

How Obama Gets Re-Elected in 2012, Part 5

Edward D. Duvall
29 Sep 2012

Now that the respective nominating conventions are over, it is safe for the mainstream media to start the traditional mantra “the Democrats are running unopposed”. Governor Romney’s odd rhetorical missteps haven’t helped his cause. While there continue to be debates about the merits of one poll as against others, the fact remains that media will continuously seek ways to help the Democrats get elected or re-elected. This year is no different.

The next phase of the Presidential race is the series of joint press conferences, laughingly referred to as “debates”. The paid Democratic operatives/moderators will of course make 90-second speeches about the evils of “predatory capitalism”, then follow up with a question to Governor Romney demanding he explain in 15 seconds why he hates the working class so much, and does he feel bad about all those defenseless foreign workers he exploited when Bain Capital invested in Chinese companies while laying off American workers. President Obama, on the other hand will be faced with “tough” questions such as “Do you like ice cream, and if so, what is your favorite flavor?” Mr. Obama can then re-assure us that he likes vanilla and chocolate equally, and that anyone who says differently is a right-wing race-baiter.

But that is not Mr. Romney’s biggest problem. As I alluded to in an earlier edition of this series, Mr. Romney’s main problem is that he is unable or unwilling to lay out a consistent set of policies (translation: ones that do not directly contradict the policies announced during the nominating campaign). His secondary problem is that he appears to be weak and vacillating in describing the things that differentiate him from Mr. Obama. He will no doubt come fully armed with every variety of gentlemanly wet noodles to match up against Mr. Obama’s Chicago-style ideological gunfight. It will be a hostile environment, but Mr. Romney should emphasize the significant differences between Mr. Obama and himself, and ignore the rudeness of the Democratic Party’s hand-picked audience.

The first of these is the basic difference in their experience. The difference between Mr. Romney, businessman, and Mr. Obama, community organizer, that that a businessman can read numbers. Mr. Obama seems unfazed by consistently high unemployment and the \$6 trillion addition to the national debt. Mr. Obama has claimed that the private sector is doing well; proving that he believes 8% unemployment (14% true unemployment) is evidence of a successful economic policy. Mr. Romney can say that while he might be a dumb businessman, he at least knows that the present course cannot be sustained because the numbers suggest the middle class is shrinking and the debt will further reduce future economic opportunity.

Secondly, Mr. Romney, businessman, knows the importance of keeping track of the competition, which requires monitoring of trends and activities in the industries, looking out for both opportunities and risks. On the other hand, one can prepare a daily Presidential Security Brief, but you can’t make Mr. Obama read it. Perhaps if Mr. Obama had been paying attention, the fiasco in Libya could have been averted. Mr. Romney can say that he may be another out-of-touch CEO, but he at least knows enough to listen to the advice and threat assessments made by his expert subordinates.

Speaking of the fiasco in Libya, Mr. Obama insisted for ten days that the killing of four American employees was the work of a mob angry about a video. Let me get this straight: Mr. Obama, who claims to be familiar with the Moslem religion, and shows respect for all religions equally, believes that regular Moslems engaging in a peaceful protest will spontaneously invade a consulate, kill people, and burn it to the ground? Peaceful Moslems went berserk over a video? If Mr. Obama believes that, then he must also believe we are at war with all of Islam, not just the radical lunatic fringe. Here is the third difference: Mr.

Romney can say that he may be a white-guy Mormon, but he at least knows that we are in a shooting war with only a small contingent of Islamic retards, not the entire faith.

The Bolshevik communists ran a dictatorship in the Soviet Union for over seventy years. During that time, the official price of bread was fixed at 10 kopecks (100 kopecks to a ruble). The plan was that the dictatorship, founded on the centrally planned economic theory of Karl Marx, would provide bread for all citizens at 10 kopecks. There was only one small problem: even with the entire agricultural workforce consigned to slave labor under collective top-down management, and with every other available resource (including the army) enlisted to aid with harvest and production, the dictatorship could not produce bread for 10 kopecks. Hence, for over seventy years, the official price remained unchanged, but there was never any available to buy except on May Day, the dictator's birthday, and other important economic milestone anniversaries. Mr. Obama's health care plan will turn into the same thing: health care is getting "cheaper", except that premiums are actually going up now. When Obamacare comes into its full fruition, health care will be "free", except you won't be able to get a doctor's appointment because they've all been forced out of business, not being able to provide the service for the price the government dictates. Here is the fourth difference: Mr. Romney can say that he might be a rich profit-taker, but he at least knows that everything of value must have a price, and that price is best regulated by free competition, not by top-down central planning as was bread in the Soviet Union.

Mr. Romney, even with all his other weaknesses, does have some significant advantages compared to Mr. Obama. I am doubtful he will find the will to bring them up and defend them against the sneering media. If he doesn't, he will lose by allowing the Democrats and their media allies to frame the debate.