

2/16/08

“Hillary or Obama”

by

Tom Holbrook

The saga continues in the search for the person thought to be best suited to become Democrat and Republican nominees for the highest political office in the land. Battle hardened veteran, Republican Senator John McCain and the surprising political upstart Democratic Senator from Illinois, Barack Obama are currently the front runners of their respective parties.

Obama's latest victories in Maryland, Virginia and Washington, DC, surprised some who thought Hillary would overwhelmingly triumph in VA and MD. The nation's capitol was a given for Obama because of its high percentage of blacks who live there. Through these victories Obama officially became the Democrat's candidate with the highest delegate count 1,242 to Clinton's 1,175 and 21 states won against Hillary's 10. 2,025 delegates are needed for a candidate to be declared the party's nominee.

According to CBS Networks exit polls of the MD and VA primaries, "race and gender have been playing influential roles in the Democratic primary elections this year, and the contests in Maryland and Virginia were no different. As he has in all of the primaries to date, Obama won the vote of African-Americans overwhelmingly. He beat Clinton 88 percent to 11 percent in Maryland, and 89 percent to 11 percent in Virginia, among black voters.

In addition, Obama also won the vote of a majority of white men, a demographic that has become something of a swing group this election season. In Maryland Obama won 54 percent of the white male vote, and in Virginia he won 56 percent. Clinton, in contrast, won over her primary support group —white women. She won 54 percent of white women in Virginia's Democratic primary, and 55 percent in Maryland's.

The way it's playing out is that Clinton is attracting those white families, specifically white females, making less than \$50,000 yearly and with no college education, while Obama is capturing those whites with college educations and

making more than \$50,000 annually. That prompts the question—is Hillary just popular with those who are un-educated, lower middle to lower income folks because they are depending on the government to provide their sustenance? Are those below \$50,000 income possibly motivated toward her because they are uncomfortable with the thought of a black man becoming the most powerful man in America? I certainly hope not. Is Hillary getting more white female votes because they feel sorry for her going through all the dirt she did with husband Bill—or maybe they just want to see a woman in the White House?

Is Obama attracting more highly educated, young men of all colors and white men making over \$50,000 annually because they are enamored with his youth and "go get 'em," antiestablishment attitude? Or are those college grads making over \$50,000 so fed up with those in Washington that they are wanting change...for change's sake...and don't want Hillary because she is a reminder of the "same old faces" in charge?

Some of those asked say they are sold on Obama because he promotes "hope and the future of America," and the "coming together of America." They also think with him in the White House that our troops in Iraq and Afghanistan would come home sooner and there would be fewer military conflicts around the world in which we would become involved. Folks, do any of you actually think that pulling our troops out of, or never sending our troops into the situations in Iraq, Afghanistan, Africa, and throughout the Middle East would be the right thing for us to do? How could we stand by and not become involved in preventing the killing of innocent civilians in any country?

Ron Paul, who recently stepped out of the presidential race, has stated time and again that the United States should not be the world's policeman and that each country should fight their own battles, with the "best" man coming out on top. We all know that is hyperbole and no American government, Republican or Democrat, can or would adopt such a "hands off" attitude or policy for our allies and friends around the world. Unfortunately, we are such a viable and necessary source of peace and hope in many countries of the world that our backing off our pledge to protect them would be disastrous for all of them.

In Obama's acceptance speech after winning the "Potomac Primaries" he alluded to those who say his "head is in the clouds" and/or that he is a "hope monger" and he said those people have given up their hope to accept the status quo in Washington. What he failed to mention is the truth that our country's status, quo or not, at any given time is determined by conditions in the world around us. I am fearful of Obama's near Pollyanna attitude that if we pull within our own borders and give no heed to the world and its mayhem and madness we will prosper and be free from the possibility that those who wish to destroy us will just back off and change their minds.

What Obama doesn't seem to realize is that our main enemy in this world is an ideology, known as radical Islam, that is looking to destroy all infidels (non-believers) who do not accept their belief that the world is theirs to conquer and rule under a world caliphate. The threat is real and no one should ever doubt it. Obama seems to ignore it or dismiss it as something that can be dealt with by negotiating with those who have sworn to kill us. That's the scary part of his rhetoric.

I have to think he believes what he is saying. He is a mesmerizer, an eloquent orator, and a charismatic young politician who is leading many away from the mainstream of rational thinking with his sweet, soulful words. Let's hope he is not a modern day Pied Piper of Hamelin who could be leading our country over the deadly cliffs of Socialism!