The optimism of the Wisconsin vote needs to make way for a warning from **Peter Schiff**.

... In recent months as turmoil bubbled across the debt markets of Europe, the United States had beckoned as a safe haven. But in truth, the problems are as bad, if not worse, on this side of the Atlantic. Ironically, America has not had to deal with its day of reckoning because lesser problems surfaced first in Europe. But when Europe comes to some modest resolution of its problems, or when bond investors realize they have jumped from the frying pan into the fire, there will be no hiding from the unresolved problems here.

As the intoxicating effects of Fed stimulus wear off, the hangover is setting in. To delay the pain, I believe that there can be little doubt that the Fed will unleash its next round of stimulus, in the form of QE3. My guess is the Fed has always known more QE was needed but it has been waiting for the most politically palatable time to announce it. That "stunner" can't be far off with the data so bad and the elections so near.

Eventually more people will figure out just how precarious America's fiscal position truly remains. That's when interest rates will finally rise in the U.S. There is no way to justify record low interest rates in this country given our atrocious fiscal position. I believe interest rates here should approach levels comparable to the more indebted European countries. Once it becomes obvious just how many dollars the Fed is prepared to print to stave off recession, people running into treasuries today will likely suffer buyer's remorse. When they rethink their assumptions, as buyers of the Facebook IPO clearly have, the Fed will then become not just the buyer of last resort, but the buyer of only resort. Then the Real Crash may finally be upon us.

Now back to the optimism; courtesy of **Jennifer Rubin**.

I distinctly recall in college reading Jean Francois Revel's "The Totalitarian Temptation" and thinking, "Well that's it. The Commies will win — too many dim people in the West." Communism, however, crumbled in large part because very undim people, including Ronald Reagan, Margaret Thatcher and Pope John Paul II, were optimists and staunch defenders of freedom.

So when conservatives today argue that we haven't the fortitude to defeat Islamic terrorists or to put our fiscal house in order, I am not despondent. Quite the contrary, there is great reason to be optimistic. In fact, there are lots of reasons to be. I've got my list:

- 1. With yesterday's win, Wisconsin Gov. Scott Walker (R) showed that self-governance, the ability and will to grasp the reins of power from the few and tame our institutions, is possible.
- 2. It is becoming conventional wisdom, from the center-left to the center-right, that President Obama blew it when he chose to reject the Simpson-Bowles committee's recommendations. ...

Andrew Malcolm asks why Walker won so big?

"Win" is too small a word for what Wisconsin Gov. Scott Walker pulled off Tuesday. So, probably, is victory.

In a referendum on the first half of his first term, the Republican became the first governor in U.S. history to defeat an attempt to oust him from office. The other two recall efforts -- against California's Gray Davis in 2003 and North Dakota's Lynn Frazier in 1921 --were successful.

Exit polls discovered a significant number of Wisconsin voters bothered by the union-led recall bid for something short of improper conduct. While others were impressed by Walker's budget surplus and billion dollar in state savings already. And Walker's national party reputation wasn't hurt either.

With 99% of the votes counted, Walker received 53% (1,326,658) to Milwaukee Mayor Tom Barrett's 46% (1,150,233) and 1% for a third candidate.

But those numbers understate Walker's success. He took 60 of the state's 72 counties and beat Barrett by two more points than he did in 2010. Walker's lieutenant governor, Rebecca Kleefisch, also defeated a recall bid. ...

Josh Kraushaar spots bad news for the prez in yesterday's results.

President Obama wasn't on the ballot in Wisconsin, but Gov. Scott Walker's decisive victory in last night's gubernatorial recall is a stinging blow to his prospects for a second term. The reelection was a telltale sign that the <u>conservative base is as energized as ever</u>, that the Democratic GOTV efforts <u>may not be as stellar as advertised</u>, and that the Democratic-leaning "blue wall" Rust Belt states of Wisconsin, Michigan and Pennsylvania will be very much in play this November.

<u>Politico</u> catches Clinton once again trashing Obama's campaign message. Last week, former President Bill Clinton disavowed a central theme of President Barack Obama's reelection campaign. Tuesday, he added that a key piece of the White House's policy agenda doesn't make much sense to him either.

With friends like this, Obama's political enemies don't need to do too much.

In an interview with CNBC that his office was scrambling to clarify Tuesday night, <u>Clinton sided</u> with congressional Republicans over Obama in calling for Congress to temporarily renew the soon-to-expire Bush tax cuts — but he also heaped praise on private equity companies like Mitt Romney's Bain Capital, pleaded ignorance for his past gaffes and asserted his independence from the Obama campaign message operation.

