

The shocking stories contained between these covers about “the Ruben Gallego we never knew” take about 30 minutes to read. Less if your eyes start *really* popping out of your head.

- If you’re happy with today’s grocery store and gas prices, *don’t read this book!*
- If the scenes of chaos at America’s open borders and the flood of illegals into “someone else’s town” simply makes you shrug, *don’t read this book!*
- If you think that boys pretending to be girls and showering with your daughter in her high school locker room is just “kids being kids,” *don’t read this book!*
- If you like paying for Biden/Harris canceling college students’ loans, *don’t read this book!*

Rep. Ruben Gallego *seemed to be one of us*. He seemed to be fighting for our jobs and for common sense policies in that crazy place called Washington, DC. Now—as you will discover in this revealing book—*he’s voting like one of THEM*.

Illegal immigrants, crime, inflation, *and* crazy race-and-gender politics all come from DC. We show you how and why Gallego is now bringing them all home to Arizona. **Why?** *Because more than \$26 million of his campaign money is from the East and West coasts, only \$4 million from Arizona. Will he vote FOR THEM if elected, or FOR US?*

**This little book could mean the world to your family and to your vote in just a couple of weeks. It’s time for a return to normal. *The Other Side of Ruben Gallego* will tell you why, what TV and the newspapers won’t tell you!**

# The OTHER SIDE of RUBEN GALLEGO



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

# **THE OTHER SIDE OF RUBEN GALLEG0**

*What the Press Isn't Telling You*

Jameson Books, Inc.  
Ottowa, Illinois

# DISCLAIMER

This book was written in the summer of 2024. It was finished *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 and sports teams 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

# Introduction

In the November election for Arizona’s new U.S. Senator, the big question is: which Ruben Gallego will get your vote?

The Ruben Gallego who said the flood of illegal immigrants across our southern border was not a big problem? Or, the Ruben Gallego who says it is?

Ruben Gallego is a Phoenix Democrat running to fill the seat of retiring Independent Senator Kyrsten Sinema. If he wins, that would be a promotion from the seat in the House of Representatives he has occupied since 2014. But his physical move from the House to the Senate would be nothing compared to how he has “moved” from his long-held views in order to win an election.

Gallego is a master mind-changer. He’ll head in a different direction depending on which way the political wind is blowing.

You will quickly see evidence of that in this little book by examining his voting record, past statements, legislation he has co-sponsored, his endorsements, *and who contributes the really big money to his campaign.*

You’ll see that while in the House of Representatives, Gallego had nothing good to say about his political

# Contents

<i>Introduction</i> . . . . .	1
Chapter 1: Ruben Finally Noticed: There’s a Border There . . . . .	6
Chapter 2: Have You Noticed the Price of Eggs? . . . . .	22
Chapter 3: Where’s Your Daddy? . . . .	30
Chapter 4: Boys and Girls Together . .	36
Chapter 5: I Pledge Thee My Troth . .	47
Chapter 6: Who <i>Are</i> These People? . .	52
Chapter 7: Conclusion . . . . .	57

opponents—Republicans, conservatives, old fashioned liberals, and, yes, even moderates.

In January 2022, he tweeted that a U.S. Marine who didn't want to take a COVID vaccine "should shut the f— up." In May 2022, following a school shooting in Uvalde, Texas, he said, "F— your prayers. They haven't worked for the last 20 mass shootings."

Of Republican senators, he ranted about Texan Ted Cruz, "F— you @tedcruz you care about a fetus, but you will let our children get slaughtered. Just get your ass to Cancun. You are useless." Of Josh Hawley of Missouri, he said, "You are such a f—g coward @HawleyMO."

Of President Trump, he tweeted: "The f—g former President of the United States tried to lead the coup himself. Assaulted secret service and tried to drive himself."

Not to leave out a member of Trump's family, he ranted about Donald Jr., "You are such a piece of sh—." Nice.

He didn't leave moderates alone, either. He went after Senator Sinema, widely considered to be a moderate, accusing her of "once again putting her own interest ahead of getting things done for Arizonans."

That was when Gallego faced the prospect of running against Sinema. Of course, after she announced she would not seek

re-election, Gallego sought her endorsement, noting that she's "very well liked among independents."

All that happened was Sinema's retirement announcement made it time for Gallego to switch tactics.

Let's take a look at what "switch" means.

Political nerds would say that Gallego went from being a "progressive" to becoming a "moderate." But those are just words. Let's just call him *Ruben Gallego Before (RGB)* he switched and *Ruben Gallego After (RGA)*.

RGB is someone who voted almost 100% with President Joe Biden. That means that he went along with a wide-open southern border, inflation denials, false claims of a great economy, unrestricted abortion, defund the police, and accepting money from out-of-state special interests who agree with him—but not us—on all these issues.

RGA is *now* someone who tries very hard *not* to say that he's a Biden/Harris New Democrat guy. Now, he's a guy who worries about the open border, the weak economy, higher inflation, crime, and special interest money infecting elections.

None of this mattered to him when he was running from a 100% safe Democratic district in Phoenix.

Gallego's switch is so dramatic that *even*

*the national media noticed*, with these comments from friendly East Coast progressive newspapers:

“The moderate reinvention of Ruben Gallego, Senate hopeful in Arizona: The liberal congressman has raced to the political middle in a key battleground where moderates have a huge influence. Will it work?”

—*The Washington Post*

“In Arizona’s Crucial Senate Race a Liberal Fighter Courts the Center: Ruben Gallego has long embraced his progressive background. Now with his state newly in the spotlight over abortion politics, he’s getting tough on the border and targeting swing voters.”

—*The New York Times*

The *Times* went on:

Delicately turning to the political center is a time-honored tradition for candidates of both parties. But Mr. Gallego, who represents a liberal district in Phoenix and has a long history of identifying as a progressive, could face a tougher challenge than most in redefining himself in

a battleground state with a decades-old conservative bent—even after a major court decision on abortion this week put Democrats firmly on offense in the state.

Changing your mind is not an automatic mortal sin. You can justifiably do so if you come across new information that puts things in an entirely new perspective. Changing your mind can be a virtue, especially in these times when America seems to be divided into two stubbornly warring camps where changing your mind is forbidden.

*But candidates should not get away with changing their minds just during election years—and then changing back again after being elected—only to fool voters like me and you.* They cannot be allowed to do so if our democratic republic is to survive. Changing your mind for your own personal benefit—and nuts to everyone else—is a betrayal of everyone who counted on a politician’s promises.

Gallego has turned himself into a political joke. But that’s not funny. At best, it’s deceitful. If he’s elected, can you trust him to do what he said during the few months while running for office? Or should you believe his long track record?

Let’s take a look at it.

## Chapter 1

### **Ruben Finally Noticed: There's a Border There**

If anyone should be consumed with worry about the millions of illegal immigrants scrambling across the border, it should be Ruben Gallego.

As a Phoenix politician he is smack dab in the middle of a humanitarian crisis that President Biden and Vice President Harris caused by throwing open wide the southern doors to whoever wants to sneak into America.

