The Schwarz Report

Dr. Fred Schwarz | Volume 50, Number 12 | Dr. David Noebel

December 2010

Merry Christmas!

Joy to the World
Psalm 98 Adapted by Isaac Watts

Joy to the world! The Lord is come:
Let earth receive her King;
Let every heart prepare Him room,
And heaven and nature sing,
And heaven and nature sing,
And heaven, and heaven and nature sing.

Joy to the world! The Savior reigns:
Let men their songs employ;
While fields and floods, rocks, hills, and plains
Repeat the sounding joy,
Repeat the sounding joy,
Repeat, repeat the sounding joy.

No more let sins and sorrows grow,
Nor thorns infest the ground;
He comes to make His blessings flow
Far as the curse is found,
Far as the curse is found,
Far as, far as the curse is found.

He rules the world with truth and grace,
And makes the nations prove
The glories of His righteousness,
And wonders of His love,
And wonders of His love,
And wonders, wonders of His love. Amen.

A Communist Rally in Washington, D.C

by David A. Noebel

If Communism is a dead issue for the 21st century, the October 2, 2010 rally in Washington, D.C., sponsored by the Tides Center, must have been a resurrection of sorts because there were more Communists in attendance than are found in Moscow's Red Square!

The Tides Center, according to Robert Chandler in *Shadow World*, is the legal firewall partner of the Tides Foundation. The Tides Foundation, in turn, receives millions of dollars from George Soros, which it passes on to progressive causes such as the Center for American Progress, which Communist Van Jones calls home, and Media Matters for America, "dedicated to comprehensively monitoring, analyzing, and correcting conservative misinformation in the U.S. media."

The Washington, D.C. rally was called "One Nation Working Together" and involved over 400 leftist organizations that had gathered and enlisted their followers to protest the Tea Party movement, political conservatives, the religious right, Christianity in general, and anyone else to the right of Fidel Castro and Che Guevara.

The primary message of the rally was a call for "economic equality" or "social justice." Both expressions drip with socialist/communist implications. The Rev. Al Sharpton, one of the rally's key figures, defines social justice and its goals

plainly: "We won't have true 'social justice' until everyone is equal in everybody's house." Alternative names for this ideological position are communism, collectivism, and statism. It is sometimes called black liberation theology! (See Anthony Bradley, *Liberating Black Theology*)

To bring about a society wherein everyone is equal with everyone else would require an all-powerful state that could take from the "haves" and give or transfer it to the "have-nots." You could call this "shakedown socialism"—to transform society you shake down the wealthy by taking their wealth and spreading it amongst the rest of society.

In the glory days of the Bolsheviks, they simply eradicated (by the millions) those who had wealth and property and re-distributed it first to themselves, next to the intellectuals, and finally to the enlightened poor, who swore allegiance to keep them in power.

Today, the Fabian communists have cleaned up the Bolshevik slaughtering machine because they understand that once the rich are eliminated there will be no one left to produce wealth or even food. Instead, they have decided to keep the rich and the middle class around, but to bleed them dry through taxation. The slogan at the "One Nation" rally was "Tax the Rich." The fact that the rich already pay most of the taxes doesn't seem to deter the elites (e.g., the Institute for Policy Studies, Center for American Progress) or the new proletariat (e.g., the AFL-CIO). And the "useful idiots" (e.g., Sojourners) fall unwittingly for anything that smells communistic!

This is exactly what Whittaker Chambers was hinting at in his 1952 book, *Witness*. Therein he quotes a Bedrich Smetana to the effect that in the United States, "the working classes are Democrats. The middle classes are Republicans. The upper classes are Communists."

The participants at the Washington, D.C. rally were there to encourage and to justify the elites stealing from those who "have" and spreading it amongst those who "have not." The elites tax the rich to keep the intellectuals in tow (see Thomas Sowell's *Intellectuals and Society*) and to buy off the poor with welfare handouts. This scheme works only until the rich finally figure it out and park their wealth in the Cayman Islands.

But the scheme ultimately fails because the poor desire to move up to the middle class and even higher, which they can do in a free society.