It was Clinton in full Mr. Hyde mode — in a flashback to the deep and lasting tensions between the Clinton family and the Obama team that still linger from the bitter 2008 primary fight.

The interview was part of a whirlwind television tour Tuesday afternoon, with Clinton spending also granting interviews to NBC, PBS and CBS that followed up on his turn last week on CNN, when he referred to Romney's business background — which the Obama campaign had spent

days tearing apart — as "sterling." Once again, Clinton was sucking up all the media oxygen and generating dozens of headlines about an intra-party split between the two presidents.

It took Hillary Clinton's campaign a good part of the 2008 primary season to realize the damage that the former president's straight talking, can't-be-muzzled ways could do — after he helped sink his own wife's chances at the presidency in advance of the South Carolina primary by alienating black voters. It took the Obama campaign only one week to learn the same lesson, as Clinton swung wildly between effective surrogate and major headache.

Talking about the economic crisis in Europe and the persistent economic malaise in the United States, Clinton told CBNC that extending the Bush-era tax cuts across the board was "probably the best thing to do right now."

Obama has made raising taxes on upper earners a signature part of his reelection pitch — and Republicans were quick to exploit the daylight between the two Democratic presidents. ...

WSJ OpEd notes the administration's hard time at the Court this year.

As the world awaits the Supreme Court's ruling on ObamaCare, there's a larger story that the pundits are missing: the court's rejection of the Obama administration's increasingly extreme claims on behalf of unlimited federal power.

This term alone, the high court has ruled unanimously against the government on religious liberty, criminal procedure and property rights. When the administration can't get even a single one of the liberal justices to agree with it in these unrelated areas of the law, that's a sign there's something wrong with its constitutional vision.

Let's take these cases in order:

First, in Hosanna-Tabor Church v. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, the government sued a church school that fired a teacher for violating one of the church's religious tenets: threatening to sue over an employment dispute rather than resolving the disagreement internally. The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission claimed this violated the Americans with Disabilities Act because the firing was related to the teacher's health issues.

The Supreme Court ruled 9-0 in January that punishing a church for failing to retain an unwanted teacher "interferes with the internal governance of the church, depriving the church of control over the selection of those who will personify its beliefs." Such interference, it concluded, violates the First Amendment's Free Exercise and Establishment Clauses. ...

Roger Simon compares Elizabeth Warren to another Ms. Warren, the madam in one of Bernard Shaw's plays; *Mrs. Warren's Profession*.

... Warren can be an Indian if she wishes; she can exploit bank foreclosures if she wishes. Eliot Spitzer can bust hookers while employing them and end up with a television show. Who knows — Elizabeth may end up with her own reality show now, her own version of "Flip This House" called "Flip This Tepee"?

It's their profession — modern liberalism. They can be capitalists while the rest of us rot under taxes and government regulation. Socialism for thee but not for me.

And it pays better than the original Mrs. Warren's. You can even get tenure at Harvard, no questions asked. Just check the right identity square. No one will know. And if they suspect, they can't prove anything. After all, ancestors.com only goes so far.

USA Today OpEd in high dungeon over fake Indian claims.

... For several years, Warren falsely identified herself as a Native American — a designation that raises serious questions about how such a misrepresentation might have advantaged her in obtaining a professorship at the Harvard Law School at a time when it was being attacked for its lack of diversity.

But when Brown attacked her claim, Democrats rallied their defense and Warren responded with a lot of feisty talk.

"If that's all you've got, Scott Brown, I'm ready. And let me be clear. I am not backing down. I didn't get in this race to fold up the first time I got punched," Warren said of her <u>GOP</u> opponent's non-stop efforts to keep this issue before voters.

Brown is a go-along-to-get-along Eastern Republican who kowtows to the GOP's right wing. His voting record ought to offend most Massachusetts voters, who are liberal. But his right-wing ideological rigidity could prove to be less of an issue for a decisive bloc of voters in the Bay State than Warren's identity crisis. Her assertion that family tales and the high cheekbones of some relatives led her to believe she had Native American blood coursing through her veins is laughable. That many Democrats, obsessed with unseating Brown, treat what she did as meaningless is lamentable. ...

Euro Pacific Capital Economic Reality Bites

by Peter Schiff

Many people became convinced that data releases earlier this year indicated that "recovery" in the U.S. was imminent. But as I have been saying for months, this evidence would ultimately be shown to be as reliable as sightings of Bigfoot. Lots of people claim to say they have seen it, some even produce plaster footprints, but in the end all we have is a guy in an ape suit. The economic recovery, that has been discussed so loudly and often in recent months, will be shown to be similarly mythical.