If he wanted to know about it firsthand, he could have travelled a short distance south to Lukeville, Arizona, a tiny border town of 35 residents that was overwhelmed by *thousands* of illegal immigrants passing through.

All along the 300-mile-border separating Arizona and Mexico he could have watched hundreds of thousands of illegal immigrants who leapfrogged into America to be picked up by the border patrol, loaded into buses and be released, helter-skelter, into who-knows-where America.

He could have seen that they were coming not just from Mexico and Central America but also Turkey, Iraq, China, India, the Congo, Egypt, Senegal, Bangladesh, Afghanistan, Egypt, the Palestinian territories, and scores more countries.

He might have caught sight of tens of thousands of illegal immigrants, so-called got-aways, disappearing to somewhere in America. Some are terrorists, murderers, rapists, child sex traffickers, and drug cartel gang bangers here to poison more than 100,000 young Americans a year with fentanyl and other drugs.

There are men like Jose Antonio Ibarra, 26, charged with brutally and randomly murdering 22-year-old nursing student Laken Riley. He was an illegal immigrant, processed and released by border patrol, arrested in New York on a motor vehicle violation, but not detained because New York is a "sanctuary city," don't you know? Had he been detained Laken would be alive today.

It's hard to tell how many more are like Ibarra. The border patrol is seeing vast numbers of single men of military age disappearing into the brush and, hence, into America's interior. Terrorists? Many of those nabbed by law enforcement officers are on the terrorist watchlists maintained by the

federal government. Thousands are from China, where getting out of that communist country almost always requires the approval of the unfriendly communist government.

Gallego might have noticed that every last one who is an illegal immigrant has jumped in line in front of millions of *legal* immigrants who have been waiting patiently, sometimes for years, for permission to realize their dreams of coming to America.

It's unfair. It's unjust. For some reason, this doesn't get a lot of attention in the media, but this is an affront to millions of law-abiding Americans who are right to be angry at *the New Biden/Harris Democrats who are deliberately making it happen*.

The details of the shocking invasion into Arizona have been described widely. CBS News, for example, reported that earlier this year,

Arizona sector becomes No. 1 hotspot for migrant crossings, despite border walls and treacherous terrain. . . . Undeterred by miles of border wall, violent Mexican cartels, and a treacherous terrain with extreme temperatures, migrants have been crossing into the Tucson sector of Arizona by the hundreds, and sometimes by the thousands,

*each day* [emphasis added]—often with the help of smugglers. . . .

During the first four months of fiscal year 2024, the Border Patrol recorded more than 250,000 migrant apprehensions in the Tucson sector, the most of any region patrolled by the agency. . . .

Due to the area's remoteness, the first group [of illegal immigrants] often has to wait and walk for hours after entering the U.S. before reaching Border Patrol agents. In those cases, the work of American volunteers can be a lifeline.

So many immigrants were unaware of challenges they would face—some with children, having to walk in the hot sun for hours before finding those border patrol agents that would take them to a processing center. Consider the charitable, religious, and governmental agencies that are struggling to provide basic food and shelter, their budgets strained to the breaking point. Imagine how the diversion of those resources deprives needy Americans here of *their* rightful humanitarian aid.

We are a nation of legal immigrants who sometimes were confronted with restrictive immigration laws, to our shame. Ideally, our laws should welcome the persecuted and the



most deserving. However much America has come up short of realizing that goal, the laws still must be enforced if our country is to survive. The millions of illegals who have been allowed to trample that law seriously threaten America.

*None of this* can sidestep the attention of politicians like Ruben Gallego.

That's shocking, because Gallego is an honored veteran. He served in Iraq with Lima Company, 3rd Battalion, 25th Marine Regiment, one of the most decimated units in the war. He saw his best friend die and wrote about it in his book *They Called Us Lucky*. How can someone who fought for his country now look the other way while his country's sovereignty, freedom, and safety have been attacked so openly and so close to home?

As a member of Congress *before* entering the race to be Arizona's senator, he couldn't have ignored it. He failed to express the kind of outrage this iniquity fully deserved. Instead, he tried to straddle the fence as his Senate race approached.

He has been full of contradictions as he now tries to falsely persuade voters that he's doing something about the illegal border crossings.

Let's look:

At first, he denied that the huge unregulated border crossing posed a national emergency. In 2019, he tweeted, "There is no 'national emergency' coming from the border. The only national emergency is to our Constitution coming from the [Donald Trump] White House."

But by late 2023, he'd changed his tune, warning, "What's happening at the Arizona border is a crisis, and our state's border communities should not be the ones forced to figure out the federal government's failures." He called on the "Biden administration to issue an emergency declaration for the Southwest Border"—*but only to give Arizona border towns more resources to process incoming migrants*.

That's just one of his many politically motivated flip-flops.

Here's another, concerning a border wall:

In 2017, he called the idea of a border wall "ridiculous." In his newsletter, "Why We Should Not Build Trump's Border Wall," he wrote:

- "Trump's border wall is trying to solve a problem that doesn't exist. Border apprehensions have been falling for years, and the border wall will do nothing about the real issue of visa overstays."

- “At its heart, Trump’s wall seeks to prey on the fears of Americans made anxious by decades of social and demographic change and seeks to spread the dangerous notion that immigrants are a threat to the American way of life.”
- “Let’s be clear. The idea of building 2,000 miles of wall through remote, arid sectors of the U.S.-Mexico border is ridiculous.

Sure thing. But come September 2023, after he announced he was running for the Senate, there’s this flop: “Gallego told KTAR in September he voted for more border agents, more customs border police, *more fencing*” along the border. [Emphasis added.]

In August 2018, he issued this chilling warning to sworn federal officers, tweeting, “If you are a U.S. government official and you are deporting Americans, be warned. When the worm turns you will not be safe because you were just following orders. You do not have to take part in illegal acts ordered by this President [Trump]’s administration.”

Later, after Biden/Harris became president and vice president and illegal entries increased dramatically, Gallego tried to

identify himself as among those who’d raised the alarm over the porous southern border.

While he had earlier *threatened border patrol officers* who did their job for arresting illegal immigrants, now he *demand*ed the same officers do their job of arresting illegal immigrants. *Only now* did he support legislation like the Laken Riley Act that requires those officers to arrest illegal immigrants who commit theft, burglary, or shoplifting offenses.

How about sending troops to the border? Absolutely not, according to Gallego. In 2018, in response to Trump thinking about sending troops to the southern border, Gallego told CNN: “I will gladly work with the president when his ideas aren’t stupid and detrimental to the United States. Unfortunately, this is what this plan is.”

And yet, five years later, when Biden announced he was sending troops to the border, the idea no longer was “stupid and detrimental.” Now, Gallego said additional troops were “needed to alleviate some of the burdens our border communities on the frontlines are expected to face.”

Certainly, he knew about this suffering at the border without needing to visit the border. It appears he thought a visit was a bad idea, seeing as how he mocked Republicans

who went to see for themselves. He sneered: “They put bulletproof vests on and walk around like they’re in Baghdad.”

