Liberals, Trayvon Martin, And Black Envy

I have always thought that many white liberals suffer from "black envy," and that belief has been confirmed by the media coverage and the Internet postings about the shooting of Trayvon Martin on February 26.

I do not know all the facts of the situation—and neither does anyone else. The police department of Sanford, Florida is certainly under no obligation to provide me with the official report from their ongoing investigation. I assume they have information that has not been released to the media, and that may only see the light of day if criminal charges are placed against George Zimmerman, the man who shot Martin. But some information seems to have been leaked to the Orlando Sentinel¹, which related, "He [Zimmerman] said he was on his way to the grocery store when he spotted Trayvon walking through his gated community. Trayvon was visiting his father's fiancée, who lived there. He had been suspended from school in Miami after being found with an empty marijuana baggie. ... On Feb. 26, when Zimmerman first spotted Trayvon, he called police and reported a suspicious person, describing Trayvon as black, acting strangely and perhaps on drugs. Zimmerman got out of his SUV to follow Trayvon on foot. When a dispatch employee asked Zimmerman if he was following the 17-year-old, Zimmerman said yes. The dispatcher told Zimmerman he did not need to do that." (Note that the newspaper account refers to Zimmerman using his last name but uses Martin's first name. That discrepancy may be intentional, along with the media's decision to post a photograph of a cherubiclooking Martin that was taken perhaps five years earlier, while Zimmerman's photograph is decidedly mug-shot-like.)

The Sentinel continues, "There is about a one-minute gap during which police say they're not sure what happened. Zimmerman told them he lost sight of Trayvon and was walking back to his SUV when Trayvon approached him from the left rear, and they exchanged words. Trayvon asked Zimmerman if he had a problem. Zimmerman said no and reached for his cell phone, he told police. Trayvon then said, 'Well, you do now' or something similar and punched Zimmerman in the nose, according to the account he gave police. Zimmerman fell to the ground and Trayvon got on top of him and began slamming his head into the sidewalk, he told police. Zimmerman began yelling for help. Several witnesses heard those cries, and there has been a dispute about whether they came from Zimmerman or Trayvon. Lawyers for Trayvon's family say it was Trayvon, but police say their evidence indicates it was Zimmerman. One witness, who has since talked to local television news reporters, told police he saw Zimmerman on the ground with Trayvon on top, pounding him—and was unequivocal that it was Zimmerman who was crying for help. Zimmerman then shot Trayvon once in the chest at very close range, according to authorities. When police arrived less than two minutes later, Zimmerman was bleeding from the nose, had a swollen lip and had bloody lacerations to the back of his head."

Martin happened to be black, while Zimmerman happens to have a white father and an Hispanic mother—all of which may be largely or even totally irrelevant to the situation. *The New York Times* coined the term "white Hispanic" to describe Zimmerman,

apparently in an effort to ensure that animosity was properly ginned up against every (non-Democrat) white and Hispanic person residing in the United States—especially those living south of the Mason-Dixon Line. One can readily suspect that if Martin and Zimmerman (who is a registered Democrat) were both black, or both white, or both Hispanic, there would have been no uproar and no media onslaught, and certainly Barack "Teachable Moment" Obama would not have been telling us how much the victim looks like the son he never had. (Would Obama's son have a gold "grill" in his mouth, and tattoos, and use the Twitter name, "@no_limit_nigga?" Or would Obama first check with the Turkish prime minister to see if those accoutrements and handle are permissible?²)

Knowing only what I know from media reports, it appears that both Martin and Zimmerman acted unwisely. The altercation could probably have been avoided by either of them. Instead, emotions likely overruled reason and the result was a terrible tragedy. But tragedies occur every day in the United States. Over the St. Patrick's Day weekend in Chicago there were a reported 40 shootings in which 10 people were killed. One must assume that in those incidents people also acted unwisely and emotions overruled reason. But the media did not descend on Chicago to express outrage, race hustlers Al Sharpton and Jesse "you're blocking the camera" Jackson did not show up to incite violence (Jackson told a Florida gathering, "Martyrs have power. ... He represents all of us. ... How do we go from a moment to a movement that creates fundamental change? If it's a moment, we go home. If it's a movement, we go to war. Movements are made of serious substance. ... There is power in the blood of the innocent"), and Obama did not comment on how the Chicago victims resembled him. White-on-black violence provokes national outrage—even without knowledge of all the facts—yet black-on-black violence is strangely acceptable. Obama's attorney general, Eric "my people" Holder is on a mission to block the states from daring to require that voters present photo I.D. on election day, yet as the nation's top law enforcement official he has done nothing to address inner-city violence in places like Chicago, New York City, Los Angeles, Detroit, or Washington, D.C. (Photo I.D. is required, by the way, to enter the Department of Justice building where Holder works.)

