical interventions. These are core debates, but the issue here I am addressing is whether one side of the debate should be imposed by a D.C. law on reasonable people who disagree. Should those with legitimate concerns about safety and biology be called bigots?

The Equality Act has twice passed the House with 100% Democratic support. Although it never got Senate approval, it's back again. Baldwin is a major co-sponsor

of this very *unequitable* act, and she has voted for it three times.

Baldwin doesn't just believe in "gender fluidity"; she also wants to impose that view on you and strip rights to privacy and equal access to sports from your daughters and granddaughters. If you're a parent and the Equality Act passes, your children will be required to conform to a view that you might find wrong, even harmful. And young women everywhere will no longer be able to count on Title IX protections to ensure their rights to a fair and just athletic playing field.

"The Equality Act," Baldwin said in press release, "... marks an important and historic step forward for our country." In 2016, Baldwin told the LGBT advocacy group Lambda Legal that legislators trying to block transgender students from using bathrooms different from their biological sex were "advancing discrimination" and "have found themselves on the wrong side of history."

You can find such rhetoric from other supporters of the Equality Act, using the theme of "some bigots just want to discriminate." There's no room for honest,

good faith disagreement. They refuse to acknowledge the impact on children and the rest of society. They avoid such central questions as: What should children be required to learn? Why don't parents have a say about such issues?

Why must everyone conform to what Baldwin believes?

Chapter 3

Meet Senator Baldwin's Friends

There's a saying that advises: "Show me who your friends are, and I'll tell you who you are."

In politics, it's similar: "Show me who pays for your election campaign, and I'll show you what you are politically."

Who you are as a politician is usually tied to the people who shower you with the most cash.

Those deep-pocket donors are called "special interests" because their interests are, well, special—as opposed to not-so-special everyday Americans.

They pay for those high-priced consultants to specially craft their message because the candidates are too cowardly to say what they really believe. They need these ever-present and usually wrong advisers to tell the candidate what nonsense to say, because to win, they believe they've got to fool the voters.

They pay for big campaign offices where computers are tracking you down during dinner time to reach you with a phone call. You might have gotten one.

Thankfully *we now know* who's showering how much money on which candidates. Candidates didn't want to tell us until a law came along that forced them to tell. That information is a handy tool for voters to look behind the scenes to see what's what. The problem is that this tool isn't used enough. After all, who's got the time? You'd have to plow through piles of data that the Federal Election Commission (FEC) collects, and too often first-timers give up.

So, I've done it for you.

Wisconsin Democrat Tammy Baldwin is running in November to be reelected to the Senate. The facts are, Tammy Baldwin received a total of \$20.7 million in contributions from 2019 to 2024. Well, everyone receives contributions, but Baldwin has it down to an art. That sum includes the \$10.7 million she's raised so far during the 2023–2024 election cycle.

That makes her one of the best fundraisers among senators. She comes in ninth among the senators running this year.

That's impressive for the twentieth-largest state. She shares the top ten with well-funded publicity hounds like Ted Cruz, Adam Schiff, and Bernie Sanders.

So, where does that money come from? In the 2023–2024 election period, most of it flowed in from out of state—**THREE TIMES AS MUCH AS FROM THE PEOPLE OF WISCONSIN!** Here are the numbers: \$15,034,333 came from other states; only \$5,160,060 came from Wisconsin.

Baldwin actually received more money from just one of the big Eastern states, Massachusetts (more than \$6 million dollars), than from her home state of Wisconsin.

All this may cause you to wonder, who does Tammy Baldwin represent when she votes in the U.S. Senate? “Them” or us?

Keep in mind, these figures are at the time of this writing in early 2024. By the time you get this, the sums will be much higher.

You're right to ask if Baldwin has been working for you or for someone else far away.

Baldwin has been harvesting a lot of that cash in years that she wasn't running

for reelection. It's just been piling up in a bank. Why would special interests be paying her in years she wasn't running? Here's an answer: each check that arrives is a reminder that senators are beholden to those special interests. Results are expected, even in off years.

