

Of Alligators, Moats, And Rappers

In a recent speech in El Paso, Obama laughably called the border fence “basically complete.” That statement did not receive much attention, however, because Obama also went out of his way to chastise Americans in general and Republicans in particular for being dissatisfied with the job done by his Secretary of Homeland Security, Janet “Butch” Napolitano. He stated: “We have gone above and beyond what was requested by the very Republicans who said they supported broader reform as long as we got serious about enforcement. But even though we’ve answered these concerns, I gotta say I suspect there are still going to be some who are trying to move the goal posts on us one more time. ...Maybe they’ll need a moat. Maybe they’ll want alligators in the moat.”

The mainstream media obligingly highlighted the “alligators in the moat” remark because it ridicules everyone who is not a snooty, multicultural, amnesty-loving, open-borders leftist. Heaven forbid that it would quote Senator James DeMint (R-SC), who noted, “Five years ago, legislation was passed to build a 700-mile double-layer border fence along the southwest border. This is a promise that has not been kept. Today, according to staff at the Department of Homeland Security, just 5 percent of the double-layer fencing is complete, only 36.3 miles. The Government Accountability Office (GAO), Congress’s investigative arm, reported in early 2009 that only 32 miles of double-layer fencing had been built. That means under ...Obama, only 4.3 miles of double layer fencing has been built. This is woefully inadequate.” Why bother reporting facts and numbers when you can ridicule flag-waving Southern conservatives who prefer that illegal immigrants not traipse across their property in the middle of the night, leaving behind a trail of dirty diapers, beer cans, cigarette butts, empty plastic water bottles, and torn Che Guevara T-shirts?

Most believe that Obama’s “alligators in the moat” (AIM) comment was merely an insensitive ad lib, much like his comment that the Cambridge police “acted stupidly” when they arrested his belligerent friend, Henry Louis Gates, for breaking into what turned out to be his own house. But the AIM remark was not off-the-cuff—it appeared in the copy of the speech distributed to reporters in advance. It was therefore not a case of Obama saying something stupid because he strayed from his trusty TelePrompTer, it was an intentional remark. Regardless of who wrote the line—Obama himself or one of his hack speechwriters—it was likely read by more than a few White House staffers before it received their blessings. That may lead some to wonder, “How can the White House be so tone deaf? Did they not know that millions of Americans would be insulted by Obama’s comment? Why would he essentially emphasize that he does not take border security seriously?”

No, the White House is not tone deaf. Yes, Obama and his team knew the AIM remark would offend millions of Americans. Yes, Obama does not take border security seriously—and he knows that everybody else knows it.

Then why ridicule those who *do* care about border security?

Because Obama is running for reelection in 2012 and he needs to stir up his base. Yes, conservatives and other thinking Americans were no doubt angered by his AIM comment. But that does not bother Obama one whit because he will not get their votes in 2012 any more than he got them in 2008. (He won't win Texas either, yet he chose El Paso as the location of his speech. That is known as "rubbing it in your face"—one of Obama's favorite practices.)

Although Obama does not expect to carry Texas in 2012 or gain the votes of conservatives, he certainly cannot afford to lose many of the votes of those who supported him in 2008. (Remember that Obama received only 52.9 percent of the popular vote in 2008, and 9 percent unemployment, 15 million unemployed, and \$5.00 gas can certainly put a dent in that small margin of victory.) Many of his 2008 supporters are now angry with him. Those on the far left are angry that Obama did not close Guantanamo, did not charge Bush and Cheney with war crimes, did not get a full "public option" in ObamaCare, did not get "card check" legislation passed for the labor unions, and did not end the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. Blacks are angry because of high unemployment and rising food prices, both of which are affecting them more than whites and Hispanics. Many Hispanics are also angry because of high unemployment and Obama's failure to get amnesty legislation passed.

Obama knows that he cannot resolve any of those issues by November 2012. He also knows that dissatisfied leftists, blacks, and Hispanics are unlikely to vote for the Republican candidate in 2012, but *he is most assuredly worried that they will stay home on election day*. There may not be many blacks who will vote against Obama, but there are probably quite a few who will ask, "What have you done for me lately?" and not bother waiting in line at the ballot box. Obama also risks losing the support of many Hispanics, some of whom *will* vote for the GOP candidate. If Obama cannot possibly give those voters what they want, how does he get them to vote?

By playing the race card and the fear card.

What was the response to Obama's AIM comment? Conservatives expressed outrage—and the media predictably played up that outrage, portraying the conservatives as ignorant, racist, uncivilized thugs with itchy trigger-fingers who would be more than happy to see alligators relaxing on the banks of the Rio Grande. That image frightens many Hispanic voters, who cannot help but ask, "Who will stand between us and angry white males?"

Obama provides himself as the answer: Obama, the protector of the downtrodden and the disadvantaged. Suddenly the issue shifts from "Where are the jobs?" to "Who will protect me?" Yes, the Hispanics know full well that Congress is not going to pass "comprehensive immigration reform"—not with Republicans controlling the House and an assemblage of anxious Democrats in the Senate up for reelection in 2012. That situation is fine with Obama, of course, because if Congress were to pass amnesty legislation he would be risking his political neck by signing it into law. With no possibility of it passing he can therefore easily tell Hispanic audiences he endorses some

sort of ill-defined “change,” blame the GOP for the lack of progress, and then make sure they get the message that they need him to protect them from Rick Perry, Paul Ryan, and Michele Bachmann. With his AIM comment Obama essentially said, “Look, I may not be able to help you now—but I can stop the Republican enemy from hurting you.”

