



The Phyllis Schlafly Report



VOL. 48, NO. 8

P.O. BOX 618, ALTON, ILLINOIS 62002

MARCH 2015

How Democrats Plan to Win Elections

The Obama Democrats have an audacious scheme for winning future elections. They plan to import 5,000,000 non-citizens and credential them as voters who will, in gratitude, vote Democratic. The way this devious formula works is stunningly simple. Just continue full-funding for Homeland Security without any exception for Obama's illegal executive amnesty. That will allow Obama to give work permits, Social Security numbers, and driver's licenses to five million illegal aliens.

Once the five million so-called undocumented persons are given those valuable documents, there is no way to stop them from voting. That's the testimony of voting experts such as Kansas Secretary of State Kris Kobach who told the U.S. House Oversight Committee on February 12, "It's a guarantee it will happen."

Secretary Kobach's warning was reinforced by testimony before the same committee by Ohio Secretary of State Jon Husted, who noted that the five million non-citizens would receive the "same documents that federal law requires the states to recognize as valid forms of identification for voter registration." Once an alien registers to vote, Secretary Kobach said, it is "virtually impossible" to remove him from the voter rolls.

A third expert witness, Hans von Spakovsky, suggested that Social Security numbers issued to the five million illegal aliens should contain a code (such as "N" for non-citizen) that would instantly reveal their ineligibility to vote. But that simple fix would happen only if the Obama administration sincerely wants to keep them from voting, which I doubt.

In case the illegal aliens need spending money, they can collect a special handout from the U.S. taxpayers called EITC (Earned Income Tax Credit), which was designed to help parents who are working to support their families. IRS Commissioner, John Koskinen, told the Senate Finance Committee on February 3 that as soon as the illegal aliens receive their Social Security numbers, they will be allowed to go back and claim the EITC for up to three previous

years during which they worked illegally.

What about the employers who illegally hired these people? They will get off scot-free, even though documentation clearly exists to prosecute and punish them.

Opponents of amnesty were cheered by the news that a federal judge issued an injunction against Barack Obama's unconstitutional and illegal executive amnesty. The judge ruled in favor of the lawsuit filed by the new Texas Governor, Greg Abbott, along with 25 other states.

Obama's outgoing Attorney General, Eric Holder, has promised to appeal, and don't expect any help from Holder's replacement. His designated successor, Loretta Lynch, has already testified that she thinks Obama's executive actions are perfectly legal.

Meanwhile, Obama's 5,000,000 amnestied illegals allowed to remain in our country can cash in on free health care plus schooling for their kids, including free lunch, breakfast and even dinner. I heard one public school superintendent complaining on television that he now has 40 languages spoken in his school, and nobody has yet added up the costs that this burden imposes on the taxpayers.

Of course, these illegals will become eligible for all sorts of America's generous welfare benefits. This includes food stamps, Obamaphones, Medicaid, WIC, Social Security disability, and dozens of other handouts.

Most important is that the illegals take jobs from American citizens. The Obama Administration brags that the official unemployment rate is only 5.6 percent, but that number is misleading because it doesn't include anyone who stopped looking for work four weeks ago.

As many as 30 million Americans are either out of work or extremely underemployed. If you work just one hour per week for a payment of at least \$20, you can't be counted as unemployed in the official government statistics.

The 5 million beneficiaries of Obama's executive action would be added to the already high number of foreigners who enter our labor force each year. They include 1.1 million legal immigrants, 700,000 guest workers on

temporary visas, plus roughly a half million work permits which the Obama administration has been handing out each year to various categories of non-citizens who are not eligible for employment under the law.

It's no wonder that the Center for Immigration Studies reported last year that literally 100 percent of all net new jobs in the past decade have gone to immigrants and foreign workers. Fewer Americans of working age (16 to 65) are employed today than in 2000.

"It Hit a Nerve"

"It hit a nerve," Rudy Giuliani observed about his widely reported insight that President Obama does not love America. Amid the uproar from the liberal media that anyone would dare question a liberal's patriotism, the former mayor of New York City is not backing away from his candid comment, telling the *New York Times* that "I said exactly what I wanted to say. I conveyed exactly the message that I wanted to convey."