But after declaring his run for the Senate, he changed his mind on this too. He emphatically proclaimed: “What’s happening at the Arizona border is a crisis, and our state’s border communities should not be the ones forced to figure out the federal government’s failures. . . . I will continue to do everything I can to push the Administration and Congress to better support Arizona and end this crisis.”

Oh, now we see; it *is a crisis*.

If you, your parents or grandparents legally immigrated, patiently waiting your turn, you certainly will be interested in this:

In April 2020, Gallego tweeted that “undocumented” immigrants should be eligible for “free healthcare” and green cards. And this: “If @realDonaldTrump is going to force workers to put [illegal immigrants’] health in danger the least we can do is give them free healthcare, a living wage and green cards for those that are undocumented.”

Once he cosponsored Medicare for All, a big, costly campaign promise made by far-left Democrats. But now, he doesn’t mention his earlier enthusiastic support of Medicare for All even *for illegal immigrants* on his 2024 campaign website.

Gallego must have sensed the coming immigration crisis in 2017—when Trump was president—when he co-sponsored a bill that would prohibit the federal government from withholding funds from “sanctuary cities”—cities like New York and Chicago that declared themselves to be safe places for illegal immigrants, where by law local cops could not trouble anyone for unlawfully being there and who were prohibited from working with federal immigration authorities to track them down.

When illegal immigration soared with the coming of the Biden/Harris administration, Gallego wanted the cities to be taken care of with large doses of federal cash. In September 2023 he complained that “border security funding formulas sent far more migrant shelter money to New York than to Arizona.”

Another switcheroo involved something called Title 42. It allowed border officials to turn away immigrants from the southern border to stop illegals with COVID from spreading COVID during our pandemic. Trump used the provision to reduce illegal immigration.

So, shortly after Biden became president, Gallego signed a letter to Secretary of Homeland Security Alejandro Mayorkas, urging him to “safely end all expulsions under Title 42 . . . as soon as possible.”

But when deportations under Title 42 were on the cusp of ending and illegal immigration was expected to surge again, Gallego worried that Arizona border regions were “simply unequipped to handle the surge of migrants.”

In other words, send us the money to fix “problems” caused by the open border, but don’t bother to *close* the border.

Not only must we take care of the illegal immigrants’ every need, but we must also watch our language when talking about them.

In 2015, Gallego co-sponsored a bill to end the use of the term “illegal alien” in federal law and U.S. Code. The bill aimed to replace the term “aliens” with “foreign nationals,” and “illegal alien” with “undocumented foreign national.” In an interview from the same year, Gallego said that the term alien “has become pejorative” and “unduly harms the person who is trying to go through due process.” *What due process?* Breaking the law is not following “due process.” What word will be required next? Travelers? Visitors?

But as the election approaches, Gallego isn’t so determined to enforce his speech code. Unlike many other House progressives who were furious when Biden referred to an illegal immigrant as an “illegal,” to

describe Laken Riley’s killer, Gallego had no comment.

Gallego insists that he is heading up efforts to provide “real solutions to the crisis at our southern border.” He crows about bills he has introduced designed to speed up “migrant processing and providing relief to Arizona’s frontline border communities.” That’s simply *not* a “real solution.”

Nor is Biden’s half-measure executive order to temporarily halt most asylum claims at the border when the seven-day average of illegal crossings exceeds 2,500. That still allows huge numbers of crossings that can lead to such things as Mexican drug and human trafficking cartels still burrowing into America.

A *real* solution would be to restore Trump’s prior executive orders that so effectively combated illegal immigration during his term. Biden, on his first day in office, cancelled those orders. That was his promise to the fringe of the “New Democratic Party” *which has now replaced the old Democratic Party*. It was based entirely on politics.

Why?

What could possibly be the purpose of breaking down our borders, allowing in, virtually unquestioned, anyone who shows up? Why have we, in less than four years,

allowed—if not encouraged—*the illegal entrance of people whose numbers are greater than New York City’s entire population? How in the world are they supposed to be smoothly adopted into an America that is already struggling to adequately care for the 330 million people already here?*

If someone has a solid, non-political reason for opening the border to one and all, we’re *still* waiting to hear it.

Are Biden and Harris trying to make businesses happy, those who are looking to hire cheap labor? Are they doing favors for big agri-businesses that need tens of thousands of migrant workers and their families to harvest the seasonal vegetables and fruits that otherwise would rot in the field?

If Biden and Harris are not kowtowing to big business, what’s the *real* reason for an open-door policy that is so destructive to America? Is it purely politics? Is the expectation that the millions of immigrants would show their gratitude by voting for Harris and other Democrats up and down the ballot? That, of course, would require a law to be passed that would allow non-citizens to vote in elections. Or maybe he’s expecting their American-born children to vote for Democrats . . .

But if non-citizens were allowed to

vote, and if most of them would vote for Democrats, Gallego, a Democrat, would benefit greatly—perhaps get elected to the Senate.

So, where does Gallego stand on the idea of letting non-citizens vote?

We can get a good idea by looking at where he has stood on letting non-citizens vote in the Washington, D.C., local elections. In 2022, the District of Columbia Local Council passed a law letting non-citizens do exactly that. *Gallego supported it!*

Imagine. Give ambassadors from Bahrain, Azerbaijan, Botswana, and scores of other countries the right to vote in an American election. Wait, it gets better. (Or, we should say, much worse.) Russian President Vladimir Putin’s ambassador in D.C. could also vote. And if that’s not enough, the Communist Party ambassador from the People’s Republic of China could also vote. Not just the ambassador, mind you, all the Chinese spies, propagandists, military attaches, and everyone else who lives in D.C. can vote there.

Oh, and all the foreign lobbyists from everywhere in America or overseas who live in D.C. can vote.

They can vote for the city’s mayor, attorney general, members of the D.C. Council,

members of the District's Board of Education, or Advisory Neighborhood Commissioners, and on such measures as referenda, official recall, or charter amendments.

If this isn't political nuttiness in the most extreme, we'd be hard pressed to find something worse. Thankfully, the D.C. law doesn't, yet, authorize these non-citizens to vote in federal elections.

But allowing them a voice in D.C. governance didn't bother Gallego. Because he supported it.

In February 2023, Gallego voted against a bill that would have *stopped* non-citizens from voting in D.C. In effect, he was just fine with foreigners, America's enemies, and others having a voice in governing our nation's capital.

Most voters, being of clear mind, wouldn't think that's such a good idea and would vote against anyone like Gallego who thought it was. But that didn't bother Gallego who represented a solidly Democratic district where he had been safely reelected several times before.

Until he decided to run for the Senate.

Then he again changed his mind—or at least he did for this year's election.

This past May, the House, of which he is a member, voted again on the question of

allowing non-citizens to vote in D.C. elections. This time Gallego voted with every House Republican to prevent non-citizens from voting locally! It's a shift that can only be explained one way: he wants to secure whatever votes he can to be elected senator. He's hoping to pick up the votes of some Republicans and independents who are against this insane idea.

