

July 14, 2014

Looking over this administration's foolishness, Victor Davis Hanson says the chickens have come home to roost.

Often, crazy things seem normal for a time because logical catastrophes do not immediately follow.

A deeply suspicious Richard Nixon systematically and without pushback for years undermined and politicized almost every institution of the federal government, from the CIA and the FBI to the IRS and the attorney general's office. Nixon seemed to get away with it — until his second term. Once the public woke up, however, the eventual accounting proved devastating: resignation of a sitting president, prison sentences for his top aides, collapse of the Republican party, government stasis, a ruined economy, the destruction of the Vietnam peace accords that had led to a viable South Vietnam, the end of Henry Kissinger's diplomatic breakthroughs, and a generation of abject cynicism about government. Did Nixon ever grasp that such destruction was the natural wage of his own paranoia?

In the post-Watergate climate of reform, for nearly three years a naïve Jimmy Carter gave utopian speeches about how American forbearance would end the Cold War and create a new world order based on human rights — until America's abdication started to erode the preexisting global order. Scary things followed, such as the fall of the shah of Iran, the rise of Iranian theocracy, the taking of American hostages in Tehran, revolutions and insurrection throughout Central America, the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, radical Islamists taking over Mecca, more gas lines, continued stagflation, and China invading Vietnam. Did the puritanical Carter ever understand what might be the consequences of his own self-righteousness in an imperfect world?

Barack Obama likewise has done some crazy things that seemed for years to have no ramifications. Unfortunately, typical of the ways of Nemesis (a bitter goddess who waits until the opportune moment to demand payment for past hubris), suddenly the bills for Obama's six years of folly are coming due for the American people.

When a president occasionally fails to tell the truth, you get a scandal like the monitoring of the Associated Press reporters. When a president serially fails to tell the truth, you get that plus the scandals involving the IRS, the NSA, the VA, Benghazi, and too many others to mention.

The same is true abroad. ...

Kimberley Strassel with an example of this foolishness.

In the smallest stories we sometimes find the biggest themes. The small story of the past month has been dysfunction at a backwater federal agency known as the Chemical Safety Board. Yet in this tale of obstruction, bullying and lawlessness we find what is now the clear pattern of the Obama administration.

If you've never heard of the CSB, join the rest of humanity. Created by Congress in 1990, the CSB is charged with probing industrial chemical accidents. Like the National Transportation Safety Administration, it's a rare entity with no regulatory authority; CSB's only job is to investigate and make recommendations. Its board and staff have mainly been wonky safety experts, and the agency largely devoid of political controversy.

That changed with this administration. The scandal popped in late 2013 when the Environmental Protection Agency's inspector general, Arthur Elkins (charged with CSB oversight), sent a "seven-day letter" to Congress. Said letters are rare, since they are used (reads the statute) to convey to legislators "particularly serious or flagrant problems" at an agency. ...

Andrew Claven thinks the country will be able to overcome what this president has left behind.

... In fact, I would predict that almost everything Obama has done in his time in office will vanish without a trace within a decade or two. Obamacare, the clown car foreign policy, the corruption... I think it has caused some problems and will cause some more, but then I think we'll shrug it all off and move on. Even some of the cleverer subterranean stuff, like favoring cities over suburbs, will only have a long-lasting effect if, in fact, the suburban era is over. If people still want their houses and lawns and cars, they'll get them back, no matter what oppressive regulations this guy puts in place.

Many people on the right think Obama is an Evil Leftist Genius. Not me. I think he is a hapless putz. I think his ideas are all wrong, his application of his ideas is incompetent, and the chaos that he causes with his wrongness and incompetence will not lead in the direction he thinks it will.

I think when the history of the 21st century is written, Obama will not merit more than a single line. Even the fact that he was the first black president may come to seem irrelevant in a couple of decades. In which case, he will not merit any line at all.

The guy is just a sad little schmuck who played cynical politics well and got promoted way above his competence. His policies won't change the face of the nation. They'll just make a mess that those who come after him will have to clean up.