The endorsers of the "One Nation" rally were communists, socialists, statists, collectivists, progressives, radical left, call them what you will. They included the Democratic Socialists of America, the Communist Party USA, the International Socialist Organization (founded by Karl Marx), the Committees of Correspondence for Democracy and Socialism (a breakaway from the Communist Party USA), International ANSWER, United for Peace and Justice, Pax Christi, Sojourners, Code Pink, Progressive Democrats for America, the AFL-CIO (which has opened its leadership positions to Communists), the NEA, the American Federation of Teachers, SEIU, USAction, the National Action Network (headed by Al Sharpton), Earth Day Network, the Midwest Academy (established by the Students for a Democratic Society), Institute for Policy Studies, Friends of the Earth, AAUP, National Organization for Women, and others. President Obama's personal "Organizing for America" helped to publicize the rally!

Rally attendees cheered speakers such as Van Jones, who was thrown under the bus by the White House when it became known that he was a hard-core Communist. The person responsible for hiring him to work in the White House has never been revealed, but it is not unreasonable to believe that whoever hired him knew his political ideology since Jones said publicly, "I was a communist." He was involved with the San Francisco-area revolutionary movement STORM, which has Marxist roots. Jones is currently the green czar for the Center for American Progress, a George Soros project headed by former Clinton Chief of Staff John Podesta.

Harry Belafonte was also cheered in spite of his known support for Communist Fidel Castro. *First Things Online* (October 2, 2010) reported that "Castro-supporting actor Harry Belafonte lashed out at the 'insidious' Tea Party movement today at the leftist One Nation rally." Al Sharpton spoke about Democrats as "dead dry bones," in hopes of bringing the dry bones back to life!

The Rev. Jim Wallis and his Sojourners organization also graced the rally. Wallis, the one-time Students for a Democratic Society leader, is now the token evangelical "useful idiot" who defends Communists and Socialists and has called anti-Communist evangelicals "members of the forces of darkness." In his 2008 book *The Great Awakening,* Wallis says his only gripe with Pope John Paul was the Pope's "anticommunism."

Wallis said this about America's defeat in Vietnam: "I don't know how else to express the quiet emotion that rushed through me when the news reports showed that the United States had finally been defeated in Vietnam." But he, along with Jane Fonda, offered no criticism about the Communist genocide that followed the wars in Vietnam and Cambodia.

The "progressive" evangelicals who continue to endorse Wallis are an interesting lot. Bill Hybels, pastor of the Willow Creek Community Church, endorsed Wallis' *The Great Awakening* by saying, "Progressive and centrist evangelicals are one stirring away from a real awakening. We are interested in the poor, in radical reconciliation, in global poverty and AIDS, in the plight of women in the developing world. What Wallis has been talking about is coming to fruition." Rev. Hybel's wife is a consistent defender of Jim Wallis and his *Sojourners* magazine.

Joel C. Hunter, senior pastor of Northland, A Church Distributed, praised Wallis' book with these words: "Wallis is one of the great moral voices of our time. In this book is a path to our spiritual maturity and our country's moral progress."

Glen R. Palmberg, Evangelical Covenant Church, insists that "Jim Wallis is giving voice and leadership to a segment of the evangelical community long ignored by the mainstream media. His insights resonate with evangelicals who have felt unrepresented by the religious right."

Richard Land, president of the Southern Baptist Convention Ethics & Religious Liberty Commission, comments, "Despite our significant public policy differences, I commend Jim Wallis for advocating religious belief as an invaluable resource in addressing the urgent moral and social crises of our time."

And Tony Campolo of Eastern University says that Wallis "is one of the most important voices in Christendom . . . who synthesizes spiritual renewal with progressive social change."

It appears that "progressive" evangelicals have a leader who is the modern day equivalent of the Rev. Hewlett Johnson, the Red Dean of Canterbury, who said, "Communism has recovered the essential form of a real belief in God which organized Christianity just now has largely lost." He also said that mass-murderer Josef Stalin was "the embodiment of good-humored common sense."

Progressive Wallis himself referred to Soviet dictator Brezhnev as "a man open to reason." This is a man who deployed SS-20s, invaded Afghanistan, and repressed Sahkarov! Following Brezhnev's death, Wallis called a prayer meeting to ask God for forgiveness—for "anti-communism!"

Wallis has played a role in nearly every Latin American country (12 at the present time) that has gone Communistic. Why is it that evangelicals cannot figure out that Rev. Wallis is a staunch apostle and defender of Communism?

Progressive evangelicals are even lining up behind him in his fight against global warming/climate change/climate disruption and in his anti-capitalistic, pro-socialistic charge. (I include a chapter on Wallis' communist leanings in my new book *You Can Still Trust the Communists (to Be Communists)*.