Giuliani's on-target comments hit the same nerve that has produced an uproar over the new Advanced Placement U.S. History (APUSH) Framework, which is teaching 500,000 of our brightest college-bound high school seniors to be ashamed instead of proud of our country. A half dozen states have introduced legislation demanding changes in the APUSH Framework, which minimizes the American Revolution, the Founding Fathers and the exceptional greatness of our country, in order to give disproportionate emphasis to the grievances of minorities.

The former mayor observed that Obama criticizes our country "much more often than other American presidents," both Republican and Democrat. He added that Obama "was educated by people who were critics of the U.S. And he has not been able to overcome those influences."

"From the time he was 9 years old, he was influenced by Frank Marshall Davis, who was a Communist," Giuliani pointed out. As a young "community organizer," Obama was influenced by the radical socialist Saul Alinsky, who was also the subject of Hillary Rodham's 92-page senior thesis at Wellesley College. Giuliani continued: "He spent 17 years in the church of Jeremiah Wright, and this is the guy who said 'God damn America, not God bless America.'"

Giuliani has, in fact, been making many comments like these, without much media attention. But this time the comment was made in the presence of a leading presidential candidate, Scott Walker. "The mayor can speak for himself," Walker told a reporter who demanded to know if Walker agrees with the mayor that Obama does not love America. "You should ask the president what he

thinks about America."

Another prospective presidential candidate, Gov. Bobby Jindal of Louisiana, reportedly telephoned Giuliani to congratulate him for his comments. Publicly, Jindal said, "The gist of what Mayor Giuliani said . . . is true," adding, "If you are looking for someone to condemn the mayor, look elsewhere."

Jindal also stood by his own remarks that criticized "non-assimilation" by immigrants to our country. He described as "dangerous" the "people who want to come to our country but not adopt our values," including our English language, adding that "it is absolutely correct to insist on assimilation" by immigrants to America.

Responses by other Republican presidential candidates to Giuliani's insight have been less impressive. Jeb Bush and Rand Paul were quick to run from Giuliani's remarks by insisting they would not question Obama's "motives," while Marco Rubio and Lindsey Graham both said they have "no doubt" that President Obama loves America. And 2012 presidential nominee Mitt Romney's chief foreign policy adviser, Dan Senor, told CNBC that it is "insane" to question "whether or not Barack Obama loves America."

While running for president in 2008, Obama criticized Americans in rural Pennsylvania and in small towns in the Midwest by saying that "they get bitter, they cling to guns or religion or antipathy toward people who aren't like them or anti-immigrant sentiment or anti-trade sentiment as a way to explain their frustrations." That offensive comment was not long after Michelle Obama declared, "Let me tell you something. For the first time in my adult lifetime, I'm proud of my country."

Obama refers to our Nation as "this" country, as though it is some other country and not "our" country, as when he said, "There's a long history in this country of African-Americans and Latinos being stopped disproportionately by the police, and that's a fact." Obama once told a European audience that "there have been times where America has shown arrogance."

When Obama has expressed admiration for our country, it is often in a backhanded manner. "I realize that America's critics will be quick to point out that at times we too have failed to live up to our ideals; that America has plenty of problems within its own borders. This is true," Obama declared to the United Nations General Assembly last year.

By contrast, Mayor Giuliani said, "with all our flaws we're the most exceptional country in the world. I'm looking for a presidential candidate who can express that, do that and carry it out."

"I want a president who is not embarrassed to say America is the strongest power on earth," the mayor continued. "And I want our enemies to be afraid of our president."

The Costly Asylum Racket

We've had a lot of media comment about the bad effects of Obama's executive orders admitting millions (yes, millions) of illegal immigrants and giving them welfare, Social Security, driver's licenses, and a path to citizenship. Like many Americans, I realized the importance of this when thousands of unfamiliar people from a foreign country, without any advance notice, appeared in my community.