Writing in the National Review, **A. J. Delgado** argues the costs of immigration amnesty will fall most heavily on African Americans.

One of the sleeper issues surrounding the debate on amnesty for illegal immigrants – an inconvenient one that no proponent of a widespread amnesty wishes to acknowledge – is the devastating effect so-called immigration reform will have on African Americans.

The black unemployment rate is almost 11 percent, far higher than that of any other group profiled by labor statistics. African Americans are disproportionately employed in lower-skilled jobs – the very same jobs immigrants take. As Steven Camarota asked in a recent column, why double immigration when so many people already aren't working?

Who will be harmed most by amnesty? African-Americans.

The issue resurfaced this week when a YouTube video emerged of two young African-Americans confronting pro-illegal-immigration demonstrators in Murrieta, California. Murrieta is one of the towns in which undocumented minors are being relocated — and supporters are squaring off with protestors.

The young man argues: ...

Road & Track publishes the unbelievable costs of maintaining super cars. A new clutch for a Porsche Carrera GT is \$25,000. A brake job - \$30,000.

On paper, a used super-exotic makes sense. You get the mind-blowing performance and heartbreaking looks, but at a lower price than a new hypercar, and with no yearlong stay on a dealer's waiting list. But—surprise!—the buy-in is only half the damage. Parts are far from cheap and often hard to come by. Many jobs require purpose-built tools. And for countless reasons, supercars are rarely designed for ease of maintenance—the same task that takes an afternoon on your mother's Toyota could consume five days on a McLaren. We polled owners and mechanics to find out what makes working on these cars aggravating, expensive, and just plain weird. ...

National Review

Our Roost, Obama's Chickens

From the Middle East to Russia to our own southern border, Obama's bills are coming due.

by Victor Davis Hanson

Often, crazy things seem normal for a time because logical catastrophes do not immediately follow.

A deeply suspicious Richard Nixon systematically and without pushback for years undermined and politicized almost every institution of the federal government, from the CIA and the FBI to the IRS and the attorney general's office. Nixon seemed to get away with it — until his second term. Once the public woke up, however, the eventual accounting proved devastating: resignation of a sitting president, prison sentences for his top aides, collapse of the Republican party, government stasis, a ruined economy, the destruction of the Vietnam peace accords that had led to a viable South Vietnam, the end of Henry Kissinger's diplomatic breakthroughs, and a generation of abject cynicism about government. Did Nixon ever grasp that such destruction was the natural wage of his own paranoia?

In the post-Watergate climate of reform, for nearly three years a naïve Jimmy Carter gave utopian speeches about how American forbearance would end the Cold War and create a new world order based on human rights — until America's abdication started to erode the preexisting global order. Scary things followed, such as the fall of the shah of Iran, the rise of Iranian theocracy, the taking of American hostages in Tehran, revolutions and insurrection throughout Central America, the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, radical Islamists taking over Mecca, more gas lines, continued stagflation, and China invading Vietnam. Did the puritanical Carter ever understand what might be the consequences of his own self-righteousness in an imperfect world?

Barack Obama likewise has done some crazy things that seemed for years to have no ramifications. Unfortunately, typical of the ways of Nemesis (a bitter goddess who waits until the opportune moment to demand payment for past hubris), suddenly the bills for Obama's six years of folly are coming due for the American people.

When a president occasionally fails to tell the truth, you get a scandal like the monitoring of the Associated Press reporters. When a president serially fails to tell the truth, you get that plus the scandals involving the IRS, the NSA, the VA, Benghazi, and too many others to mention.

The same is true abroad. The American public hardly noticed when Obama recklessly withdrew every peacekeeper from Iraq. Did he not boast of "ending the Iraq War"? It did not mind when the U.S. posted dates for withdrawal from Afghanistan. Trashing all the Bush–Cheney anti-terrorism protocols, from Guantanamo to renditions, did not make much sense, when such policies had

worked and, in fact, were of use to Obama himself. But again, most Americans took no note. Apparently the terrorists did, however, and they regrouped even as the president declared them “on the run.”

