

The Democrats, the NAACP, ACLU, SPLC, and the rest of the usual suspects are trying to get America lathered up about "voter suppression." And what a marvelous tool is that phrase: "voter suppression." It brings to mind all sorts of horrific images: of men in white sheets and hoods with shotguns and on horseback or in Model Ts circling the homes of innocent black families who have tried to exercise their right to vote; of rigged elections in the old Iron Curtain countries, where voting booths open to public view permitted Party officials to see how ballots were cast.

Yes, voter suppression is a term that must make the blood *boil* in any good, decent, clear thinking believer in democracy.

So, just naturally, it's the term chosen by the Democrats (whose record of presiding over corrupt elections is nothing less than awesome) in their campaign against legislation that is designed to stop voter fraud.

In a way, you can't blame them. In November 2011 the NY Times, chief house organ of the Democrat Party, published a column by Thomas Edsall saying that the Party and Obama in preparing for the 2012 elections have made "it clear for the first time that the party will explicitly abandon the white working class. All pretense of trying to win a majority of the white working class has been effectively jettisoned in favor of cementing a center-left coalition made up, on the one hand, of voters who have gotten ahead on the basis of educational attainment — professors, artists, designers, editors, human resources managers, lawyers, librarians, social workers, teachers and therapists...socially liberal whites in alliance with the growing ranks of less affluent minority voters, especially Hispanics."

Edsall's sources for his column were a memo by Democrat junk yard dog James Carville and Democrat pollster Stanley Greenberg, and a paper by Ruy Teixeira and John Halpin of George Soros's Center for American Progress.

Consider the two constituent groups of the Democrat coalition. It's only natural that "less affluent minorities" who are already dependent on government would support the party that promises them ever larger handouts. As to "socially liberal whites," the process of putting the alphabet after their names may have squeezed out most of their common sense, but they've got enough left to know where their bread is buttered and that it's the Democrats doing the buttering: like their poorer allies, these people are reliant in whole or in part on government for their income.

Professors, if they're at public universities are on the taxpayer's dime. If they're at private universities their salaries have been inflated thanks to government programs. Social workers, teachers, librarians. On the public payroll. Human resource managers. Dependent largely on government regulation for their employment. Little of the time of such folk is devoted to the actual task of finding capable employees and firing the incapable; most is spent ensuring that their employers do not run afoul of government regulations, virtually all of which are designed by liberals to help other liberals. Get rid of the regulations and much of the human resource manager cohort will be out looking for work. Lawyers. Nothing more needs to be said. Editors. Since what remains of the newspaper industry has largely been captured by the Left, the reason for their Democrat allegiance is obvious. Finally, artists. Can never be expected to act rationally, thus are reliably liberal.

Both the Carville/Greenberg and Teixeira/Halpin papers admit that the Democrats' loss of support among the white working class means that for "progressive" candidates to win they have to find voters elsewhere.

Even Democrats understand that there's a limit to how many people can be professors, lawyers, or social workers, so their numbers can't be expanded sufficiently to replace the votes of citizens who actually contribute to the nation's wealth and have therefore fled the Democrat Party.

Forcing members of the middle class into poverty has been an effective method of increasing the dependent class. Policies such as financing oil development in Brazil while blocking the Keystone pipeline or drilling in the Gulf, giving contracts for the military's new light attack plane to a Brazilian company owned in part by Soros, and closing hundreds of car dealerships are only some of the methods successfully used to accomplish the goal of impoverishing the middle class.

But that policy also has its limits. There's only so much this Administration can do to destroy the economy without alerting even the Kool-Aid drinkers that it isn't Bush's fault anymore.

Teixeira and Halpin of Soros's PAW recognize that the real growth potential for Democrats is among the massive numbers of poor, uneducated immigrants, both legal and illegal who have flooded our country since Jimmy Carter first opened the flood gates during the Mariel Boat Lift.

These legal immigrants and illegals, now organized by and funded by groups spawned and paid for by the likes of the Ford Foundation, Soros, and other Far Left individuals and organizations, have the potential to swing elections in support of the far left, which is to say Democrats.

The problem, from the Left's point of view is that just so darn many of these potential voters are illegal aliens or non-citizens and they can't actually *vote* for Democrats; at least not legally.

So whatcha gonna do if you're a Democrat who wants ineligible voters to swing elections? Why, you simply look to Chicago as your model, and make sure that everybody else's elections are as corrupt as those.

Bill Clinton laid the groundwork for nationwide Chicagoizing of elections with the Motor Voter Act in 1993, and we see the fruits of that effort in all parts of the Nation as "progressive" outfits effectively organize to help ineligible voters sign up and vote.

Recognizing that the integrity of their electoral systems was under coordinated attack nearly forty States have responded with legislation that would require that voters actually *be* citizens of the United States and that a person voting is really the person he or she claims to be. In most cases this is accomplished by requiring voters to obtain and show photo ID.

Since the Dems and allies can't come right out and admit they want corrupt elections they had to claim these efforts to protect the integrity of the vote were really "voter suppression."

The first method of attacking these laws was to claim that some people couldn't afford to obtain proof of citizenship or photo ID and thus the poor, would be prevented from voting. In response,

supporters of clean elections added provisions to waive costs and even bring mobile photo units to those unable to afford a bus to the DMV.

But count on the Left to never quit: NYU Law School's Brennan Center for Justice noted that opponents of a Nebraska voter ID bill claimed that forcing voters to prove indigence before voting could be subject to constitutional challenge and that all ID's should be free. (The reference was made in a pro-corrupt voting "study" by the Center which is funded in part by Soros, the Tides Foundation, the Joyce Foundation, etc.). The Brennan Center for Corrupt Elections made numerous other equally specious arguments against election integrity.

But the Left has a problem. The US Supreme Court has upheld the constitutionality of voter ID laws. This of course did not prevent Attorney General Holder, representing the Chicago school of voting standards, from recently blocking enforcement of South Carolina's new voter ID law. (One cannot of course ignore Holder's dismissing of charges, already admitted to by New Black Panthers, of voter intimidation with billy clubs in Philadelphia. Nor can we but marvel that the same Administration so dedicated to fighting voter suppression favors "card check" i.e. open voting in union elections.)

Led by the Democrats and the current mob in the White House, the ACLU, Soros, Tides, ACORN (or its successors) will continue trying to corrupt American elections. "Voter suppression" is as much a myth as the "nation of Atzlan" but the 20th century shows that extremists' ability to create and exploit such lies has subverted the stability and democratic institutions of many nations. The Chicago School of voting represents a clear and continuing threat to our Nation.