

The Collapse of the Democrat Party

The last six months have convinced me that the Democrat Party is collapsing. Why? *It has run out of groups it can divide.* The first major victory in the Democrat Party's identity politics war was winning the black vote. When discussing upcoming civil rights legislation, President Lyndon Baines Johnson reportedly told two governors, "I'll have them niggers voting Democratic for two hundred years." Johnson convinced African-Americans that the Democrats were on their side and the Republicans were not. More than 50 years later, most black voters still believe that—even though their lot in life has generally been made worse by Democrat policies. (See: Chicago, Detroit, Baltimore.)

The next major victory for the Democrats came with the 1973 Supreme Court decision in *Roe v. Wade*. From that moment forward, a "right to an abortion" became a prominent part of the Democrat Party platform, and "pro-choice" women voters moved in the Democrats' direction. The gender wage gap issue also moved women to the Democrat Party—which conveniently neglects to mention that gender pay discrimination had been illegal since the Equal Pay Act of 1963.

Although Democrat policies destroyed many black families, the tradition of strong Hispanic families continued. That, along with their work ethic and anti-abortion views, led many Hispanics to lean Republican. But because immigrant families often come from countries with socialist policies, many Hispanics were also used to the concept of a big, powerful government. The Democrat Party naturally believed it could increase its share of the Hispanic vote. Over several decades, Democrats (and willing Republicans) have succeeded in shifting immigration policies. The United States government had traditionally favored white European immigrants, but slowly began accepting more immigrants from Mexico, South America, Southeast Asia, and third-world countries. The Democrats knew it was easier to import people who leaned toward socialism than to persuade existing Americans to turn to socialism. The atrocious immigration policies of the 1980s enabled that change, when President Ronald Reagan got snookered by the Democrats—who promised border security in exchange for more immigration. Of course, America got the immigrants but never got the border security.

While the immigration policies were changing, the Democrat Party convinced increasing numbers of Hispanics that the Republicans were racists. By the 2000 election, the Democrat Party had successfully wooed black voters, pro-abortion voters, and Hispanic voters. That was still not enough, however, as George W. Bush narrowly defeated Al Gore. In 2004 the Democrats failed again. (Of course, they did not help themselves by nominating John Kerry—one of the dumbest people ever to have run for president.)

By the time 2008 rolled around, the Democrats had convinced many voters that the Republicans were also anti-woman. That would, they thought, put Hillary Clinton in the White House. She may have been a crook and a liar, but the fact that she was a woman meant instant votes. With leftists

in the mainstream media paving her way with fawning glass ceiling stories, Clinton was certain to win the Oval Office.

But Barack Hussein Obama came onto the scene, first propelled to fame by a book ghost-written for him by William Ayers and a 2004 Democrat National Convention speech that, while lackluster, cliché-filled, and sophomoric on paper, was well delivered by an expert con man. Obama entered the race in 2007 because he knew the Republicans would lose in November 2008. They had the economy, the media, and the juggernaut of the Democrat Party working against them. Obama knew the only races he had to win were the primary contests against Clinton. If that meant bringing in busloads of Chicagoans to improperly cast ballots in the Iowa caucuses, so be it. If that meant primary shenanigans in Texas, that was just the cost of doing business. (Obama had no desire to be vice president, and he had no desire to languish in the Senate while Clinton served two terms. It was 2008 or never for Obama.)

The 2008 election results made the Democrat Party believe it was unstoppable. It had divided Americans by race, gender, and abortion positions. The growing Hispanic population was continuing to move further to the political left, and getting non-citizens to illegally vote would not be difficult—especially with the “Motor Voter” legislation that had been enacted. How could the Democrats lose? They had the black vote sewed up, as LBJ had promised. They had the majority of the Hispanic vote, and that population was growing because of higher birth rates and massive immigration. They had the votes of single women because of the abortion issue. They had close to half the votes of married women. The only group they had not fully captured was white men. But the Democrats had even won over many of them in 2008 by playing the “white guilt” race card. What could go wrong?