Gallego also knows his vote is only symbolic because the House-passed bill would get killed in the Democratic-controlled Senate.

Again, as we've seen, Gallego points to bills he sponsors, which *supposedly* will reduce illegal immigration, but that don't stand a chance of passing in the Republican-controlled House, and he knows that. Those bills, too, are only symbolic, designed to reap votes and cover his true agenda.

Is there any other politician who is more hypocritical and two-faced than Ruben Gallego? Someone who would so easily betray his own beliefs for the sake of personal advancement? It's hard to say.

## Chapter 2

### Have You Noticed the Price of Eggs?

Rep. Ruben Gallego has. The average cost of a dozen Grade A large eggs was \$1.20 nationally in June 2019. This spring, the price of a dozen large eggs in Phoenix ranged widely, *but in some stores was close to \$5.00 a dozen.*

So, what is he doing about that?

Well, he said he wrote to the secretary of agriculture to “express his concern.” He also met with Arizona’s largest egg producers to see “how they could work together to bring down egg prices.”

At the beginning of 2021, just before Gallego started “helping” Biden and Harris fix our economy, a pack of eight Ball Park Franks cost \$3.23 at Walmart. This spring, that same “plump when you cook ’em” goodness costs \$4.84.

Another kid-and-dad staple? In 2021, there were 36 Oreos in a standard package of delicious eat-’em-plain-or-dunk-’em-in-milk Oreos. If Nabisco baked cookies like Gallego and Biden/Harris have baked our

economy, today the same package would contain only 28 cookies. We’ve been robbed of eight delicious Oreo cookies. For the same price per package. Darn!

You better sit down for this one: a comparison of McDonald’s prices at a selected location from 2019 to mid-2024. The price of a Big Mac skyrocketed to \$7.49 from \$3.99, an 88% increase. A cheeseburger soared to \$3.15 from \$1, a 215% increase. The average price increase for those two items plus medium French fries, a McChicken, and 10 McNuggets was 141%.

Clearly, it’s dishonest to argue that McDonald’s corporate bosses have caused the kind of wild and broad inflation we’re experiencing by charging more for snacks and fast food. Higher prices are everywhere, *including* the cost of the beef and bread and eggs McDonald’s has to buy.

Every American can point to the increased prices of paper towels and bathroom tissue, Huggies diapers, heating oil, clothing, appliances and hardware, new cars, even used cars.

First-time homebuyer? Forget it. Higher interest rates and zooming home prices are making home ownership a fading dream. Finding an affordable place to rent is just as bad.

I give this much credit to Gallego: unlike some Washington politicians and those of the press, he's not denying that inflation is a big, big problem. At least for now. He's not joining the distant Washington crowd that says, "Oh look, we've stopped inflation in its tracks. Oh, what good boys and girls we are."

The problem is that Gallego hews to what now has become standard Democratic chatter: the "greedy" corporations are causing higher prices. Democrats have gleefully joined President Joe Biden's fantasy world, believing that despite high prices greeting Americans here, there, and everywhere, the economy is just fine. Well, more than just fine. More than just ducky. Better than ever.

Now Gallego recognizes, a little later than the rest of us, that everything isn't just fine.

Gallego has fallen right in line with the politicians who want you to believe that those swine—the men and women who run American businesses—want to squeeze every last penny they can get out of you and me. Man, if we could only make those grabby businesspeople care about Americans, we'd have a lot less—*if any!*—inflation. Right?

Economists who value facts and look favorably on common sense don't point to corporate gouging as the main cause of inflation. Most of them—and most

Americans—understand the real and obvious cause of inflation: a whole lot of free new money being printed by the New Democrats to chase too few items that many people want to buy.

Let me boil it down. If corporate greed causes inflation, why does inflation sometimes happen when profits are low? Or why is there no inflation when profits are high?

As we all know, the American economy had been shut down with COVID during much of 2020. When Biden and Harris arrived in Washington, D.C., in 2021, economists, families with kids in schools, and every business owner in America was screaming, "Lift the lockdowns! Let us take off our masks!" But Biden, Harris, and Gallego had a better idea: "Let's 'stimulate' the economy with money we don't have."

So, in March 2021 Gallego voted to spend \$1.9 trillion—*on top* of the \$6.9 trillion to be spent on the federal budget. Biden called it the "American Rescue Plan."

He was just getting started. In November 2021 Gallego threw another \$2.2 trillion log on the fire with the "Build Back Better" bill.

*That was a nearly 60% increase in federal spending in a single year at a time when America only had about \$4 trillion in tax money to spend . . . on anything.*



American families like ours already know what's happening from our own experience. 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 again, and stays up.*

In other words, inflation happens when Americans find there is too much money chasing too few goods. Some of us may, or may not, have more dollars in our pockets, but these dollars don't buy as much because Biden/Harris and their Democrat Congress reduced the value of our dollar by inflating the supply of dollars by 25%—by one-fourth. So the \$5 bill you once had became worth only \$3.75. Stated another way, what your old \$5 bill *used to be able to buy* now costs \$6.75.

Here's a staggering way to look at the trillions of dollars Gallego and the Biden/Harris Democrats voted for. World War II's cost in today's dollars was \$4 trillion. That paid for an unprecedented, many-years-long and bloody fight against two world powers for our lives. What crisis in today's world is so staggering that it could justify spending like we did during World War II?

The Biden/Harris administration's response to COVID was the terribly mislabeled "Inflation Reduction Act" (or Bidenomics), a grab bag of hundreds of billions of dollars

of pork projects (including those for electric vehicles), which the government has subsidized to date with \$5 trillion. It *should have been* called the "Inflation Acceleration Act." After the truth about the law became clear, even Joe Biden said he regretted its name.

This law included \$369 billion in new spending to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, invest in green energy technologies, and extend subsidies for the Affordable Care Act. It also funded some infrastructure: a few bridges here, an airport runway there. Perhaps some of these might be worthwhile, *but should that be in a law that's claiming to reduce inflation?* It's quite the opposite.

Consider Biden's claim that he has reduced inflation from a high of 9% to 3%. That is just deceptive. Inflation didn't come down 3.2%. That number means the costs of what you buy were *only 3.2% higher than the previous month.* This extra 3.2% a month adds up to 15% a year because each monthly 3.2% is "compounded." *This 15% compounding works in reverse when government inflates its currency, reducing the power of your dollar to 85 cents a year in purchasing power.*

**This is the "hidden" tax of inflation.** It's what bad politicians do—spending money they don't have to buy votes, but instead of raising taxes to pay for the spending, they tax

you with the hidden tax of inflation. Inflation has destroyed more countries than all the major wars have over the last 2,000 years.

A more realistic number to consider is the ***total inflation*** increase during Biden/Harris's three-plus years in office: 18%. ***18%!*** And even if inflation comes down to zero—so unlikely—prices will STAY at the high levels the Biden/Gallego crowd caused by spending money the government did not have.