Lecturing Israel while praising Islamist Turkey was likewise ignored. America snoozed as its president insidiously redefined its role in the Middle East as secondary to the supposed pivot to Asia. Each new correction in and of itself was comparatively minor; but in aggregate they began to unravel the U.S.-inspired postwar global order.

At first, who cared whether Iran serially violated every Obama deadline on halting nuclear enrichment? Did we worry that Libya, where Obama was proud of having led from behind, was descending into Somalia? Few Americans were all that bothered over Obama's empty order to Syrian president Bashar Assad to step down, or over Obama's later vacuous red-line threats that bombs would follow any use by Assad of chemical weapons.

Few noted that Obama lied to the nation that a video had caused the deaths of four Americans in Benghazi, that Obama had known who the real terrorist perpetrators were but had ordered no immediate action to kill or capture them, and that Americans had been engaged in mysterious and still unexplained covert activities in Benghazi. After all that, we still shrugged when the president traded five top terrorist leaders for an alleged American deserter.

Trashing George W. Bush's policy toward Vladimir Putin while promising a new reset approach (illustrated with a plastic red button) to an aggressive dictator raised few eyebrows at the time. Nor did many Americans worry that our Pacific allies were upset over Chinese and North Korean aggression that seemed to ignore traditional U.S. deterrence.

We were told that only Obama-haters at home had catalogued the president's apologies abroad, his weird multicultural bowing to authoritarians, his ahistorical speeches about mythical Islamic achievements, his surreal euphemisms for radical Islam, terrorism, and jihadism, his shrill insistence about civilian trials for terrorists and closing Guantanamo, or the radical cutbacks at the Pentagon, coupled with the vast increase in entitlement spending.

But after six years of all that, our allies have got the message that they are on their own, our enemies that there are few consequences to aggression, and neutrals that joining with America does not mean ending up on the winning side. The result is that the Middle East we have known since the end of World War II has now vanished

Supposedly crackpot fantasies about a worldwide “caliphate” are becoming reified. What were once dismissed as conspiracy theories about an “Iranian arc” — from a nuclear Tehran through Syria to Hezbollah in Lebanon to the borders of Israel to the Shiite minorities in the Gulf kingdoms — do not seem so crazy.

The idea of visiting the Egyptian pyramids or hoping to reengage with a reforming Libya is absurd. The best of the Middle East — Israel, Jordan, Kurdistan — no longer count on us. The worst — ISIS, Iran, Syria — count on us to remain irrelevant or worse. Old allies in the Gulf would probably trust Israel or Russia more than the Obama administration. In the next two years, if Obama continues on his present course, we are going to see things that we could not have imagined six years ago in the Middle East, as it reverts to premodern Islamic tribalism.

The same trajectory has been followed on the home front. Americans at first were amused that the great conciliator — and greatest political recipient on record of Wall Street cash — went after the rich with an array of hokey epithets and slurs (fat cats, corporate-jet owners, Vegas junketeers,

limb-logging and tonsil-pulling doctors, business owners who should not profit, or should know when they have made enough money, or should admit they didn't build their own businesses). Few connected the dots when the polarizing attorney general — the John Mitchell of our time — referred to African-Americans as “my people” and all the rest of the nation as “cowards.” Did we worry that the craziest things seem to come out of the president's own mouth — the Trayvon-like son he never had, the stereotyping police, the absence of a “smidgen” of corruption in the Lois Lerner IRS scandal, or the mean Republicans who “messed” with him?

The president before the 2012 elections lamented to Latino groups that he did not have dictatorial powers to grant amnesty but urged them in the meantime to “punish our enemies” — a sort of follow-up to his 2008 “typical white person” incitement. Who was bothered that with “a pen and a phone” Obama for the first time in American history emasculated the U.S. Border Patrol, as part of a larger agenda of picking and choosing which federal laws the executive branch would enforce?

