The Phyllis Schlafly Report

Democrats: Where's the Diversity?

By John and Andy Schlafly

October 8, 2019

After a nearly 70-year-old northeastern white woman senator was nominated by the Democrats for president in 2016, Hillary Clinton then went down to a stunning defeat at the hands of Donald Trump. This time liberals promised to turn to their imaginary strength, namely their diversity, in picking their nominee for the upcoming presidential election.

So here we are. Yet the Democrats are rallying behind another 70-year-old dishonest northeastern white woman senator as their nominee, this time Elizabeth Warren.

"When did you first find out you were white?" was the essence of a hilarious question put to Warren earlier this year. After exaggerating her Native American heritage in order to boost her legal career and get on the faculty of Harvard Law School, Warren released a DNA report showing that she has very little Cherokee Indian ancestry.

For Democrats this was supposed to be the year of the African-American candidates, such as Kamala Harris and Cory Booker. Kamala Harris was poised to give us an extra bonanza in diversity, because her mother was from India and her father is from Jamaica, but she has fallen flat as a presidential candidate.

None of these candidates is getting any traction in the Democratic presidential primary. After multiple debates, with another scheduled for next week, it appears that Democrats do not really want to nominate a diversity candidate after all.

Atop the polling and ahead in fundraising is nobody but white candidates: Warren, Biden, Sanders, and Buttigieg. The diversity candidates for the Democratic nomination have all floundered.

Warren's lack of diversity is not the only thing that she has in common with her failed predecessor, Hillary Clinton. Both apparently also have difficulty telling the truth.

Warren has bragged that she climbed her way up from an underprivileged background, describing her father as merely a janitor. But his death certificate lists him

as a flight instructor in the U.S. Army, and his obituary said he was a self-employed businessman.

Elizabeth Warren has made up other things about her background. As candidate Warren she pretends that she lost her job as a public school teacher because she became pregnant.

But in 2008, in a statement captured on video, Warren told a completely different version of why she quit as a teacher. Then she said she wanted to spend a few years at home, and to return to graduate school.

On Monday the Washington Free Beacon ran a story which uncovered the minutes for the Riverdale Board of Education, which show that it unanimously approved an additional two-year contract for Warren. Two months later, the minutes reflect that it was Warren who resigned, which the Board "accepted with regret."

Ultimately she migrated to the ultra-Left culture of liberal law professors, railing against capitalism and free enterprise. Democrats on Wall Street are so uncomfortable with her that they have signaled they will not support her as the nominee.

Meanwhile, some experts have been predicting that Hillary Clinton will reemerge on the grand stage for a rematch of 2016. After all, why settle for the cheap imitation when liberals can have the real deal, Hillary herself?

Trump is trouncing Warren in a recent independent poll of independent voters. It shows Trump leading Warren by 49% to 43%.

This is a marked improvement for Trump over a similar poll last month, when Warren was ahead of Trump by two points among independent voters. Warren does not run as well as Sanders does among independent voters, but Trump now has a comfortable advantage of 4 points over Sanders among this key demographic, too.

Warren, as a liberal law professor from Massachusetts, is not the type of candidate who could pull working class voters away from Trump. He would have a field day at his massive campaign rallies ridiculing Warren's duplicity and her many nutty ideas.

Warren wants to impose an unconstitutional wealth tax on every American who has more than $50 million in assets. Such a tax would cause wealth to flee our country, as it has in European countries which have tried that.

Also, the threshold for the tax would be lowered and lowered, such that before long the middle class would be paying a tax on their assets, too. That would deter savings, discourage investment, and induce Americans to carry more debt.

The biggest appeal of Warren to Democrat voters is her potential electability, but if she is not more electable than Hillary then they would prefer Hillary. The media, too, would like nothing more than a rematch to redeem themselves.

Then we would have a replay of the election of 1956, when stubborn Democrats nominated the very same person who had lost in the prior presidential election, Adlai Stevenson. The Republicans won that rematch just as they had won the first time.

John and Andy Schlafly are sons of Phyllis Schlafly (1924-2016) and lead the continuing Phyllis Schlafly Eagles organizations with writing and policy work.