



TRANSCRIPT

SHOW AIRING MAY 9, 2010

Host: Roland Martin

Guests: Dr. Stephen Flynn, President, Center for National Policy

Mr. Darrell Williams, President, Loop21.com

Deborah Mathis, Contributor, BlackAmericaWeb.com

**Hazel Trice Edney, Editor-in-Chief, National Newspaper Publishers
Association News Service**

Robert Traynham, Host, "Roll Call TV," Comcast Network

Cornell Belcher, Pollster and Democratic Political Strategist

Smokey Fontaine, Chief Content Officer, NewsOne.com/Interactive One



TV One – Washington Watch

K. Wills Transcripts

Contact/Producer: Jay Feldman

Story/Angle: “Washington Watch” – May 9, 2010 Show

**(HEAD-
LINES)**

MR. ROLAND MARTIN: At the top of our agenda this week, a fourth straight month of strong job creation, but is it reaching the African-American community? A new crop of African-Americans are running as Republicans for office. Will it divide the Black vote? And what can the foiled New York City terror plot teach us about staying safe at home? Our “Washington Watch” newsmaker this week: Dr. Stephen Flynn, president of the Center for National Policy on playing your part to keep your family and America safe from attack. In our “Washington Watch” roundtable, Deborah Mathis, BlackAmericaWeb.com contributor; Hazel Trice Edney, editor-in-chief of the National Newspaper Publishers Association News Service; Robert Traynham, host of “Roll Call TV” on the Comcast Network; and Cornell Belcher, Democratic political strategist and pollster.

And, folks, no, he *didn't*. *The Daily Show* 's Jon Stewart has the *nerve* to attack my style of dress. Oh! I got somethin' to say about that! All that and more today on “Washington Watch.”

**(SEG-
MENT 1)**

MR. MARTIN: This week's arrest of New York City car bomb suspect Faisal Shahzad reminds us that our terrorist enemies remain determined to try and attack us here in America. The man, born in Pakistan, but a naturalized U.S. citizen, is charged with trying to kill large numbers of people in the heart of Time Square in New York with

an SUV rigged with explosives. Fortunately, thanks to the quick response of an African-American street vendor, the police were alerted, and the vehicle was safely dismantled, and lives were saved. Shahzad was taken into custody just 50 hours after the SUV was spotted.

My first guest is an expert in securing the homeland. Stephen Flynn is president of the Center for National Policy and served as the lead policy advisor on homeland security for the Obama presidential transition team.

Dr. Flynn, welcome to the show.

DR. STEPHEN FLYNN: Delighted to be with you.

MR. MARTIN: Republican critics are – have been coming after the President, saying, with the Christmas Day plot that was – or – or – almo- -- almost attack that was averted, in addition to this, that they are weak in terms of a strong national security plan dealing with security here. How would you assess the Obama Administration's first 18 months or so in terms of protecting the homeland?

DR. FLYNN: Well, I think the record is – is pr- -- is pretty strong. I mean their overall effort has been primarily directed, of course, overseas – particularly in the area of Afghanistan – but they inherited what was still pretty weak defenses here at home. The focus of the Bush administration was very much an away game, and although we constantly heard from the former president, Vice President Cheney, “We need to do it over there so we don’t have to do it here,” that’s an attractive logic, but what it actually translated into is we didn’t do that much here to safeguard us.

Now, what's the problem? The problem right now is we have – the splinter groups of al-Qaeda have increasingly decided you don't have to do a super, big-bang, 9-11-scale attack. Smaller attacks, actually, can cause a lot of harm [and] disruption to our society. "So, let's go" – "downscale the ambition of the attacks." That means you can attract a lot more people who don't have to be as capable to support those attacks.

So, I think [al]most all national security experts, terrorist experts who've looked at the issue say the terrorist threat is changing. It has more of a homegrown dimension. They're not as large-scale as 9-11 – is what we'll likely be facing in the near term, though that always remains a challenge. And that means, basically, as I look at it, much more preparation, locally, that we need. It's not all about just the Feds; it's fundamentally about how we, the people, are geared up to deal with this.

MR. MARTIN: But I -- let's deal with these, you know, small, localized attacks; because the reality is if this was successful, it would have really brought on an amount of fear back into the American people we have not seen since 9-11. And so what must the average person be doing to be vigilant in terms of looking out for these kind[s] of attacks? Because, look. Many folks expect we're going to see this increase – malls, stadiums, high school football games – large venues, where you could have mass casualties.

DR. FLYNN: Yeah. The reality is we're – I think you're dealing [with is] the threat is now morphing itself. The first preventers, the first responders are almost going to be everyday people, and so we have to do a much better job than we *have* been

doing as a – at the national level informing and empowering.

MR. MARTIN: But – but –

DR. FLYNN: Yeah.

MR. MARTIN: -- but what does that actually mean? I mean – so, for instance – that has always been the concern that I have – I've had – after 9-11. That is that we aren't conditioned for that. We aren't conditioned to walk down the street and necessarily looking at cars, seeing what's in them, looking at people in a different way. That's just simply not what we do, because we haven't been accustomed to do that like folks in other countries have.

DR. FLYNN: Yes, and I think that's very true. There is – one is I think you – you break up the problem a little bit in this way. What was really impressive about what happened with Time Square [is] it wasn't just an everyday tourist who spotted it, but it was a vendor who was nearby, who knows the rhythm of that neighborhood, who has the relationships. They're your, often, best eyes and ears. So, when you basically create a neighborhood watch, you want people who're from the neighborhood, and you give them information. What we need to share is things like, well, what *are* car bombs? How do they work? How are they constructed? What – you know, what should you be looking out for? And there are behaviors that we know that people who're about to kill themselves, unfortunately – suicide bombers and so forth – they exhibit physical symptoms that we could do a much better job spreading information around.

MR. MARTIN: Like what?

DR. FLYNN: Well, the – in terms of – well, one – one very good program, actually, is – we put it in place in the U.S. – is actually at Logan Airport up in Boston. They call it “Logan Watch.” Every person who works in that airport, from the guy who shoe shines to the people behind the – the – the fast food counter, they’ve all been given some training about looking for the – the signs, the physical symptoms of somebody who’s often engaged, and who may be engaged, in a terrorist attack.

MR. MARTIN: So – so, should companies – large companies, folks who work in public facilities like that – should they be implementing those – that kind of training now? Because what often happens in this country [is] we do it *after* something has happened –

DR. FLYNN: Absolutely.

MR. MARTIN: -- so being reactive versus be -- going on the offensive.

DR. FLYNN: Yes. And we should do it in a proactive way. You know, this is very much stuff that’s borrowed from the Brits, borrowed from the Israelis, who have basically taught people to understand how these attacks happen and what you maybe[?] should be looking for. And the element of this, Roland, is it’s – it – it keeps us from not being as afraid. When you empower people with information, and you give them things to do, the thing that seems like almost *really* terrifying becomes less scary. And so it’s not “woe is us”; we’re going to actually, you know, frighten people. It’s actually give people real information, give them things to do. And also, we have to be prepared, obviously, to respond quickly and recover from these events.

MR. MARTIN: You actually wrote the book *The Edge of Disaster: Rebuilding a Resilient Nation*, and you wrote that: “Resiliency [such as in Times Square being relatively back to normal the day after the botched attack, has] ... “historically been one of the United States’ great national strengths.” And – and we’ve seen that, but isn’t that also, sometimes, false security; that, okay, this one was stopped: “Okay, gone. It’s” – “someone else took care of it,” and then we simply go on about our daily lives?