A torrent of recent economic data now reveals weakness, and investors are beginning to take notice. Today's release of the May jobs report showed a paltry 69,000 jobs created during the month, far below consensus estimates. Not only did the current month disappoint, but the June numbers were also revised down by 49,000. This release follows yesterday's downward

revisions of first quarter GDP growth from 2.2% to 1.9%. Also lost in the headlines was that the savings rate dropped to 3.4% in April, the lowest rate since December 2007. This shows that Americans may need to deplete their already meager savings just to keep their heads above water as the U.S. economy sinks back into recession.

The bad news sent stocks swooning. The latest sell off brings the S&P 500 down close to 10% from its levels in early April. On the other hand, bonds have reached record highs as investors seek safety in treasuries. However, I believe that treasuries will turn out to be the Facebook of safe havens. Before Facebook went public everyone wanted a piece of the action. But once the allure wore off, and people realized they owned shares of an overhyped company with unreliable earnings and a sky high valuation, the shares quickly lost a good deal of their appeal. Despite the best efforts of the media to declare the end of gold's appeal, the metal continues to shine. Today's reportalso sent gold up nearly 4 per cent. Gold is now down just 3 per cent from May 1, a period that has been horrific for other asset classes.

Oil prices continue to slide as traders brace for a fall-off in global demand that will come from the return of a global recession. What these traders fail to understand is that the recession will likely be resisted by central banks around the world with massive money printing. Such action will be much more likely to push oil prices back up to levels higher than those seen before the recent downturn. Yes recession means consumers will use a lot less oil, but inflation created by the central banks means that they will likely pay a lot more to purchase it.

In recent months as turmoil bubbled across the debt markets of Europe, the United States had beckoned as a safe haven. But in truth, the problems are as bad, if not worse, on this side of the Atlantic. Ironically, America has not had to deal with its day of reckoning because lesser problems surfaced first in Europe. But when Europe comes to some modest resolution of its problems, or when bond investors realize they have jumped from the frying pan into the fire, there will be no hiding from the unresolved problems here.

As the intoxicating effects of Fed stimulus wear off, the hangover is setting in. To delay the pain, I believe that there can be little doubt that the Fed will unleash its next round of stimulus, in the form of QE3. My guess is the Fed has always known more QE was needed but it has been waiting for the most politically palatable time to announce it. That "stunner" can't be far off with the data so bad and the elections so near.

Eventually more people will figure out just how precarious America's fiscal position truly remains. That's when interest rates will finally rise in the U.S. There is no way to justify record low interest rates in this country given our atrocious fiscal position. I believe interest rates here should approach levels comparable to the more indebted European countries. Once it becomes obvious just how many dollars the Fed is prepared to print to stave off recession, people running into treasuries today will likely suffer buyer's remorse. When they rethink their assumptions, as buyers of the Facebook IPO clearly have, the Fed will then become not just the buyer of last resort, but the buyer of only resort. Then the Real Crash may finally be upon us.

Right Turn
Plenty of cause for optimism
by Jennifer Rubin

I distinctly recall in college reading Jean Francois Revel's "<u>The Totalitarian Temptation</u>" and thinking, "Well that's it. The Commies will win — too many dim people in the West." Communism, however, crumbled in large part because very undim people, including Ronald Reagan, Margaret Thatcher and Pope John Paul II, were optimists and staunch defenders of freedom.

So when conservatives today argue that we haven't the fortitude to defeat Islamic terrorists or to put our fiscal house in order, I am not despondent. Quite the contrary, there is great reason to be optimistic. In fact, there are lots of reasons to be. I've got my list:

- 1. With yesterday's win, Wisconsin Gov. Scott Walker (R) showed that self-governance, the ability and will to grasp the reins of power from the few and tame our institutions, is possible.
- 2. It is becoming conventional wisdom, from the center-left to the center-right, that President Obama blew it when he chose to reject the Simpson-Bowles committee's recommendations. Likewise, a consensus has formed (more or less) that the 2010 midterms were a rejection of big-government statism. The president tries to claim that he is fiscally responsible, hypocrisy being the compliment that big spenders pay to fiscal hawks. In short, cutting the debt has become an article of faith, even if the details are hotly disputed.
- 3. China is experiencing the perils of its repressive system. As exports have taken a dive in the worldwide slowdown, growth comes to a halt. Fearful of expanding its domestic consumer market and creating a prosperous middle class, the Chinese ruling class has now seen growth flatline. Coupled with political infighting and the constant conflict implicit in repressing its own people, China looks less like it has "figured it out."
- 4. We have the best fighting force we've ever had. A generation of men and women have battlefield experience. They are practiced in leadership and knowledgable about the Middle East and the tactics of terrorists. The post-9/11 generation of military leaders will be among our best and brightest, whether in the military or in other endeavors.
- 5. Technology is aiding freedom movements around the world. For every device to monitor the opposition, the tyrannies around the globe are confronted with five work-arounds by freedom advocates. Repressive regimes are waging a losing battle against social media. There is no putting the genie back in the bottle.
- 6. Democracy has had enormous successes in India, Southeast Asia, Central America and the former states of the Soviet Union. With that comes the potential for new alliances, increased prosperity and the accelerated spread of freedom (success begets success).

