



Written by [Steve Byas](#) on August 22, 2016

Published in the August 22, 2016 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 32, No. 16

What's Up With Wasserman Schultz?

Representative Debbie Wasserman Schultz (D-Fla.) resigned her post as national chairman of the Democratic National Committee (DNC), just ahead of the Democratic National Convention in late July. Her resignation became necessary in the aftermath of the release of nearly 20,000 e-mails by WikiLeaks, e-mails that revealed the blatant favoritism for Hillary Clinton over Senator Bernie Sanders by the Democratic National Committee under her leadership.



Schultz supported Hillary Clinton over Senator Barack Obama in the 2008 battle for the Democratic Party nomination, but Obama named her national chairman of the DNC in 2011. Her actions in the position have been clearly designed to favor Clinton over Sanders. One glaring example was her scheduling only six debates between the candidates, and putting the debates at times that would be expected to draw smaller audiences, in order to compensate for Hillary's perceived weakness in unscripted debates where she would face "live" scrutiny.

Another criticism of Schultz was in the way she handled the data breach of the Democratic voter database, in which access for Sanders' presidential campaign was shut down. Just before the first caucuses in Iowa, in which Clinton won by the narrowest of margins, the DNC shut down access to its own voter file data for the Sanders campaign. The DNC and the Clinton campaign claimed that the Sanders campaign had stolen Clinton voter file data. An independent investigation confirmed that Sanders' campaign was innocent of the charges, but the ugly accusations may very well have cost Sanders a win in Iowa. As far back as May, MSNBC's Mika Brzezinski even demanded that Schultz resign over her bias in favor of Clinton. The proof of her bias finally came with the release of several e-mails that demonstrated the depths of the anti-Sanders position of the DNC under Schultz.

The e-mail scandal finally led President Obama to tell Schultz it would be best if she stepped down.

In one e-mail, staffer Brad Marshall suggested recruiting a reporter in socially conservative Kentucky or West Virginia to ask Sanders about his religious beliefs. Marshall wrote that it would help Hillary Clinton's campaign with Southern Baptists if Sanders could be outed as an atheist, instead of a practicing Jew. "My Southern Baptist peeps would draw a big difference between a Jew and an atheist," Marshall predicted, adding it was a "Jesus thing."

Amy Dacey, CEO of the DNC, replied, "Amen."

As *The New American* noted on July 26, "Those in leadership positions within the DNC — all the way to the top of the food chain — are not above using religion ... to their own ends, while working in cahoots with reporters who would be willing to do the DNC's bidding and ask Sanders a question designed to embarrass him for Clinton's benefit."

In this, the top staffers at the DNC were certainly following the lead of their boss, Representative



Written by [Steve Byas](#) on August 22, 2016

Published in the August 22, 2016 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 32, No. 16

Schultz, who is facing reelection this year in Florida's 23rd Congressional District. Schultz is certainly willing to use religion in a political way. For example, she once questioned the sincerity of Republicans who support the nation of Israel, arguing that "the Jewish community should be much more confident" in the Democrats' support of Israel than the Republicans'.

Why? According to Schultz, "The very far right group of Republicans' interest in Israel is not because they are supportive of there being a Jewish state and making sure that Jews have a place that we can call home. It has references to Armageddon and biblical references that are more their interest. So I would encourage members of the Jewish community to put their faith in Democrats, because our support for Israel is generally for the right reasons."

Since entering Congress, Schultz has teamed up with Senator Arlen Specter to pass a resolution declaring every May as Jewish American Heritage Month, to recognize "the accomplishments of American Jews" in the "development of American culture." Yet her father admitted that she was not very active in the Jewish community until she entered politics; since getting involved she helped form the National Jewish Democratic Council.

When fellow Florida Congressman Tom Rooney, a former JAG officer in the Army, suggested making attacks against military veterans a hate crime, Schultz expressed anger: "I'm from a state, as Mr. Rooney is, that includes and represents the districts that include *real victims*. [Emphasis added.] I represent a very large — one of the largest — gay populations in the United States of America. One of the largest Jewish populations in the United States of America. My region — our region — has a very large African-American population. It really is belittling of the respect that we should have for these groups to suggest that members of the armed services have somehow systematically been the victims of hate crimes."