Consider that Obama refuses to meet with Arizona Governor Jan Brewer about border security, yet had a dog-and-pony show in the White House with *Desperate Housewives* actress Eva Longoria and other famous hyphenated-Americans. (The event was laughable. It brought to mind the absurd congressional appearances by actresses Sally Field, Jessica Lang, and Sissy Spacek who were called to give “expert” testimony about the plight of family farmers—because they had each played the wives of farmers in movies. Eva Longoria has about as much in common with poor struggling Hispanic families as Sally Field does with soybean farmers.) Obama’s meeting with Longoria was pure theatre. He is not going to get immigration legislation passed. But he has to appear as though he cares, and he has to rile up the Hispanic voters. So he riled up conservatives and then let the media stir the pot of racial tensions. (This is not to suggest that many Hispanics did not spot Obama’s con, but he need not worry about losing their votes—which he never had to begin with.)

For those who think I am making something out of nothing here and that the AIM statement was nothing more than a dumb remark, I ask that you consider Michelle Obama’s invitation to “rapper” Lonnie Rashid Lynn, Jr.—also known as “Common”—to attend a White House poetry event. Lynn’s invitation was defended by the hapless White House press secretary Jay Carney as being “within the genre of hip hop and rap in what’s known as a conscious [sic] rapper.” (Carney may have meant “conscience,” inasmuch as “conscious” means “awake” or “not unconscious.” Of course, Carney may simply have been differentiating between the “conscious” rapper Common and the permanently “unconscious” rapper, Tupac Shakur.)

Lynn is, shall we say, “controversial” because his “poetry” includes threats to shoot police officers and a passage calling for the burning of George W. Bush. (The more creative and profanity-laced lyrics by Lynn can be found on the Internet, of course. Let’s just say, “Cole Porter he isn’t”—at least I cannot recall any songs by Porter that are tributes to JoAnne Chesimard, who shot and killed a New Jersey State Trooper in 1973. Chesimard escaped from prison some years ago and is now hiding out in Cuba.) Rapper Lynn, who is a defender of Obama’s former minister and spiritual advisor, Reverend Jeremiah “God damn America” Wright, appeared with Obama at a “Moving America Forward” rally in Chicago on October 30, 2010. On May 15, 2011 the 30th annual Peace Officers Memorial Service was held in Washington, D.C. The event, held in conjunction with National Police Week, honors police officers who were killed in the line of duty. Obama was invited to speak but declined. He could not take the time to honor fallen police officers, but he can invite fans of cop killers to the White House.

As with the “alligators in the moat” statement, many Americans responded to Obama’s “gangsta rapper” invitation with bewilderment and outrage. Obama ignored the outcry and welcomed Lynn to the poetry event. One might think that anyone with half a brain

would not have issued the invitation in the first place, let alone gone through with it after considerable condemnation. But, of course, Obama kept his nose held high and laughed at millions of outraged Americans.

Why would he risk doing that? Because Obama knows he has already lost the “outraged Americans” voting bloc. What is Obama’s logic? The rapper logic follows the AIM logic. Obama cannot possibly reduce unemployment appreciably by election day 2012. Black Americans will still be suffering to a greater degree than whites next November. If inflation continues it will only make matters worse for them—and for him. But Obama needs to keep black voters from staying home on election day. How does he do that? By increasing racial tensions. By doing something—like inviting a controversial black “performer” to the White House—that will inflame the passions of white conservatives. Then sit back and watch the media predictably remind blacks that there is still a racial divide in the country and comment on the “unreasonable fears” of whites, Tea Party activists, and knuckle-dragging Republicans who still believe in states rights. Obama’s not-so-hidden message to blacks: “I probably can’t create many jobs for you, but I am the only thing standing between you and more abuse by the white man.”

In other words, Obama’s move was calculated. He invited the rapper to the White House to intentionally rile up conservatives and increase racial tensions, thus helping to insure a greater black turnout on election day 2012. Obama knows he will not get the votes of conservatives—or Texans—so he may as well “play with them” by doing things that get them aggravated and angry. The media then turns the issue into black-versus-white, which motivates members of Obama’s black and leftist base to feel obligated to stop “white racists” from winning in 2012. (This is not to suggest that all blacks will fall for Obama’s trick, but inasmuch as he can do nothing to gain the votes of black conservatives he will do everything he can to get black Democrats to vote.)

The role of the mainstream media cannot be underestimated in this. It is a well-coordinated effort, with the White House and Democrat strategists in constant touch with members of the media. An objective media would report that the border fence is not “basically complete” and demonstrate why. An objective media would not stir the pot of racial tensions, as Chris Matthews routinely does on MSNBC, as Christine Amanpour shamelessly does on ABC’s *This Week*, or as NBC’s David Gregory brazenly did in his May 14th *Meet the Press* interview of Newt Gingrich. Obama, many Democrat candidates, and the media will inject race into as many issues as they can between now and November 2012. For them, winning on the issues is not possible. Instead they will keep playing the race card, while encouraging class warfare to promote poor-versus-rich animosities, and claiming that the Republicans will eagerly throw senior citizens off Medicare, starve little children, loosen the axles of wheelchairs, and toss helpless puppies and kittens into raging mountain streams.

This may be politics as usual, but there *is* a positive aspect to be recognized:

Obama is desperate. That means he knows he stands a good chance of losing. What the Republicans must now do is nominate a conservative presidential candidate who is not

afraid to take on Obama and who will not cower in the face of groundless charges of racism.

Now all we need to do is find that person and persuade him or her to enter the race...

Don Fredrick
May 19, 2011