But why would President Obama's "Organizing for America" promote and participate in the Red rally in Washington, D.C.?

It is because Barack Obama is himself a radical Fabian Socialist with a revolutionary bias. It is no accident that one of the President's major professors at Harvard Law School was Robert Unger, a radical Marxist. Unger is quoted as stating, "I am a leftist and by conviction as well as temperament a revolutionary. Any association of mine with Barack Obama in the course of the campaign could do only harm." (See Dinesh D'Souza, *The Roots of Obama's Rage*, p. 98).

Of course, if D'Souza is correct, and I believe he is, that Obama is seeking to live out his father's dream of a socialized Kenya (the Luo tribe was a socialistic tribe in Kenya), all the more reason to understand Obama's dream to socialize America.

Marvin Olasky, editor of *World* magazine, describes Obama as "a Marxist-Christian syncretist, blending elements of the incompatible." Sean Hannity describes Obama as "an actual Marxist in the White House." And Andrew C. McCarthy, in his *The Grand Jihad,* describes Obama as "a neocommunist."

This is why Obama and his 30 or more Marxist czars who are running the country stand in agreement with those like Harry Belafonte and Jim Wallis and the other enthusiastic attendees at the "One Nation Working Together" rally who see Fidel Castro as a hero. The Congressional Black Caucus, the Congressional Progressive Caucus, and the Progressive Democrats of America also look upon Castro's Cuba as the wave of the future (even though none of them would travel to Cuba for their personal health care). Such hypocrisy is staggering.

Stanislav Mishin notes in the former communist newspaper *Pravda* this dire warning: "The American descent into Marxism is happening with breath taking speed." The progressive evangelicals who are helping to bring about this descent into a socialistic hell need to live in Cuba or Venezuela for a year before they entice any more naïve evangelicals into such a quagmire of hopelessness and despair. In the meantime are we listening? Do we care?

Communists and the Progressive Rally

by Cliff Kincaid

Various communist and socialist groups were photographed and filmed during the October 2 "One Nation Working Together" rally in Washington, D.C. But groups can show up at any event they want to and there is not much that organizers can do about it. The real controversy lies in whether they were officially invited to participate. In this context, the involvement of the Communist Party USA, a group that served as a subversive pawn of Moscow for decades, is relevant and newsworthy.

Since the Obama organization known as "Organizing for America" urged its supporters to attend the rally, this should prompt questions to the White House. But it's doubtful the media will utter a peep.

Here are the facts: the CPUSA was an official "endorsing organization" and was given space to set up a literature table by the rally organizers. Indeed, a two-page official list of "One Nation March" organizations shows that it was given a highly coveted "reserved space."

These officially-sanctioned groups also included the AFL-CIO and several left-wing labor unions; United for Peace and Justice, founded by veteran Marxist activist Leslie Cagan; Code Pink; the ANSWER Coalition, a front of the Party for Socialism and Liberation; the League of United Latin American Citizens (LULAC); the Committees of Correspondence for Democracy and Socialism; Green for All, the group once associated with former White House official Van Jones; Democratic Socialists of America, which helped give Barack Obama his start in Illinois state politics; and the NAACP.

The special recognition accorded the CPUSA would be comparable to organizers of a Tea Party event or Glenn Beck's August 28 "Restoring Honor" rally honoring the efforts of an extremist organization that almost everyone would view as beyond the pale. Nothing like that occurred, but this hasn't stopped the liberal media from picking a few extremists out of various Tea Party events, as if they were somehow representative of the entire grass-roots movement. It is a dishonest tactic that the media and their progressive allies frequently use.

Ironically, it turns out that some of the "Tea Party extremists" selected by the press in the past have actually been representatives of Lyndon LaRouche, a perennial candidate for president and convicted felon who usually runs as a Democrat and actually started his political career in an offshoot of the radical left Students for a Democratic Society (SDS). His people are usually the ones holding posters depicting Obama with a Hitler mustache. LaRouche operatives were present at the October 2 rally, urging progressives to "dump Obama."