That means, if your weekly bag of groceries cost \$50 BB (Before Biden/Harris), you're now paying \$59. If your airplane ticket cost \$435, you'll now shell out \$513. Thinking about buying a new car for \$30,000? It'll now cost more than \$35,000, thank you. And your car insurance will be more because fender-bender repairs will cost more too.

Comparisons will help to measure how bad inflation has been under Biden/Harris. John F. Kennedy's average inflation rate was 1.1%. In other words, you'd be paying just 11 cents more for a bag of groceries. Obama's inflation rate was 1.4%. So far, Biden/Harris's 3+ year *average* has been 5.7%.

Nobel Prize-winning economist Milton Friedman taught America decades ago that there is only one cause of inflation: federal government spending and borrowing. *Not you* raising prices on chewing gum at your

convenience store, *not you* asking for a raise at work to keep up with rising prices, *not the gas station down the street* charging more for diesel, *not* greedy corporations.

And yet, Gallego clings to the boogeyman of evil, greedy forces. Investors' greed has driven up the cost of housing he says. Power company greed has driven up the cost of electricity he says. Drug company greed. Grocery greed. Airline greed. Hotel greed. He said not long ago, "Corporate greed is at record highs."

Okay, I'm sorry for the "economics lecture" and the maybe-confusing arithmetic, but I hope *you* now get it.

But Gallego clearly *doesn't want you to get it*. He has supported every piece of Biden/Harris's vote-buying, hidden inflation tax agenda, every major Biden/Harris spending bill. When it comes to inflation, Gallego and all the Biden/Harris Democrats are joined at the hip.

## Chapter 3

### Where's Your Daddy?

Politicians love to praise “family.” How they’re all for the “family.” How it’s the bed-rock of American success. Blah and blah.

Here’s Ruben Gallego talking about how he’s fighting for Arizona families: he’s a “staunch supporter” of child tax credits and the “Universal Full-Day Kindergarten Act.” He’s “championed lower health care costs, including prescription drug reform,” and advocated for affordable housing.

That’s all well and good, if you are for more government “programs” that may or may not work and are assuredly quite costly.

But if you really and truly are a fighter for “family,” you will stand on the highest mountain and shout warnings about the disintegration of the American family. Disintegration is not a strong enough word. Decay. Corrosion. Breakdown. It has been going on for decades from a time when families with both fathers and mothers present assured a well-functioning society.

Broken families and fatherlessness have created social, economic, mental health, and

crime crises in America. You don’t hear that from Gallego or from his Democratic colleagues in Congress. They have been on the side of an unravelling culture that has successfully corrupted American values about marriage, the role of fathers, the hazards of the single-parent family, and more.

The Center for Opportunity Now, a research initiative concentrating on education, criminal justice, healthcare, homeownership, and fatherhood, has assembled a large pile of research on the subject:

*About one in every four children in America lives without a father in the home. That’s 18.3 million children who are deprived of the blessings of an attentive and loving dad.*

Without fathers, children feel abandoned and angry, creating mental health and behavior problems. They suffer from anxiety and social withdrawal. Their depression has increased the risk of suicide and self-harm. Some 63% of all youth suicides are from fatherless homes.

Children with involved fathers tend to succeed better in schools. They’re less likely to flunk and more likely to get A’s. About three out of every four high school dropouts are from fatherless homes.

Students living with both parents are a lot less likely to repeat a grade when compared

to children living in step-father families. The same goes for children living in mother-only or father-only families or living with neither parent.

Of the kids who are juvenile delinquents, about two out of three experienced fatherlessness. One out of five never had a father living with the family, and one out of four had an alcoholic father. Fatherless kids are 20 times more likely to be imprisoned compared with children with fathers close to them, who are 80% *less* likely to be jailed. Income made no difference.

There are plenty of other studies that prove the critical importance of fathers. Listing them all might get boring, but here's just one more—a stunner that explains so much:

Every time there's a fatal school shooting, everyone tries to understand why. So, get ready for this: *in 56 school shootings studied, only 10 of the shooters grew up in a stable home with both biological parents.*

Sure, we must study how the availability of guns has enabled school shootings. But why should the role of fatherlessness or unstable families be almost completely ignored?

Who should understand that best?

Ruben Gallego.

He was raised by a single mother. “My father abandoned my family when I was young. His choice to leave made my life and the lives of my three sisters much harder. I slept on the floor until I went to college, and my sisters and I had to rely on the free lunch program to make sure we ate,” he wrote on his website.

He credits his wonderful single mother for rescuing him from the grim life awaiting so many others. Thankfully, he ably climbed the ladder of success to emerge as a candidate for a seat in the U.S. Senate, a goal that few ever achieve.

Yet, his commitment to the sanctity of family was tarnished when he left his wife of six years, Kate, weeks before she was to give birth to their son. They were divorced in 2016, even though he said a few years earlier, “I am Catholic. [I] don't believe in divorce.” In his memoir, he implies that he and Kate separated to protect his family from what he describes as his “extreme outbursts” related to his military service. He initially said that he wanted to break the cycle of his father's decision to walk out. (Kate, now the mayor of Phoenix, has endorsed him in the Senate race.) He married his second wife, Sydney, in 2021, a lobbyist for one of the most powerful special interests in the country—the

National Association of Realtors. (More on that later.)

One would have hoped that his own experience would have made him more focused on the root cause—fatherlessness—of so much of today’s crime and economic and social problems.

That could not have hurt his standing with the vast majority of Americans. Eight out of ten of us believe a strong family is the foundation that underpins America. The same number believe that raising children is the parents’, not the government’s, responsibility. About two out of three said that family decline harms America’s prosperity, and that children who grow up fatherless are significantly harmed.

What is so puzzling is this: with that many Americans believing that the family, especially fathers, is so critical, why do so many politicians, like Gallego, ignore it? Actually, it’s more than puzzling; it’s deeply troubling. Instead, Gallego and his fellow Democrats focus on creating more scatter-shot government programs that do little to address the root causes of what’s ailing American culture and that actually encourage single motherhood by reducing needed support to low-income households where a mother and father both live with their children . . . but

not when a mother and her boyfriend (who isn’t the children’s father) live together.

The America First Policy Institute (AFPI) puts forward numerous remedies. For one, the media must turn its attention to fatherlessness with the same dogged fixation it does with other political, economic, and cultural matters. In addition, according to AFPI, “Athletes, celebrities, musicians, actors, and national role models” should lead the way to make it a unifying issue throughout America.

“To address this crisis,” the group said, “we must first speak openly about the problem of fatherless children. Then, we must focus on fixing it by promoting strong families, confronting cultural malaise, and sharing the joys of fatherhood. It is a tall task but a worthwhile one.”

And we must stop calling those whose priority is to restore the importance of fathers as outliers who seek to impose their “extreme or religious views” on the rest of America. As we seen above, the importance of fatherhood is grounded in science as well as common sense and respected tradition.