Those choices seemed to be predicated on two extralegal criteria: Did a law contribute to Obama's concept of social justice, and did it further the progressive political cause? If the answer was no to either, the statute was largely unenforced. No president since World War II has done more to harm the U.S. Constitution — by ordering the executive branch not to enforce particular laws, by creating by fiat laws never enacted by Congress, by monitoring the communications of journalists and average Americans, by making appointments contrary to law — to the apparent yawns of the people.

Too few also seemed to care that almost everything the president had promised about Obamacare — keep your health plan, retain your doctor, save money on your premiums, sign up easily online, while we were lowering the annual deficit and reducing medical expenditures — was an abject lie. In such a climate, Obama felt no need to issue accurate data about how many Americans had lost their health plans, how many had simply transferred to Obamacare from Medicaid, how many had actually paid their premiums, or how many were still uninsured. The media ignored the serial \$1 trillion deficits, the chronic high unemployment and low growth, the nonexistence of the long-promised “summer of recovery,” and the nonappearance of “millions of shovel-ready and green jobs.” The fact that electrical-power rates, gasoline prices, and food costs have soared under Obama as wages have stagnated has never really been noticed. Nor have the record numbers of Americans on food stamps and disability insurance.

Meanwhile, as Obama has refused to enforce immigration law, the result is chaos. Tens of thousands of children are flooding across our border illegally, on the scent of Obama's executive-order amnesties. Advocates of open borders, such as progressive grandees Mark Zuckerberg and Nancy Pelosi, assume that these impoverished Third World children will not enroll in the private academies attended by their children or grandchildren, or need housing in one of their vacation estates, or crowd their specialists' waiting rooms. They do not worry about the effects of illegal immigration on the wages of low-income Americans. Dealing first-hand with the ramifications of open borders is for unenlightened, illiberal little people.

Obama's economic legacy is rarely appreciated. He has institutionalized the idea that unemployment between 6 and 7 percent is normal, that annual deficits over \$500 billion reflect frugality, that soaring power, food, and fuel costs are not proof of inflation, that zero interest rates are the reward for thrift, that higher taxes are always a beginning, never an end, and that there is no contradiction when elite progressives — the Obamas, the Clintons, the Warrens — trash the 1-percenters, while doing everything in their power to live just like them.

We are the roost and, to paraphrase the president's former spiritual adviser, Obama's chickens are now coming home to us.

WSJ

Fumes From Obama's Chemical Board

The charges of "serious or flagrant problems" at an executive branch agency have an all-too-familiar ring for this administration.

by Kimberley A. Strassel

In the smallest stories we sometimes find the biggest themes. The small story of the past month has been dysfunction at a backwater federal agency known as the Chemical Safety Board. Yet in this tale of obstruction, bullying and lawlessness we find what is now the clear pattern of the Obama administration.

If you've never heard of the CSB, join the rest of humanity. Created by Congress in 1990, the CSB is charged with probing industrial chemical accidents. Like the National Transportation Safety Administration, it's a rare entity with no regulatory authority; CSB's only job is to investigate and make recommendations. Its board and staff have mainly been wonky safety experts, and the agency largely devoid of political controversy.

That changed with this administration. The scandal popped in late 2013 when the Environmental Protection Agency's inspector general, Arthur Elkins (charged with CSB oversight), sent a "seven-day letter" to Congress. Said letters are rare, since they are used (reads the statute) to convey to legislators "particularly serious or flagrant problems" at an agency.



Rafael Moure-Eraso, chairman of the Chemical Safety Board

Mr. Elkins charged that CSB leadership was obstructing an investigation into whistleblowing retaliations. The House Oversight Committee was alarmed enough to initiate its own probe, the report of which was issued in mid-June, accompanied by a humdinger of a hearing.

