

How Obama Got Re-Elected in 2012

Edward D. Duvall
11 Nov 2012

So it turns out that I was right all along, having predicted back in April of 2011, even before Osama bin Laden was killed, that President Obama would be re-elected. How could a hayseed nobody like me have gotten this correct 18 months in advance, along with most of the other predictions related to the election? It's actually pretty easy. This essay will review my previous ones on the topic, and along the way I'll explain my rationale for the assertions previously made.

If you recall, my first essay, from 15 Apr 2011 [1], I simply pointed out the overwhelming Electoral College advantage possessed by the Democratic Party, which is to say, that the Democrats are virtually guaranteed 227 Electoral College votes without having to campaign at all. These confirmed Democratic votes include all the New England states, Maryland, New Jersey, New York, Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota, California, New Mexico, Oregon, Washington State, Hawaii, and Washington DC. If the Democrats run Adolph Hitler, they start off with 227. If the Democrats run Joseph Stalin, they start off with 227. If the Democrats nominate Pol Pot or Mao Tse-Tung or Fidel Castro, they get 227 without trying. Since only 270 are required to win, the Democrats have the luxury of being able to focus their campaign on a few states, whereas the Republicans have to campaign in about 30 states. I believe there are two simple reasons for this. The first reason is that these states are populated by people who have come to believe certain things in the face of contrary facts. First, about 15% believe that government and unions are the source of all freedom and prosperity; about 10% believe the government owes them something; about 15% are susceptible to the idealistic wishful thinking so common among Democratic operatives, and about 10% vote Democratic because they believe the Republicans are inherently racist. The second reason is that the mainstream media is able, even in its weakened state, to deliver about 5 or 10% for the Democrats, since those organizations are devoted to the ideological cause. Add those numbers up, and the Democratic Party wins somewhere between 55-45 and 60-40 in each of these states. Then the race is on to get 43 more Electoral votes; the message can be tailored as required, and the mainstream media, just as powerful in every state, can tip the balance enough in a few of the more diverse states to permit the Democratic candidate to win. I concluded then that the mainstream media would never allow any adverse circumstances (or facts) deter them from helping to elect the Democrat. Hence no word on Fast and Furious, Benghazi, unemployment, decline of the middle class, the true inflation rate, or the inability of FEMA to locate Staten Island after the hurricane. It would have been much different if a Republican had been in office.

These facts mean that the Republicans can win only if either they have a very strong candidate, or the Democrats have a very weak one. Mr. Obama, the Black Liberation Marxist Messiah, was certainly not a weak candidate, despite the fact that he has broken every promise and promoted a failed economic policy. Conversely, in my second essay [2], I recounted the weakness of the Republican field, as was evident a year ago. Of all the Republicans in the field at that time (Mr. Herman Cain, Governor Mitt Romney, Representative Michele Bachmann, Governor Rick Perry, Speaker Newt Gingrich, Senator Rick Santorum, Governor Gary Johnson, Governor Jon Huntsman, and Representative Ron Paul), I would have rated Mr. Romney in the lower third as far as electability. I stated my basic reason then: that Mr. Romney has changed positions too many times, and although he may embrace some of the traditional values that made America great, he does not articulate them well. The two that would have made the best presidents, Mr. Johnson and Mr. Paul, were guaranteed to be shut out by the Republican establishment. Mr. Perry seemed generally confused, Mr. Cain did not understand his own policy, and Mr. Gingrich cannot be trusted because of his embrace of the United Nations. All would have made better Presidents than Mr. Obama, but that is not saying much. The two most electable, Mr. Huntsman and Mr. Santorum, could not overcome the money and organization of Mr. Romney. The Republican field was weak; it left a lot to

be desired for traditional conservatives; the eventual nominee did not inspire sufficient confidence to get the non-Marxist voters to the polls.

My third essay came out in late April 2012 [3], in which I laid out my thoughts on how the mainstream media would play their part, given that Mr. Romney had nearly secured the Republican nomination. I listed what I believed would be the 10 basic thrusts of the Obama campaign and their media associates (eight of which turned out to be correct). But that list did not come from any secret inside information. I made the list by referring back to the Chapter 2 of Marx and Engels' *The Communist Manifesto*, and simply updated it for modern times and modern issues. Here is the original text of that chapter -- see if it sounds familiar from the campaign just ended:

“Nevertheless, in the most advanced countries the following will be pretty generally applicable:

1. Abolition of property in land and application of all rents of land to public purposes.
2. A heavy progressive or graduated income tax.
3. Abolition of all right of inheritance.
4. Confiscation of the property of all emigrants and rebels.
5. Centralization of credit in the hands of the state by means of a national bank with state capital and an exclusive monopoly.
6. Centralization of the means of communication and transport in the hands of the state.
7. Extension of factories and instruments of production owned by the state; the bringing into cultivation of waste lands; and the improvement of the soil generally in accordance with a common plan.
8. Obligation of all to work. Establishment of industrial armies, especially for agriculture.
9. Combination of agriculture with manufacturing industries; gradual abolition of the distinction between town and country by a more equitable distribution of the population over the country.
10. Free education for all children in public schools. Abolition of child factory labor in its present form. Combination of education with industrial production, etc.”

If we translate these to modern times: we have the following general principles followed by the Obama campaign and the media, which I expanded to 10 items in that essay:

- a. (Numbers 1 and 2): Higher taxes, especially on businesses and the wealthy; greater regulation for the common good.
- b. (Number 4): Demonization of those who have offshore bank accounts, like Mr. Romney
- c. (Number 5): Free-enterprise capitalism such as practiced by Mr. Romney is bad.
- d. (Number 6): Only media that supports Mr. Obama are worthy of your attention.
- e. (Number 7): Only unions help the working man, and Mr. Romney hates unions. Secondly, the government must protect the environment from extremists like Republicans in general and Mr. Romney in particular.
- f. (Number 10): Private schools are evil.

So it is easy to see the formula. The members of the mainstream media, whether they see it or not, and will never admit it if they did, generally embrace the Socialist free-lunch theory: if some people give their liberties to the Democratic Party, all the people will receive peace and prosperity. Republicans are rich, evil, and racist, and their nominee is out of touch with reality. And so it was for the eight months prior to the election.

My fourth essay [4] was an example of the hypocrisy practiced by the media concerning the budget, Medicare, and Obamacare. No fact has ever inconvenienced the Democrats or the mainstream media.

In the fifth essay [5] from Sep 2012, I predicted there would be a disparity between the types of questions posed to the candidates in the upcoming debates. I think I was generally correct about that. Ms. Crowley

famously saw fit to aid Mr. Obama outright in one instance regarding the incident in Benghazi, even though she and Mr. Obama were both wrong.

To summarize, there were no real surprises in the 2012 Presidential election. The Republicans failed to put up quality candidates, and the mainstream media, owned and operated by the Democratic Party, took care of the rest. It was only necessary, given the inherent Electoral College advantage, to ideologically bludgeon Mr. Romney in five or six critical “swing” states; they were successful in all but one (North Carolina).

- [1] Edward D. Duvall, “How Obama Gets Re-Elected in 2012”, 15 Apr 2011
- [2] Edward D. Duvall, “How Obama Gets Re-Elected in 2012, Part 2”, 4 Nov 2011
- [3] Edward D. Duvall, “How Obama Gets Re-Elected in 2012, Part 3”, 23 Apr 2012
- [4] Edward D. Duvall, “How Obama Gets Re-Elected in 2012, Part 4”, 12 Aug 2012
- [5] Edward D. Duvall, “How Obama Gets Re-Elected in 2012, Part 5”, 29 Sep 2011