Then I attended an education conference where the asylum racket to admit millions of foreigners (long ignored by the media) was described by a knowledgeable speaker, Ann Corcoran. She started by asking questions of her audience. Did you hear about the El Cajon, California Iraqi man who was found guilty of murdering his wife after writing a phony note from supposed Islamophobes telling the family to leave the U.S.? Did you know that the Tsarnaev Boston Bombers came to our country with false claims of persecution and then cashed in to receive \$100,000 in U.S. welfare handouts?

Did you hear about the Somali youths who left Minneapolis to join Al-Shabaab and ISIS? Did you know that a Burmese Muslim, within a month of his arrival in Utah, murdered a little Christian Burmese girl and was sent to prison for life? Did you hear that Alaska has received so many Muslim refugees that they have built a mosque in Anchorage?

If you didn't hear those facts, put it down to the secrecy of the refugee racket, which does its best to operate under the radar. We heard about these asylum events from Ann Corcoran, who has made it her mission to ferret out the facts and publish them on her blog, Refugee Resettlement Watch.

The asylum immigrants are brought into our country and settled in 180 U.S. cities by nine contractors (pretending to be "religious charities") and 350 subcontractors. These lucky immigrants are mostly selected by the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees.

Iraq tops the list of refugee immigrants with 20,000 arriving each year, of whom 76 percent are Muslims. At least 10,000 are Somalis, and our State Department has announced that we will be admitting 10,000 Syrians this year, mostly Muslims.

Ann Corcoran doesn't criticize the policy of admitting genuine refugees from persecution, but she does criticize the high numbers, the secrecy of the program, the lack of community involvement in the decision-making of where the immigrants will be located, and the large-scale admission of ethnic groups that have no intention of assimilating in America. This process is the result of the Refugee Act of 1980, the brainchild of Ted Kennedy, aggressively supported by Joe Biden, and signed into law by Jimmy Carter.

The contractors who bring in these immigrants are paid by the head with U.S. taxpayers' money. The contractors have offices and plenty of staff to finance the resettlement of the aliens and are well organized to protect their foothold and their salaries. They immediately expand the numbers of foreigners they are handling by bringing in the refugees' family members. The first arrivals are labeled the "seed community."

The big difference between these asylum refugees and other immigrants is that the refugees are entitled to all forms of government-paid welfare the minute they set foot in America, whereas our laws require ordinary legal immigrants to show that they have the means to support themselves and will not become a "public charge." The feds even give the asylum immigrants start-up money for 3 to 6 months, which gives their contractor time to sign them up for subsidized housing, healthcare, food stamps, job counseling and training.

One of the biggest problems with this program is that the immigrant kids are quickly enrolled in public schools. We can blame this piece of mischief on supremacist judges, who ruled in 1982 that immigrant kids are entitled to attend U.S. public schools.

We now have U.S. school districts where dozens of different languages are spoken. Many of these kids not only don't speak English, they don't even speak Spanish and require translators who can speak languages unknown to most Americans. It has become a tremendous cost to the U.S. taxpayers to provide interpreters in schools and in the criminal justice system. The top language of refugees now entering our country is Arabic, and Somali is the 4th language most often spoken.

Many cities are now resisting this invasion of their towns and schools. The U.S. Office of Refugee Resettlement is trying to keep them in line by labeling them "Pockets of Resistance" and hiring a left-wing community organizing group called Welcoming America to shut them up. The countries sending the largest number of refugees are Iraq, Burma, Bhutan, and Somalia. The Obama Administration is now pushing hard for us to take 50,000 from the Congo and 50,000 to 75,000 from Syria.

Ann Corcoran concluded her speech by warning: "We can survive terrorism. We can't survive migration."

The Phyllis Schlafly Report

PO Box 618, Alton, Illinois 62002

ISSN0556-0152

Published monthly by the Eagle Trust Fund, PO Box 618, Alton, Illinois 62002. Periodicals Postage Paid at Alton, Illinois. Postmaster: Address Corrections should be sent to the Phyllis Schlafly Report, PO Box 618, Alton, Illinois 62002. Phone: (618) 462-5415.

Subscription Price: \$20 per year. Extra copies available: 50¢ each; 10 copies \$4; 30 copies \$8; 100 copies \$15; 1,000 copies \$100.