But while the Tea Party would be endlessly demonized for giving official recognition or credence to an extremist group, the progressives in the AFL-CIO and other unions which sponsored the October 2 rally in the nation's capital are excused by the major media for giving special status to a political party that has always elevated the interests of world revolution ahead of the United States. The CPUSA, when it was directly funded by Moscow, was viewed by the FBI and the CIA as a subversive force representing a foreign ideology and America's destruction. The CPUSA's announced objective was a "Soviet America." That is why the CPUSA and its agents, many of them secret members such as "historian" Howard Zinn, Obama mentor Frank Marshall Davis, singer Paul Robeson and labor leader Harry Bridges, were under FBI surveillance and the subject of extensive files about their activities and associates.

Obama's grandfather, Stanley Dunham, who picked Davis as his grandson's mentor, also had an FBI file. But that has turned up missing.

The CPUSA was so extreme during its heyday that it not only defended the mass murderer Stalin but the Hitler-Stalin Pact. The group also supplied Soviet espionage agents in the U.S. Government. Nobody can claim ignorance about the CPUSA at this late date in its history. But there they were at the "One Nation Working Together" rally. There can be no doubt that they were an official part of the progressive big tent.

Their literature table proclaimed, "Communist Party,"and literature was freely available (for a donation). Red hand clappers were even passed out, courtesy of the Young Communist League.

A reporter would have to be deaf, dumb, and blind—or dishonest—to ignore it.

I found the CPUSA members at their literature table near the reflecting pool down from the Lincoln Memorial, where people like Van Jones and Al Sharpton gave their speeches. Jones, whose communist background proved to be too embarrassing and was ousted from his White House job, was introduced by Ed Schultz of MSNBC as a "great patriot."

The top CPUSA officials included executive vice chair Jarvis Tyner, who told me in a brief recorded interview that progressives had better "stick" with Obama and his

"dream" for America.

Interestingly, an on-line publication that noted the involvement of Tyner and his colleagues was The Root, which is published by *The Washington Post*. Cord Jefferson, a staff writer for The Root, quoted Tyner as saying, "This is the real deal here. We don't agree with Obama on everything, but the future of our country is associated with moving the country away from the last 30 years, and he's part of that. He said the people ought to get involved and make the change that they want, and I think that's a good thing for the country."

In terms of the size of the rally, Jefferson acknowledged, "Composed of labor union members, teachers, gay activists, and others, the excited crowd was noticeably smaller than the one that overtook the National Mall during Restoring Honor."

The CPUSA literature table featured a poster-size capitulation of everything that has supposedly been accomplished for the progressives and why they should "defend our victories" and vote on November 2 against the Republicans. For example, the document hailed Obama and Congress for voting for the stimulus bill, unemployment compensation extensions, "sweeping health care improvements," new Wall Street regulations, and forcing BP to agree to a $20 billion compensation fund.

The evidence, in other words, shows that the CPUSA, once the faithful parrot of the old Soviet Union, is firmly in Obama's camp. This is news, but it wasn't to the liberal media purportedly "covering" the October 2 event. Like Al Jazeera, which was interviewing many of the key speakers, the media tended to remain near the Lincoln Memorial, where there was free food and a VIP tent away from the sun. Rank-and-file participants were kept away from this area.

The CPUSA spin-off, the Committees of Correspondence for Democracy and Socialism (CCDS), took a different tack on Obama. Former Obama associate Carl Davidson, once a top official in the SDS, was helping run the CCDS literature table, explaining why he thinks Obama is not a socialist. "Obama is a Keynesian liberal," he told me, "and not a very good one." By that he meant that Obama prefers to use federal government monetary resources to influence but not control outright the economy. He refused to be interviewed on camera, saying conservatives misquote him.

When I commented to Davidson that there must have been a dozen different socialist groups at the event, he laughed and said I had underestimated the number.

Some of these are clearly more important than others. Two of the most important these days are the Workers World Party (WWP) and the Party for Socialism and Liberation. Some members of the former left to form the latter. They operate front organizations such as ANSWER (Act Now to Stop War and End Racism) and the International Action Center.

These groups supplied some of their representatives to meet with Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad at the Warwick Hotel in New York City on September 21, while he was in town speaking to the United Nations.

Left-wing press reports say that among the individuals and organizations in attendance at this event were Cynthia McKinney, a former Democratic member of Congress from Georgia and the Green Party's presidential candidate in 2008; poet and activist Amiri Baraka; Brian Becker of ANSWER; MOVE Minister of Information Ramona Africa; International Action Center co-director Sara Flounders; Ardeshir and Eleanor Ommani, co-founders of the American-Iranian Friendship Committee; former U.S. Attorney General Ramsey Clark; Million Worker March Movement organizer Brenda Stokely; Shafeah M'balia of Black Workers for Justice; Phil Wilayto of Virginia Defenders for Freedom, Justice and Equality; Larry Holmes of Bail Out the People Movement; Don DeBar of WBAIx.org; Ryme Katkhouda of the People's Media Center; Michael McPhearson of United for Peace and Justice; and Reverend Graylan Hagler.

