



Many voters wanted to stay on Obama gravy train

Just before the presidential election, former president Bill Clinton, as he was out on the campaign trail, said, "I may be the only guy in America who is more excited for President Obama's second term than I was for his first."

Clinton, at times, can be refreshing.

Indeed, there was not nearly the same excitement as four years earlier. Even the most liberal person you can think of, while still a huge Obama fan, no longer thinks of the president as a transformational leader who has all the answers. Four years ago, that is exactly what they thought.

Conversely, whatever your political leanings, most people would agree that Mitt Romney was a significantly better candidate than John McCain was in 2008.

So, it was pretty shocking to read some of the election results, particularly those out of Philadelphia.

In 59 Philadelphia voting districts, Romney received zero votes. That's right, zilch. No hanging chads, no voter confusion – hey, even Elvis still pulls a handful of votes. But zero for the Republican nominee.

Why? I can think of a few possible explanations for this whitewash.

Maybe Obama's 100 percent haul of the vote is because the residents of North Philadelphia are really happy with the status quo. When I attended Temple University in the early 1990s, I wouldn't have described North Philly as the Garden of Eden. But maybe it's wonderful now, so the voters decided "if it ain't broke -"

A more likely possibility is that the Democratic Party has triumphed by making people dependent on their policies. There are now 9 million Americans collecting Social Security Disability payments. Suddenly, lots and lots of us are too hurt to work.

And have you heard the radio ads encouraging us to sign up for food stamps? Obama has added an astounding 17 million people to the food stamp gravy train. Everybody knows (and Romney infamously said) these people are not going to bite the hand that feeds them. And of course you know about the free Obama phones ... Philadelphia, it seems, was simply voting for more free stuff.

When precincts return results like 4,873 for Obama and 0 for Romney, a logical person must consider fraud. (Even Saddam only pulled 99 percent of the vote in his final "fair" election.)

As you may recall, in many of these same "shutout" voting districts, the Republican observers were forcibly removed on Election Day. They returned several hours later after a judge issued an order, but perhaps the damage was already done.

Dare I suggest that race played a factor? If white people voted for the white guy because he was white, wouldn't that be considered racism? And if the roles were reversed? Not a peep. No speculation anywhere that black people voted for Obama because (gasp) he is black.

Fred Herr, Mountville