<http://www.eagleforum.org>

eagle@eagleforum.org

The Toddler Wage Gap and the Mommy Wage Gap

Just in time for International Women's Day on March 8, Facebook's feminist COO, Sheryl Sandberg, appeared on Fox News' top-rated Megyn Kelly show to complain that "There is a toddler wage gap in this country."

To prove her shocking charge of inequality within the traditional American family, Sandberg observed that "boys do fewer chores than girls and get paid more. Our sons take out the trash, [which] doesn't take that long. Our daughters set the table, [which] takes longer."

Supposedly, this injustice to little girls leads to discrimination against women in the workplace, so obviously we need government intervention and a change of cultural attitudes. Little girls should "lean in" and demand the right to carry out the trash instead of doing cleaner household tasks.

This is the latest wrinkle in the Left's campaign to get moms into the labor force and eliminate the traditional middle class family with a father provider and a full-time mother caring for their own kids. President Obama made that goal clear in Providence, Rhode Island, last fall when he pronounced that whenever "mom leaves the workplace to stay home with the kids, which then leaves her earning a lower wage for the rest of her life, that's not a choice we want Americans to make."

If you thought Obama believed in giving choice to women, think again. It's only some kinds of choice he will tolerate, such as the choice whether or not to kill her baby; certainly not the choice of whether to be a stay-at-home mom, or work full-time or part-time.

A week earlier, at Hollywood's Academy Awards, Patricia Arquette used her acceptance speech for Best Supporting Actress to rouse up the audience with the statement, "it's our time to have wage equality once and for all, and equal rights for women in the United States of America." She wasn't talking about all women because it's well known that unmarried or childless women in the workforce make almost as much as men, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

No, Arquette was specifically addressing "every woman who gave birth." She was giving voice and drama to the feminists' new issue: the "motherhood pay gap" which results when pregnant women take time off and often choose to return to reduced hours after giving birth.

As Obama said a few weeks earlier, "that's not a choice we want Americans to make." In order to "ensure that women are full and equal participants in the economy," he said, the taxpayers must pay the cost of caring for newborns and toddlers. In a government daycare center, you can be sure that girls will take out the trash and boys will set the table.

The mommy pay gap is even greater for married

women (who earn 24 percent less than men) than single mothers (17 percent less). Of course, one reason a woman gets married is to be supported by her husband while caring for her children at home. So long as her husband earns a good income, she doesn't care about the pay gap between them.

Obama's \$80 billion daycare plan would triple the current child-care tax credit to \$3,000 for two-earner families with children under age five and a combined income of less than \$120,000, plus sweeten the package with a new \$500 credit for couples when both spouses are in the workforce. Tough luck for the one-third of families where the mom leaves the work force for a time to give her children personal (instead of commercial) care.

Obama wrapped his tax plan in a lot of rhetoric about fairness and claims that he will make "everyone play by the same set of rules," but his plan isn't fair and certainly does not set the same rules for all families. It's highly discriminatory against families that want to give their babies mommy care rather than turning them over to hired caregivers whose salaries are paid by increased taxes.

Candidates running for national office this year or next should be asked the question: Do you believe mothers should have the choice to leave the workforce for several years to care for their own children?

Do you believe our income tax code should treat a married couple as two people even though one spouse is the family provider and the other has made the choice to care for their children full-time? That obvious fairness was written into our the income tax rates by the great Republican Congress in 1948 (over President Harry Truman's veto), but subsequent Congresses cut the tax-return value of "married filing jointly" to about 1.6 people instead of two whole people.

The benefits in the income tax tables and the credits given to married couples are rigged in favor of the wife going into the workforce instead of caring for her children. Obama is not reflecting the polls or listening to what the American people want, but he is following the playbook of the Left. A Pew Research Center survey reports that 60 percent of Americans say children are better off when one parent stays home to care for the children.

Wikipedia defines "the war on women" as "an expression in United States politics used to describe certain Republican Party policies and legislation as a wide-scale effort to restrict women's rights, especially reproductive rights." Since Obama's Rhode Island speech, Wikipedia surely needs a new definition that includes the Democrats' war on women.