



Written by [Selwyn Duke](#) on September 28, 2018

## Michelle Obama Says Know-nothings Should Vote

Can you think of anything that's better when people who know nothing about it get involved? Michelle Obama apparently can, telling a crowd Sunday that "voting does not require any kind of special expertise." In fact, she essentially said casting ballots is okay even if "you know nothing about nothing."



Speaking at a Las Vegas Democrat rally, Obama did her best to fire up what has euphemistically been called the "low-information voter" base (another term for it involves being "useful"). After bemoaning the lack of voter participation in elections, the former first lady outlined some supposed reasons for it. She then said:

Here's something I just want to make sure people understand: Voting does not require any kind of special expertise. You know, you don't need to be — have some fancy degree to be qualified to vote. You don't have to read every news article to be qualified to vote. You know what you need to be qualified to vote? You need to be a citizen, you know; you need to be a part of this country.

You need to be a citizen? Wow, that position could bring down the wrath of cutting-edge Democrats, who increasingly embrace the notion that everyone residing in the United States — even illegal aliens — should have voting rights. In fact, illegals are already allowed to vote in certain municipalities' local elections.

Now, Obama's message is so silly, being cheap demagoguery, that one can actually feel silly addressing it. But here we go. Obviously, citizenship gives you the *right* to vote, but this doesn't equate to qualifications. As G.K. Chesterton put it, "Having the right to do something is not at all the same as being right in doing it."

Yet not long after the citizenship comment, Obama appeared to change her mind about qualifications, saying, "You need to have opinions about the issues in your community. That's what qualifies you to vote."

"Don't let somebody intimidate you from being a part of this process," she added a bit later (video below. Relevant portion begins at 4:55). "I've been voting since I was 18 years old — and, trust me, I didn't know nothin' about nothin' at 18 years old."

Some would say nothin' has changed.

Obama then reiterated an earlier point, stating, "But what you do know is what you care about. For all the young people, you do know you have a voice. You do have opinions about what goes on. That qualifies you to vote."

You know what "they" say about opinions. Since it's a bit crass, I'll just ask: Does having opinions about



Written by [Selwyn Duke](#) on September 28, 2018

---

air travel qualify you to pilot a 787? Does having opinions about neurosurgery qualify you to root around inside someone's cranium?

Obama and leftists in general encourage voting for a simple reason: Democrats do better when the turnout is higher. It's the reason why YouTube has recently had a voter-registration feature on many of its pages and why MTV partners with the "Rock the Vote" organization; it's why leftists in general orchestrate get-out-the-vote drives, which some would describe as efforts to rally the low-info vote disguised as a noble exercise in "democracy."

Nonetheless, there are many good people who believe that higher turnouts yield a healthier nation. Yet this position makes no sense. After all, most of us understand that having an educated populace is a prerequisite for a sound constitutional republic. But we also know that not everyone is well-educated (and, no, I don't mean well-schooled). Ergo, it cannot be a good thing for *everyone* to vote.

While many view majority participation as synonymous with "democracy," note that in the system's very birthplace, ancient Athens, only about 10 percent of the population voted. And in reality, low turnout is never a problem but, if anything, merely a symptom of it.

As I [wrote](#) in 2008, "It's one thing to have one man, one vote; it's quite another to have one man, one obligation to vote. Yet we still hear that it's our 'civic duty' to go to the polls. Well, no, actually, it's a civic duty to make ourselves worthy to do so."

After all, "If people don't have the initiative to get out and vote without prodding, it follows that they don't have the greater initiative necessary to inform themselves on the issues; thus, they shouldn't vote," I later added.

And as I [explained](#) in 2004, this "is a problem that takes care of itself when we let nature take its course. Those who don't care may not inform themselves, but more often than not a result of that will be that they won't vote, so no harm done. The problem arises when we put the cart before the horse and encourage those who can't yet drive to take the wheel."

The 2008 Duke again:

This is no minor point. When people don't vote, it's for the same reason why they don't repair cars, fly planes or perform brain surgery.

They're not interested in those things.

This is important because, generally speaking, interest is a prerequisite for competency. How often have you met someone who became adept at something through disinterest? "You know, I don't like playing the piano, but one day someone convinced me to tickle the ivories and my fingers started playing Mozart's Concerto No. 9."

... Really, we delude ourselves. We see a lot of posturing about getting people "engaged in the process," but it's all talk. A process is just that, a *process*, "[a systematic series of actions directed to some end](#)," while voting is simply *an action*. Or perhaps we could say it's a *reaction* — catalyzed by one's own knowledge and passion.

If people really were interested in the health of the "process," they would start at the beginning of that "systematic series of actions" — which is the step whereby you encourage people to care, study and inform themselves — not at the end with voting. They would understand that once this step was tended to, people would naturally cast ballots, as it is merely a by-product of personal political health.



Written by [Selwyn Duke](#) on September 28, 2018

---

If mere “participation” really does have some type of remedial effect, why don’t we apply this philosophy to other areas of life? We’re currently [experiencing a shortage of airline pilots](#), and, of course, the irredeemably old-fashioned might think the solution is to get people interested in the field so that they’ll undergo aeronautical training. If M. Obama is right, though, air travel might be better if everyone — even those knowing nothin’ about nothin’ — got a chance in the cockpit.

But, hey, Obama’s perspective is understandable. Her husband said in 2004 that he [wouldn’t run for president in 2008 because he didn’t know enough](#) — but then he ran, anyway. And now we know why M. Obama loves the low-information voter.

Photo: [Clipart.com](#)



## 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.