In the midst of mass murder in Syria, crippling debt at home, European recession, the erosion of public values and sometimes maddeningly stupid political discussion, it is easy to fall prey to pessimism. But we've seen much worse as a country (including large chunks of the 20th century). We can get this right.

How did Scott Walker win so big and what's next?

by Andrew Malcolm



"Win" is too small a word for what Wisconsin Gov. Scott Walker pulled off Tuesday. So, probably, is victory.

In a referendum on the first half of his first term, the Republican became the first governor in U.S. history to defeat an attempt to oust him from office. The other two recall efforts -- against California's Gray Davis in 2003 and North Dakota's Lynn Frazier in 1921 --were successful.

Exit polls discovered a significant number of Wisconsin voters bothered by the union-led recall bid for something short of improper conduct. While others were impressed by Walker's budget surplus and billion dollar in state savings already. And Walker's national party reputation wasn't hurt either.

With 99% of the votes counted, Walker received 53% (1,326,658) to Milwaukee Mayor Tom Barrett's 46% (1,150,233) and 1% for a third candidate.

But those numbers understate Walker's success. He took 60 of the state's 72 counties and beat Barrett by two more points than he did in 2010. Walker's lieutenant governor, Rebecca Kleefisch, also defeated a recall bid.

As might be expected, 94% of Republicans and 93% of Tea Party supporters went for Walker. Barrett took 91% of Democrats and 86% of liberals. Walker, however, captured 54% of the crucial independent vote to Barrett's 45%.

Surprisingly, less than three-of-four union members (71%) voted for Barrett and union household members went for the Democrat by only 62%.

Walker immediately called for a bipartisan picnic confab next week to begin healing the wounds over brats and beer. Democrats concurred.

The long-running heartland political struggle convulsed the nation's former capital of cheese for 16 months, as unions reacted to the joint effort by the budget-balancing Walker and the Republican legislature to curb members' pay and benefits that have state workers better remunerated than the p[people paying their salaries. They still are, though slightly less.

Until recent days the public unions, which poured millions of dollars and hundreds of volunteers into the state, had portrayed the contest as a must-win in order to halt the erosion of unions rights, such as government collection of dues, by other states, 29 of which are run by Republicans. Chances are Walker's success will embolden other state leaders to make similar tough decisions incrementally.

The GOP and related groups too poured in vast resources--millions of dollars and thousands of volunteers. But despite Tuesday's big victory, Wisconsin really is not in play come November. The state hasn't gone Republican since Ronald Reagan and Mitt Romney could better invest more effort in the far more important state of Ohio.

While making support clear, the individual presidential candidates, however, kept their distance for fear of alienating voters for their main event come Nov. 6. In a statement, Romney said, "Gov. Walker has demonstrated over the past year what sound fiscal policies can do to turn an economy around, and I believe that in November voters across the country will demonstrate that they want the same in Washington, D.C."

Sarah Palin chimed in with, "Congratulations to the people of Wisconsin for standing by strong leaders who made tough decisions in dire circumstances that have begun to turn their great state back to prosperity. Leadership is doing what is right, not what is popular."

The Democratic National Committee sent in about \$1 million and ex-President Clinton. Pres. Obama's mind is focused on a different priority than trivial union causes like Wisconsin. He himself donated nothing to the recall effort save for a supportive last minute tweet. Gee, thanks, sir, for all 140 of those thumb moves.

Last Friday when Obama found time for six fundraisers in Minnesota and Illinois, he flew directly over Wisconsin but did not stop or even phone down words of support.

It was a careful move. His campaign stops have proven useless for a string of high-profile Democrats since 2009. (Can you say Jon Corzine, Arlen Specter and Martha Coakley?) And with his job approval hovering a few points below 50%, Obama doesn't need any more embarrassments. Not after his unbelievably awful seven days last week, detailed here.

