

In Support Of Discrimination

In what was a strong rebuke of Obama and Attorney General Eric Holder, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled on May 26 that individual states have the right to revoke the licenses of businesses that knowingly employ illegal immigrants. In a 5–3 decision the Justices upheld Arizona’s 2007 law, asserting that the state is within its rights to enforce such an immigration requirement. The Obama administration argued that Arizona was restricted by the “supremacy clause” of the U.S. Constitution:

“This Constitution, and the Laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof; and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land; and the judges in every state shall be bound thereby, anything in the constitution or laws of any state to the contrary notwithstanding.”

Liberals have long argued that this means the federal government can pretty much do anything it wants and the states must be subservient, but the clause means only that where there is a *conflict* between federal law and state law, federal law takes precedence. (Liberals also typically ignore the phrase “...which shall be made in pursuance thereof;” which means that only those laws which are *constitutional* are the supreme law of the land. If a federal law is *unconstitutional*—and there are many, such as ObamaCare—it not only cannot preempt state law, it can be ignored by the state.) Chief Justice John Roberts wrote for the majority: “Because we conclude that the state’s licensing provisions fall squarely within the federal statute’s savings clause and that the Arizona regulation does not otherwise conflict with federal law, we hold that the Arizona law is not preempted.”

This important ruling establishes a precedent that will no doubt give fits to Obama and his collectivist comrades. To no one’s surprise the dissenting Justices were Stephen Breyer, Ruth Bader Ginsberg, and Obama appointee Sonia Sotomayor. Obama appointee Elena Kagan recused herself from the decision because of her related work as Solicitor General. (Kagan would no doubt have voted with the minority if she had been given the opportunity, and I would have placed a large bet that she would not have recused herself if she thought she would be the swing vote.)

Justice Breyer wrote in the dissenting opinion that the ruling will cause employers to discriminate against certain job applicants. *Read that again: the ruling will cause employers to discriminate against certain job applicants.*

Here’s a note to the dim-witted Breyer: *that is precisely the point of the Arizona law*—to insure that employers do *not* hire illegal immigrants. In other words, it is *legal* for employers to *discriminate* against illegal immigrants in their hiring practices.

I can’t speak for anyone else, but I am personally very much *in favor of discrimination*. For example, I think day care centers *should* discriminate against child molesters in their hiring practices. I believe that restaurants should not be forced to hire tuberculosis

sufferers who cough on the food; banks should not have to hire former bank robbers; the TSA should not hire perverts to screen airline passengers (although it has been shown that it does); NBA teams should be allowed to discriminate against short people; and Wal-Mart should be free to say “No thanks” to lepers who apply for jobs as greeters.

Further, I think attractive people should be free to discriminate against ugly people when they seek dates; all-you-can-eat restaurants should be free to charge Michael Moore and Rosie O’Donnell higher prices; rifle ranges should be free to keep blind people away from their arsenals; and airlines with 42-inch aisles should be free not to hire flight attendants who are 43 inches wide.

While many would argue that people discriminate too much, I would argue that we discriminate *far too little*.

To “discriminate” is not evil or immoral; it is only to differentiate or make distinctions between objects, tasks, and values. If a man marries a woman instead of another man, he is “discriminating against” a male spouse. If he marries a thin, attractive woman, he is discriminating against fat, ugly women. If a woman buys a red Ford rather than a white Buick, she is discriminating against white Buicks.

Each of us engages in thousands of acts of “discrimination” every day. We discriminate in favor of fresh bread and against stale bread at the bakery; we discriminate against the horror movie in favor of the romantic comedy (or vice versa) at the theater; we typically discriminate against walking and in favor of driving; and we discriminate against MSNBC because, well, it’s the logical thing to do.

The problem is not that people discriminate. Discrimination is not only a good thing, *it is a requirement of life*. (We discriminate against poisonous mushrooms, for example.) The problem is that some people discriminate for the wrong reasons. To have voted against Obama because he is half-black is unfair discrimination. To have voted for Obama because he is half-black is also unfair discrimination. In either case, the decision was based on a factor that is not relevant to the issue. On the other hand, to have voted for or against Obama because you agree or disagree with his fundamental view of mankind and his political philosophies *is* discrimination—but it is *fair* discrimination based on reasoning rather than emotion.

From my perspective, America is in decline partly because *too many people are reluctant to discriminate*. There is no sound reason to make an 87-year-old grandmother remove her shoes before letting her board a plane. There is no sound reason to frisk a six-year-old girl and take away her treasured teddy bear for a close examination. But we should “discriminate” against young Middle Eastern men who wear beards, act suspiciously, and sit reading the latest issue of “72 Virgins” before they board a plane. To not do so puts lives in danger. Is paying closer attention to bearded Muslims than to old ladies in wheelchairs fair? No. So what. Life is not fair. If you are a Muslim, persuade your fellow Muslims not to slice off the heads of Jewish journalists—then you can keep your shoes on.

Political correctness has made Americans afraid to judge *anything*, and that carries far more potential for disastrous consequences than not hiring someone because the Social Security number on his job application did not have a match on the E-Verify system. A mistake caused by mistyping a nine-digit number can be corrected a lot more easily than the World Trade Centers can be rebuilt. (While we're mentioning Social Security numbers, it is worth noting that Obama himself would not make it past the E-Verify system. His most recent Social Security number—it appears that he has used more than one over the years—was issued to a man in Connecticut in 1977 when Obama was a high school student in Hawaii. Note to GOP presidential candidates: it is not racial discrimination to ask how Obama got a Social Security number whose 042 code represents a state where he never lived or worked; it is exposing felony fraud.)

