

Why McCain Lost

There are many factors that led to the Obama win on November 4. To be sure, he ran a good campaign. He started by busing hundreds of people from Illinois across the Mississippi River to win the Iowa caucus from Hillary Clinton. The dirty tricks his campaign used were outrageous. Still, Hillary should have done a better job of fighting back - it's not as though she's never seen dirty campaign tactics.

One can argue that almost *any* Democrat could have won the Presidential election in 2008, considering how much Americans blame President Bush for everything from the Iraq War to Hurricane Katrina to stale corn flakes, arthritis pain, and baldness. The media has been, to say the least, less than kind to George W. Bush, despite the fact that his Administration has thwarted at least 30 terrorist attacks on American soil since 9/11.

And Obama certainly had the script down pat. Exaggerate every single malady of every single American voter, make them believe their lives and their nation is in shambles, and then convince them that only he is capable of saving them. That's a pretty neat trick coming from someone whose life accomplishments consist of taking credit for the work of others, hiding his past, and writing two self-absorbed books about how thoughtful he is. You have to give him credit, flim-flam man Obama puts Professor Harold Hill to shame – Obama had the audacity to actually build the pool hall before warning the residents of River City of its existence.

Still, telling the voters that America sucks and is a terrible place to live (“Oh my God! We have only a 94 per cent employment rate! The economy grew by only 2.8 per cent! Inflation is... is... 3 per cent!”) is nothing new to Democrats. It is, after all, the main theme of all Democrat campaigns. Obama is an expert at the “your life is pathetic and only I can make it better” game (that's the first class at “community organizer school”), but that alone doesn't explain his victory.

What about the Wall Street melt-down? Well, it might have been interesting to see how the election would have played out had that not happened. Blame it on serendipity or a George Soros-led master plan, but it certainly didn't help the Republicans look good. It could have made the Democrats look astoundingly bad had the media bothered to explain it was mostly Democrat legislation, policies, and politics that caused the sub-prime mortgage disaster in the first place, but Republicans are never going to win elections by depending on objectivity (or even half-assed reporting) from the media.

Let's be blunt. Obama is a socialist. He was born and raised by socialists, mentored by a communist, and surrounded by socialists throughout his entire life (along with assorted influence-peddlers and Illinois politicians). Only a fool would believe Obama is a “traditional Democrat” or a “centrist.” He campaigned against Hillary Clinton from the left, moved ever-so-slightly toward the center during the election, and will most assuredly swerve back to the left after he is sworn in on January 20. It's not as though Nancy Pelosi or Harry Reid will be trying to talk him out of any of his leftist schemes, after all. The man's brain is hard-wired to be a socialist. He east, breathes, and sleeps big government

schemes and individual subservience. He is as unchangeable as the faces on Mount Rushmore he expects to someday join.

His leftist policies did not get Obama elected. Most Americans, deep down inside, don't want socialism – at least the Americans who have any understanding at all of what it is. Obama's ability to hide his true beliefs certainly kept him in the game, but he did trip up with “Joe the plumber” at the end. Luckily for Obama, the media was eager to change the story and make it about “who is Joe?” rather than “what Obama said.” And with a few revealing quotes from earlier interviews that turned up at the last minute, Obama almost showed his full hand.

All of the above factors played a part, of course, but they aren't the reason why John McCain lost the election. What then was the reason?

The simple answer is that John McCain tried to play Santa Claus for the electorate but Obama already owned the costume. Looking at the voters as children (and it was the youth vote that ultimately catapulted Obama into the White House), Obama promised them toys from his red velvet bag. McCain came along, saw the smiles on the faces of the children, and displayed his own bag. Regrettably, his bag was a lot smaller. Thus he lost the election.

The failure of McCain was in also trying to be Santa Claus. The Democrat candidate, of course, is always Santa Claus – whether it is an election for President, Senator, Congressman, Governor, Mayor, or dog-catcher. And the Republican candidate will *always* lose if he puts on a Santa suit, because his bag will necessarily always be smaller. (In order to carry the full bag, he has to register as a Democrat.)

For McCain – or any Republican – to win, he has to be the adult. He has to be the one to say, “Children, you are now all at least 18 years old. It is time to learn that there is no Santa Claus. No tiny elves made those toys that are being promised to you, they have to be purchased. And guess what? They will be purchased with your money. Oh, and don't forget the large handling fee that will be tacked on to the purchase price.”

Democrats are Santa Claus, promising goodies to all. Republicans cannot win elections being “Democrat-lite.” If Santa promises Playstation 3 to the voter, promising Playstation 2 will not stop the children from running to Santa. And McCain promised Playstation 1.

A Republican wins when he is the grown-up in the room, the conservative who points out Santa's fake beard and the pillow under his red suit. Granted, the media will help by keeping Santa's image out of focus to make it harder to spot the wires looped around the ears, but voters will see them eventually – if they are pointed out. (Throughout the debates, conservatives were constantly yelling at McCain to tug at Obama's fake beard.)

But when both candidates wear Santa suits and one is a brand new \$600 million dollar model with a shiny belt buckle and polished boots, the faded \$84 million dollar version

looks a lot less appealing. Faced with the choice of two fantasies, the voters will take the better-staged fantasy.

Ronald Reagan refused to wear a Santa suit. The conservatives who voted against the “Wall Street bail-out” also refused to don the red flannel. Sarah Palin (who kept McCain from being totally humiliated) refused to fasten the fake beard. But John McCain had already tried it on a few times – for the McCain-Feingold bill, the illegal alien amnesty proposals, and “global warming” cap and trade schemes.

McCain couldn’t help being McCain, and that’s why he lost. The Democrat voters said, “If we want goodies, we’ll get them from the more generous Santa with the larger sack.” The conservative voters said, “We don’t want someone who will cross the aisle and be eager to compromise. If Pelosi and Reid say that two plus two equals six, we don’t want a candidate who will negotiate the result down to five.”

The Republican Party would be wise to toss out all of its old Santa suits and act like grown-ups. It’s got two years until the 2010 mid-term elections. By then it may be able to persuade some of the voters that there is no Santa Claus. And, of course, it’s likely to be aided by the gaping hole at the bottom of Santa Obama’s sack that will keep a lot of the children from receiving their expected presents.

Don Fredrick

November 5, 2008

Copyright 2008 Don Fredrick