So, who are these special interests?

Well, two of them are Emily's List and Planned Parenthood. Unlike most Americans who, polls show, are moderate on abortion restrictions, these two special interest groups espouse elective abortions for *any* reason through nine months of pregnancy and up to the day of birth.

JStreetPAC also is a top Baldwin contributor that has broken away from full support of Israel's invasion of Gaza. It is aligned with those who call for an unconditional end to the invasion, support for Palestinians, and a two-state solution without required recognition of Israel's right to exist. This puts them at odds with the more moderate Democrat Jewish Americans who support the American Israel Public Affairs Committee.

ActBlue pours millions from Democratic donors into campaigns of loyal

Democratic candidates, such as Baldwin. A congressional investigation has begun into ActBlue's fundraising technique that allegedly included getting illegal contributions using recurring donations from small donors, including seniors, without their consent or awareness.

You'd think that Baldwin, who has been hanging around Washington for twenty-five years as a senator and before that as a congresswoman, would at least have a higher national profile. You'd think that with all that money, she'd have risen to one of the top leadership posts in the party . . . that she would have introduced major bill after bill and guided them to passage.

Not so. She's virtually invisible—except as a solid vote for her big donors, and of course, her awful, so-called Equality Act.

Chapter 4

Crime and Non-Punishment

You don't have to be an older American to wonder what's happened to us, nor to realize that today's America doesn't resemble the America we grew up in.

Among today's symptoms of our broken society:

- Crime has gone crazy. Mobs in broad daylight are smashing and grabbing merchandise—and not just toilet paper and other essentials from dollar stores but jewels and other valuables from opulent shops along some of the most elite boulevards, such as Michigan Avenue in Chicago.
- Drug gang wars have broken out in major cities, with gun battles killing innocent bystanders, even infants.
- It no longer matters where you drive; your car can be hijacked even in areas once considered safe.

- Once peaceful protests now regularly turn into violent riots, destroying communities, burning down stores, and causing serious injuries that haven't been tallied—never mind the costs of human suffering.
- Outbreaks of mass shootings in schools, places of worship, malls, and elsewhere have become common, something almost unheard of not that many years ago.

And the list goes on.

Some will call it a “break down” in society. As one explanation, scholars identify some “root causes” of crime: poverty, the social environment, and family structure. Much has been written about the first two, so I'd like to focus on the family and what we, as Americans, value. In other words, the culture.

Let's start with this: where have all the real men gone?

Every child rightfully deserves to have a father in his or her life, especially boys who suffer most from the absence of an adult male in their lives. Furthermore, a child also deserves to live with an intact

family. That means an intact family with a father and mother.

Just the statistics describing how men are fleeing their critical roles as fathers and husbands should be alarming enough. According to the Census Bureau's population surveys, in 1968 only 15% of children did not live with both a mother and father. By 2020, that had jumped to 30%, with the vast majority living only with a mother.

Black families were mostly intact in 1960, with a father and mother instilling values and behavior that are the backbone of America. Eventually fathers started to disappear, helped along by a federal rule that men couldn't reside in the public housing unit with a single woman with his child while she was receiving welfare. It wasn't long after that that fatherlessness also became a troubling part of white households. “No men around” is almost the rule now, especially in black households with 72% of black children being raised by a single parent or a grandparent.

It's not hard to find study after study confirming the importance of fathers, not only their impact on raising their children to be law-abiding citizens but

their necessity to the maintenance of a well-functioning society.

Here are a few of the troubling findings: a child raised in a father-absent home is more likely to commit a crime and go to prison. Some 90% of homeless or runaway children are from fatherless homes, as are 63% of youth suicides. Such children are more likely to be impoverished, to drop out of school, to abuse drugs and alcohols, be obese, be neglected and abused, to have behavioral problems, and to become rapists or victims of sexual abuse. Fatherless homes are associated with higher infant mortality. Girls without fathers in the home are more likely to become pregnant out of wedlock.