## Chapter 4

### Boys and Girls Together

Boys want to show up in girls' locker rooms, and men want to compete in women's sports these days.

Once upon a time, any male who said he wanted to do either of those would have been called a pervert or worse. Never would such a wild idea have been found in a newspaper. Even more certainly, no politician in his right mind would have tried to persuade voters that it was a fine idea.

Now, this once unthinkable idea appears everywhere: online and in the media, or more amazingly, on the wagging tongues of some politicians. They want to cancel years, centuries, even millennia of obvious wisdom: there are men and there are women.

We are supposed to accept this sea change in how we view humanity as if it were no more consequential than buying a cup of coffee. Now if you say otherwise, *you are considered a bad, bad person*. A hateful person. A homophobe. A transphobe. Or worse.

Amazing. Although most Americans still

think that their gender is determined biologically, the whole debate over who is a boy or a girl, a man or a woman, has become a huge, consequential, and sometimes an ugly political debate. Political candidates now must say where they stand on this issue, or they can be accused of dodging, hemming, hawing, and hiding.

So, where does Gallego stand? It takes some digging, but once you know, you'll discover that Gallego stands squarely with the squad of true believers in the dogma that gender is "fluid"—that a man can "become" a woman simply by saying it's so.

Moreover, he seems to agree with other politicians who insist that laws should protect the rights of biological males trying to pass themselves off as women. Let's all cheer the "trans woman"—someone who has the right to waltz right into the bathroom of his/her/their/etc., choosing.

Here's an example of what this fantasy can lead to: a biological man declared himself to be a woman named Lia Thomas. As a "woman" he was able to wangle his way into the women's swimming competition at the collegiate level. As a man, he was a mediocre swimmer, but as a "woman," he creamed the competition, winning swim meets by large margins and breaking records.

It's hard to forget the photo of Thomas standing on the middle podium holding the winning trophy with his 6-foot, 4-inch male physique on full display, flanked by the second and third placers who were unmistakably female. They had been robbed of their dreams for which they had trained so hard for years. But nuts to them; who should care?

For Gallego, Biden, Harris, and fellow Democrats, Thomas not only should be *allowed* to compete but that's "her" *right*. They want laws that guarantee that right.

Democrats have often unanimously supported a raft of bills that basically open the doors of women's and girls' bathrooms, locker rooms, and showers to biological men who proclaim that they have decided they're really women. To be legally precise, these bills would ban discrimination against anyone because of their "sexual orientation," "gender identity," or "sex characteristics."

Recently, the Biden/Harris administration unveiled the opening act. It updated its interpretation of Title IX, which was originally passed to protect the rights of female students to have equal treatment with male students. *The new interpretation* states that Title IX also forbids discrimination based on "gender identity" and "sexual orientation."

Biological boys who claim or pretend to be girls are free to share a shower with your daughter, sister, or granddaughter, *in college, high school, middle school, or, arguably, elementary school*. Overnight school trip? Your daughter may be sharing a bedroom, even a bed, with a teenage boy.

That's fraught with danger and clearly a violation of the girls' privacy. Already a trans "girl," a biological boy, sexually attacked a female student in a northern Virginia school. In an attempt to hide the attack, the school transferred the offender to another school, where he attacked *another* girl.

Notice that Biden's order does not specifically refer to the likes of Lia Thomas who want to compete against girls and women in sports; that provision was put on hold—likely to be brought out as soon as the next election is over. The Thomas affair created so much heated controversy that Biden's handlers probably figured correctly that unveiling it now would cost the president too many votes.

As bad as that new interpretation is, it only applies to schools. A federal bill—*"The Equality Act"*—that Gallego voted for would be much, much worse than Biden's order. It would forbid discrimination against "gender non-conforming" people (another

description for transgender males and females) not just in schools but *everywhere*. It would apply to stores, shopping centers, daycares, battered women's shelters, beauty salons, youth/children's camps, banks, prisons, hospitals, doctors' offices, and everything else you can think of.

Biological men who want to use the women's restroom at your local clothing store or the women's locker room to change into a women's bathing suit at a fitness gym (this actually happened), under The Equality Act could not be forced to leave. Your fitness gym could not protect your teenage daughter from a biological male gawking at her in the changing room. If anyone tried to stop the transgender person from going anywhere, they'd *be the one in violation of a federal law*.

Here's a little-noticed feature in The Equality Act: it forbids discrimination against anyone who *looks* transgender. Say a male grocery store cashier shows up one day as an obvious cross-dresser. Say he/she wants to be called they/them. Can the manager tell him/her that he/she can't dress like that? Can he say, "Go home and change into the store's uniform. If you don't, you are fired"? If the manager does, expect a federal lawsuit against him and the store for

violating The Equality Act. The manager will likely be fired.

If Gallego's Equality Act is passed (*Gallego and every other Democrat in the U.S. House of Representatives voted for it, but the U.S. Senate did not let the bill come to a vote after it passed the U.S. House*) this issue no longer would be a state issue. Because it would be a federal law, it would apply everywhere, to every American bakery, photography studio, child/youth camp, domestic abuse shelter, preschool, and any business *you* may own.

Every American would be required to "obey." If you run a childcare center, male transgender "women" could be overseeing those kids, and if you don't hire a transgender person or rent to him/her for an entirely unrelated reason . . . expect to be sued.

We already know just how damaging Biden's order and The Equality Act would be by what happened in real life when the federal bureaucracy turned the screws on a suburban Chicago school district to accept the transgender bill of goods. The issue there was whether the Obama administration could force a high school to give a trans girl (biological boy) full access to the girls' bathrooms, locker-rooms, and showers.

Even before any law was passed, Obama's Education Department's Civil Rights Office



took it upon itself to threaten to withhold millions of dollars of federal aid if it didn't give the boy full and unfettered access to the girls' private facilities. How do you think those girls felt?

It doesn't matter. Under Obama's, Biden's, Harris's, and Gallego's philosophy, you must let those boys have access to girls in their most private moments.

The blowback at the Chicago-area school filled an auditorium with hundreds of angry students and parents. Parents wanted to know how bureaucrats ensconced hundreds of miles away could legally substitute their new and scientifically false theories for the parents' own right to raise their children as they see fit.

Fathers and mothers passionately objected to allowing a biological boy to gawk at their daughters in the buff. One daughter rose to say courageously, passionately, and eloquently how she and other girls have been badly treated because they argue they have a right to privacy. She said:

"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. We are self-conscious of our bodies: this is a difficult time for us."

Applause rang out. Boys stood in support of her statement. It didn't matter. In the end the school district had to obey the Obama administration's decree, although it wasn't based on science, existing law, or common sense. If they hadn't, *federal funding to the school would have been cut. It was bullying at a high level.*

By the way, another Democratic bill, waiting in the wings, is called the "Therapeutic Fraud Prevention Act," would ban procedures to help people who have suffered from a *prior* transgender surgery, medication, or therapy to re-transition to their original, biologically determined state. Wow. Apparently, Democrats no longer believe that all medical decisions should be up to the doctor and patient.