DR. FLYNN: Yeah. The – the complacency – right – is the real issue here. And what I’m really trying to say overall is if we go back into our history, every generation of Americans, from those who were first here to those who landed here and moved across the frontier, they confronted adversity, and they overcame it. And that’s a big part of, I think, our sense of confidence and optimism as a people. It isn’t we lived in a risk-free world; it’s that we met it, and we can bounce back better and stronger.

But that’s got[ten] a little bit, I think, shelf-worn here more recently, in part, because our national security – the, basically, framework was “we’ll take care of you.” You know, “You shop and travel. We[‘ve] got it covered.”

MR. MARTIN: Just – just, “Look. Go back shopping. We’ve] got us all covered.”

DR. FLYNN: Exactly. And that’s a promise they can’t deliver. The nature of this threat is such that we’re talking about the kinds of people we saw just this past weekend in the Times Square bomber here. They’re folks that don’t fit a very easy profile. You’re not going to have all the intelligence you want.

MR. MARTIN: Right.

DR. FLYNN: And so we've got to engage the citizenry. When you go back to the Second World War, *everybody* was involved. *Everybody* had a job, from the victory gardens to the war bonds. And it's not that we all need to be on a war footing; it's just that we all 've got to be not on a *complacency* footing. We need information. We need to go about our lives with a *little* bit of sophistication and be prepared and then bounce back.

MR. MARTIN: So, if someone's sitting at home right now, and they are, a mother, a father – there're children there as well – what are some of the basic things that you think the American people should be doing? You talked about what's happening at Logan Airport, but what's – what are some of the other things that the average person can be focused on? Because, again, you know, the whole point – other shows might be dealing with, "Oh, the drone attacks. Is that the reason why this guy is doing all that kinda stuff?" – along those lines. We still have to deal with the average person who might be affected, because, frankly, we want the next vendor, we want the next person seeing that car saying, "Hey, something is wrong here."

DR. FLYNN: Yes. And so one is the overall – I think you can't just have a counterterrorism focus. Community policing and community-neighborhood watches are a very strong program that help you with a terrorism risk, because what you're asking people to do is look around them. "Know your neighbor," and – and know the rhythm of the neighborhood. The chances are – the process of carrying out a terrorist attack is you do surveillance in advance. You – you do a dry run, because before you actually

do this thing, you know – and that’s – of course, in this case, where somebody *was* inexperienced, that helped, obviously, ‘cause they weren’t successful. They didn’t *have* the experience.

MR. MARTIN: Right.

DR. FLYNN: But the real scary stuff is they – they never just drive in the first time and try to do it. They do surveillance. They do the dry runs, and somebody usually is going to look around and go, “That just isn’t right.” And there has to be a relationship with the community and the police, and it’s often at the local level. It’s not, you know, somebody calling the FBI.

MR. MARTIN: Right.

DR. FLYNN: That’s why we have to make sure that – right now, we[‘ve] got states and locals that are just cutting the budgets for emergency responders and public safety. And then we’re relying, again, on our national security players, who may not always be able to protect us. It’s an all-hands evolution. It is – I – I think, if you basically, as you should, in most neighborhoods have a neighborhood watch to deal with the crime issue, you’re well on your way to dealing with this risk as well.

MR. MARTIN: Well – and the reality is in this case, it was a[n] average, ordinary American [who] spotted it. The Christmas Day near-attack on the airplane – average Americans flying; but, again, it is about being attentive to what is around you and not simply having the earplugs in, simply being oblivious to what’s going on; because let’s just be honest. A lot of folks *do*. We’re sitting on our BlackBerrys, just typing away –

DR. FLYNN: Yeah.

MR. MARTIN: -- not really understanding what is happening around us. And so it's about -- you said "all hands on deck."

DR. FLYNN: Absolutely[?].

MR. MARTIN: Dr. Flynn, we certainly appreciate it. Thanks a lot.

DR. FLYNN: Well, thank you so much for having me.

MR. MARTIN: All right.

DR. FLYNN: I really enjoyed it.

MR. MARTIN: Thank you.

Coming up, Michael Steele isn't the only African-American who believes the GOP is the party for him. Plus, what's all the fuss about Mirandizing the New York City bomb suspect? Our roundtable panelists, Deborah Mathis from BlackAmericaWeb.com; Hazel Trice Edney from the Black press; Robert Traynham of "Roll Call TV"; and Democratic pollster Cornell Belcher join me for a candid and, no doubt, spirited discussion on these stories -- and you never know what else will bubble up. Be sure to stick around.

[END OF SEGMENT.] --

**(SEG-
MENT 2)**

MR. MARTIN: All right, folks. A lot to talk about with our roundtable. Let's get right to it. Deborah Mathis, BlackAmericaWeb.com; Hazel Trice Edney. She's the editor-in-chief of the National Newspaper Publishers Association, also known as "the

Black press.”

Long business card, Hazel. All right.

Robert Traynham, host of “Roll Call TV” on the Comcast Network; and, of course, my man – he *loves* Prince –

MR. CORNELL BELCHER: [Chuckles.]

MR. MARTIN: -- Cornell Belcher, Democratic political strategist and pollster. And, trust me, before we end this segment, we *will* get a shot of Cornell’s shoes.

[LAUGHTER.]

MR. MARTIN: Gotta do it.

All right, folks. Let’s get right into it. Republicans are making all kinds of noise this week about why did you read the Miranda rights to Faisal Shahzad. Okay. The guy’s an American citizen. Now, what I’m trying to figure out [is] if you didn’t know at the outset if it was actually terrorism, don’t you give him the benefit of the doubt for being an American citizen?

MR. ROBERT TRAYNHAM: Roland, this is a philosophical question that Democrats and Republicans are faced with.

MR. MARTIN: Or, is it a constitutional one?

MR. TRAYNHAM: Well, it’s that, too; and – and –

MR. MARTIN: [Chuckles.]

MR. TRAYNHAM: -- and it’s an – a different interpretation of the Constitution. If, in fact, you’re an enemy combatant, should you give this person the Miranda rights?

MR. MARTIN: When is –

MR. TRAYNHAM: Because –

MR. MARTIN: -- that decided?

MR. TRAYNHAM: -- because when you give the person Miranda rights, it opens up a – literally and figuratively – a Pandora's box of rights and speedy trial and the whole nine years. *And* on top of that, it also opens up a conversation as to where the trial should be, because a lot of folks – and even some Democrats even would agree – that when you open up the Miranda rights issue, you, thus, in the process have to decide whether or not there's going to be a fair trial and the whole nine –

MR. MARTIN: But, Cornell –

MR. TRAYNHAM: -- yards.

MR. MARTIN: -- where –

[CROSSTALK.]

MR. BELCHER: This is –

MR. TRAYNHAM: But – but – but –

MR. MARTIN: -- Cornell, when do you –

[CROSSTALK.]

MR. MARTIN: -- decide who is an enemy combatant?

MR. TRAYNHAM: -- okay. Go –

MR. BELCHER: [Crosstalk] – this is –

MR. TRAYNHAM: -- ahead.

MR. BELCHER: -- [crosstalk] -- is politics; because, quite frankly, they didn't do anything that the Bush Administration didn't do. And, [as] far as I know, when you're an American citizen, you get read your Miranda rights. Now, this --

MR. MARTIN: Right.

MR. BELCHER: -- is wha- --

MR. MARTIN: A little thing --

MR. BELCHER: -- what's happening -- what -- what --

MR. MARTIN: -- called the Constitution.

MR. BELCHER: -- what's happening is this guy's actually cooperating, is getting u- -- giving us tons of information.