This exchange is illustrative of the aggressive and personal attack style for which Schultz has become known, both in her role as a member of the House of Representatives and in chairing the DNC. On *Face the Nation*, Schultz charged, "The Republicans have a plan to end Medicare as we know it. What they would do is they would take the people who are younger than 55 years old today and tell them, 'You know what? You're on your own. Go and find private health insurance in the health-care insurance market.'" Of course no Republican officeholder has ever said anything like, "You know what? You're on your own."

Such less-than-truthful accusations are common with Schultz. In 2014, with polls indicating that the Republicans would do better than the Democrats in the upcoming congressional elections, Schultz, in her role chairing the DNC, was looking to fire up her base. At a meeting of the National Urban League, she issued a dire warning to the group that the Republicans "have told us" that they were going to impeach President Barack Obama. Obviously, the Republicans had not told Schultz or anyone else any such thing. If anything, the Republicans were then, and still are, far too deferential to the president.

And in typical Democrat fashion, Schultz played the "race card" on *Washington Watch*, telling Roland Martin, "You have the Republicans, who want to literally drag us all the way back to Jim Crow laws and literally — and very transparently — block access to the polls to voters who are more likely to vote for Democratic candidates than Republican candidates." She is obviously referring to making voters show IDs when they vote, which she claims is keeping adults from voting, even though voters need IDs for the types of activities Democrats encourage, such as applying for Social Security and welfare.



Written by [Steve Byas](#) on August 22, 2016

Published in the August 22, 2016 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 32, No. 16

This in-your-face style no doubt made her a sought-out guest on the cable news networks that favor bombast over information, and before her fall as a result of the e-mail scandal at the DNC, she had enjoyed a rapid rise as a political office-holder.

Born in Queens, New York, Schultz went to the University of Florida in Gainesville, where she received a bachelor's and a master's in political science.

While in college, she became an aide to Peter Deutsch, a state legislator. When he ran for Congress in 1992, he encouraged her to run for his legislative post, which she did. Upon election at the age of only 26, she was the youngest female legislator in Florida history. After term limits forced her out of office, she became an adjunct instructor in political science at Broward Community College, and was elected to the Florida Senate in 2000. While in the state Senate, she received an award from the Save the Manatee Club for her work in manatee protection.

When her mentor Peter Deutsch ran for the U.S. Senate in 2004, she won his congressional post. In Congress, Schultz has been a reliable vote for progressive causes. Strongly pro-abortion, she is an active supporter of Planned Parenthood; she supports more gun control legislation; and she is a strong advocate for the LGBT community.

Schultz is not just a "social liberal," but a consistent supporter of more government spending, as well. In 2008, she voted for the bailout of the Big Banks, with the TARP legislation.

In fact, Schultz's cumulative "Freedom Index" score is a dismal 15 percent. The Freedom Index is a congressional scorecard based on the fidelity of members of Congress to the U.S. Constitution, and rates congressmen based on their adherence to such constitutional principles as limited government, fiscal responsibility, national sovereignty, and a traditional foreign policy of avoiding foreign entanglements. As can be determined by her low score on the Freedom Index, Debbie Wasserman Schultz is certainly no friend of freedom.

One issue that raises serious questions involving American national sovereignty is that of multilateral trade agreements. Usually called "free trade" agreements, they are actually better termed "managed trade" agreements, and are intended to transfer the power to regulate trade (and eventually other powers, as well) to supranational arrangements. The British public realized this, and opted to leave the European Union (EU) because they found, among other things, the EU was destroying Britain's national sovereignty.