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?

I asked a mother who earlier in high school had lettered in three varsity sports how she would have felt if a boy, claiming

to be a girl, had shown up in her locker room. Let's just say her answer was powerful. She also said she'd expect her father to raise Cain.

As the mother of three teen girl athletes, she would have expected them to react the same way. Not so. Two said they didn't think it was a big deal, and the third was only beginning to think it might be an issue. How did her girls come to think like that? "*That's what they're taught in school,*" she said. Apparently, that's another case of educators endowing themselves with more control of children than their parents. Teaching religion in public schools was forbidden years ago but drenching them in gender indoctrination propaganda is not.

Let's not ignore the impact of a mandate on classmates and teachers. Will "cisgender" boys and girls (those who identify with their biological sex) be required under threat of expulsion to say "they" when speaking to a "him" or "her"? Goodbye, grammar.

Will teachers be required to do the same or be fired? *It has 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. The state supreme court has

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

Gender identity is a controversial and far-from-settled subject. Beyond locker rooms and girls' sports issues, debate is passionate over things like hormone blockers and life-changing irreversible surgical interventions.

And what about children who are talked into undergoing life-altering surgery to remove healthy body parts and cause permanent sterility? A legal battle is raging over whether parents rightfully can have a say in that, instead of a teacher, student counselor, or a health care provider.

*The Equality Act has twice passed the House with 100% Democratic support,* including the backing of our Rep. Gallego in the House. Although it never passed out of the Senate, it's back again. Maybe Gallego thinks that the act would never actually become law—at least in such a radical form—so perhaps he signed on just to satisfy the Democratic fringe, showing how virtuous he is. Or, maybe he really believes this stuff.

Gallego and other like-minded lawmakers don't just say they believe in "gender fluidity." *They are determined to impose that view on you.* If you're a parent and the

Gallego-promoted Equality Act passes, your children will be required to conform to a view that you might find wrong, unscientific, or even harmful.

There's no room here for honest good-faith disagreement! Extreme transgender advocates refuse to acknowledge the impact on children and the rest of society of their unscientific and biased (mostly against women and girls) behavior.

They avoid the central question of why don't parents have a say about such issues? And they ignore the many now-adults who bitterly regret their transgender surgery.

Why must everyone conform to what Gallego and all the rest believe?

## Chapter 5

### I Pledge Thee My Troth

Gallego is married to a lobbyist for one of the most powerful special interests in Washington—the National Association of Realtors (NAR). Is it just a coincidence that he has backed lots of legislation that the organization wants?

The NAR is no minor lobby. It's America's largest trade association, representing 1.5 million members, mostly real estate brokers. The National Rifle Association has nothing on the NAR. When the NAR speaks, Washington listens.

Gallego's second wife, Sydney Barron, has been a voice of the organization since 2019, a year after the two met at the annual Congressional Baseball Game. What followed is an impressive number of, say, *favours* that Gallego did for the organization.

In return, the NAR has contributed \$34,000 to Gallego's campaigns since 2014.

*The Washington Free Beacon* reported that since 2019, Gallego has voted for 38 bills that his wife lobbied for in the House of Representatives, including 17 bills he has

sponsored or cosponsored. Among them was the “Neighborhood Homes Investment Act,” which the NAR pitched as an incentive for developers to build and rehab low- and moderate-income housing.

In fact, it was a deal that benefited two financial giants: banks and the real estate gang.

*Forbes* magazine warned that big banks would benefit from the act but that it would have minimal impact on housing affordability: “There’s a looming shadow . . . the interests of financial behemoths,” the magazine said. “Banks and developers with their expansive reach and financial clout, are poised to leverage these credits optimally. Thus, while we might witness a cosmetic revival of neighborhoods, the deep-rooted challenges of housing affordability might remain largely unaddressed.”

That’s just one more bill sailing under false colors, flying a flag that it’s serving the public’s good, while really doing the bidding of a powerful special interest.

*It’s appropriate to point out that the House Committee on Ethics has warned members to avoid conflicts of interest that entail being married to lobbyists, like Gallego is.* Says the committee, “At a minimum, such an official should not permit the spouse to lobby either

him- or herself or any of his or her subordinates.” Living with and sharing a bed ought to matter also.

And another: in 2021, Gallego introduced a bill to punish Americans who have declined to get a COVID vaccine. The bill would allow insurance companies to charge the insured who don’t get the vaccine a 50% premium surcharge for the duration of the pandemic. No respect there for Americans who in good conscience or for religious or medical reasons refused to be forced to get the shot. What about the Democrats oft-repeated claim that medical decisions should be between a person and their doctor?

Okay, just one more: “The Restoring Tax Fairness for States and Localities Act” would eliminate the \$10,000 limit on state and local tax deductions for 2020 and 2021. That could make your eyes glaze over, but a liberal think tank, the Institute on Taxation and Economic Policy, described the bill as bringing “bigger tax cuts for the rich” with over half the benefits going to the top 1% of taxpayers.

Speaking of tax cuts for the rich, do you know of Gallego’s clever manipulation of veterans’ laws helped him buy two homes at lower costs—one in Phoenix and one in Washington? Here’s how it worked:

As reported by *Politico*, in April 2020, Gallego and Sydney purchased the Phoenix house, declaring that it was his primary residence so they could get a Veteran Administration mortgage loan. A VA loan provides certain benefits to qualified veterans, such as no down payment required. Claiming that the house was their principal residence was one requirement for the loan.

All right, fair enough. But then they bought a house in Washington in the ritzy neighborhood near the Capitol, presumably because it's close to where the meat is a'cookin'. Again, they claimed to be eligible for a VA loan, because *this* was their primary residence, just like the one in Arizona.

Oops. You can't have two primary homes. "Primary" means *first* in order of time, place, importance, or development. The VA, of course, is keenly aware of the definition, which explains why *they offer the benefit only for one primary home*.

And yet, the VA, knowing that the Gallegos claimed two primary loans, handed them the benefits anyway. Came the explanation from the VA: its loan "requirements are applied equally to all Veterans and Service members, and there is no exception to the policy based on a Veteran's occupation. There is, however, an option for Veterans to

'discuss unusual circumstances of occupancy with the appropriate VA office or submit a description of the circumstances to the VA office for prior approval.'

So, what's the "unusual situation"? The VA says it can't talk about it because it can't talk about individual veterans.

*Politico* said, "Gallego has not been accused of wrongdoing in filling out the loan documents." Very well, but one can wonder how many veterans received the same consideration for such an "unusual situation"? Arizonians, of course, are free to consider the special treatment when they vote.

Gallego promises that he won't be a toady for special interests, but he seems to be looking out for himself pretty well. Although, it seems that special interests groups like the guy enough to send *many* millions of dollars his way in campaign contributions.

## Chapter 6

### Who Are These People?

Gallego says that if elected to the Senate, he will “not be on the hook” to lobbyists and other special interests.