Michael McPhearson was the "peace organizer" of the "One Nation Working Together" October 2 march and his "peace contingent" assembled near 14th Street and Constitution Ave., where Larry Holmes riled up the crowd at a mini-rally by denouncing recent FBI raids on so-called "peace" and "anti-war" groups.

While Holmes remains with the WWP, Brian Becker left to join the Party for Socialism and Liberation, a favorite of the Kremlin's propaganda arm, Russia Today television.

The Workers World Party had been investigated by the House Internal Security Committee for its support

Founded in 1953, the Christian Anti-Communism Crusade, under the leadership of Dr. Fred C. Schwarz (1913-2009), has been publishing a monthly newsletter since 1960. *The Schwarz Report* is edited by Dr. David A. Noebel and Dr. Michael Bauman. The Crusade's address is PO Box 129, Manitou Springs, CO 80829. Our telephone number is (719) 685-9043. All correspondence and tax-deductible gifts (the Crusade is a 501(c)3 tax-exempt organization) may be sent to this address. Permission to reproduce materials from this *Report* is granted provided our name and address are given.

of the North Korean regime and Arab terrorist groups. But the House Committee was disbanded by liberals in Congress.

In total, there were reportedly "100 leaders and representatives of anti-war, labor, alternative media, and Iranian and Palestinian solidarity organizations" at the event with Ahmadinejad. Anti-Israel activists were clearly visible at the October 2 rally, with McPhearson expressing the predominant view that U.S. military aid to Israel should be immediately ended.

There is clearly some disagreement among the far-left over whether to work inside or outside of the Democratic Party. A representative of the Workers International League, which publishes *Socialist Appeal*, told me that organized labor should establish its own independent party rather than fund the Democrats. He said the reception at the October 2 event to his message was "very positive."

—Worlview Times online, October 4, 2010

Red Betty Friedan's Feminist Movement

by Alana Goodman

"Feminists" have complained for years about the lack of women in public office, insisting that once females gained prominent positions of power that all the supposed ills that plagued women would be abolished—sexism, male dominance in the workplace, the gender wage gap, and so on.

In fact, even with a record number of women running for office this year—thanks, in part, to a massive surge in the number of conservative female candidates—"feminists" continue to fret to the media that the 2010 election season will be a major "setback" for women in politics.

USA Today exemplified this trend on Oct. 4, with a splashy front page cover story warning that "In Congress, a step back for women is looming."

But despite claims by "feminists" that they want to see more females in politics, they have been doing all they can to block conservative women candidates during this election cycle—even if it means stooping to tactics that are blatantly sexist and misogynistic.

"Feminists" have acted in ways that they claim to deride—portraying women they dislike as crazy or slutty, denigrating female candidates as "whores" (while declaring the characterization off-limits in regard to female Democrats), and mocking their sexuality. The National Organization for Women (NOW), a feminist organization that says it strives to "achieve gender parity in government," has not endorsed a single Republican female candidate—but it has endorsed several of their liberal male opponents.

While the media have ignored the hypocrisy of the so-called feminist movement during this election cycle, reporters have continued to treat groups like NOW as respectable, pro-women organizations. Many articles even ignore the liberal leanings of these groups.

"Women's issues have changed over the years, but the battle for equality continues," read a recent *Chicago Tribune* headline above an article profiling NOW.

The *Boston Herald* simply labeled NOW as the "nation's most powerful women's group" in a Sep. 10 article, and the *Baltimore Sun* described NOW as a group that is currently "working to elect candidates of both sexes who support women's equality" on Aug. 29.

Feminist Sexism Against Female Conservatives

The self-proclaimed feminist movement's sexism—and selective outrage over sexist comments—has been going on for years, but it has reached a fever pitch during this election cycle.

After Jerry Brown was caught discussing whether or not to call his conservative opponent Meg Whitman a "whore," NOW barely batted an eyelash—and endorsed Brown just hours later.

In fact, the president of the California chapter of NOW even agreed with Brown's characterization of his opponent.