Nation of Islam leader Louis Farrakhan contributed by stating, "Where there is no justice, there will be no peace. Soon, and very soon, the law of retaliation may ...be applied." Mikhail Muhammad, head of the New Black Panther Party, has offered a \$10,000 reward for the capture of Zimmerman and said he "should be fearful for his life. ...If the government won't do the job, we'll do it." Spike Lee offered his assistance by making public Zimmerman's home address and telephone number. (Liberals were eager to blame the shooting of an Arizona Congresswoman on nothing more than a crosshairs symbol on Sarah Palin campaign literature, but Lee is no doubt considered only to be seeking "healing.") Jesse Jackson also sought to "ease tensions" by declaring, "Blacks are under attack. ...Targeting, arresting, convicting blacks and ultimately killing us is big business."

Merely repeating the statements of Farrakhan and Muhammad and pointing out that Sharpton and Jackson are race pimps will no doubt get me branded as a racist. (What exactly *does* Jackson do for a living?) I am used to that, of course, as my maintenance of *The Obama Timeline* routinely prompts angry emails from liberals who call me a racist and a Nazi, and who proclaim that my mother should have aborted me. The venom (and foul language) in those emails and threats is remarkable, but the anger I have seen in the messages about the Martin shooting is almost beyond comprehension. To point out that Martin is 17 years old, not 12, and about six feet tall angers the liberals. To note that he had been suspended from school because of drugs angers the liberals. To relate that a witness insisted that Martin was beating Zimmerman angers the liberals. To mention that Zimmerman was calling out for help angers the liberals. In the minds of many liberals the situation is clear cut: Martin was black and Zimmerman is not; therefore Zimmerman is guilty; Zimmerman was on a mission to kill the first black he could find; the Sanford Police Department is obviously full of racists who are covering for Zimmerman; the witness is clearly lying; Florida is full of racists because it is in the South; and, "Thank God Obama was elected or McCain would have sanctioned the murder of every black in the nation!"

The crazed rantings I have seen about the Martin shooting are long on emotion and short on reason. I don't know if Zimmerman is a racist. I don't know if Martin was a racist. I don't know Florida law, but if Zimmerman is charged and convicted of anything the penalty will not be enough to make liberals happy. The question is, "Why are liberals so fired up about this particular issue?" There are two answers. First, they know that Obama cannot win reelection based on his record. Obama can win only if his political base is motivated. But black voters know that their economic situation has not been made better by Obama. In fact, for most of them it has been made worse. If 10 percent of the blacks who voted for him in 2008 stay home on election day, he cannot win reelection. How, then, can they be encouraged to vote for four more years of incompetence? With fear. By fanning the race flames, a message can be sent to the black voters: "Obama and Holder are the only people standing between you and Republicans who do not care if you are gunned down in the streets." That such a claim is absurd is irrelevant. (It is, in fact, Democrat policies that for decades have kept many blacks-and many whites and Hispanics—in poverty, but community activists do not succeed when they appeal to reason. They are trained to appeal to emotion.)