His campaign boasts that “unlike the people pushing [a] flimsy political attack, Ruben Gallego *has been clear about wanting to get money out of politics*—and he has the record in Congress to back it up. Over 100,000 hardworking folks have chipped in to support his campaign because they know he’s laser-focused on representing the people of Arizona—not wealthy donors.” [Emphasis added.]

Fine. So, let’s look at the record.

In just the first three months of 2024, Gallego raised \$7.5 million for his 2024 campaign for the Senate. Total contributions for his campaign are \$19.5 million, so far, as of this writing. Apparently, he has succeeded in driving money out of politics and into his own campaign’s pockets. For someone who “has been clear about wanting to get money out of politics,” he has received a huge pile of dough.

Apparently, he wants us to believe that the millions are coming from the more than, “100,000 hardworking folks [who] have chipped in . . . not wealthy donors.”

Okay, so he’s got a bunch of “hard-working folks” chipping in, but here’s a fact: the vast percentage of his donations come *from out-of-state donors*, people who have opened their wallets to get something they want from Gallego in case he wins.

One of the biggest contributors is something called ActBlue. It’s a major fundraiser for Democrats, including the so-called progressive radicals that have taken control of the Democratic Party. These are the people who have opened the border without so much as a by your leave.

ActBlue likes to say that the source of those millions are grassroots donors making small contributions. But its fundraising methods have been called fraudulent, based on reports that people have been listed as donors who haven’t actually donated. Some even said they have never heard of ActBlue.

Why would anyone donate in someone else’s name? Because the donor doesn’t want anyone to know he’s making the donation. A donor can want to remain anonymous for many reasons. For example, he wants to donate more than the law allows, or someone

whose political beliefs are so extreme or out of favor, that his donation, if it became public, would cost the candidate some votes. Whatever the reason, it's up to the candidate whether to disclose his PAC contributors.

Here's the fact: Gallego is receiving huge donations from ActBlue. How much? ActBlue has showered Gallego with \$7.4 million (as of this writing) for his Senate war chest. *That's an incredible three times more than what Arizonans have donated to Gallego!*

Clearly, it's fair to ask why a single, out-of-state special interest, especially one like ActBlue that supports the most radical Democrats, can *donate more to Gallego than what he gets from his entire home state*. Arizona is drowning in Gallego's out-of-state contributions. Who are they and what do they want?

One answer is that this election is crucial for the Democrats if they want to keep control of the U.S. Senate. Arizona is one of a handful of small Western states that are less expensive to win than large states. Democrats must win to preserve what is now their slim, one-vote control of the Senate. It amounts to a load of donors that Gallego will have to thank one way or another.

That out-of-state cash is flowing mostly from Democratic-controlled states. Mas-

sachusetts leads the pack by a wide, wide margin. *Special interests in Massachusetts have bestowed Gallego with \$8 million. Almost all of that came from political action committees (PACs). And PACs are the way for anonymous donors to slip money to their candidate in secret.*

To get a feel for how out-of-state interests wish to dominate Arizona, consider this: those Massachusetts special interests gave Gallego three times more than the \$2.8 million he got from folks in his own state!

Massachusetts, it appears, is more interested in getting Gallego elected than Arizonans are. Think about it: Gallego owes three times more to that East Coast state than he does to Arizona—our state, the state that he promises he'll represent above all others.

Well, Massachusetts isn't the only Democratic state that wants Gallego in its pockets. Of the top five contributors to his campaign, four are from the Democrat powers of Massachusetts, California, District of Columbia, and New York.

Among the top individual out-of-state donors is Illinois Governor J.B. Pritzker, worth a tidy \$3.5 billion, who has supported progressive causes for decades. Before Harris stepped in, he was often mentioned as a possible alternative to President Biden.

Summing up: 85% of Gallego's campaign funds are raised from out-of-state sources. 85%! *More than eight times as much as from us in Arizona.* Who are these donors and why have they given millions and millions to Gallego?

It all amounts to a load of donors that Gallego will have to thank—one way or another—donors who are pushing their own causes.

For sure, they are not interested in the welfare of Arizona. Do you really think that Gallego is, if you follow the money?

## Chapter 7

# Conclusion

However hard Ruben Gallego tries to portray himself as a moderate, middle-of-the-road Democrat, the facts laid out here show him to be something quite different.

As a member of the House of Representatives, he voted as Biden wanted almost 100% of the time. So, if you want to know how Gallego will vote if he rises from the House to the Senate, you can be pretty certain he'll fall in line and never, ever deviate from the New Biden/Harris Democrat Party's instructions.

What does that mean?

- It means that he doesn't oppose Biden/Harris's open southern border, despite what Gallego says now. He didn't stand up and demand that Biden do something to stop the flow of millions of illegal immigrants directly into Arizona, straining the state's resources and subjecting citizens to whatever crimes some illegal immigrants might bring. It means that he was



blind to the terrorists, criminals, rapists, and murderers who have hidden among those who are seeking freedom and a better life in America.

- It means that he turned a blind eye to the trillions of dollars the government is printing that's causing the inflation that is reflected everywhere you turn: groceries, health care, mortgage rates, automobiles, and home purchases. He claims to be "working to cut costs on everything from gas and groceries to rent and health care costs." Not really. If he were, he would not have endorsed the trillions upon trillions of dollars that have to be borrowed by a government already in unprecedented debt.

Gallego would have everyone believe that Arizona families are his highest priority. If so, why does he avoid dealing with the root causes of the family breakdown that has done such harm to our community? Does he make supporting responsible fatherhood one of his high priorities? Does he really fight for girls and women when he agrees with so many Democrat leaders that it's just

fine for boys to shower with high school girls and to dominate women's college sports?

You've worked hard, but if you didn't go to college but instead took out a loan to build a business, you don't qualify for the same forgiveness that tens of thousands of college students do. You'll certainly have to pay back any loans you took to buy a car, a house, or send your kids to, for example, a religious school that offers better schooling and moral instruction than so many failing public schools do. Why should college grads, many of whom are lawyers and doctors, be the beneficiaries of the government's largess at taxpayers' expense?

Where are the action plans to stem the violence that has gripped the nation? Violence that was regularized by the "mostly peaceful" protests that led to such things as the widespread torching of small businesses, police stations, federal facilities, and, yes, a church across the street from the White House. Did Gallego speak up against the "defund the police" insanity? No.

You, your parents, grandparents patiently waited your turn to enter the United States, but Biden and Harris say, "C'mon in!" to millions who simply show up with no paperwork or background checks or health exams. Your citizenship qualifies you to vote, but

you'll listen in vain for calls from Gallego and his friends to require proof of citizenship in order to vote. How better to insult and dilute the votes of citizens like you?

Washington needs new voices, independent voices that are not tied tightly to big money special interest donors from somewhere on the East Coast, congressman and senators who don't *always* vote for what the party leaders dictate—especially when Democrat Party leaders favor today's New Biden/Harris Democrat insane policies that have already hurt so many of us.

We need someone not Ruben Gallego.