This is evidence that fathers and mothers together are important ingredients in the formation of individuals who are essential for the creation of a vital, vigorous, and dynamic democracy. Without these ingredients, democracy dies in violence, injustice, decay, and suffering.

But, if you say such things publicly, you will be called nasty names. People who believe that single motherhood is a good thing with no societal drawbacks or

risk to children will scold you for saying fathers are needed as more than just sperm donors. “Moron. Misogynist. Racist.” I dare say that most of those criticisms spring from extreme New Democrats, progressives, and other arrogant academics I heard from when as a newspaper columnist I wrote about the importance of fatherhood.

Just how worried are Sen. Tammy Baldwin and her like-minded partisans about our unraveling society? If they are, they don’t say much about it. Because it is unfashionable. Because it takes courage. Because the extreme progressive wing of the Democratic Party doesn’t give a fig. They are so blinded by their unrealistic and disastrous ideology that doesn’t tolerate *any* disagreement.

If Sen. Baldwin is passionate and devoted to creating healthy families with a father and a mother, I don’t find that mentioned on her website nor in her public utterances.

As if proof is needed of Sen. Baldwin’s disdain for traditional married parents raising their children together, we need look no further than her endorsement by

the elitist Human Rights Campaign. The group bills itself as the nation’s largest lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer (LGBTQ+) “civil rights” organization. The group said in its endorsement, “There’s no one who has put more hard work in for Wisconsin families than Tammy Baldwin.” Obviously, they weren’t talking about traditional families.

Sen. Baldwin also was given an award by the National Education Association, the powerful national union that unconscionably, and in their own interest, demanded unnecessary remote learning for students during and after the COVID pandemic, long after most of the country had opened up again and despite the negative effects on children. No question where that union’s interests are. Not with the children.

Aside from her virtual silence on the demonstrated need for fathers, Baldwin’s votes and endorsements also display how badly she identifies the root causes of family values disintegration.

During recent campaign cycles, Baldwin has endorsed candidates with damaging stances on crime and policing. In February

2023, she endorsed the ultra-liberal Janet Protasiewicz for Wisconsin’s Supreme Court. Three times Protasiewicz rejected requests from prosecutors to give felons prison time for harming children—including two convicted of sexually assaulting minors.

In July 2022, Baldwin endorsed Mandela Barnes for U.S. Senate. She must have agreed with his positions to (among other things) abolish the Immigration and Custom Enforcement agency, give illegal immigrants access to drivers’ licenses, slash “bloated” police budgets, and cut Wisconsin’s prison population in half by “not sending people back to prison.”

Sen. Baldwin has supported congressional legislation that would reduce sentences for criminals and make policing harder. She opposed legislation that would mandate life in prison for criminals convicted three times of such crimes as murder, kidnapping, arson, and armed robbery. As a member of the House of Representatives in 2005, she was one of only 106 backing legislation to remove the mandatory minimum sentence of sex offenders who fail to register as sex offenders. In 2020, she

co-sponsored the “Justice in Policing Act” that would have weakened police powers. Thankfully, it failed to pass.

Perhaps you favored some of these bills, and I’m not here to scold you for your choices. The point here is that *taken together*, Baldwin’s voting record, her complete disregard of the crisis facing American families, and her lackadaisical approach to rising crime rates describes a senator who cannot claim to be a moderate or traditional Democrat. She is part of the so-called progressive crowd that has taken over the former Democratic Party.

Chapter 5

Every Town Is Now a Border Town

Just because you’re in Wisconsin, some 1,500 miles from the southern border, doesn’t mean that illegal immigration has no impact on you.

Here are some examples of why it does:

In January 2024, an illegal immigrant, Jorge Sanchez-Tzanahua, was charged with multiple felonies after he allegedly crossed the highway center line and smashed into a semi-trailer truck in Rusk County in western Wisconsin.

The driver of the semi, thirty-five-year-old Steven Nasholm, a husband and father from Clayton, Wisconsin, was killed.