Monday the president flew to New York City for three more fundraisers. Tuesday Michelle Obama made another withdrawal from New York.

Today Obama takes Air Force One back out to his favorite Western ATM, the state of California. He'll do two fundraisers in San Francisco, then two more in LA. Thursday, it's on to Las Vegas, of course, a city he so famously said taxpayer money should never be spent in.

Watch for many major media this morning to report optimistically for Obama on Wisconsin exit poll results showing a 54% to 42% lead for the Democrat over Romney at this moment, 154 days before the real polling.

These are the same respondents who lied to exit pollers Tuesday about supporting Barrett, making the race seem too close to call for hours. As a result, cautious networks delayed projecting Walker the winner until his growing lead in the actual statewide count could no longer be ignored.

National Journal

Red Flags All Over for Obama in Wisconsin

by Josh Kraushaar

President Obama wasn't on the ballot in Wisconsin, but Gov. Scott Walker's decisive victory in last night's gubernatorial recall is a stinging blow to his prospects for a second term. The re-election was a telltale sign that the <u>conservative base is as energized as ever</u>, that the Democratic GOTV efforts <u>may not be as stellar as advertised</u>, and that the Democratic-leaning "blue wall" Rust Belt states of Wisconsin, Michigan and Pennsylvania will be very much in play this November.

Walker won by a bigger margin than he did in 2010, and with more overall votes. He <u>carried 38 percent of union households</u> - a slight improvement from his 2010 midterm tally -- a strikingly strong number given how he's been cast as the villain of labor. It's a sign of the cultural divide between national Democrats and blue-collar whites, one that is particularly acute for the president.

Obama's team is taking consolation in the fact that <u>exit polling</u> showed him leading Mitt Romney, 51 to 44 percent. But that's hardly good news: with near-presidential level turnout (and notably higher level of union turnout), Obama is running five points behind his 2008 performance. Replicate that dropoff across the board, and all the key swing states flip to Mitt Romney.

For all of Obama's political talent, he's been a major drag on his party since taking office. In 2009, Republicans won two hotly-contested gubernatorial races in Virginia and New Jersey, with the victors (Chris Christie/Bob McDonnell) now on Romney's vice-presidential short list. During the heat of the health care debate in 2010, Scott Brown picked up Ted Kennedy's Senate seat in deep blue Massachusetts. Later that year, Republicans regained control of the House, by winning a whopping 63 seats while picking up six Senate seats. And now, Walker wins the recall by a bigger margin than in the 2010 election, which was already a watershed year for Wisconsin Republicans.

All this suggests that something has to change fast for Obama to avoid the fate of his party colleagues come November.

Politico

Bill Clinton ditches Obama message — again

by Byron Tau

Last week, former President Bill Clinton disavowed a central theme of President Barack Obama's reelection campaign. Tuesday, he added that a key piece of the White House's policy agenda doesn't make much sense to him either.

With friends like this, Obama's political enemies don't need to do too much.



In an interview with CNBC that his office was scrambling to clarify Tuesday night, <u>Clinton sided</u> with congressional Republicans over Obama in calling for Congress to temporarily renew the soon-to-expire Bush tax cuts — but he also heaped praise on private equity companies like Mitt Romney's Bain Capital, pleaded ignorance for his past gaffes and asserted his independence from the Obama campaign message operation.

It was Clinton in full Mr. Hyde mode — in a flashback to the deep and lasting tensions between the Clinton family and the Obama team that still linger from the bitter 2008 primary fight.

The interview was part of a whirlwind television tour Tuesday afternoon, with Clinton spending also granting interviews to NBC, PBS and CBS that followed up on his turn last week on CNN, when he referred to Romney's business background — which the Obama campaign had spent days tearing apart — as "sterling." Once again, Clinton was sucking up all the media oxygen and generating dozens of headlines about an intra-party split between the two presidents.

It took Hillary Clinton's campaign a good part of the 2008 primary season to realize the damage that the former president's straight talking, can't-be-muzzled ways could do — after he helped sink his own wife's chances at the presidency in advance of the South Carolina primary by alienating black voters. It took the Obama campaign only one week to learn the same lesson, as Clinton swung wildly between effective surrogate and major headache.

Talking about the economic crisis in Europe and the persistent economic malaise in the United States, Clinton told CBNC that extending the Bush-era tax cuts across the board was "probably the best thing to do right now."

Obama has made raising taxes on upper earners a signature part of his reelection pitch — and Republicans were quick to exploit the daylight between the two Democratic presidents.

