

## Fear And Whining In Los Angeles

On July 10 the *Los Angeles Times* posted an article by Hector Tobar in which he whined about Arizona daring to defend its borders. To “prove” his point about the evil of white Americans, he hid behind his mother’s skirt, using her recent trip to Arizona as an excuse to warn about racial profiling. Because of copyright restrictions I cannot repeat his entire article here, but it can be found at:

<http://www.latimes.com/news/local/la-me-0711-tobar-20100710,0,4469008,full.column>

Even the title of Tobar’s article, “An Immigrant’s Trip to Arizona,” gives away his viewpoint. His mother is a naturalized U.S. citizen. Why, therefore, was it not merely “A Trip to Arizona” or a “Californian’s Trip to Arizona?”

Tobar states that his mother has a U.S. passport; thus she eventually became a naturalized citizen. That is all well and good. But did he tell his readers whether she arrived in the United States legally or illegally? No. Why did he omit that information? If she entered the country illegally, she has no right to complain about being criticized for having broken the law; if she entered the country legally she should be angry that others are not being made to follow the rules she followed. (It is worth noting that a majority of the Hispanics in the United States who are either citizens or legal immigrants *support* Arizona’s new law—which is similar to a Missouri law that has been in effect for several years. Why haven’t Obama and Holder filed a legal challenge against Missouri’s law?)

Tobar wrote that his mother was concerned about how she would be treated because of the new Arizona law, but the law does not go into effect until the end of July—and she has already returned from her trip. Her “concern,” and his writing about it, suggests that both he and his mother are looking for a problem where it does not exist.

He notes, “She had heard that Arizona police could detain anyone they suspect of being undocumented—presumably anyone, like her, who had an accent.” (She probably “heard” that from Obama, who incorrectly and irresponsibly said in April that families “going out for ice cream” could be stopped by the police for “looking Hispanic.”) With his statement, Tobar is *intentionally* misrepresenting the new Arizona law—that law that doesn’t even go into effect for a few more weeks—by suggesting that having an accent is probable cause for being stopped by the police. That is not accurate, and he is purposely promoting fear with misstatements to promote an open-borders, amnesty-for-undocumented-Democrats agenda.

“*No se preocupe*,” she told him. (“Don’t worry.”) I would suggest that having an accent is not as much a problem as not routinely speaking English after being in the United States for 47 years. I suggest that his mother can readily avoid issues with the police simply by speaking English with them in response to any questions they have—in the unlikely event that she is stopped. How many police do Tobar and his mother think are in the United States? There are perhaps as many as 20 million illegal immigrants in the country. The odds of most of them being stopped by the police are minimal—unless they

are engaged in suspicious behavior or criminal activity. (I have the suspicion, however, that if Mama Tobar is ever stopped by the police her response may be on the confrontational side: “*Do you know who I am? Do you know that my son writes for the Los Angeles Times? You are going to be in a lot of trouble, I can tell you that!*” (Note to police officers: keep the video camera focused on her at all times. You will need it after she sics the ALCU and La Raza on you.)

Tobar ridicules the whites who tell her mother, “You’re only going to be stopped if you’re breaking the law!” But that is, of course, a correct statement (at least in the case of the vast majority of police officers—and those who abuse their authority no doubt abuse it with legal citizens as well) and it applies not only to immigration laws but to all laws. There is, after all, something called “probable cause.” Tobar should look it up. “Probable cause” is *not* simply visiting Cathedral Rock without blonde hair and blue eyes, as his mother did. “Probable cause” is driving a stolen car without a license, not speaking English, and having 10 Mexicans in your trunk.

Most Americans understand that the Arizona police are likely to be *overly cautious* in following the new law. After all, they certainly know that leftist groups have their ambulance chasers at the ready, eager to pounce and file a lawsuit at the drop of a sombrero. (Sorry, I couldn’t resist that.) You can bet your bottom peso (I couldn’t resist that either.) that the first instance of a *legal* immigrant or a U.S. citizen of Hispanic ancestry being stopped by the police without justification will be met with howls of protest from Democrats (who have illegal immigrant housekeepers). And from the tone of Tobar’s article, I would not be surprised if he breaks one of his own headlights the next time he drives into Arizona in order to force a police stop and provide an excuse for filing a multimillion dollar racial profiling lawsuit.