Sanchez-Tzanahua was charged with homicide by intoxicated driving. His blood alcohol was more than twice the legal limit. Last year he was convicted of operating a vehicle while intoxicated/impaired. So why hadn’t he been deported? Why was he still living free in this state?

Alarmingly, a bill in the Wisconsin state legislature would allow certain illegal immigrants to become police officers. This is impossible to understand: a criminal “law-enforcement” officer? What?

One more: Whitewater, a college town in southern Wisconsin, seems to be a magnet for illegal immigrants. Whitewater Police Chief Dan Meyer told PBS Wisconsin: “I’ve had a lot of people ask, ‘Okay, where are the buses dropping people off?’ That’s not happening here. It wasn’t a ton. It was like 50 at first, and then it was like another 50. And so, it wasn’t like a massive rush.” But they haven’t stopped coming.

Whitewater is home to between 800 and 1,000 illegal immigrants and growing, mostly from Nicaragua and Venezuela. That might not sound like much, but in a town of only 15,000, of which as many as 10,000 are students at the University of Wisconsin-Whitewater, that’s a concerning percentage.

So much so that Chief Meyer wrote a letter to President Joe Biden asking for help. The letter spurred a couple of Wisconsin congressmen—Northwoods Rep.

Tom Tiffany and southern Wisconsin Rep. Bryan Steil—to sound an alarm. Tiffany wrote on social media, “By releasing migrants into small towns in Wisconsin, Joe Biden’s border crisis is piling new costs on local taxpayers. Wisconsinites cannot continue footing the bill for Biden’s failed immigration policies.”

Good point. How much have Wisconsin citizens spent on illegals’ medical bills, food and housing, education, incarceration?

Biden ignored the letter . . . just like he and Vice President Harris have ignored similar pleas from other cities and states across the country.

Tiffany then co-sponsored a bill that would let state and local governments reject federal refugee resettlements. The “Community Assent for Refugee Entry Act,” he said, would allow Wisconsinites to have a part in deciding how to handle immigrants. If the illegal immigrants overflow local hospitals—it has happened—citizens can decide what to do, instead of waiting for a bureaucrat a thousand miles away to issue pages of new orders that might or might not be appropriate. It would also grant local authority

to deal with issues such as measles and COVID-19 outbreaks brought across the border and into your community from unvaccinated immigrants.

Then there is fentanyl. Keeping track of precisely how many Wisconsinites have died from fentanyl being illegally smuggled across the border is difficult. But that hasn't stopped doctors and health providers from noticing not only the existence of a fentanyl problem but that it is worsening.

An estimated 1,000 mostly young Wisconsinites die from fentanyl every year. Dr. Jasmine Zapata, a state health official, called the spread "devastating." She said opioids, primarily fentanyl, accounted for 91% of Wisconsin overdose deaths last year. Those deaths, she said grew by 97% from 2020 to 2021.

Still think Wisconsin is isolated from the effects of illegal immigration?

Since President Joe Biden and Vice President Kamala Harris have relaxed the immigration rules, it's estimated that 10–12 million illegal immigrants have entered our country. The vast majority are released into America, never to be located or to appear in immigration court.

That doesn't even include the got-aways who evade the border authorities entirely. Among them are uncounted criminals, including terrorists and rapists—and an estimated 200,000 single, military-age Chinese men since 2021. (Today's entire active duty American Army has just 453,000 soldiers.) Some of them land in Chicago; how many do you think make their way into Wisconsin?

You can hardly blame people for wanting to come to America, some so desperate that they're willing to fight the currents in the Rio Grande River, carrying a child on their shoulders. America is the land of opportunity and freedom, the dream of all peoples, and we want to welcome those who come legally to work and raise their families. Yet, many are jumping in line ahead of others who are waiting patiently—those who are following the immigration regulations and laws before the gate swings open. How is that fair? It's not an exaggeration to say that those who are content with the illegal flood on the southern border don't give a damn about those pursuing legal entry. Where is the equity in that?

So, where is Sen. Tammy Baldwin in all this? She certainly knows that the border is wide open, but does she care?