"Meg Whitman could be described as 'a political whore.' Yes, that's an accurate statement," California NOW president Parry Bellasalma told Talking Points Memo after the incident.

And even after far-left Rep. Alan Grayson (D-FL) referred to the female adviser to the Federal Reserve chairman as a "K Street whore," NOW has continued to endorse him.

This, despite the fact that NOW has loudly opposed the use of the term "whore" to describe women in politics. Last November, the organization slammed Fox News host Glenn Beck for using the term to describe Sen. Mary Landrieu (D-LA).

"So what's wrong with equating politicians with prostitutes? After all, it's a quick and vivid way of accusing legislators of selling their votes (and presumably their principles) for money," wrote NOW on its website. "The problem is, the accusation conjures up an image almost exclusively of women—typically streetwalkers,

but sometimes high-class escorts like Beck describes. Also, the term seems to flow so easily off the tongues of men seeking to degrade successful, powerful (perhaps 'uppity'?) women."

In addition to ignoring the use of derogatory terms by liberal male politicians, "feminists" regularly bash conservative political figures like Sarah Palin, Nevada senatorial candidate Sharon Angle, and Delaware senatorial candidate Christine O'Donnell as nutty or slutty.

Francine McKenna, a feminist blogger for the Huffington Post, wrote in September that Palin—who calls herself a feminist—was the "Stepford" robot of the conservative movement.

"The Republican strategists have successfully engineered a 'Stepford-like' robot candidate intended to appeal to men of all political persuasions who are excited by the sexy schoolteacher, kitten with a whip persona she's so good at promoting," wrote McKenna. "That segment of the voting population—men between the ages of 18-98 who are not die-hard liberals—doesn't care if she makes up words. In fact, they'd like her even more if she didn't talk at all."

The avowed feminist blog Jezebel regularly mocks O'Donnell, and has called her "batsh-t," and the Rachel Maddow show has featured videos on O'Donnell's sex life and views on masturbation. Last month, Joy Behar called the Delaware candidate a "witch who doesn't masturbate."

And Citizen Radio host and "feminist" writer Allison Kilkenny has bashed Sharon Angle as "crazy."

"Unlike Rand Paul, Sharon just can't hide the crazy, and she's not savvy enough to pass off the delusional stuff spewing from her mouth as 'being mavericky,'" wrote Kilkenny.

In a column denouncing "Republican 'Mean Girls,'" Maureen Dowd compared Angle to "the inebriated lady in a country club bar" and described her views as "nutty."

Political War on Female Conservatives

The "feminist movement" has also waged a battle against female conservatives through political means. NOW's extensive list of endorsed candidates doesn't include a single conservative woman, despite the fact that there are record numbers of them running for congress. According to the *Washington Post*, "107 Republican women have filed to run for a House seat."

NOW has even gone so far as to endorse several of the male opponents of female conservative candidates. The group endorsed Paul Hodes over Kelly Ayotte in New Hampshire, Chris Coons over Christine O'Donnell in Delaware, Dan Maffei over Ann Marie Buerkle in New York, Steve Cohen against Charlotte Bergmann in Tennessee, and Mike Ross against Beth Ann Rankin in Arkansas.

NOW's opposition to conservative women seems even to transcend the subject of legal abortion—a major policy issue for many feminists, who say it is non-negotiable. Pro-choice conservative female politicians like Rep. Mary Bono Mack in California, Ginny Brown-Waite in Florida, Rep. Judy Biggert in Illinois, Sens. Susan Collins and Olympia Snowe in Maine, Rep. Kay Granger in Texas, and Rep. Shelley Moore Capito in West Virginia still have not won endorsements from the organization.

Despite the neglect or even active hostility of allegedly feminist groups for conservative female women candidates, the media continues to give credence to feminist movement's lamentations over the lack of women in politics.

"I want women in office," Betty Smith, the vice president of the Arkansas Federation of Democratic Women, told *USA Today* on Oct. 4.

In an August *Baltimore Sun* article on how the "Ranks of women in congress could thin," the paper reported that "Prospects of a setback leave advocates of women's rights determined to try to prevent it."

"That is not going to happen," the *Sun* quoted Terry O'Neill, president of the National Organization for Women, as saying. The paper added that the group "is working to elect candidates of both sexes who support women's equality."

In a June press release, O'Neill noted that, "Early support for women candidates is critical to their success. We must continue backing women like [Alabama Democrat] Terri Sewell if we hope to achieve gender parity in government."