Do not think that the reporter's question to Obama about the Martin shooting was unplanned. Do not think that Obama's response was not well thought out and rehearsed. Obama remarked, "When I think about this boy, I think about my own kids. I think every parent in America should be able to understand why it is absolutely imperative that we investigate every aspect of this. And that everybody pull together, federal state and local, to figure out exactly how this tragedy happened. ...Obviously, this is a tragedy. I can only imagine what these parents are going through. All of us have to do some soul searching to figure out how something like this has happened." Why does Obama state that "all of us" have some soul searching to do? Does Obama believe that guilt should be assigned to anyone *not* involved in the incident? Or to *all* Americans? Why? Are 310 million Americans responsible for the actions of others? Exactly what are they supposed to be "searching their souls" for? The statement was intentionally planned by Obama to induce feelings of "white guilt'—the same feelings that won him millions of votes in 2008 and that he sees slipping away in 2012. Obama wants... in fact, he *needs* white

voters to feel guilty about the Martin shooting, so they can atone for their sin of whiteness by voting for him in November. That is why liberals are expressing such outrage over the Martin shooting. *They know Obama needs their help*.

The other reason for the outrage is that white liberals have feelings of "black envy." The history of blacks in the United states is one of struggle. Yet the history of the modern American white liberal does not involve struggle. It is a history of privilege, with parents who went through the Great Depression and fought in World War II and who then gave their children everything they could have wanted: a roof over their heads, food on the table, a college education, the likelihood of a job in an office rather than in a coal mine, vacations at Disney World, and a Toyota Prius in the garage. Today's liberal, indoctrinated in Marxism by his college professors, vehemently believes in "class struggle" but feels guilty because his life has, in fact, *not been a struggle at all*.

The liberal, therefore, feels guilty. He cannot claim to have been "beaten down by the man" because he was not. He cannot claim that his ancestors were slaves because they were not. He cannot claim that the cards are stacked against him because they are not. What he *should* feel is gratitude for having been born in the United States, where he has far more potential to succeed than anywhere else in the world. But that is inconsistent with Marxism, so he has to prove that he is among the downtrodden. Hence, he "occupies Wall Street" and whines that he cannot find a \$100,000 per year job right out of the starting gate (with a useless degree in art history and a minor in "womyn's studies"). He complains that the greedy taxpayers are not eagerly offering to pay off his education loans. The liberal "struggle" cannot compare with the black man who fought discrimination in the 1950s, because he essentially has no struggle. His "struggle" is nothing more than facing the everyday realities that everyone else faces. The black struggle was the result of having essential liberties taken from them. The liberal "struggle" is not being given enough "free stuff" by the taxpayers. Being denied a job because of skin color is a struggle. Being denied free birth control pills is not.

The liberal knows that, even if only subconsciously. As a result he feels guilty. He desperately wants "street cred." He wants to show his scars, but he doesn't have any. He envies blacks because they have engaged in a struggle and he has not. So he demonstrates in favor of justice while carrying a placard that reads, "I am Trayvon!" But he is *not* Trayvon and he is *not* seeking justice. He is seeking membership in the "downtrodden club." He is seeking to justify his devotion to the Marxist cause by pretending to be an essential part of a class struggle. He is seeking validation of his ideology... and George Zimmerman will pay the price.

Don Fredrick March 27, 2012

1. http://articles.orlandosentinel.com/2012-03-26/news/os-trayvon-martin-zimmerman-account-20120326_1_miami-schools-punch-unarmed-black-teenager?pagewanted=all

2. While in Seoul, Korea on March 25 Obama met with Turkey's prime minister, Recep Tayyip Erdogan. According to DailyCaller.com, the two discussed "...Syria's civil war and Iran's nuclear weapons program, but they also talked about [Obama's] two daughters, Malia and Sasha..." During a press conference Obama stated, "The bottom line is that we find ourselves in frequent agreement upon a wide range of issues... [and] because he has two daughters that are a little older than mine—they've turned out very well, so I'm always interested in his perspective on raising girls." Erdogen's daughter Sumeyye is an Islamist politician who "...wears Islamist-style clothes that obscure her hair and shape." (Barry Rubin, an expert on Turkish politics, remarks, "[I]t is shocking that [Obama suggests] he takes child-raising advice from a radical Islamist." Rubin says the White House statement describing the meeting "goes beyond polite praise and good manners and practically slobbers over a repressive, pro-Iran leader whose hatred for Israel is literally hysterical.") http://dailycaller.com/2012/03/26/obama-turkeys-islamist-prime-minister-discuss-nukes-teenagers/