Apparently not. Because with every opportunity to address the problem she takes a duck. Or she votes with the block of Democratic politicians who pretend there's no problem. Or agrees with those like Homeland Security Secretary Alejandro Mayorkas, who swore under oath that the border was "secure."

Here's an example: Baldwin voted against Kate's Law. It is named in memory of Kate Steinle, a thirty-two-year-old woman who was brutally murdered by an illegal immigrant. This killer had numerous felony convictions and had been deported five times.

The bill was introduced after a public outcry, but Democrats killed it every time. The legislation would have imposed a mandatory minimum sentence of five years for illegal immigrants who have been convicted of such felonies as murder, rape, drug trafficking, and more. The bill also would have imposed mandatory minimum sentences for repeat illegal entries and for terrorists. How could anyone *not* vote for that?

Sen. Tammy Baldwin didn't. Several times. In compliance with instructions from her Democratic senate bosses. No independent thinking there.

Oh, yes, Sen. Baldwin attempts to portray herself as someone who wants to stem the flood of illegal immigrants. In a press release she claimed to be "committed to being a part of the solution to secure our border and fix our broken immigration system." If only. Before anyone shuts the door to drug dealers and terrorists, she demands a complete reform of complex and incomprehensible immigration laws—something that's needed, certainly, but she knows that it's not possible in the current political climate.

So, what *could* be done now? President Joe Biden on his own has the power to shut down the border invasion. He could restore the border rules created by the prior administration that worked so well. To please his progressive base, however, Biden, seemingly without thought, cancelled them on the first day he became president. So, with a stroke of his pen, he can restore them. Baldwin and her fellow Democrats are united *against* this

commonsense solution. Have you heard any calls from them for Biden to act?

For what possible reason could anyone choose to ignore the existing law that establishes meaningful order at the border? Why would Sen. Baldwin, her fellow Democrats, Vice President Harris, and President Biden intentionally want to flood America with millions of unvetted people who will quickly disperse into all corners of the nation? Because no explanation is forthcoming, conspiracy theories—some quite wild—have popped up. Still, reasonable people remain mystified and frustrated.

Sen. Baldwin's voting record sides with the open-the-border rules and regulations. In 2016, she voted as a member of the House of Representatives against the bipartisan "Security Fence Act" authorizing 700 new miles of border fencing. In 2020, she signed a letter asking that all work on the border wall be halted because of the COVID-19 pandemic. What?

She repeatedly opposed sending illegal immigrants back to their countries of origin to protect Americans against COVID-19 infections and other communicable

diseases. How to explain this vote when everyone was worried about getting sick and dying in the pandemic? International flights into this country were stopped, but if you were smuggled across the southern border you could stay?

Her position on illegal immigration is a charade. She's trying to show herself as a thoughtful moderate, but when it comes to millions of people—including gang members, drug dealers, and potential terrorists—sneaking across our border, she fails to pry herself away from her progressive Democrat donors and bosses.

Chapter 6

Baldwin on Abortion: Fighting Back or Fear-Mongering?

Do you remember the old “Calvin & Hobbs” comic strip?

Calvin was a 6-year-old boy and Hobbs was his stuffed toy tiger who only came to life in Calvin’s imagination. They had many a great adventure together. In one instance, Calvin advised Hobbs,

Calvin: “I’m writing a fundraising letter. The secret to getting donations is to depict everyone who disagrees with you as the enemy. Then you explain how they’re systematically working to destroy everything you hold dear. It’s a war of values! Rational discussion is hopeless! Compromise is unthinkable! Our only hope is well-funded antagonism, so we need your money to keep up the fight!”

Hobbs: “How cynically unconstructive.”

Calvin: “Enmity sells.”

When it comes to the hot-button issue of abortion, I'm starting to think Calvin is writing for Sen. Baldwin.

There shouldn't be all this fighting over abortion—not when most Americans aren't on the side that's making the most noise.