Unfortunately, Schultz usually sides with surrender of American national sovereignty through these so-called free trade deals. Perhaps the most significant vote cast by Representative Schultz in this area was in 2005, when she voted against the effort of Congressman Ron Paul of Texas and Congressman Bernie Sanders of Vermont to have the United States withdraw from the World Trade Organization (WTO). While portrayed by its supporters as a "free trade" agreement, the WTO is in reality an international bureaucracy that manages trade and imposes its rulings on member nations including the United States — even when those rulings contradict U.S. laws. In fact, U.S. membership in the WTO is unconstitutional, since under our Constitution Congress, not an international body, is given the power to "regulate foreign commerce."

For example, the Country of Origin Labeling Amendment (COOL) repealed a 1946 law that required labeling of the country of origin for beef, chicken, and pork sold in the United States. This repeal complied with a ruling of the WTO. As Congressman Thomas Massie of Kentucky asked during the



Written by [Steve Byas](#) on August 22, 2016

Published in the August 22, 2016 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 32, No. 16

debate, “What is the World Trade Organization, and who are they to tell Congress what laws we have to pass?”

In this instance, Schultz correctly voted in opposition to repealing the country of origin labeling law.

Interestingly, Schultz voted during the Bush years to deny him “fast track authority,” while voting to give such power to the president of her own party, President Obama. This “fast track authority” requires Congress to expedite consideration of presidentially negotiated trade pacts without offering amendments. This is yet another example of Congress’ willingness to surrender a portion of its constitutional powers to the executive branch.

Another very serious issue facing America is that of immigration. On this issue, Schultz is consistent in her support for immigration, legal and illegal. Incredibly, just last year, the DNC under Schultz’s leadership faced criticism and the filing of a complaint with the Federal Election Commission by Judicial Watch over its “knowingly” having “hired a foreign national” who is an illegal alien, Cindy Nava, “to help craft the party’s message to Hispanics, women, and children.”

Judicial Watch’s specific complaint was that this is a violation of the Code of Federal Regulations, which states: “A foreign national shall not direct, dictate, control, or directly or indirectly participate in the decision-making process of any person, such as a ... political committee ... with regard to such person’s Federal or non-Federal election-related activities, such as decisions concerning the making of contributions, donations, expenditures, or disbursements in connection with elections for any Federal, State, or local office or decision concerning the administration of a political committee.”

In addition, it is against federal law to knowingly hire an illegal alien for any job, but Schultz said they were “extremely proud to have Cindy on our team at the DNC. Her story is an inspiration for all of us about what immigrant youth can achieve despite their undocumented status.”

This utter disrespect for federal law in this area is reflected in Schultz’s voting record over many years. When the U.S. House adopted a resolution in March of this year to authorize the speaker of the house to present an *amicus curiae* (aka “friend of the court”) in the case of the *United States et al. v. Texas*, “and to file a brief in support of the position that the [Obama administration has] acted in a manner that is not consistent with his duties under the Constitution of the United States,” she voted no.

This effort, to which Schultz voted no, was in regard to the case brought by 26 states against the Obama administration for its November 2014 executive actions that would defer deportation and provide work permits for illegal immigrants. As Representative Ted Poe (R-Texas) explained, “This unprecedented, unilateral action by the executive branch was a nullification of immigration law of the United States. And it was not done by Congress. It was done by administrative edict that came from the White House.”

In her first year in the House, Schultz voted against a bill that provided for the authorization of 700 miles of security fence to be built along parts of the U.S.-Mexican border, made unlawful entry into the United States a criminal rather than a civil offense, and increased penalties for immigration-related crimes.

Representative Schultz has voted repeatedly to increase the national debt of the U.S. government, and she voted against extending the Bush tax cuts in 2012. Schultz voted in opposition to repealing the “death” tax, or estate tax. This cruel tax discourages upward mobility in America’s middle class by



Written by [Steve Byas](#) on August 22, 2016

Published in the August 22, 2016 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 32, No. 16

making it prohibitively expensive to pass on a family business or farm to one's descendants.