The star witness was Dr. Rafael Moure-Eraso, nominated by President Obama in 2010 as CSB chairman. Mr. Moure-Eraso came out of academia but had also spent 15 years working as an industrial hygienist engineer for unions. The Oversight report shows he decided to unilaterally turn the investigating body into a de facto regulator along the European model—ginning up safety recommendations that would impose onerous new burdens on industry.

CSB staff told Congress that seasoned investigators who tried sticking to the facts of investigations—rather than the Moure-Eraso agenda—were bullied, humiliated in front of peers, and stripped of duties by senior CSB leadership. Since Mr. Moure-Eraso took over, at least nine senior employees (nearly one-quarter of the agency) have left. This has crippled CSB investigations and piled up their costs.

CSB once tended to get reports out within six months of an accident; today the average is three to four years. It is still working on the 2010 Deepwater Horizon spill and has racked up \$4.25 million in expenses on that investigation alone. The average CSB probe runs about \$400,000.

Mr. Moure-Eraso has shown equal contempt for fellow board members, cloistering himself with handpicked senior staff and defying board authority. When the board wanted more time to approve an annual budget, Mr. Moure-Eraso ordered staff to spend money anyway. When the board obtained advice from CSB General Counsel Chris Warner on how it might prohibit the chairman from making more senior personnel hires without the board's (required) approval, the chairman retaliated by demanding Mr. Warner's resignation. When Mr. Warner refused, Mr. Moure-Eraso hired his own general counsel (without board approval) and demoted Mr. Warner.

An Obama board appointee, Dr. Beth Rosenberg, resigned in May—after only 17 months. She told Congress in June that those who disagreed with "senior leadership" were "marginalized and vilified," and that the "level of dysfunction" had made her continuance impossible.

Then there's the IG investigation. Turns out some CSB employees went with complaints to the Office of Special Counsel, tasked with protecting federal whistleblowers. The IG, Mr. Elkins, in 2012 began investigating an allegation that someone at the Office—in violation of law—had informed the Moure-Eraso general counsel, Richard Loeb, of the identities of the whistleblowers. Concerned there had been retaliation within the CSB, Mr. Elkins demanded that Mr. Loeb hand over documents.

Mr. Loeb has testified that nobody at OSC gave him names, but we can't know since he and Mr. Moure-Eraso refused to comply with the IG requests. He informed Mr. Elkins that the documents were covered by attorney-client privilege—a stunt never before tried, since it utterly violates the law decreeing that IGs have unfettered access. This is what prompted the seven-day letter, and Mr. Elkins reported Wednesday that CSB is still refusing to give him documents.

What's notable is just how familiar this tale feels. It might be Gregory Jaczko, the former Obama head of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, whose fellow commissioners accused him of bullying and unilateral action. Or maybe the National Labor Relations Board, where President Obama's three illegally appointed board members joined with a never-confirmed acting general counsel to churn out extralegal opinions.

It has shades of the National Mediation Board, where an Obama majority muscled out 75 years of established labor policy to help unions. It feels like OSHA and its dust rule. Or the Justice Department and its armed raid of Gibson Guitar. Or the IRS and its targeting. Or Health and Human Services and its unilateral rewrites of ObamaCare.

It feels, in short, like President Obama. The president says openly that neither Congress nor laws will keep him from implementing his agenda. That attitude now seems to reign at every body in Washington, down to the teeny CSB. Blame Mr. Moure-Eraso for dysfunction, but remember that he's just emulating the boss.

PJ Media

Is Obama Just a Hapless Putz?

by Andrew Clavan

In an [interview](#) the other day, I was asked what the president might've been thinking when he instigated the chaos on our borders with his talk of pen-and-phone amnesty. Half a dozen things went through my mind. Maybe he's trying some sort of [Cloward-Piven](#) maneuver: an attempt to overwhelm our welfare state to the point where we replace it with "a guaranteed annual income and thus an end to poverty." Or maybe he's just trying to flood the population with Democrat voters. Or maybe he feels America stole its southland from Hispanic people anyway and it's up to him to give it back.