If you think abortion should generally be allowed in the first trimester, and then with exceptions—such as to save the life of the mother or in cases of rape or incest—you're with most Americans, according to a Gallup poll.

If you think parents of minor daughters should be involved if their children are undergoing a life-altering medical procedure, you're with 70% of Americans who also believe that.

Only one out of three Americans actually gives a green light to abortions at any time, for any reason, without restriction. “No limits on abortion” literally means that abortions are legal all the way up to the moment when nine months have passed, and the mother is in labor.

Sen. Tammy Baldwin proudly accepts campaign contributions from people and institutions that are *that* extreme. They

rate her 100% on their side. Among them are pro-abortion outfits like Planned Parenthood, which refuses to answer such questions as, “When does life or personhood begin?” Ask Planned Parenthood if they would accept a legal requirement that parents be notified if their 14-year-old child is about to undergo an abortion and the answer will be, “Oh, no, no! Can't do that! That's denying her the right to choose!”

Abortion law is in an upheaval following the Supreme Court's recent *Dobbs* decision that returned the issue to the people in the states, where it had been for generations before *Roe v. Wade*. The People are again able to decide what kind of law we want in our states. And that, like it or not, has made abortion a hotter political issue more than ever. Democrats surely know how to stoke the fire. They use the issue to scare women into voting Democrat. They portray anyone who disagrees with their extreme “no limits whatsoever” position as one who wants to cancel your “reproductive rights.” How often have you heard that in a campaign ad?

It worked well in the 2022 midterm election, and Democrats are warming up

the same issue in the coming presidential, congressional, and state elections.

In Wisconsin, Baldwin brags about standing fast with these unbending pro-abortion groups. And now the *Dobbs* decision has opened the door wide to crafting reasonable legislation such as parental notification for minors and protecting infants who are developed enough to easily survive outside the womb.

But the Wisconsin stage is too small for Baldwin. Only a national law will do the trick. She and some forty Democrats have introduced the most radical pro-abortion bill yet. The “Women’s Health Protection Act,” according to its formal description, “prohibits governmental restriction on the provision of, and access to, abortion services.” That means NO restriction of ANY KIND.

The legislation’s language is so broad that it likely means there will be no restrictions on self-administered abortion drugs, despite their risk of causing excessive bleeding and even death. No notifying parents of a young teen’s scheduled abortion. No limits on abortion for a nearly full-term, healthy infant. No “medically

inaccurate information” (as determined by a government bureaucrat)—which is a deceptive arrow aimed directly at shutting down crisis pregnancy clinics that offer alternatives to abortion and support young mothers who choose to keep their babies.

The actual bill, if anyone bothers to read it, gives the abortion industry free rein to make millions of dollars off of women in difficult circumstances. As Calvin noted, it’s always about the money.

Baldwin and her cosponsors are counting on an absence of independent thinking based on the certitude that Americans are too disinterested or stupid to decide for themselves on reasonable abortion regulations.

An Afterword

One of the biggest complaints about politicians is their failure to keep their word. They promise one thing, then do something different.

If a public opinion survey were conducted on whether people believe candidates keep their campaign promises (and I couldn't find one), I'd bet that almost everyone thinks that none of them do.

That's why it is important to dig below the campaign rhetoric and fancy TV ads. It all sounds good during the campaign, but are you really getting what you voted for?

Apparently not in the case of Sen. Tammy Baldwin, unless you are a radical progressive. As we've seen here, her voting record says something way different from any idea that she is a moderate, center, middle-of-the-road Democrat.

By letting her strings be pulled by establishment elites who are completely out of touch with normal Wisconsin like you, she walks in the footsteps of self-proclaimed socialist Sen. Bernie Sanders

and those like him. With her record of voting 95% with President Biden and Vice President Harris's agenda—pushed by the progressive New Democrats in their administration—she has shown where her heart is. And it's not with those good senators of both parties that Wisconsin was blessed with in previous years.

Wisconsin has produced some of the most independent, fair-minded public servants in our nation's history. Unfortunately, Sen. Tammy Baldwin isn't one of them.