But from the actions of self-proclaimed feminists and feminist groups, their political goal clearly isn't gender parity—it's liberal hegemony.

—Culture and Media Institute, October 20, 2010

Elizabeth III

Whatever else can be said about this White House, it isn't afraid to poke a stick in the eye of its critics. How else to explain President Obama's decision Friday to put Elizabeth Warren in charge of the new Consumer Financial Protection Bureau while avoiding Senate confirmation and, for that matter, any political supervisions.

The chutzpah here is something to behold. The pride of Harvard Law School, Ms. Warren is a hero to the political left for proposing a new bureaucracy to micromanage the services that banks can offer consumers. But she is also so politically controversial that no less a liberal lion than Connecticut Senator Chris Dodd has warned the White House that she probably isn't confirmable. A President with more political and Constitutional scruple would have nominated someone else. Mr. Obama's choice is to appoint her anyway and dare the Senate to do something about it.

The plan is for Ms. Warren to run the new bureau from an office at the Treasury Department. Instead of calling her the "Director" of the bureau—her statutory title for the organization's boss—Mr. Obama has appointed her an "assistant" to him and a special adviser to Treasury Secretary Timothy Geithner.

Mr. Geithner's supervision will be pro forma, however, because Ms. Warren rolled over him during the financial reform debate and has her own pipeline to the Oval Office. The President emphasized that Ms. Warren will enjoy "direct access" to him and said she would oversee all aspects of the creation of the new agency, including staffing and policy planning. For all intents and purposes, Ms. Warren will be Treasury Secretary for all consumer lending.

We would have thought a Harvard law professor would object to the extra-legality of this arrangement, but then this is also the crew that gave us ObamaCare via budget reconciliation and put Donald Berwick in charge of Medicare without a Senate debate. Remind us again why the tea party critique of Obama governance is crazy.

The new bureau was already destined to be a bureaucratic rogue. When Members of Congress objected to it being "independent" in the way Ms. Warren hoped, Mr. Dodd and the Administration cooked up a plan to make it part of the Federal Reserve without actually answering to anyone there. The bureau has independent rule-making authority and can grant itself an annual budget up to $646 million. It will draw this money from the operations of the Fed, so the bureau needn't deal with the messy intrustions of Congressional appropriators and will therefore receive limited Congressional oversight.

Ms. Warren's bureau will dictate how credit is allocated throughout the American economy—by banks and financial firms, and also by many small businesses that extend credit to consumers. The bureau's mandate under the new Dodd-Frank law is to ensure that "consumers are protected from unfair, deceptive, or abusive acts and practices and from discrimination." If those terms sound vague and overboard now, wait until Ms. Warren's hand-picked staff begins interpreting existing laws on fair lending and writes new rules.

In a blog posting Friday on the White House website, Ms. Warren made her intentions clear enough: "President Obama understands the importance of leveling the playing field again for families and creating protections that work not just for the wealthy or connected, but for every American." Given the economic growth and jobless figures, maybe we should start calling this the "leveling" Administration.

Though her mandate goes beyond banks, the banking system is likely to suffer the most damage. Ms. Warren was a vociferous opponent of allowing regulators charged with maintaining the safety and soundness of banks to control this new bureau. No matter how destructive its new rules may be, they can only be rescinded by a two-thirds vote of the Administration's new Financial Stability Oversight Council.

And the bureau will now be staffed and shaped by an "assistant" with no obligation to appear before the Senate. The possibility that an appointed official could hold significant authority is why the framers wrote the Senate into the process of approving the President's senior hires. Article II, Section 2 of the Constitution says the President "shall nominate, and by and with the Advice and Consent of the Senate, shall appoint . . . Officers of the United States."

Article II, Section 2 also says "Congress may by Law vest the Appointment of such inferior Officers, as they think proper, in the President alone," but Congress explicitly did not view the head of the financial consumer bureau as an inferior officer. On July 21, Mr. Obama signed a bill passed by both Houses stating that the "Director shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate."

We have here another end-run around Constitutional niceties so Team Obama can invest huge authority in an unelected official who is unable to withstand a public vetting. So a bureau inside an agency that it doesn't report to, with a budget not subject to Congressional control, now gets a leader not subject to Senate confirmation. If Dick Cheney had tried this, he'd have been accused of staging a coup.

—*The Wall Street Journal*, Sept 18-19, 2010, p. A14