The president's not an idiot so obviously he intended to accomplish something by bringing this humanitarian disaster down upon the heads of ourselves and the children of Central America. What exactly was it?

Then, after the interview, it suddenly occurred to me: What difference, at this point, does it make what the president is thinking? What difference does it make what he intends? Intentions, as every conservative knows, don't dictate results. While, in the moment, he has put the lives of thousands of children, the health of Americans and the nation's security at risk, the end game is out of his control and may — almost assuredly will — be entirely different from what he expects.

Cloward-Piven, for instance, has always struck me as an idiot strategy. The idea that you can cause chaos and then predict what will come out of that chaos makes absolutely no sense. If our welfare state were overwhelmed, who knows what would come out of it? Hell, maybe it would be the end of the welfare state. I can dream, can't I?

Likewise, the prediction common on both the left and right that illegal immigrants will be now and forever Democrat voters is about as certain to come true as computer models of the future climate: i.e. not certain at all. Only Jews and blacks are doomed to vote eternally for Democrats even as the Dems screw them relentlessly into the ground. Not sure why. Maybe an evil curse. But hey, even Jews and blacks may one day come to their senses. As for illegal aliens? The future's not ours to know.

And yes, I do believe Obama has a radical's dislike of the country that has given him everything he is and has and that he wants to make us less of a power in the world. But who cares what he wants? I can virtually guarantee you our power is not going anywhere for at least a century or so. We are far, far more mighty and durable than people think. By not asserting American force, Obama can cause the death and oppression of many innocent people in far off lands — he already has. But as soon as we have a patriotic president again, our power will reassert itself and bring some sort of order back to the world.

In fact, I would predict that almost everything Obama has done in his time in office will vanish without a trace within a decade or two. Obamacare, the clown car foreign policy, the corruption... I think it has caused some problems and will cause some more, but then I think we'll shrug it all off and move on. Even some of the cleverer subterranean stuff, like favoring cities over suburbs, will only have a long-lasting effect if, in fact, the suburban era is over. If people still want their houses and lawns and cars, they'll get them back, no matter what oppressive regulations this guy puts in place.

Many people on the right think Obama is an Evil Leftist Genius. Not me. I think he is a hapless putz. I think his ideas are all wrong, his application of his ideas is incompetent, and the chaos that he causes with his wrongness and incompetence will not lead in the direction he thinks it will.

I think when the history of the 21st century is written, Obama will not merit more than a single line. Even the fact that he was the first black president may come to seem irrelevant in a couple of decades. In which case, he will not merit any line at all.

The guy is just a sad little schmuck who played cynical politics well and got promoted way above his competence. His policies won't change the face of the nation. They'll just make a mess that those who come after him will have to clean up.

National Review

[Black Americans: The True Casualties of Amnesty](#)

Democrats throw black voters under the bus.

by A. J. Delgado

One of the sleeper issues surrounding the debate on amnesty for illegal immigrants – an inconvenient one that no proponent of a widespread amnesty wishes to acknowledge – is the devastating effect so-called immigration reform will have on African Americans.

The black unemployment rate is almost 11 percent, far higher than that of any other group profiled by labor statistics. African Americans are disproportionately employed in lower-skilled jobs – the very same jobs immigrants take. As Steven Camarota asked in a [recent column](#), why double immigration when so many people already aren't working?

Who will be harmed most by amnesty? African-Americans.

The issue resurfaced this week when a [YouTube video](#) emerged of two young African-Americans confronting pro-illegal-immigration demonstrators in Murrieta, California. Murrieta is one of the towns in which undocumented minors are being relocated — and supporters are squaring off with protestors.

The young man argues:

If somebody brought six children to your house and you ain't got no job, are you gonna take them in?... What are you gonna do? Are you gonna try to go out there and take care of these children AND the children you got already that you can't take care of?... What are we going to do for the people who are here who are starving already?... We got our OWN people that are starving and hungry.... Why would we add to the problem?!

He also laments the problems in black neighborhoods where prices “are upped on everything” after large groups of immigrants move in.