Another area in which Schultz has been consistent is in her votes against the operations of the free market. In 2011, she voted to phase out incandescent light bulbs that range from 40 to 100 watts. Of course, the Congress has no constitutional authority to establish efficiency standards that would prevent the production, distribution, and consumer purchase of a previously perfectly acceptable and universally used product, such as the incandescent light bulb.

In 2009, Schultz voted for the "Cash for Clunkers" program, which spent \$4 billion so that rebates of up to \$4,500 could be given to consumers who traded in their old cars for more fuel-efficient ones. The vehicles traded in were destroyed, which of course led to a shortage of lower-priced used cars for poorer individuals. In 2008, Schultz voted for a bill to permit states to sue retailers who have supposedly been "price gouging" for fuels sold in areas where there was an energy emergency. The bill would have permitted civil and criminal penalties for price gouging. Of course, this violates basic free market economics in which supply and demand take care of these types of situations. The federal government should not dictate prices in the private sector, under any circumstances.

The reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank in 2012 won Schultz's support. The bank issues loans and loan guarantees to foreign governments or companies for the purchase of U.S. products. Again, the federal government has no constitutional authority to use taxpayer money to provide loans and terms that the private sector has deemed too risky to provide. It is clearly a case of corporate welfare, not free enterprise.

Not surprisingly, Schultz has consistently supported so-called hate crimes legislation. For example, in 2009, she supported an expansion of federal hate crimes laws to include crimes that are based on sexual orientation, gender, or physical or mental disability. (Current law covers crimes based on race, color, religion, or national origin.) This bill would allow for harsher sentencing for individuals who commit violent crimes because of politically incorrect hateful motives. But aren't all violent crimes committed with a hateful motive?

In the area of foreign policy, Schultz tends to favor foreign involvements, if conducted by a president of her party. In 2011, an effort was made to direct President Obama "pursuant to ... the War Powers Resolution, to remove the United States Armed Forces from Libya." The War Powers Resolution bars the president from militarily engaging the armed forces for more than 60 days without congressional approval. Obama had not sought congressional approval for undertaking the military action in Libya. As Congressman Dennis Kucinich (D-Ohio) noted, "In the weeks leading up to the war, the administration had time to consult with the Arab League, the United Nations, the African Union, but apparently had not time to come to Congress for approval." Schultz voted against Kucinich's modest effort to rein in presidential war power.

Not every vote of Debbie Wasserman Schultz has been bad, of course. After all, she did vote correctly 15 percent of the time. One good vote was an effort to bar funding, after 2014, for U.S. forces in Afghanistan. Enacted in 2001, after September 11, the Authorization for Use of Military Force (AUMF) has been invoked numerous times by the executive branch for U.S. military intervention not only in Afghanistan but elsewhere. And also in 2014, Schultz voted to prohibit the indefinite military detention of any person detained under the AUMF inside the borders of the United States, its territories, or possessions by providing for the immediate transfer to a trial and proceedings by a court.



Written by [Steve Byas](#) on August 22, 2016

Published in the August 22, 2016 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 32, No. 16

But for the most part, Representative Schultz can be expected to vote against limitations on government power, against the free market, and for more government spending. She is a reliable internationalist, environmentalist, and a dedicated radical on social issues, where she can be expected to favor abortion on demand, same-sex “marriage,” and attacks upon religious liberty.



Written by [Steve Byas](#) on August 22, 2016

Published in the August 22, 2016 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 32, No. 16

Subscribe to the New American

Get exclusive digital access to the most informative,
non-partisan truthful news source for patriotic Americans!

Discover a refreshing blend of time-honored values, principles and insightful perspectives within the pages of "The New American" magazine. Delve into a world where tradition is the foundation, and exploration knows no bounds.

From politics and finance to foreign affairs, environment, culture, and technology, we bring you an unparalleled array of topics that matter most.



Subscribe

What's Included?

- 24 Issues Per Year
- Optional Print Edition
- Digital Edition Access
- Exclusive Subscriber Content
- Audio provided for all articles
- Unlimited access to past issues
- Coming Soon! Ad FREE
- 60-Day money back guarantee!
- Cancel anytime.