Because of political correctness and a reluctance by the U.S. Army to engage in reasonable and appropriate discrimination, Major Nidal Malik Hasan murdered 14 innocent people—yes, I'm counting the unborn child of a pregnant victim—while yelling, "Allahu Ahkbar." Rather than buy furniture for his barren apartment, Hasan donated large sums of money to groups that are known for funneling cash to terrorist organizations. He even gave an on-the-job PowerPoint presentation that in itself should have prompted an investigation of his activities. Justifiable discrimination prompted by those facts would have saved 14 lives. We *should* discriminate against people who attend mosques where radical imams preach jihad and who carry business cards that read, "Soldier of Allah."

We *should* discriminate against an Ohio Muslim who attends a radical mosque and whose 17-year-old daughter, Rifqa Bary, fled to Florida because she converted to Christianity and feared she would be killed by her father for her apostasy. (For the record, her father's imam is a "jihad buddy" of Nidal Hasan's imam.) We should not have so feared charges of religious discrimination that a Florida judge returned Rifqa to Ohio—where she was kept under lock and key and was prevented from seeing her friends. We should care more about protecting the life of a young girl than hurting the feelings of Muslim Americans—who understand their own culture enough to know that her father might have killed her. (Did the Florida judge not know the story of the girl in Arizona who was run over by her Muslim father because she had become too "Westernized?" What did he think would happen when he moved to the United States? Don't Muslims expect to "Islamize" Westerners who relocate to the Middle East?)

Speaking of Florida, what about the recent Tampa "honor killing" of Fatima Abdallah, whose parents somehow convinced politically-correct (or incredibly stupid) authorities that her brutal death was the result of her flinging herself on a coffee table? (Read the details at AtlasShrugs.com* and then tell me why we should not be critical of suspicious deaths in Muslim-American households.) If I were a Tampa voter, I would certainly remember to "discriminate" against every elected official involved in the cover-up of that murder.

My humble advice:

We *should discriminate* against politicians who lie.

We *should discriminate* against a media that covers up the lies of politicians.

We *should discriminate* against men who want to have sex with young children.

We *should discriminate* against those who place a crucifix in a jar of urine and demand tax dollars to support their “art.”

We *should discriminate* against illegal immigrants who do not follow the laws that the legal immigrants from their countries follow.

We *should discriminate* against stores that refuse to use the words Christmas or Hanukkah but advertise sales celebrating Eid ul-Adha (Festival of Sacrifice) and Eid ul-Fitr (Festival at the Conclusion of Ramadan fasting).

We *should discriminate* against those who feel the need to rename Easter Eggs “Spring Spheres.”

We *should discriminate* against officials who believe flying the flag of the United States on school property is “provocative.”

We *should discriminate* against singers Rihanna and Britney Spears for singing about “S&M” while dancing around stripper poles on prime time Sunday night television.

To discriminate is to make a judgment based on a rational observation of reality. To discriminate is to judge. But we have been taught to be afraid to judge, and *that has screwed up our nation*. (“Judge not, that ye be not judged” does *not* mean one should never judge. The message is that we should judge, but we should do so righteously: “Thou hypocrite, first cast out the beam out of thine own eye; and then shalt thou see clearly to cast out the mote out of thy brother’s eye.”)

Afraid to tell little Johnny he failed the test because it might “harm his fragile self-esteem,” we give him an “A” for effort—rewarding him for not having applied much effort. Afraid to upset those who graduated at the bottom of their class, we fail to applaud the young woman or man who graduated at the very top—giving every student a reason not to excel. Afraid to say, “Men should not use women’s restrooms,” we place all women at risk. Afraid to harm sensitive egos, we come up with ludicrous “hate crime” legislation that make everyone afraid to *say* anything, while excusing *real* crimes—like “honor killings.” Afraid to assign convicted felons to overpopulated prisons, we opt to let them loose on the street to commit even more crimes.

This is *not* an accident. It is the result of intentional actions to tear down society, to degrade it to such a level that *sound reasoning and proper judgment are eliminated*. Then, when a majority of individuals become afraid or even incapable of reasoning, they

will rely increasingly on the government to make their decisions for them. *That is the goal.* When problems arise fewer Americans will have the ability to resolve them on their own. More Americans will demand that the government “*Do something!*” It is *that* response which will seal the fate of the United States of America because, out of fear, the citizens will increasingly consent to *anything*— even the loss of fundamental liberties. *That* is what the leftists have planned. *That* is what Rahm Emanuel meant by “Never let a crisis go to waste.”

It happened in Germany in 1933, and it can happen again.

We can avoid it only by *discriminating...* by *choosing* reason over emotion, by *choosing* essential liberties over temporary safeties, and by *choosing* individual rights over government control and power.

Don Fredrick
May 27, 2011

*http://atlasshrugs2000.typepad.com/atlas_shrugs/2011/05/former-prosecutor-on-the-honor-killing-of-fatima-abdallah-this-woman-was-beaten-with-a-vengeance-aut.html