

Eric Holder Wants to Save America From President Trump

It's only been a week since the tragic near-assassination of roughly two dozen Republican congressmen and senators in Alexandria last Wednesday, and already some elements of the left are crawling back to their previous positions as full-throated warriors of the anti-Trump resistance, vowing to continue the fight for the causes liberals hold most dear.

None other than former Obama Attorney General Eric Holder surfaced in California this week, stirred the stewing pot of unrest and even suggested he might run against the incumbent president in 2020.

Andrew Romano of Yahoo News reported, "Seized by a sense of urgency to oppose Trump and restore what he regards as America's best self, [Eric] Holder is mulling a White House bid of his own, according to three sources who have spoken to him and are familiar with his thinking.

"'Up to now, I have been more behind-the-scenes,' Holder told Yahoo News in an exclusive interview about his plans. 'But that's about to change. I have a certain status as the former attorney general. A certain familiarity as the first African-American attorney general. There's a justified perception that I'm close to President Obama. So I want to use whatever skills I have, whatever notoriety I have, to be effective in opposing things that are, at the end of the day, just bad for the country.

"'Now is the time to be more visible,' Holder added. 'Now is the time to be heard.'"

Raise your hand if you think Eric Holder is an appropriate arbiter to assess what is "bad for the country." To Holder, "being heard" includes leading an effort in California to

effectively turn it into a sanctuary state—he consulted on a bill, which if passed, would prevent local law enforcement from cooperating with federal border agents. As a matter of course, Holder is encouraging Californians to nullify or ignore federal law and the will of Congress as expressed through immigration statutes.

Therefore, doing “what’s right for the country,” in essence, means fostering open rebellion. In more sane times Holder would be hauled away and tried as a traitor. These are strange days, indeed.

As would be expected considering the source, Romano’s Yahoo News article depicts Holder as a Robin Hood-like charismatic figure, courageously battling back against the evil powers that be in Washington—you know, the ones who want to enforce the law. Holder doesn’t deny his close association with Obama and promises resistance through lawsuits when the time comes.

As far as Holder’s possible run for president in 2020, the notion is laughable. Obama’s most loyal right-hand man will no doubt have to compete for the ultra-far left Democrat vote with Bernie Sanders, Elizabeth Warren, Corey Booker and whichever other crackpots choose to throw their hats in the ring. If you thought 2016 was ridiculous with Crooked Hillary trying to out-left Bernie for the love of Democrat primary loons, just wait until the next cycle.

Assuming President Trump will try for a second term, the nastiness of the upcoming 2020 general election campaign will make 2016’s look tame by comparison. Some might argue this is an exciting time in politics, but with the way Holder and other leftist scoundrels are talking, we’re teetering on the edge of a total societal breakdown where anarchy reigns and everyone feels justified to ignore laws they believe are “bad for the country.”

In the meantime Holder and Obama are concentrating their

efforts on redistricting ahead of the 2020 census, hell-bent on getting more Democrats elected to further their jointly held goal of fundamentally transforming America. What they and their ilk can't accomplish at the ballot box, they intend to finagle through the courts.

One of Holder's pet projects as Obama's Attorney General and now as a highly-paid leftist advocate, operating under a \$25,000 a month contract with the California Assembly, was to oppose those states that enacted tighter voter restrictions to ensure the integrity of the elections process. Holder was successful in blocking common sense voter ID laws, in some instances several years ago, by appealing to biased, friendly judges, all the while suggesting that such requirements would dampen the voter turnout of certain demographic groups.

There's only one problem; it's not true. Hans A. Von Spakovsky and Benjamin Janacek wrote at *National Review*, "In short, there is no credible evidence that voter ID laws have impeded turnout, especially among minorities and Democrats, as their opponents suggest. Meanwhile, a Heritage Foundation database tracking documented voter fraud now contains 492 cases and 773 criminal convictions, with untold other cases unreported and unprosecuted.

"It is thus more important than ever that we implement voter ID laws, while also taking steps to prevent non-citizens and individuals registered in multiple states from voting. Across the country, as Heritage's database shows, voter-fraud convictions include everything from impersonation fraud and false registrations to ineligible voting by felons and non-citizens. American voter fraud continues apace, and the United States remains one of the only democracies in the world without a uniform requirement for voter identification."

It's the final fact that should draw attention, even from liberals. Leftists cried foul a few weeks back when President Trump announced he was pulling the United States out of the

non-binding Paris climate accord, whining at the time that America would be isolated in the world by refusing to take part in the supposedly global effort to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

But when it comes for basic and simple requirements for individuals to show identification in order to cast a ballot, liberals claim it's racist and discriminatory. Does that mean all the other democratic institutions in the world with stringent voting rules are illegitimate?

The arguments for and against voter ID laws are well-known and certainly don't need to be rehashed, but I still can't help but wonder how it is liberals like Holder and Obama can claim with a straight face that requiring Americans to prove their eligibility to vote by revealing a state-required document is burdensome and meant to suppress them?

If everyone is required to carry a license in order to drive or buy alcohol, then why are minorities the only ones impacted by voter ID laws? Don't minorities operate cars? Don't they use IDs to cash checks?

If the minorities Holder and Obama are referring to are in the country illegally, they shouldn't be registered to vote in the first place. And what about those jurisdictions where ethnic minorities constitute a majority of the population? Is it still oppression?

So how is it Holder and crew can realistically argue such laws dampen turnout?

Perhaps even more difficult to accept is why more members of the various minority communities do not speak out on this issue since Holder, Obama and anyone else who gripes about simple voter ID requirements is essentially labeling them as less capable of obtaining the requisite documents and following the law. Isn't that the very definition of institutional prejudice—claiming someone can't do something

because of their skin color or ethnic origin?

Speaking of dampened voter turnout in key states, shouldn't the Democrats be focusing their anger at Green Party candidate Jill Stein, the one who clearly took votes away from Hillary Clinton?

For her part, Stein says she has no regrets. Ben Shreckinger wrote in *Politico Magazine*, "Democrats ... still blame Stein for helping install Trump in the White House. In Michigan, Stein garnered more than 51,000 votes, while Clinton lost by fewer than 11,000. In Wisconsin, Trump's margin was 23,000 votes while Stein attracted 31,000. And in Pennsylvania she attracted 50,000 votes, while Trump won by 44,000 ...

"Beyond the question of whether staying off swing-state ballots or endorsing Clinton could have prevented Trump's victory, there is the question of the extent to which Russia attempted to use Stein's candidacy as a vehicle for influencing American politics and the extent to which it succeeded. Democrats have long accused the Green Party of being like a watermelon—green on the outside, red on the inside—and Stein's closeness to a Kremlin-backed entity like RT has only fueled those suspicions."

There you have it. It's not enough for Democrats to pursue the fantasy of Donald Trump colluding with the Russians to steal the 2016 election; now they're suggesting ultra-leftist Jill Stein was potentially in on the action, colluding with the Russians, and by extension, Trump, to defeat Hillary Clinton.

You can't make this stuff up. Liberals and Democrats are so desperate to find a scapegoat for losing last November they're latching on to anything that could potentially motivate their brainwashed followers to stay with them. And if the actions of Eric Holder and post-presidency Obama are any indication, the effort has just begun.

This article was originally published at . Used with

permission. {eoa}