



Written by [Selwyn Duke](#) on November 8, 2012

Where Obama Was 99-Percent Pure

In a 1936 referendum on his policies, Adolf Hitler “won” 99 percent of the [German vote](#). A popular fellow he was. Yet he had nothing on Barack Obama’s performance in 13 Philadelphia (mental?) wards, where the president received upwards of 99 percent of the tally.

Philly.com reports on the story, [opining](#) that these “neighborhoods outdid themselves in Tuesday’s presidential election.” Well, that is one way to put it. Also making euphemizing an art was St. Joseph’s University history professor Randall Miller, who said, writes Philly.com,



politicians almost never get 99 percent of the votes anywhere except, perhaps, the towns where they were born.

He said the Democratic voter turnout effort deserved credit for the president’s success.

“Ninety-nine percent is extraordinary, and it shows discipline as much as anything else,” he said.

Except it’s the “anything else” that’s the rub. Remember that on Election Day there were [reports](#) of court-appointed Republican poll watchers being thrown out of voting locations in 14 Philadelphia wards, almost precisely the same number (13) that were 99-percent pure. Since this was illegal, the courts ordered that these officials be allowed back to monitor the vote. But the interim period was certainly long enough to execute any scheme that might have been planned.

Having said this, since Obama enjoys more than 95 percent support from black Americans, the pure results aren’t surprising. In fact, if there was vote fraud, it would more likely be indicated by level of turnout; Philly.com reports this as having been 60 percent in Philadelphia overall, but says nothing about the 13 wards in question. What was their turnout?

Whatever the case, big-city Democrat strongholds have long been rife with vote fraud. One way in which this is done was explained years ago by a local Washington, D.C., community leader (who I’ll keep anonymous) who contacted me. He [said](#) that he had “done some computer work for several candidates over the years in DC” and had conducted his own study of inner-city vote fraud. And, he reported, the biggest factor in stealing votes is *transiency*.

Low-income minority neighborhoods include many people who relocate frequently and thus may be in one place for only a relatively short period of time. Now, these areas also have political operatives known by the get-out-the-vote term “block captains” or “apartment captains,” who are familiar with the communities and know exactly who the recently departed are. All they need do then is vote for these people or have others do so. Just say, “Hi, I’m so-and-so and I’m here to vote,” and then sign the book. Now you know why Democrats oppose voter-ID laws.

Yet this is just the tip of the iceberg. Given the multitude of ways votes can be stolen today, it wouldn’t surprise me if the number of fraudulent ballots cast on Tuesday numbered in the millions.



Written by [Selwyn Duke](#) on November 8, 2012

First we have the illegal aliens who can vote due to the absence of voter-ID laws. There are those who perhaps have voted multiple times. And then there are incidents such as the [Ohio Somali vote-steal](#), where newcomers who know nothing about American politics and who sometimes can't even speak English are brought to the polls by Democrat operatives and told how to vote.

That would be "how" in the sense of "for whom."

And, in the case of the Ohio situation, it was certainly illegal since there were no Republican vote-facilitators present, as required by law.

Then there are the electronic voting machines in many states that were [switching Mitt Romney votes to Obama ones](#). These were said to be "glitches." Maybe they were. Yet you've all used ATMs, iPods, and other electronic gadgets. Have you ever had one switch data input on you? I haven't. And we have to wonder how often this happened on Tuesday where the voter didn't even notice it.

Yet this also is just the tip of the iceberg. We've heard news stories about computer geeks hacking into supposedly secure, high-tech government and corporate systems. So how hard could it be to hack voting machines? This could be done prior to the election so that the machines furtively flip a certain percentage of the vote, during the "count," or during the transmission of data.

Did I miss something? Probably, since I'm more Luddite than computer expert. But I am an authority on the situational-values set (leftists), and what we define as vote fraud, they call a get-out-the-vote effort.

Anyway, this at least places an Obama campaign narrative in perspective. Now we know who the real "one percent" are and why the president hates them so much.



Subscribe to the New American

Get exclusive digital access to the most informative, non-partisan truthful news source for patriotic Americans!

Discover a refreshing blend of time-honored values, principles and insightful perspectives within the pages of "The New American" magazine. Delve into a world where tradition is the foundation, and exploration knows no bounds.

From politics and finance to foreign affairs, environment, culture, and technology, we bring you an unparalleled array of topics that matter most.



[Subscribe](#)

What's Included?

- 24 Issues Per Year
- Optional Print Edition
- Digital Edition Access
- Exclusive Subscriber Content
- Audio provided for all articles
- Unlimited access to past issues
- Coming Soon! Ad FREE
- 60-Day money back guarantee!
- Cancel anytime.