MR. MARTIN: Exactly[?].

MR. BELCHER: And the important thing here is that 50 hours. From the time he did what he did 'til the time our law enforcement found him and cuffed him, 50 hours. Applaud what -- what this administration's doing. Applaud what our law enforcement efforts are doing. Stop playing politics with this issue.

MS. HAZEL TRICE EDNEY: Once --

MS. DEBORAH MATHIS: And -- [crosstalk]- --

MS. EDNEY: -- you are an American, though -- once you are an American, you have every right to get your Miranda rights, every right under the Constitution of the United States that every other American *has*.

MS. MATHIS: -- may I --

MR. MARTIN: Go ahead.

MS. MATHIS: -- inject just a little bit of new fact in this thing? This is seriously underreported, if it's been reported much at all.

MR. MARTIN: Okay.

MS. MATHIS: And that is that there are exceptions to the Miranda law. When the matters of public safety are at issue, you have a window in there. The Supreme Court has allowed this. You have a window in which you may ask certain kinds of questions that relate to the public safety *before* you read the Miranda rights. Do you know that that's what happened in this case? For -- for up to four hours, I believe, he was questioned, under this exception, about who he was working with. "Are there any other bombs around?" "Anybody on the way here?" "What are you doing next?" "Who gave you the supplies?" -- that kind of thing -- public safety issues, the exceptional issues allowed under Miranda, before he was read the Miranda rights.

MR. MARTIN[?]: Well the b- --

MS. MATHIS: That's something that --

MR. BELCHER: That's what --

MS. MATHIS: -- I think needs to be *known*.

MR. BELCHER: -- but -- but w- -- well, they must be doing that to me when they pull me over, 'cause whenever --

MS. EDNEY: [Chuckles.]

MR. BELCHER: -- I'm stopped bla- --

MS. MATHIS: I'm telling – [crosstalk] –

[CROSSTALK.]

MR. BELCHER: -- driving while Black – [chuckles] –

MS. MATHIS: -- yeah, we – [crosstalk] –

MS. EDNEY: Is that s- –

MS. MATHIS: -- exceptions all the –

MS. EDNEY: -- is that something –

MS. MATHIS: -- time.

MS. EDNEY: -- since 2001 –

MS. MATHIS: What –

MS. EDNEY: -- the anti-terrorism laws? Or –

MS. MATHIS: -- no, that – that – that has been on the books for a while, actually, and I heard Eric Holder testify to this before Congress just the other day, explaining exactly what they did. I believe it was – it was – it was on Wednesday that he –

MR. MARTIN: Well, what --

[CROSSTALK.]

MS. MATHIS: -- testified.

MR. BELCHER: -- Deborah – [crosstalk]- --

MR. MARTIN: -- what – what – what bothers me the most in this whole conversation is that you have politicians who, frankly, know nothing about law

enforcement. You have individuals who are grandstanding, making political statements, when my position is you let the police officers –

MR. TRAYNHAM: Roland –

MR. MARTIN: -- you let law enforcement –

MR. TRAYNHAM: -- Roland –

MR. MARTIN: -- do what they do. There's not a *single* politician who could've gone out there and arrested this –

MS. MATHIS: And found them.

MR. MARTIN: -- guy.

MS. MATHIS: Or found –

MR. TRAYNHAM: -- Roland –

MS. MATHIS: -- them.

MR. TRAYNHAM: -- Roland –

MR. MARTIN: So, the – let law – la- -- law enforcement, that's – *they know what they're doing*.

MR. TRAYNHAM: -- Roland, first responders should always be the f- -- they're the first responders. They're the first ones on the scenes, obviously, to – to a- --

MR. MARTIN: They're also –

MR. TRAYNHAM: -- to address –

MR. MARTIN: -- trained to *do* this!

MR. TRAYNHAM: -- however – and correct me if I'm wrong – most first

responders are not – no- -- not – are not in national security briefings. All lawmakers are. These politicians that are, quote, “grandstanding” know the threat assessments that people wake up every, single –

MR. MARTIN: But –

MR. TRAYNHAM: -- day, and what –

MR. MARTIN: -- but, Robert –

MR. TRAYNHAM: -- let me finish.

MR. MARTIN: -- do any of these –

MR. TRAYNHAM: *Let me finish.*

MR. MARTIN: -- poli- -- do any of these politicians know – survey evidence? Do any of these politicians – have they actually ever *questioned* a suspect?

MR. TRAYNHAM: No.

MR. MARTIN: They haven't.

MR. TRAYNHAM: No, they haven't, but – *but* let's – let's just call a spade a spade here. But they also are entrusted with – with making sure that we're all safe from a global terrorism –

MR. MARTIN: No.

MR. TRAYNHAM: -- perspective.

MR. MARTIN: *Law enforcement is!*

MR BELCHER: We- -- well – but, Roland, the forest for trees here. They – tha- -- it worked. They got the guy. They brought him in. They brought him in a – a – a

quick time, and he's – and he's now cooperating. For us to get d- -- bogged down in these small sort[s] of conversations that are *clearly* for – for Republican politics is – is one thing. And then – and I understand why Republicans are doing this -- 'cau- – 'cause, quite frankly, if you look at where they were on national security, the advantage they had on national security, what – going into 2004, they – where they had a double-digit advantage on that, and when you look at where they are sort of tied with Democrats on national security right now, they cannot go into this election with a disadvantage on national security. And *that's* why they're doing what –

[CROSSTALK.]

MR. TRAYNHAM: But you –

MR. MARTIN: [Crosstalk] –

MR. BELCHER: -- they're doing.

MR. TRAYNHAM: -- know, Roland –

MR. MARTIN: -- [crosstalk] –

MR. TRAYNHAM: -- but you know, Roland, thank God no one got killed. Thank God that this would-be terrorist is cooperating. But let's stop and think about this for a moment. I *guarantee* you we would be having a – a different conversation if, in fact, that bomb did go off and if, in fact, people did, in fact –

MR. MARTIN: But, Robert –

MR. TRAYNHAM: -- unfortunately, die.

MR. MARTIN: -- we wou- --

MR. TRAYNHAM: The fact of the matter –

MS. MATHIS: [Crosstalk.]

MR. MARTIN: Robert, Robert –

MS. MATHIS: We *should* be having a different –

MR. MARTIN: -- you can take –

MS. MATHIS: -- conversation.

MR. MARTIN: -- any national tragedy and apply that same logic. Frankly, we would've ne- -- you – one could say we would've never had any of the safety measures put in place by NASA had the space shuttle not blown up. I mean so we – we could apply it to *anything*.

MR. TRAYNHAM: Well, I think you're –

MR. MARTIN: Of *course* –

MR. TRAYNHAM: -- mixing an apple and an orange.

MR. MARTIN: -- no, no. Of *course* there would be a different conversation, but the – but the over po- -- overall point that I'm making [is] that I believe that it is fundamentally wrong when you have politicians, who know nothing about law enforcement –

MR. TRAYNHAM: I disagree with you.

MR. MARTIN: -- getting in –

MS. EDNEY: But –

MR. MARTIN: -- the way of the people –

MS. EDNEY: -- they --

MR. MARTIN: -- and that's their job.

MS. EDNEY: -- are politicians. Obviously.

MR. BELCHER: [Chuckles.]

MS. EDNEY: They voted[?] --

MR. MARTIN: And that's why I'm calling --

MS. EDNEY: -- they voted --

MR. MARTIN: -- them *out*!

MS. EDNEY: -- they voted --

MR. BELCHER: Right. [Chuckles.]