Well, 2010 went wrong. Obama and the Democrats overreached with ObamaCare. The legislation was meant to be a stepping stone to a fully socialized health care system. But ObamaCare was so disastrous that the Democrats lost the House to the Republicans in a massive upset.

The Democrats did manage to get Obama reelected in 2012. They did so with the help of the media. (See: Crowley, Candy), and a weak Republican candidate who did not know how to fight. ObamaCare, Benghazi, Operation Fast and Furious, and the IRS scandal all gave Mitt Romney policy ammunition to use against Obama. But Romney never even picked up a gun, let alone load it.

Because Obama was not on the ballot in 2014, the Republicans won the Senate. Regrettably, they failed to do anything of substance with their power. They controlled the House and the Senate. That gave them the opportunity to send hundreds of bills to Obama’s desk. Yes, he would have vetoed most of them, but the voters would have seen the unmasking of the Marxist. Like Romney in 2012, the Republicans in Congress choked in 2015 and 2016.

But the Democrats were still busy dividing Americans. They had the support of blacks, Hispanics, young women, leftist university professors, and the mainstream media. They still did not have

the white vote, but they could continue to chip away at that. The Democrats did so, continuing to pound away on the issues of abortion, race, gender, immigration, and wealth inequality. Add homosexual rights to the mix, telling the voters that Republicans hate gays because they oppose gay marriage. Toss in transgender rights as well. How could the Democrats lose in 2016?

Then Donald Trump came along to upset the establishment apple cart. The Democrats (and establishment Republicans) hate Trump, but do not yet understand that *they created him*. They are now throwing everything against the wall to see what sticks. "Russian collusion and hacking?" That's going out the window with the revelation that the DNC data published by WikiLeaks could not have been hacked via the Internet and was copied directly by someone in the organization. (Records show that the data transfer speed could not have been accomplished via an Internet hack. The documents were copied in house, and then given or sold to WikiLeaks.)

If Russian collusion does not help the Democrats destroy Trump, what comes next? Obviously, the tried-and-true Democrat tactic of charging racism. How do they do that? When racists gathered in Charlottesville, Virginia, they allowed George Soros-funded Antifa and Black Lives Matter counter-protesters to assemble in the same place. The inevitable conflict created headlines, and the confrontation was blamed on Trump. The argument? Republicans and Trump are racists, so any violence committed by anyone is the fault of Trump and the GOP.

The problem now faced by the Democrats is that they have overplayed their hand. Because they have run out of groups to exploit, they have to go back to the same wells in an attempt to get a greater share of those groups. But to do that, they must take positions that are even more extreme. For example, the average American voter is comfortable with the position that homosexuals are entitled to the same rights as everyone else. As a result, many heterosexuals who felt homosexuals were being denied rights voted for Democrat candidates who supported that minority. The Democrats then pushed the envelope by not only endorsing same-sex marriage, they demanded punishment for anyone who opposed it. That backfired on the Democrats. Instead of gaining support, they lost it. Even someone who supports same-sex marriage may draw the line at jailing a county clerk who opposes the practice, or destroying a bakery or photography business because its owners prefer not to provide services for a same-sex wedding.

Similarly, one can be sympathetic toward individuals who believe they were born with the "wrong gender." A voter might oppose a candidate who argues that transgenders are evil sinners, and endorse a candidate who is more understanding and accepting. But the Democrats pushed that envelope too far as well. A voter who might be sympathetic to transgenders does not necessarily extend that understanding to allowing men to freely use women's public restrooms. Most Americans tend to have a "live and let live" attitude. If John wants to dress up like Jane, well, that's his prerogative. But when John demands that the U.S. Army accept him as a recruit and then pay for his hormone treatments and sex-change surgery, a lot of voters move from the "Live and let live" category to the "What are you, nuts?" category.