"President Obama's plans for a massive tax increase after the election will further harm the economy," Romney's spokeswoman Andrea Saul said. "Don't just take our word for it. Today, former President Bill Clinton endorsed continuing tax relief for job creators — not the tax increase President Obama has in mind."

Clinton made clear in the interview that he wasn't fully endorsing the Republican plan — "the real issue is not whether they should be extended for another few months. The real issue is whether the price the Republican House will put on that extension is the permanent extension of the tax cuts, which I think is an error."

But his office nonetheless Tuesday was emailing out a statement explaining what the former president was meaning to say.

"As President Clinton has said many times before, he supported extending all of the cuts in 2010 as part of the budget agreement, but does not believe the tax cuts for the wealthiest Americans should be extended again. In the interview, he simply said that he doubted that a long-term agreement on spending cuts and revenues would be reached until after the election," Clinton's spokesman, Matt McKenna said in a statement. "Second, on the current condition of the economy, he said at the top of the interview that the main goal for those in Washington was 'to keep the expansion going.' Later, in the interview, he said government spending levels were higher and revenues were lower than they would normally be because there was a recession and we're still living with the aftermath of it. It's obvious since we've had 4.3 million new private sector jobs in the last 27 months that we're not in a recession, even though we'd all like growth to be higher."

Republicans had already pounced.

"Bill Clinton and I disagree on many things, but when it comes to stopping this massive tax hike on Jan. 1, we agree," Sen. Orrin Hatch (R-Utah) said in a statement. "It's my sincere hope that President Clinton's call for action will spur this president to finally lead and prevent the largest tax increase in history."

That's less than a week after Clinton praised Romney's time at Bain — a statement he stood by in the interviews Tuesday — and called the former Massachusetts governor qualified for the presidency, just as the Obama campaign launched a multi-pronged attack on Romney's business background in private equity and corporate buyouts.

Clinton was doing more than just politely disagreeing with the Obama campaign's narrative about Romney's business experience — he was undermining the foundation of the campaign's case against Romney as a candidate.

As expected, those were comments that Republicans were also eager to throw back at Chicago.

"It is time for a leader like Mitt Romney, who — according to President Obama's surrogates — had a 'sterling' business career," Saul said, referring to Clinton.

But if Clinton got an earful from the Obama campaign, he was in no mood to apologize. In an interview Tuesday with PBS, Clinton played down the controversy and said he had never ever seen the Obama campaign's planned Romney attack.

"I didn't have any idea when I was giving that answer that I was wading into some controversy in the campaign," Clinton said. "I haven't seen the ads and I'm not following it and I'm not really part of it."

Despite all outward signs of an improved relationship between Obama and Clinton, there's no love lost between the two presidents, who have never been close.

But Clinton's sudden re-emergence as a major distraction for Team Obama comes just as he seemed ready to settle into the role of elder statesman and beloved Democratic Party regular.

Tuesday's tensions came just one day after a three-stop New York City fundraising tour with Obama in which Clinton fired up party faithful, rallied the base and spoke with the kind of credibility that comes from being the only two-term Democratic president since FDR.

"Remember me? I'm the only guy that gave you four surplus budgets out of the eight I sent," Clinton told supporters at one.

Clinton, for his part, seems unfazed by the waves he has made. In another interview with NBC, Clinton addressed a POLITICO column by Roger Simon that described him as being "out of control."

"I've been aghast by all this flutter about it," Clinton said. "I don't think I should have to criticize Romney personally to disagree with his politics.

"Mr. Simon may think I should be an employee of the campaign, but I'm not," Clinton said.

WSJ

Why Obama Strikes Out In Court

Three unanimous Supreme Court decisions against the government suggest that the administration has a faulty view of federal power.

by Ilya Shapiro

As the world awaits the Supreme Court's ruling on ObamaCare, there's a larger story that the pundits are missing: the court's rejection of the Obama administration's increasingly extreme claims on behalf of unlimited federal power.

This term alone, the high court has ruled unanimously against the government on religious liberty, criminal procedure and property rights. When the administration can't get even a single one of the liberal justices to agree with it in these unrelated areas of the law, that's a sign there's something wrong with its constitutional vision.

Let's take these cases in order:

First, in *Hosanna-Tabor Church v. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission*, the government sued a church school that fired a teacher for violating one of the church's religious tenets: threatening to sue over an employment dispute rather than resolving the disagreement internally. The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission claimed this violated the Americans with Disabilities Act because the firing was related to the teacher's health issues.