MS. EDNEY: -- they -- but they're -- they're --

MR. MARTIN: That's why I'm calling them out!

MS. EDNEY: -- in the middle of midterm elections. Obviously, they're going to jump out there to make themselves look like great heroes for American -- for -- for American protection, for American safety, et cetera. So, they're going to say whatever they --

MS. MATHIS: But it's up --

MS. EDNEY: -- need to say --

MS. MATHIS: -- to us --

MS. EDNEY: -- in order to win --

MS. MATHIS: -- it's up to us, the Amer- --

MS. EDNEY: -- the races.

MS. MATHIS: -- it's up to -- to us, the media; it's up to us, the American public, to put it into context and put it in perspective, and to realize, as Hazel said, these are, after all, politicians. It's almost their *job* to pipe up, whether they know what they're talking about or not.

MR. MARTIN: [Chuckles.] I w- -- I w- -- I would've --

MS. EDNEY: [Chuckles.]

MR. MARTIN: -- I would've, for --

MR. BELCHER: Well, they --

MR. MARTIN: -- that's a good point.

[CROSSTALK.]

MR. BELCHER: -- but they shouldn't do it --

MR. MARTIN: I -- I wanna -- [crosstalk] --

[CROSSTALK.]

MR. MARTIN: -- but now -- now --

MR. BELCHER: -- on national security. They really shouldn't do it.

MR. MARTIN: -- now, I want to move on to what's happening in Arizona. This week, Rev. Al Sharpton, he was in Arizona, leading a protest there. We saw the Phoenix Suns, many of their -- the entire team unanimous --

MS. MATHIS: [Crosstalk] -- Suns.

MR. MARTIN: -- the owner, they came out and made it perfectly clear where

they stand on the issue as well. Yet, when you look at the polling on this issue, the majority of Americans [are] supporting the Arizona law. So, what happens come November, when this – when the immigration issue is on the table, when you don't have folks in the Congress actually confronting the immigration policy?

MR. BELCHER: Well – well, let's back up one thing. The – the latest polls show 51 percent sort of think it's – it's ... right, and so that's not a strong majority. And you still have a large segment of the population who are unsure of it, and there's probably a segment of that 51 percent who're – who're unsure exactly what's –

MR. MARTIN: Well, they – [crosstalk] – h- --

MR. BELCHER: -- happening.

MR. MARTIN: -- it is a hot-button issue –

MR. BELCHER: It *is* a hot-button –

MR. MARTIN: -- and when you're –

MR. BELCHER: -- issue. It's –

MR. MARTIN: -- dealing with –

MR. BELCHER: -- absolutely a hot-button issue.

MR. MARTIN: -- but – a- -- and we've seen in the last two weeks where you've had a deputy sheriff shot. It almost – because here's the reality. That changes the dynamics of the conversation when a law enforcement person is injured or killed. All of a sudden –

MR. BELCHER: Well, Am- --

MR. MARTIN: -- [for] a lot of people.

MR. BELCHER: -- well, Americans want --

MS. MATHIS: The -- the --

MR. BELCHER: -- to deal with immig- -- one thing. Americans *do* want to deal with immigration, but what's going on in Arizona is go- -- is be- -- is beyond just dealing with immigration. That is -- what's happening is profiling, and it's -- it -- and it's -- it *is* absolutely profiling, and it -- and it's -- and it's racial. That's what's happening in Arizona, and *that's* why the ou- -- outrage is.

MS. EDNEY: The --

MR. TRAYNHAM: Let's take a look --

MS. EDNEY: -- the racial --

MR. TRAYNHAM: -- at the facts.

MS. EDNEY: -- profiling issue --

MR. TRAYNHAM: The fact- --

MS. EDNEY: -- the racial profiling issue is on the frontline here. There's *absolutely* no reason that we should have -- they should a law when they *have* people out there on the borders -- or, should have *more* people out there on the borders -- to have a law that would exacerbate racial profiling, which is going on across America just pervasively in the African-American community, in the -- the -- the Asian community, in the Hispanic community. Anybody who is not White is subject to this and knows --

MR. MARTIN: But, Robert --

MS. EDNEY: -- what they're --

MR. MARTIN: -- states --

MS. EDNEY: -- what they're --

MR. MARTIN: -- but, Robert --

MS. EDNEY: -- fighting against.

MR. MARTIN: -- the states are saying, "Look. The federal government, you are supposed to be protecting us. You're not. [If] you don't do it, we will."

MR. TRAYNHAM: -- that's exactly right. Let's take a look at the facts here and just step back from the hyperbole. Twenty-one states right now require that *everyone* require some type of photo I.D. or some type of identification. Here's why. And the reason why is because under the Constitution, with the "full faith and credit" clause, you have to identify -- or, you *should* be able to identify --

MR. MARTIN: Do they *require* --

MR. TRAYNHAM: -- people --

MR. MARTIN: -- it --

MR. TRAYNHAM: -- that --

MR. MARTIN: -- on demand from officers?

MR. TRAYNHAM: -- uh, yes, in 21 states. Now, the dif- --

MS. MATHIS: Does it require that --

MR. TRAYNHAM: -- the --

MS. MATHIS: -- you have it with you at all times?

MR. TRAYNHAM: -- it's -- i- -- in 21 states, absolutely. Now, the difference with this is -- is that you can make the argument from a xenophobic standpoint that Arizona went a *little* bit too far, because "just because" --

MR. MARTIN: Just a wee bit?

MR. TRAYNHAM: -- "just becau-" -- "just because you may not look like the majority, we have the right to stop you." That is racial profiling. If you take a look at the Arizona state law, that's not what it says. What it says is -- is that if, in fact -- and I'm making this up -- if, in fact, you're driving a white van, and if you get pulled over for speeding, and ten people that don't look like the majority run out and go in different directions, the cops have the right --

MR. MARTIN: Okay. Okay. First --

MR. TRAYNHAM: -- the cops have --

MR. MARTIN: -- okay, okay, okay.

MR. TRAYNHAM: -- the right to stop you and then ask all those ten --

MR. MARTIN: Robert --

MR. TRAYNHAM: -- other people --

MR. MARTIN: -- Robert --

MR. TRAYNHAM: -- for their papers.

MR. MARTIN: -- Robert, Robert, Robert, Robert --

MR. TRAYNHAM: That's the difference.

MR. MARTIN: First -- first -- first --

MR. TRAYNHAM: And the reason –

MR. MARTIN: -- of all – Robert, Robert –

MR. TRAYNHAM: -- why is that the federal government –

MR. MARTIN: -- *Robert* –

MR. TRAYNHAM: -- has not done their job –

MR. MARTIN: -- Robert –

MR. TRAYNHAM: -- to secure the borders.

MR. MARTIN: -- Robert, the –

MR. TRAYNHAM: That's what –

MR. MARTIN: -- scenario –

MR. TRAYNHAM: -- the Arizona state legislation –

MR. MARTIN: -- the scenar- --

MR. TRAYNHAM: -- specifically said.

MR. MARTIN: -- Robert, the scenario you just simply laid out? *In all 50 states*, if
– no, no. Robert, if a cop pulls somebody over, and ten folks in –

MR. BELCHER: [Chuckles.]

MS. EDNEY: And – and they *run* – [chuckles] –

MS. MATHIS: [Chuckles.]

MR. MARTIN: -- jump the hell out and start runnin' – *yeah*, they get to stop 'em.

MR. BELCHER: [Chuckles.]

MR. MARTIN: The difference here is – and, again, I – I get all this, but there is a reason, Deborah, the Arizona legislature came back –

MR. BELCHER: That's right.