The righteous Tobar provides a list of principles from his mother. (“Learn the language,” “Obey and respect the law,” “Be careful of the image you project...” and others.) The list is admirable, and she deserves praise if she has followed them. If most immigrants did the same, perhaps we would not have an immigration issue today. (But, again, I’d like to know if Tobar’s mother entered the United States legally; if not, she broke her own principle number two.)

Tobar does not stop at simple accusations of Hispanic-phobia. No, he also does not like the term “protect our border.” Does not Guatemala protect its borders? Does not Mexico? Do not most nations? I encourage him to invent a new phrase—although I am quite sick of political correctness. (Even the term “undocumented worker” has become passé. One federal agency has used the term “displaced foreign traveler, while Secretary of Homeland Security Janet “Butch” Napolitano now cautiously refers to illegal immigrants as “undocumented asylum seekers”—even though the legal term asylum does not apply to persons fleeing their home country for purely economic reasons. Perhaps Napolitano also refers to bank robbers as “ineligible withdrawal initiators.”) But unless and until a better term than “protect the borders” comes along, Tobar should shut up and not criticize legal U.S. citizens for wanting to avoid spending hundreds of billions of dollars every year on welfare benefits, food stamps, subsidized housing, reduced tuition, and free

medical care for illegal immigrants. Tabor no doubt considers such concerns about tax dollars “racist.” But most Americans have no problem with *legal* immigrants; they resent providing financial support for *illegal* immigrants. Americans do not want “Anglos” entering the United States illegally either. Nor do they want the drugs or gang members that come across the border.

Yes, Tabor, we *do* want the border “protected”—and our homes, our automobiles, our neighborhoods, our jobs, our banks, our jewelry stores, and our daughters. It’s not as though Americans have not been given good reasons for wanting the border protected. (It is, after all, not Mexican physicians and professors and captains of industry who wade across the Rio Grande with wire cutters, leaving trails of dirty diapers, syringes, and water bottles behind them. And don’t even get me started on the issue of Iran-sponsored Hizbullah terrorists making their way into the United States via Mexico, more than a few of whom have been captured sporting tattoos written in the Farsi language.)

Tabor’s mother complains, “And now if I don’t have my passport with me, I feel scared.” But as a U.S. citizen she has nothing to fear if she does not break the law. As far as requiring that legal immigrants and foreign visitors “carry papers,” that has been part of federal law for *decades*—it is *not* something newly-created by Arizona’s law. Under *existing* federal law all immigrants and foreign visitors are *required* to carry proper documentation with them at all times. (Try taking a trip to Europe, traveling from country to country without any documentation, and see how far you get.)

“Those who aren’t citizens, her Mexican-born friends told her, fear being deported and separated from their U.S.-born children.” No illegal immigrants who are deported must necessarily be separated from their children—they can take their children to Mexico with them. But if they are concerned about separation issues, they should have thought of that *before* they entered the United States illegally and had their “anchor babies” at a near-border hospital. Americans who enter Mexico illegally and have children there would face the same problems. *Newsflash: Actions have consequences. Illegal actions sometimes have severe consequences. Such is life— regardless of the country from which one comes.*

“I’ve never been a person with a complex,” states his mother, “But this new law makes me feel sad.” From the tone of Tabor’s article, it seems as though both of them have a complex. Frankly, it reads like Michelle Obama’s Princeton thesis: “*Oh, woe is me... the entire world is against me. Blah, blah, blah. Now give me my Ivy-League college degree even though I can write no better than a ninth-grader.*”

Tabor and his mother need to get over it. The simple truth is that most white people in the United States, including residents of Arizona, do *not* look at every black and Hispanic they pass on the street with fear and loathing. They are too busy living their lives and, quite frankly, they probably don’t even pay any attention to most of them—any more than they pay much attention to the white Americans they pass on the street.

*In other words, Tobar and his mother are not as special as they think they are...*

*Don Fredrick*  
*July 18, 2010*