The Supreme Court ruled 9-0 in January that punishing a church for failing to retain an unwanted teacher "interferes with the internal governance of the church, depriving the church of control over the selection of those who will personify its beliefs." Such interference, it concluded, violates the First Amendment's Free Exercise and Establishment Clauses.

In *United States v. Jones*, also decided in January, the government claimed the power to attach a GPS device to a suspected drug dealer's car and electronically monitor his movements, all without a warrant. This claim drew opposition not just from the ACLU and the Cato Institute, but from the conservative Rutherford Institute, the liberal Constitution Project and organizations ranging from the Gun Owners of America to the Council on American-Islamic Relations.

While the justices had differing opinions on why this action violated the Fourth Amendment—was it a physical trespass, a violation of privacy expectations, or something else?—all agreed it was unconstitutional. Nevertheless, last week the Justice Department was back in a lower court, using technicalities in *Jones* to claim again (*United States v. Pineda-Moreno*) that it could attach GPS devices without seeking warrants.

Third, in *Sackett v. Environmental Protection Agency*, the government denied the right of property owners to judicial review of an EPA order to stop building a house it claimed was in violation of the Clean Water Act. In March the court unanimously rejected that position. Justice Antonin Scalia, who wrote the opinion, called access to courts the least the government could provide in response to "the strong-arming of regulated parties" by government agencies. "In a nation that values due process, not to mention private property," wrote Justice Samuel Alito in a concurring opinion, the government's "treatment [of the homeowners] is unthinkable."

Later in March, the administration claimed in the ObamaCare case that the government could require people to buy something as a means of regulating a broader national market. And a month later in *Arizona v. United States*, the government said that a federal policy decision regarding immigration enforcement priorities could by itself trump state law—a position that seemed to trouble even Justice Sonia Sotomayor, one of the president's own nominees.

More recently, the Justice Department has been suing states over voter-ID laws. Attorney General Eric Holder makes speeches claiming these laws herald the return of Jim Crow. Never mind that the Supreme Court has found them to satisfy the Voting Rights Act and the Constitution, most recently by 6-3 in *Crawford v. Marion County Election Board* (2008), where plaintiffs claimed that needing a photo-ID placed an undue burden on their right to vote.

The government's arguments across a wide variety of cases would essentially allow Congress and the executive branch to do whatever they wanted without meaningful constitutional restraint. This view is at odds with another unanimous Supreme Court decision, *Bond v. United States* (2011). *Bond* vindicated a criminal defendant's right to challenge the use of federal power to

prosecute her. As Justice Kennedy wrote, "[F]ederalism protects the liberty of the individual from arbitrary power. When government acts in excess of its lawful powers, that liberty is at stake."

If the government loses in the health-care or immigration cases, it won't be because its lawyers had a bad day in court or because the justices ruled based on their political preferences. It will be because the Obama administration continues to make legal arguments that don't pass the smell test.

Mr. Shapiro is a senior fellow at the Cato Institute and editor in chief of the Cato Supreme Court Review.

Roger L. Simon Elizabeth Warren's Profession

It's perhaps a bit mean to liken the hapless Harvard law professor and Massachusetts Democratic U.S. Senate candidate Elizabeth Warren to that other Warren, Kitty — the brothel owner from George Bernard Shaw's *Mrs. Warren's Profession*, described by the playwright as "a genial and fairly presentable old blackguard of a woman." Elizabeth Warren is, after all, rather WASPish in her demeanor, almost prim, despite her risible faux Native American identity pretensions.

Nevertheless, when I read the latest of the endless revelations about Ms. Warren — that she was making scads of cash "flipping" foreclosed homes in Oklahoma (!) – I thought immediately of the Shavian masterpiece and also of Molière and Aristophanes

Elizabeth Warren is a character from classical comedy. She is Il Dottore, the pompous and finally empty-headed blowhard professor from the Commedia dell'Arte.

The pathetic hypocrisy of Warren — who rails against predatory banks and foreclosures while profiting from the same (not to mention pretending she's an Indian) — is obvious enough, reminiscent of Eliot Spitzer busting escort networks and John Edwards preaching about the "two Americas."

But there's more to it — a way in which Elizabeth Warren's profession is strangely close to Shaw's Mrs. Warren's. Just as the prostitute's aim is to mislead and provide illusory comfort through instant gratification, phony love, if you will, Warren and her ilk create false images of concern for the poor and the downtrodden to sooth their consciences, misleading the public and themselves, while preserving the worst of the status quo. ("I'm an Indian too," in the words of Irving Berlin.)