MR. MARTIN: -- to modify their law –

MS. MATHIS: That's right.

MR. MARTIN: -- because of the initial heat.

MS. MATHIS: That's right, because what it originally says is that a law enforcement officer has to "reasonably suspect" that this person may be in the country illegally.

MR. MARTIN: And that's –

MS. MATHIS: Well, what –

MR. MARTIN: -- beyond speeding.

MS. MATHIS: -- that's – that's about –

MR. MARTIN: That's –

MS. MATHIS: -- [as] subjective as you could *get*.

MR. BELCHER: [Chuckles.]

MR. MARTIN: -- right.

MS. MATHIS: "Reasonably suspect"? Who's going to – who's going to judge what's "reasonable," and who's going to say whether someone actually ha- -- has a suspicion or not? So, that is just *hopelessly* –

MR. TRAYNHAM: Well –

MS. MATHIS: -- absurd.

MS. EDNEY: What --

MR. TRAYNHAM: -- but -- but --

MS. EDNEY: -- legislature --

MR. TRAYNHAM: -- but [crosstalk] --

MS. EDNEY: -- what -- what it --

MR. TRAYNHAM: -- that's no different from what[?] no-fly did. That's no different from profiling if, in fact, someone that has a Middle Eastern last name, that pays cash for a -- a[n] airline ticket. The airlines have a right to say, "We need to ask for more I.D." "We need to ask for" -- there -- the- -- there's -- there's no difference there, because --

MS. EDNEY: You know, but --

MR. TRAYNHAM: -- is it profiling?

MR. BELCHER: But it *is* different.

MR. TRAYNHAM: Yeah, it *is*, but there's a *reason* why it's pr- -- and I'm not say- -- and I'm not --

MS. MATHIS: There is --

MR. TRAYNHAM: -- advocating --

MS. MATHIS: -- th- -- you're right. There is no -- let me s- -- let me *agree* with you.

MR. MARTIN: Go ahead.

MS. MATHIS: There *is* no difference. They *both* suck –

MR. TRAYNHAM: -- well –

MS. MATHIS: -- that you –

MR. MARTIN: [Laughs.]

MS. MATHIS: -- have –

MR. BELCHER: [Laughs.]

MS. MATHIS: -- that you have –

MR. TRAYNHAM: -- well, look.

MS. MATHIS: -- profiling.

MR. TRAYNHAM: Look. Look.

MS. MATHIS: But, yeah –

MR. TRAYNHAM: I am not –

MS. MATHIS: -- I understand –

MR. TRAYNHAM: -- for –

MS. MATHIS: -- the reasoning behind it, but they – but – but people –

MR. MARTIN: Right.

MS. MATHIS: -- would argue with you that there is a legitimate reason to do this
in *Arizona*.

MR. TRAYNHAM: But –

[CROSSTALK.]

MR. MARTIN: [Crosstalk] -- before we go to break. Go ahead.

MR. BELCHER: But this is the contradiction. You know, Republicans are all about rights and – and limited gover- -- limited government, but they keep expanding laws that sort of take away our freedoms and will infringe on our freedoms every chance they get. And this *exactly* what this is d- -- this is doing. And what they're doing in Arizona is what they – if – is going to help Democrats nationally, 'cause it's going to do for us nationally what Pete Wilson did for us in California.

MR. MARTIN: All right. On that note, we're going to a break. Y'all can sit back, take a deep breath, drink some water. Be back in a moment.

[CHUCKLING.]

MR. MARTIN: We'll have much more from our roundtable panelists when we come back. Trust me. You don't want to miss the next conversation.

[END OF SEGMENT.]

**(SEG-
MENT 3)**

MR. MARTIN: We're back for round two with our roundtable guests Deborah Mathis, Hazel Trice Edney, Robert Traynham and Cornell Belcher.

Now, the next topic I don't really give a flip about, but Robert was so piped, he was so hot about it. *The New York Times* had a story showing that across the country, 32 Black Republicans are running for office. My point is, hey, show me when one of you win[s]; because just a few years ago, we had the "Year of the Black Republican." I mean it seems every two or three years, we see stories about, "*Oh*, all these Black Republicans running," and none ever seem[s] to win.

So, Robert, why is it a story that they're running when none win[s]?

MR. TRAYNHAM: It's a reason – it's a – it's a story for two reasons. One, this is the largest number since Reconstruction. The second reason why is Obama, the President --

MR. MARTIN: It's really the largest number since a few years ago.

MR. TRAYNHAM: -- the – the – the President, who, obviously, is of African-American [sic] descent, has inspired more and more people that look like you and me and everyone else on this panel to run. And that's inspiring in [and] of itself, because let me tell you something, Roland. I know you sound cynical about this, and I know deep in your heart you're *not* cynical about this.

MR. MARTIN: I'm not cynical.

MR. TRAYNHAM: The real –

MR. MARTIN: I'm saying –

MR. TRAYNHAM: -- issue –

MR. MARTIN: -- "win"!

MR. TRAYNHAM: -- the – but – but it's not about winning all the time; it's about running and believing in something that's bigger than yourself. It's about putting yourself out there and saying, "You know what? I may not win, but this is what I believe in." It's about the ... young kid in a[n] inner city who sees someone that looks like them that's actually running for office for the first time.

MS. EDNEY: I'm sorry.

MR. TRAYNHAM: *That's* what it's about.

MS. EDNEY: I'm sorry, Robert. It is *very* much about ... winning, especially when it comes to –

MR. TRAYNHAM: That's a bunch of –

MS. EDNEY: -- it – [chuckling] – especially when it comes to Black candidates running. What's the sense in running if you don't have a constituency, such as the Republican Party, who believes in you enough to make you win?

MR. TRAYNHAM: I cannot believe –

MS. EDNEY: I've written the story –

MR. TRAYNHAM: -- it. I ca- -- I – this is –

[CROSSTALK.]

MS. MATHIS: [Crosstalk.]

MR. TRAYNHAM: -- so sad.

MS. EDNEY: -- over and over and over again –

MR. TRAYNHAM: This is – [crosstalk].

MS. EDNEY: -- about Black Republicans running for office, and they don't get it. It's a rarity.

MR. TRAYNHAM: Hazel –

MR. MARTIN: Well, no, but they –

MS. EDNEY: It will ba- -- it would make *news* –

MR. MARTIN: -- but, but, but, but, Ro- --

MS. EDNEY: -- if they got in.

[CROSSTALK.]

MR. MARTIN: -- Deborah, go ahead. Go ahead. Go ahead.

MS. MATHIS: This is what I'm hoping. I think this is great. I believe in divide and conquer. As -- you know -- you know, I -- I *do*.

MR. BELCHER: [Chuckles.]

MS. MATHIS: Don't just hold everything in -- on one place. Divide and *conquer*. But what I'm *hoping* that at least a good portion of these 32 will do is to move in to work inside to *reform* the Republican Party, to make it more empathetic, more reflective, more sensitive to the Black experience in America, and not just buy into the game that's already there.

MR. MARTIN: Cornell, the real -- the -- the real question that people are also raising, which Hazel speaks to -- and that is when you look at the party apparatus, is the funding there? Staffing there? Support there? So, you may have folks *running*, but the question is, will you have --

OFF CAMERA: Do they have your back?

MR. MARTIN: -- y- -- will you have the *resources* --

MS. EDNEY: This is --

MR. MARTIN: -- to run?

MS. EDNEY: -- a litmus test for the Republican Party.

MR. BELCHER: [Chuckles.] See --

MS. MATHIS: Yes, it is.