The average American dislikes abortion but accepts that they are performed and tries to be sympathetic to young women whose poor judgment or abuse by men prompts them to seek to “terminate a pregnancy.” But an abortion in the first month of pregnancy is not the same as an abortion in the ninth month. On this issue the Democrats again overplayed their hand. Their 2016 presidential candidate, Hillary Clinton, refused to even condemn late-term abortions. How can one possibly support aborting on October 23 a healthy baby whose due date is October 22? Yet that is the extreme position the Democrat Party has now taken. In working to increase support among pro-choice voters, the Democrats have turned away reasonable voters who said, “No, that is simply too extreme a position for me.” The Democrat Party is even reluctant to accept pro-life Democrat candidates; that is a litmus test many Americans reject.

On the issue of immigration, the Democrats oppose a border wall and endorse sanctuary cities. While those positions may boost support among Hispanic voters and those who endorse borderless, global socialism, they turn away millions of Americans who cannot fathom why anyone would not want to imprison or deport someone who has crossed the border illegally and then committed rape, armed robbery, or murder. Perhaps more than any other, that issue cost the Democrats the White House. (It will also cost Republicans some House and Senate seats if they do not fund a border wall.)

When Democrats go so far as to insist on renaming elementary schools because they were named after a man named Lynch who decades ago donated the property, the average American does not respond, “Yes, the Democrats are right. The name Lynch is offensive.” Rather, the average American responds, “The Democrats are nuts!”

With the tragic events in Charlottesville, the Democrats are again falling back on the race card to divide the American electorate. But their efforts to brand whites as racists are generating a result that is the opposite of what they expected. Increasing numbers of whites are saying, “Yes, there are some racists. But I am sick and tired of the Democrats trying to make it look as though *all* whites are racists. We are not and I am not!” *Instead of dividing whites, the Democrats are uniting them.*

The Democrats have pitted blacks against whites, blacks and whites against Hispanics, citizens against non-citizens, Muslims against Christians and Jews, atheists against believers, heterosexuals against homosexuals and transgenders, abortion supporters against abortion opponents, taxpayers against welfare recipients, young against old, middle-income earners against the wealthy, and they have intervened in just about every other conflict they could intensify and exaggerate. It worked for the Democrats for decades. But it is the only tactic in the party’s playbook (other than promising something for nothing). Now it has been played so often that almost everyone sees it coming. The Democrats have become the party of real and imagined victims and trumped up outrages. The rest of us have seen enough, had enough, and done enough to compensate those victims.

The Republican Party has become a party of straight white men and women—*not* because it is bigoted or racist, but because the Democrats have picked off most of the voters who are not straight white men and women. The Democrats have defined its enemy, yet now seem shocked to find that its declared enemy is starting to act in self-defense. The Democrats' shame-and-blame tactic is collapsing, and the more they use it the more ridiculous they appear. When media pundits declare President Trump "subhuman," all Republicans racists, and straight white males evil destroyers of the planet, they have moved into the realm of hysteria. When you have done nothing wrong but are continually being lambasted by the Democrats and their media comrades, at some point you demand a stop to it. Just as Fox News' Greg Gutfeld gets so frustrated with Juan Williams that he is eventually forced to tell him to stop the condescension and pipe down, white Americans are saying to the Democrats, "Enough is enough." The sleeping bear of conservative America has been awakened after years of aggravating prodding by the Democrats. That bear is bigger and angrier than the Democrats imagined, and they will not escape the bear's revenge by hiding under Pajama Boy's blanket.

The Democrat Party is now collapsing. As its leaders move further to the political left, it will transform into a socialist party. It cannot repair itself because that would require a repudiation of everything it has been doing for decades. Where the reasonable Democrats go remains to be seen, but if the nation is to survive the Republican Party must return to its conservative principles. If it chooses not to do so, a third party may emerge, and three major parties are unlikely to result in anything but diminished freedoms.

Don Fredrick
August 15, 2017