This is the essence of modern liberalism, whose object is to deceive the self or others, hopefully both, for personal gain in money, status, and power. It is neither liberal nor progressive in any intelligible definition of the words, and entirely reactionary. But it has succeeded to a great degree in gulling itself and others, even as the global economy goes into freefall from its very policies.

It gets worse, however. As modern liberalism bleeds into leftist socialism, it begins to border on the perverse. Elites imposing their views on the masses evolves into a more than slightly sadomasochistic societal relationship, turning increasingly sinister as it becomes increasingly non-consensual (socialism into communism). As I wrote <u>earlier</u>, leftism is just a massive form of social sadism that leads to the totalitarian state.

Elizabeth Warren and similar "liberals" are the sometimes witting, sometimes unwitting, *aides de camp* in this transformation. They know what's best for us to such a degree that they are exempt from their own nostrums as well as from the results of their actions.

Warren can be an Indian if she wishes; she can exploit bank foreclosures if she wishes. Eliot Spitzer can bust hookers while employing them and end up with a television show. Who knows — Elizabeth may end up with her own reality show now, her own version of "Flip This House" called "Flip This Tepee"?

It's their profession — modern liberalism. They can be capitalists while the rest of us rot under taxes and government regulation. Socialism for thee but not for me.

And it pays better than the original Mrs. Warren's. You can even get tenure at Harvard, no questions asked. Just check the right identity square. No one will know. And if they suspect, they can't prove anything. After all, ancestors.com only goes so far.

USA Today

Warren needs to apologize to Native Americans

By DeWayne Wickham

In a victory that has all the trappings of a political coronation, <u>Elizabeth Warren</u> emerged from Massachusetts' Democratic Party convention this weekend with enough support to avoid a primary battle for the right to seek the <u>U.S. Senate</u> seat held by Republican <u>Scott Brown</u>.

However, her win could end up being a cause of concern, not celebration, in Boston and Washington, D.C.

With the last-minute backing of <u>Deval Patrick</u>, the state's popular Democratic governor, Warren got the backing of 97.5% of the 3,500 delegates and thus prevented Marisa DeFranco, her only opponent, from having enough support to force a runoff election. But while her victory cleared the last hurdle she faced before competing for the Senate seat once held by liberal icon <u>Edward Kennedy</u>, it left a nagging issue unresolved.

For several years, Warren falsely identified herself as a Native American — a designation that raises serious questions about how such a misrepresentation might have advantaged her in obtaining a professorship at the Harvard Law School at a time when it was being attacked for its lack of diversity.

But when Brown attacked her claim, Democrats rallied their defense and Warren responded with a lot of feisty talk.

'Not backing down'

"If that's all you've got, Scott Brown, I'm ready. And let me be clear. I am not backing down. I didn't get in this race to fold up the first time I got punched," Warren said of her <u>GOP</u> opponent's non-stop efforts to keep this issue before voters.

Brown is a go-along-to-get-along Eastern Republican who kowtows to the GOP's right wing. His voting record ought to offend most Massachusetts voters, who are liberal. But his right-wing ideological rigidity could prove to be less of an issue for a decisive bloc of voters in the Bay State than Warren's identity crisis. Her assertion that family tales and the high cheekbones of some relatives led her to believe she had Native American blood coursing through her veins is laughable. That many Democrats, obsessed with unseating Brown, treat what she did as meaningless is lamentable.

Dogfight of an election

Democrats are in a real dogfight. President Obama, the top of their ticket in November, is in a neck-and-neck race with Mitt Romney, the GOP's White House candidate. And with 23 Democratic and just 10 Republican members of the U.S. Senate up for re-election this year, the GOP has a good chance of winning control of both houses of Congress because the party is expected to retain its solid majority in the House of Representatives.

The <u>Massachusetts Senate</u> race, considered a tossup, could be pivotal. The lingering specter of a white, liberal Democrat who claimed to be a minority in a job where that status could have enhanced her chances for promotion and tenure might decide the outcome of the battle for control of Congress.

That's why Warren must act quickly to put this issue behind her. She needs to apologize to Native Americans, whose struggles for opportunities she minimized by claiming from her position of prestige to be one of them. She should apologize to the supporters of affirmative action for undermining their efforts to bring real diversity to the faculty of Harvard's law school. And in a "come to Jesus" speech to the people of Massachusetts, Warren needs to offer them the kind of contrition that has eluded her when discussing this issue.

Only then, I think, will she be able to turn the focus from her misspeak to Brown's misdeeds in supporting so much of the GOP's right-wing agenda.













