

# Politics 101

I used to think that if the GOP could ever get a sufficient number of black Americans to leave the huge plantation known as the Democratic Party, liberals would never again win a presidential election. After all, I knew for a fact that the last Democrat to garner a majority of the white vote was Lyndon Johnson, and that was 48 years ago. But I recently discovered that there is an even larger hurdle to get over, and that, I'm sad to say, are female voters.

While I understand that roughly one in seven American females is black, the same holds true when it comes to the percentage of male voters. So, although I am rarely shocked, I must confess I was absolutely flummoxed when I went back and checked the statistics for every election since 1980 and found a gender gap that led me to reconsider the wisdom of the 19th Amendment. Now, I'm not one of those Neanderthals who thinks women should be kept barefoot and pregnant, but the evidence strongly suggests they shouldn't be allowed to get too near a ballot box.

Scoff all you like, but consider the facts. In 1980, even after Jimmy Carter had overseen record inflation, record unemployment, record gas prices and seen to it that the Ayatollah Khomeini would be allowed to displace the Shah of Iran, women only gave Reagan a one-point edge over the incompetent incumbent, 46%-45%. Men favored Reagan 54% to 37%. Each group included enough ninnies to provide John Anderson with 7% of their votes.

In 1984, women wised up long enough to split their vote 56% for Reagan, 44% for Mondale, still falling short of men, who divided their vote 62%-37% for The Gipper.

In 1988, which was the last time that women favored the Republican, they went 50% for Bush, 49% for Dukakis, whereas

men split 57%-41% for Bush.

In '92, women gave Clinton 45%, Bush 37% and Perot 17%; men went 41% for Clinton, 38% for Bush, 21% for Perot.

In '96, 54% of women went for Clinton, 38% for Dole, 7% for Perot, while men split 44% for Dole, 43% for Clinton and 10% for Perot.

In 2000, women went 54% for Gore, 43% for Bush, 2% for Ralph Nader; 53% of the male vote went to Bush, 42% to Gore and 3% for Nader.

In 2004, women naturally went for Kerry over Bush 51% to 48%; fortunately, men favored Bush 55% to 41%.

In 2008, both genders went crazy, but even then males split their vote 49% for Obama, 48% for McCain, while women, no doubt dazzled by Obama's smile, provided him with a 13% margin, 56-43.

Most men, I believe, are willing to acknowledge that they are not very good at multi-tasking, asking for directions or talking about anything except sports and hunting. In the face of all this indisputable evidence, I don't know why women can't acknowledge that they simply aren't at the top of their game when it comes to electing presidents.

Recent polls indicate that even in the upcoming election, which pits the totally inept, corrupt and two-faced, Obama against a challenger who is not only honest, successful and capable, but a faithful husband, a loving father, and who just happens to be taller and better-looking, women continue to confound by favoring Obama. What more do we need to know about their inadequacies when it comes to electing presidents?

If nothing else about Obama disturbs women, you would think that his general lack of machismo – he throws a ball like a girl – and his general smugness and vanity would be more than

sufficient reasons for women to be turned off.

I mean, just a few months ago, he insisted with a straight face that there have only been two or three presidents who have been his equal when it comes to getting things accomplished. Then, just recently, after describing himself as the best friend that Israel has ever had in the Oval Office, he told a group of rabbis that he knew more about Judaism than any of the other presidents because he had studied it when he was a youngster. Now let us keep in mind that his earliest studies would have taken place in Indonesia, the largest Islamic nation in the world. One can easily imagine that those studies would have consisted of differentiating between the two most common types of Jews, those who are pigs and those who are monkeys.

His expertise when it comes to Judaism would have been news to John Adams and James Madison, who were both fluent in Hebrew. In fact, I find it annoying that in spite of the fact that in 2008 the Obamas suggested we all learn Spanish, the only language other than English, for which he requires the use of a Teleprompter in order to appear even slightly coherent, the only language in which Obama claims to be conversant is Indonesian. That hardly compares to the 12 presidents who could write and speak Latin, the 10 who knew Greek, the seven who were fluent in French and the five who spoke German. Herbert Hoover and his wife would often speak Mandarin Chinese when they didn't want anyone eavesdropping.

Speaking of the man whose Native American name would have been Speaks with Forked Tongue, I was recently sent an enlightening email that finally explained what Obama means when he repeatedly tells us that his energy policy involves All of the Above. Quite literally, it means everything above ground (sun, wind, corn), but nothing below (oil, coal, natural gas).

When I read that 400 Spaniards missed a soccer match in Bucharest because they had mistakenly flown to Budapest, I

couldn't help thinking that if they had been Americans I would have wagered they were all Democrats.

Finally, it has annoyed me for the longest time that a great many conservative pundits joined the chorus of liberals who denounced anyone who dared to question Obama's birthplace. Perhaps if I had heard them at least ponder why Obama has kept his college application, his earliest passport and his academic records, under lock and key, it wouldn't have galled me quite as much. But after we recently discovered that in the biographical material he'd sent to his literary agent 20 years ago, Obama claimed he'd been born in Kenya, their continuing to insist he was hatched in Hawaii verges on lunacy.

I even heard one of these talk show hosts insist that Obama only mentioned Kenya in order to make himself appear more exotic, in the hope of hyping book sales.

Call me a cynic, but is there anyone out there who believes that when my new book, "Barack Obama, You're Fired!" comes out, and my bio just happens to mention that I was born several thousand light years ago on Mars, these same loons will also give me a pass?

©2012 Burt Prelutsky. Send your comments to [BurtPrelutsky@aol.com](mailto:BurtPrelutsky@aol.com).