MR. BELCHER: -- see, I'm with you. I -- I -- I agree. Diversity anywhere is a good thing, and I love it that you get inside the Republican Party and -- and challenge it, because, quite frankly, we[ve] got to do better on the Democratic side as well.

But the interesting thing about the apparatus is that one of the candidates in particular -- I think it's the one in -- in Florida who's running -- is actually getting a lot of national money, and it's become sort of a *célèbre* cause for the Repub- -- the Tea Partiers, who want to say that -- that -- that "I'm not racist."

But here's the -- but for -- for me, the fundamental problem -- and we can have that conversation -- but for -- for me, the fundamental problem is this -- is that when you look at sort of all these African-Americans running, and you look at sort of the historic numbers that Democrats are now getting in -- in -- in the Black community, Republicanism is really sort of outside the mainstream values of the African-American community overall. So, it's interesting that they'll never sort of represent a Black com- - the Black community.

MR. MARTIN: I'm glad --

OFF CAMERA: That's why I say --

MR. MARTIN: -- you -- I'm --

OFF CAMERA: -- this is a litmus test.

MR. MARTIN: -- I'm glad you brought up diversity, and so we're seeing what's happening with the Supreme Court. There's a report that Elena Kagan, Solicitor

General, may very well be Pres. Barack Obama's choice. Salon.com has a piece on their website that lays out her horrible record on diversity as head of the Harvard law school, that she [had an] opportunity to hire 32 *full-time* faculty. No African-Americans, virtually *no* women – [a] handful of women. And four minority professors came out and said, “*Wait* a minute. Here's a person who had a shot,” compared to the *Yale* law professor who served the Yale – head of the Yale law school, who only had about ten or so hires. Half were women. One was African-American. And so it's interesting ho- - their report says how the White House is trying to push back on it on the issue of diversity, when she was running the Harvard law school, saying, “Well, the issue is how many offers were made,” as opposed to those accepted.

Who would turn down a[n] offer to the Harvard law school?

MR. BELCHER: [Chuckles.]

MR. TRAYNHAM: But, you know, Roland, this is – this is bigger than just diversity on the Court. This is about the President making a safe choice – assuming that this is the – the pick – because guess what? Women make up – make up about 97 percent of the overall electorate when it comes to making up their mind[s] in terms of going with the right candidate.

MR. MARTIN: Gotcha.

MR. TRAYNHAM: My point – my point in all this is – is that independent women certainly go back and forth in terms of who they – who they choose as their next president. This is about placating to [sic] the women vote – not about diversity of the

Court –

MR. MARTIN: Hazel, we saw –

MR. TRAYNHAM: -- if he chooses –

MR. MARTIN: -- publicly –

MR. TRAYNHAM: -- her – [unintelligible].

MR. MARTIN: -- they released [the names of] three candidates interviewed. Not a single African-American.

MS. EDNEY: I'm disappointed. And not a single African-American *woman* –

MR. MARTIN: Are you –

MS. EDNEY: -- in –

MR. MARTIN: -- shocked, or –

MS. EDNEY: -- particular.

MR. MARTIN: -- disappointed.

MS. EDNEY: I'm –

MR. MARTIN: 'Cause some folks are not shocked.

MR. BELCHER: [Chuckles.]

MS. EDNEY: -- I – I'm – I'm – *both*. Actually, I'm really both, especially since so many African-American women – the Black Women's Roundtable, headed by Melanie Campbell, hel- -- held a big conference the other day. If I'm not mistaken, they even sent the President a letter. Black people across the country in notable positions, who are jurists, are recommending African-American women. The Court needs to be

diversified. It *needs* that voice of an African-American woman, that *perspective* for the *interest – for the public interest*.

MR. MARTIN: Cornell?

MR. BELCHER: A- -- are -- are you guys saying that Clarence Thomas isn't representing the community? I -- is that what's -- is that what I'm hearing? [Laughs.]

[LAUGHTER.]

MR. MARTIN: No. Go ahead.

MS. EDNEY: Did we just have a *laugh break* right there? [Laughs.]

MR. BELCHER: [Chuckles.] No -- [chuckles]. Yeah. No, here's the -- here's the thing.

MS. EDNEY: That's what you're --

MR. BELCHER: You know --

MS. EDNEY: -- say. That's what --

MR. BELCHER: -- the -- the o- --

MS. EDNEY: -- *I'm* saying.

MR. BELCHER: -- getting back to diversity -- it wa- -- ye- -- it was a joke. Getting back to -- getting back to --

MR. MARTIN: [Laughs.]

MR. BELCHER: -- the diversity point --

MS. EDNEY: I just want to make it clear.

MR. BELCHER: -- getting back to the diversity point here is that we, as a

community, even wi- -- and -- and I -- I -- and I'm a company guy. I mean I'm -- I'm Barack Obama all the way, but even when this administration doesn't stand up to diversity, or we don't think that they're putting people place- -- in place of diversity, we should challenge this administration, just like we'd challenge any administration --

MR. TRAYNHAM: But you-all --

MS. MATHIS: Right. And I -- I think --

MR. TRAYNHAM: -- don't understand. You-all don't --

MS. MATHIS: I think --

MR. TRAYNHAM: -- understand.

MS. MATHIS: -- Michelle needs to turn up the pillow talk a little -- don't you?

MS. EDNEY: Ah!

MS. MATHIS: Here -- here she is, a Black, woman lawyer, who certainly would have her finger on -- on a good list of -- of people of her gender and of her ethnicity --

MR. TRAYNHAM: Generation?

MS. MATHIS: -- who -- and of her generation who would be good on that Court, and she needs to turn up the pillow talk and get --

MR. TRAYNHAM: But, you know --

MS. MATHIS: -- her husband's ear --

MR. TRAYNHAM: -- I think -- I think we all have --

MS. MATHIS: -- a little on that.

MR. TRAYNHAM: -- a different definition of ver- -- diversity. I think the White

House thinks they *are* being diverse by picking a woman, a); but also, b) picking someone of intellectual heft – assuming, again, this is the pick – that goes *against* Scalia, that –

MR. MARTIN: Okay.

MR. TRAYNHAM: -- goes *against* Thomas.

MR. MARTIN: A- -- and – and my –

MS. EDNEY: Are you saying –

MR. MARTIN: -- and – and –

MS. EDNEY: -- that there are no African-American –

MR. MARTIN: -- and – and my whole –

[CROSSTALK.]

MS. EDNEY: -- women that –

MR. MARTIN: -- argument –

MS. EDNEY: -- fit the –

MR. MARTIN: -- and – and my whole –

MS. EDNEY: -- description?

MR. MARTIN: -- argument [is] there were African-American women with just as much intellect- -- int- -- intellectual capability –

MS. EDNEY: Absolutely!

MR. MARTIN: -- African-American women, who can represent the demo[graphic] as well. And the point I – the point I'm making in- -- again [is] when you

only publicly talk about three people being interviewed, none African-American – the *last* choice [was] non African-American – the reality is this – and we need to be honest – if this was a White, Democratic president, there is *no way* any –

MS. MATHIS: He would be under pressure.

MR. MARTIN: -- *any* –

MS. MATHIS: Right.

MR. MARTIN: -- of the civil rights organizations – *any of them* –

MS. MATHIS: That's right.

MR. MARTIN: -- would be quiet if they did not have an African-American –

MR. TRAYNHAM: You know, Roland –

MR. MARTIN: -- on the short list.

MR. TRAYNHAM: -- you know, Roland, what I'm surprised by?

MS. EDNEY: Absolutely.