The young woman argues:

It’s just too much.... We already have our own poor people. Starvation, kids walking with no shoes.... We don’t need other people’s kids to bring more problems.... You’re gonna watch America go spiraling down... We’re already in debt as it is. [Now] we’re gonna need more money to support these kids.

Why are Democratic politicians disregarding the concerns and needs of black Americans in a push to address the concerns and needs... of foreigners? Amnesty proponents speak of the need to grant others a better life – but what of the need to look out for our fellow Americans? What of those black Americans whose ancestors quite literally built this nation through the sweat of their brows?

Instead, Democrats are chucking aside black voters in their rush to lock in the Latino vote (or so they’re hoping). Taken for granted as a given come election-time, blacks are now actively *harmed* as the Democrats vow to grow their voting base through importing more and more of what they see as future blue-voters. It’s the husband who leaves his wife of 30 years: ‘We had a good run, honey, but I’ve found someone new.’

Black attorney and member of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights Peter Kirsanow, serves as one of the lone voices of reason, repeatedly outlining the harm amnesty will cause black Americans. In a 2013 letter to the Congressional Black Caucus, he wrote: “The obvious question is whether there are sufficient jobs in the low-skilled labor market for both African-Americans and illegal immigrants. The answer is no.” Kirsanow’s statistics demonstrate the way in which immigration impacts the wages and employment opportunities of black males and hurts the black community.

But no one seems to listen to Kirsanow.

Meanwhile, the harm to African Americans is not limited to reduced wages, greater competition for jobs, and declining household incomes – now even the black history of suffering is being diluted. Liberal columnist and CNN pundit Sally Kohn penned a column last week arguing that the term ‘illegal immigrant’ is the same as the N-word. Kohn, is usually fair-minded and reasoned in her arguments, lumping black Americans’ unique history and suffering with that of certain Latino immigrants is absurd and offensive. Consider that the N-word was used to describe a person who was whipped daily, while ‘illegal immigrant’ is a word used to describe a person who receives free education (even in-state tuition!), housing, driver’s licenses, legal aid, food, and healthcare. To even claim the two words are similar is an unthinkable affront – and insult – to African-Americans.

Senator Jeff Sessions’s recent National Review column “On Immigration, It’s Time to Defend Americans,” hits the nail on the head. Sessions notes:

Harvard professor George Borjas estimated that high immigration rates from 1980 to 2000 resulted in a 7.4 percent wage reduction for lower-skilled American workers.... The Center for Immigration Studies issued a study based on Census data showing that “since 2000 all of the net gain in the number of working-age (16 to 65) people holding a job has gone to immigrants.”... If mass immigration is so good for the economy, why then — during this long sustained period of record immigration into the U.S. — are incomes falling and a record number of Americans not working?

Birthright citizenship is already bad enough; largely refusing to deport illegal immigrants is already bad enough. But now, we've upped the ante even further. Overburdened taxpayers, including black taxpayers, are covering the cost to feed, clothe and educate illegals, and black Americans face the additional burden of having their historic suffering belittled and their precarious circumstances made even worse.

Democrats have built a brand as the party willing to stand up for black Americans, but the amnesty push shows what a false promise that was. The message to black voters is: "Yes, your ancestors endured unimaginable hardships and helped build this country, and we said we'd help you out. But now we have a new trophy wife."

A. J. Delgado is a conservative writer and lawyer. She writes about politics and culture.

Road and Track

Owning a supercar is just as expensive as you think

For countless reasons, supercars are rarely designed for ease of maintenance.

by Phil Berg



The Diablo's V12 has two \$5000 engine computers, which occasionally fail. Lamborghini is sold out of replacements.

On paper, a used super-exotic makes sense. You get the mind-blowing performance and heartbreaking looks, but at a lower price than a new hypercar, and with no yearlong stay on a dealer's waiting list. But—surprise!—the buy-in is only half the damage. Parts are far from cheap and often hard to come by. Many jobs require purpose-built tools. And for countless reasons, supercars are rarely designed for ease of maintenance—the same task that takes an afternoon on

your mother's Toyota could consume five days on a McLaren. We polled owners and mechanics to find out what makes working on these cars aggravating, expensive, and just plain weird.