MR. TRAYNHAM: I'm surprised by two things: one, that the White House didn't even put one on the list, just to say they were interviewed; but I'm also s- -- and maybe we are – may be surprised come next week, or two weeks from now; that, perhaps, maybe the President throws us a curveball, and it *is* a Black woman, and we just don't know.

MS. EDNEY: Well, we need to look at, also –

MR. MARTIN: L- -- that --

MS. EDNEY: -- the civil rights –

MR. MARTIN: -- [crosstalk] --

MS. EDNEY: -- organizations ri- --

MR. MARTIN: -- that would be a great surprise.

MS. EDNEY: -- of dealing --

[LAUGHTER.]

MS. EDNEY: -- with African-American women.

MR. MARTIN: I['ve] got to cut this whole thing off. Deborah, Hazel, Robert, Cornell, we certainly appreciate it. Thanks a bunch -- especially Cornell in those purple shoes over there.

[LAUGHTER. QUICK SHOT OF MR. BELCHER'S EASTER EGG PURPLE NUBUCK BROGANS.]

MR. MARTIN: Folks, you can join in on this discussion. Log on to TVOneOnline.com and leave your comments there.

Coming up next, we're looking at what 3,000 African-American college graduates say about the state of their careers and finances. Their answers will certainly surprise you. And later, I'll have a few choice words about some guy on Comedy Central who had the *audacity*, the unmitigated *gall* to question my *fashion* sense. You wanna stick around.

[END OF SEGMENT.]

**(SEG-
MENT 4)**

MR. MARTIN: This Friday, the government reported that 290,000 [sic -- 209,000]

jobs were created in April. That's the fourth straight month of job growth – certainly good news, but nowhere near enough to erase the loss of 8 million jobs in this recession. But the unemployment rate went up to 9.9 percent for last month, probably reflecting more people back in the job market as the economy is improving.

But the unemployment rate for African-Americans was 16.5 percent – unchanged from the previous month. According to a recent survey by the website TheLoop21.com, job creation is the number one issue among the 3,000 Black college graduates they surveyed. Joining me now to discuss this is Darrell Williams, president of TheLoop21.com.

Darrell, glad you're back.

MR. DARRELL WILLIAMS: Good to be back.

MR. MARTIN: All right, then[?].

MR. WILLIAMS: Thanks for having me.

MR. MARTIN: 290,000 jobs crea- -- I'm sorry. 209,000 jobs created, but [the] unemployment rate goes up. But we've heard lots of conversation about the deficit – lowering the deficit. Your survey shows they don't *care* about the deficit; it's about getting jobs.

MR. WILLIAMS: And, Roland, that's one of the reasons why we went out to take this survey. You know, we hear from the media and from analysts what is –

MR. MARTIN: But[?] really inside the beltway, Washington –

MR. WILLIAMS: -- inside –

MR. MARTIN: -- D.C.

MR. WILLIAMS: -- the beltway -- what's important to the American people. So, we wanted to go out and let the American people speak for themselves -- especially African-Americans, who often are not ever given an opportunity to give their opinions on economic policy issues. And when we went out and asked them about the question of creating jobs versus deficit reduction, 90.1 percent said that they favored creating jobs over deficit reduction.

MR. MARTIN: Now, of course, we had several different reports come out as related to the employment situation. Yet, [the] African-American [unemployment] rate [is] still 16.5 percent. Let's talk about your survey as it relates to what people said about racial discrimination in the workplace.

MR. WILLIAMS: Well, one of the -- we were focused on two things: job security and financial security. And on the job security side, we asked the respondents to rank what issues they thought were at the top of their list with respect to job security. At the very top was the current recession, which is no surprise; but the second most important factor was racial discrimination in the workplace. That ranked higher than outsourcing jobs as a threat to job security, and it ranked higher than competition from foreign workers in the U.S.

MR. MARTIN: Last year, we discussed immigration on this show, and you talked about foreign workers in the U.S. Any time I've had a conversation on radio, on television about illegal immigration -- a visceral reaction from African-Americans. So,

what did these college graduates have to say about the impact of im- -- illegal immigration on jobs prospects for African-Americans?

MR. WILLIAMS: You're -- you're raising a good point, because there's been a lot of discussion about this, and there's been economic studies that show that foreign -- immigrant workers put downward pressure on low -- on low s- -- low wages. So, I was very surprised to learn that, in fact, these college graduates hold the view that tougher enforcement of immigration laws wasn't necessary to protect their own jobs. Now, I think that reflects a schism, if you will, within the Black community. I think it says a lot about how we talk about the Black community --

MR. MARTIN: But --

MR. WILLIAMS: -- in general.

MR. MARTIN: -- but does it also speak to those students thinking that the jobs they perceive illegal immigrants to have are not jobs they plan on fulfilling?

MR. WILLIAMS: That's exactly my point. I think when we talk about the state of the Black economy, we've got to be sensitive to who we're talking about. And for some low-skill workers, there's much more competition from foreign workers than there are for more educated African-Americans.

MR. MARTIN: Optimism as relates to the President fixing the economy -- a Pew study came out [and] said that, of all races, 36 percent said the economy will stay the same. 19 percent said it would get worse a year from now. What did you find from African-Americans?

MR. WILLIAMS: Remember these are college-educated African-Americans, and they actually were much more optimistic. Nearly three quarters of them believed that the U.S. economy would improve in the next 12 months, and roughly the same percentage believed that their own personal economic circumstances would improve in the next 12 months.

MR. MARTIN: Well, again, one of the reasons why I appreciate what you guys do is that you have all of these different polls, and the reality is different people think in a different way. African-American college graduates may be very well different than African-Americans as a whole – those who ... actually haven't gone to college, or actually finished, but certainly what we see from Americans at large, 'cause[?] – *Americans* at large.

So, where can they go to read the entire survey, to get a better sense of what these graduates think?

MR. WILLIAMS: They can go to TheLoop21.com. All the r- -- all the survey results are posted. They're posted in a way where it's easy to read.

MR. MARTIN: Okay. We appreciate it. Thanks a lot.

MR. WILLIAMS: Appreciate it.

MR. MARTIN: All right.

In the '60s, activists turned to lunch counter sit-ins to make a point, but as NewsOne.com's Smokey Fontaine tells us, today's activists are using the Web to make a stand. That story, and you'll never believe how many Black folks are tweeting. All

that up next.

[END OF SEGMENT.]

**(SEG-
MENT 5)**

MR. MARTIN: Last week, we talked about what the students in New Jersey did to protest the rising cost of education. Now it looks like that digital activism is spreading. Smokey Fontaine joins us from NewsOne.com headquarters in New York via the HP Sky Room with the story.

Smokey, so what's the latest protest?

MR. SMOKEY FONTAINE: Well, we saw this protest explode online just this week. It started in New Jersey with the woman who created a Facebook event just from her personal Facebook page. Then it immediately went to Chicago. Thousands of students walked out of Chicago [schools] last week, based, again, on one student taking their activism to Facebook and to social media. It actually happened to be the same high school that Michelle Obama went to. Whitney M. Young –

MR. MARTIN: Right.

MR. FONTAINE: -- Students for a Democratic Society is this group, and they walked out, and it's spawning all of this happening in every city in America.

MR. MARTIN: Well, again, reminding folks that when you think about the lunch counter sit-ins in the '60s, started by the students at North Carolina A&T for students, [the] same thing happened. It spread like wildfire all across the ... South, solely because of the actions of four students.

MR. FONTAINE: Well, grassroots activism is now digital activism. There are organizations that are trying to mobilize not just American students, but students worldwide, for all of their protests, to really kind of galvanize this youth spirit. And you can do it online instantly, so our protest post that we put out, that taught young people – and older folks – whoever –

MR. MARTIN: Right.