McLaren F1

McLaren estimates annual running costs to be \$30,000. Oil changes are \$8000. Owners can have their cars serviced at the factory in Woking, which employs two full-time F1 techs. (Ralph Lauren does this with his three F1s. The money from that blazer you bought goes to good use.)

"The car is appreciating so fast, the repair bills will never catch up to the price."

—The bright side, according to Lauren's mechanic, Mark Reinwald.

- The factory generally insists on replacing tires (\$3000 each) in pairs. McLaren scrubs in every set sold, for free.
 - Service can take up to six weeks, not including transit to the UK. (Ten days door-to-door by air, seven weeks by boat.)
-

Ferrari Enzo

Resale value on the 650-hp Enzo works as it does with all Ferraris—service records are crucial. "Every time something was done to the car, you better have the piece of paper that goes with it," says Michigan's Ken Lingenfelter, the owner of our photo car. If you don't, get ready to knock far more than the service cost off your asking price.

\$6,000

Oil or shop fluids can irreversibly damage a \$6000 carbon-ceramic rotor, so a set of factory covers protects them during service.

Each dealer must buy a \$10,000 tool package and this scissor lift for Enzo work. (It won't hold the new Laferrari.)

SCHEDULED MAINTENANCE

15,000 miles: Oil change and air filters. Not bad.

30,000 miles: Spark plugs, fuel filters, and timing chain (an engine-out service—ouch).

15 years (mandatory): Seatbelt pretensioner replacement.

Topping off after an oil change takes an hour:

1. Add eight quarts oil, idle V12 until warm.*
2. Run engine at 4000 rpm for two minutes, idle for two minutes.
3. Add oil one quart at a time until full. Total capacity: 12 quarts.

* **Warm up the Enzo's V12 with the \$60,000 engine lid open, and the carbon-fiber body will expand enough that the lid won't close until the car cools.**

Porsche Carrera GT

Like other Porsches, Weissach's 205-mph, V10 super-Boxster runs 15,000-mile oil-change intervals. And by supercar standards, a valve-adjustment service (30,000 miles, engine out, four days) hits once every blue moon. Everything else is, predictably, nuts.

\$3,000 OIL CHANGE

Three reasons why:

1. A set of four ramps (\$1100) is required to get the car over the hoist arms.
2. The rear-heavy car has to be fixed to the lift so it doesn't tip or fall off. A \$550 set of ¾-inch aluminum plates bolts to the car for the purpose. (Many owners leave them installed.)
3. Two engine-oil filters—one replaceable and one reusable screen. Strip the drain-plug hole in the aluminum cover, you're out \$6800.

SERVICE THE Carrera GT OR BUY A USED CAYMAN?

Replace the trick ceramic clutch: \$25,000 including labor. A full brake job—\$30,000—is a steal by comparison.

When the Carrera GT was new, dealers had to buy a special \$10,000 table and an \$8000 jig to hold the car's engine during service.

* **The battery hides behind a panel in the right rear wheel well and only fits through the hole one way. All the more reason to use the sold-with-every-car trickle charger.**

Lamborghini LM002

Not a supercar, but the Rambo Lambo used enough parts from the superbin. Roughly 300 were made from 1986 to 1993, using the V-12 from the Countach.

\$5,000 per tire

Pirelli recently resumed production of LM002-specific Scorpion tires, although without the early sidewall ridge for flotation in loose sand. A set of five is discounted to \$15,000.



**LET'S GIVE THE PRESIDENT POWER
TO BYPASS CONGRESS AND
DO WHATEVER HE WANTS**



**SAID NO FOUNDING
FATHER EVER**

**I don't always eat
bananas, but
when I do...**



**... I prefer them
to be boneless.**