MR. FONTAINE: -- of how to do this online got a lot of attention. A lot of people are reading it, clicking through “Mobilize Yourself” on –

MR. MARTIN: Right.

MR. FONTAINE: Black Planet, on Facebook. You can *do* it.

MR. MARTIN: All right, Smokey.

What’s going on in terms of African-Americans and Twitter?

MR. FONTAINE: Well, it’s confirmed today. We’ve spoken about it in this segment quite a lot – about how many African-Americans use Twitter. The Pew study came out that confirms once and for all that we, as African-Americans, over index on Twitter. We’re 13 percent of the population. We’re 24 percent of Twitter.

MR. MARTIN: Wow.

MR. FONTAINE: So, this is putting notice to all the marketers who’re using Twitter –

MR. MARTIN: Right.

MR. FONTAINE: -- all the media folks who are using Twitter: it is a service that

is dominated by an African-American voice.

MR. MARTIN: Well, look. Hey, that's why also I'm on Twitter. So, go to RolandSMartin. That's my handle.

All right, Smokey. Toyota rap video. What's up?

MR. FONTAINE: I'm just curious about this, Roland. Toyota's been in the news for all the wrong reasons lately, with their – with their brake recalls and their pedal issues. Now they have a homerun of a distraction – a viral video –

MR. MARTIN: Right.

MR. FONTAINE: -- over 750,000 views on You Tube, a White family imitating a hip- --

MR. MARTIN: Hey, S- --

MR. FONTAINE: -- -hop video.

MR. MARTIN: -- hey, Smokey?

MR. FONTAINE: It's – [crosstalk] –

MR. MARTIN: Smokey? Well, we actually have the video, so hold on one second.

Folks, check this out.

[VIDEO CLIP OF COMMERCIAL.]

MR. MARTIN: All right, Smokey. So, what's the big deal? 80 percent of the kids who buy hip-hop are White, so what's the outrage online?

MR. FONTAINE: Well, they're taking – Toyota's taking a big chance of doing

this. The outrage is – and I'll quote one of our Black Planet commenters: "I don't see Toyota making fun of country music. Toyota only ever mocks African-American culture. Or, is this video funny? Yes, but is it also racist? Yes. Toyota takes a culturally identifiable element associated with people of a particular ethnic group and exploits it for financial gain."

MR. MARTIN: Well, I'll tell you this here. First of –

MR. FONTAINE: It looks –

MR. MARTIN: -- all, I –

MR. FONTAINE: -- like they got their distraction –

MR. MARTIN: -- I – I –

MR. FONTAINE: -- but are they going to turn off a sizeable part of their community?

MR. MARTIN: -- I don't see how it's racist, so I disagree with that; but, hey, that's what happens. Smokey, we appreciate it. Thanks a lot.

MR. FONTAINE: Thank you, Roland.

MR. MARTIN: All right. Now it's time for "My Perspective."

Sandra Bullock has been in the news as of late because of her impending divorce from Jesse James because of his rampant affairs, but this week she caused a stir all across the country in the African-American community. Why? Because she revealed that she has adopted an African-American baby. Now, a lot of folks are up in arms, mad about this.

I don't see the big deal. Okay? The reality is this is a child that needs a home, and I really don't *care* she's a White woman adopting a Black child. What I *do* care about is the fact that this child is going to have a home to be raised in. Also, I appreciate the fact that she purposely chose to adopt an *American* baby. She could've gone to Haiti, could've gone to Africa, could've done like Madonna has done; but she made a conscious decision to do so.

To all the African-Americans who have a problem with it, please, *shut the hell up*. She's doing a great thing. There's – there's no issue with it. So, move on. And if you're more concerned about it, *you* focus on the adoption of Black kids where *you* are and leave Sandra Bullock alone.

I'm Roland Martin, and this is my perspective.

**(SEG-
MENT 6)**

MR. MARTIN: Okay. Many of you know that when it comes to my look – that is, what I'm wearing – I set trends; I don't follow them. *Never* has that been my style.

Now my signature style is being attacked. Jon Stewart, host of *The Daily Show* on Comedy Central, has this to say about my attire during an appearance on CNN.

Check it out.

[VIDEO CLIP.]

[APPLAUSE.]

MR. JON STEWART: Obviously, there's an awful lot going on in the news these days – the oil spill in the Gulf; devastating flooding in the South; and, of course,

the big news out of Times Square. But I wanted to take a moment to talk about a story that's been overlooked. Last week during a discussion about Arizona's controversial, new immigration law on CNN, we saw this.

[VIDEO CLIP RUNS IN THE BACKGROUND AS STEWART TALKS.]

MR. ROLAND MARTIN: But will you just go ahead and call it – call it like it is?

We have political punks in –

MR. STEWART: Ooh! There! Right there!

MR. MARTIN: -- Washington, D.C.

MR. STEWART: Hooh! There it is! [Throws up his hands in feigned horror.]

[VIDEO CLIP FREEZES. AUDIENCE LAUGHTER.]

MR. STEWART: On national television, in front of millions – no, CNN – um –

[audience laughter] – in front of *some* viewers – [audience laughter] – CNN's

Roland Martin – [chuckles, audience laughter] – wore an *ascot* –

[LAUGHTER.]

MR. STEWART: -- o- -- on a *news* program.

[LAUGHTER.]

MR. STEWART: A *news-cot*, if you – [chuckles] – will.

[AUDIENCE LAUGHTER, APPLAUSE.]

MR. STEWART: I mean I *love* this guy. He's a very smart guy. He's fun to watch on television ... but this may be my favorite thing that I've ever seen on CNN. I swear to God, that is right up there with Rick Sanchez getting tased –

[JUMP TO SHOT OF THE TASING INCIDENT, AUDIENCE LAUGHTER.]

MR. STEWART: -- and the holographic Jessica yelling[?].

[AUDIENCE LAUGHTER.]

MR. STEWART: This thing is just – [kisses his fingertips] – mu-wah! The only way this could be better is if CNN played a clip of holographic Roland Martin getting tased while wearing an ascot.

[AUDIENCE LAUGHTER.]

MR. STEWART: At that point, my underwear blows off.

[END OF VIDEO CLIP.]

MR. MARTIN: See, Jon, you gotta understand. We – we live in a country where folks are walkin' around in flip-flops and t-shirts and baggy pants and, I mean, hats indoors. In fact, even when you come to Washington, D.C., there's this boring, little Washington, D.C. look. They're all wearing the same, little, boring, D.C. ties. They all wear those little gray suits. Yeah, you wear those things as well.

I – I don't like that look, and so somebody has to, you know, have a sense of style and purpose, a little *soul*. So, yeah, I figure, with a Black president, we might as well have a brutha with a little flair on television. So, that's why we do it. A lot of folks on Twitter and – and Facebook, they were saying, "Hey," you know, "were you offended?" [Of] *course* not. They did a whole *segment* on the whole deal. So, I *appreciate* it. And so, Jon, of course, the next day you also talked about it again; and so we had some fun with it on CNN.

But let me say this here. I'll be perfectly clear. Jon Stewart, you have several ascots on the way for you and your staff, and so I'll be looking for those. And let me also be clear. I will *a/ways* rock the ascots, because when you have swagga, that's what you can do.

All right, folks. That's it for this edition of TV One's "Washington Watch." I'm Roland Martin. Goodbye, and have a blessed week – and, of course, a happy Mother's Day, including to my mom, Imelda Martin.

[END.]