

AN IN-DEPTH ANALYSIS OF THE 2004 PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION

Being a political genius is no walk in the park. Most of you have free time to organize your sock drawer or to watch Dan Rather make an ass of himself, but not me. I am constantly besieged for my insights on the political scene, particularly the upcoming presidential election. Granted, this is a critical time for our country. We must make an informed decision about who we want to lead this nation for the next four years, and who will also face the peril of a wet kiss from our Ambassador to Outer Space Cynthia McKinney every time he goes to make a State of the Union address.

My responsibility is to help you with your decision by pointing out the positives and negatives of the two leading candidates: President George W. Bush and his challenger, Sen. John Kerry. My in-depth analysis does not include Ralph Nader, whose elevator doesn't quite reach the top floor anymore, or the Libertarian candidate, because nobody knows who he or she is. As always, I present this information with my near-legendary reputation for neutrality and fairness.

First, this presidential campaign has been one of the dullest and most uninspired of all time. I have seen more enthusiasm at a goat race in Euharlee. President Bush looks about as comfortable on the campaign trail as I do in downtown Atlanta after dark, and Sen. Kerry looks like Ichabod Crane.

President Bush has several strong attributes. He hates Islamic terrorists almost as much as I do, and he isn't crazy about France. You have to admire that. He gets liberals in a dither-dather all the time, because they don't run the world anymore. That's not bad either. Plus, anybody who Barbra Streisand, Michael Moore and Sean Penn don't like, but Larry Gatlin does, is okay in my book.

That is not to say that the president doesn't have negatives. For one thing, he thinks boys ought to marry girls and vice versa. He probably wouldn't feel that way if he was married to Susan Sarandon and saw her first thing every morning when he woke up. If he did, I imagine Donald Rumsfeld would start looking pretty good to him. Bush also doesn't pay attention to what the United Nations says. The U.N. is pretty hacked off about that and is threatening to sic the army of Iceland on us.

Now, let's examine John Kerry's credentials. The good news is that Kerry says he has a plan to solve everything from the war on terrorism to inflation to carbuncles. The bad news is that he hasn't shown us his plan, which makes me wonder if there is really such a thing. Maybe the senator is jiving us. Massachusetts senators are bad about jiving. Remember the fat guy who said he wasn't driving the car that sank in the Chappaquiddick River?

Sen. Kerry's wife is very rich. That is a positive because she can personally fund all the new government giveaway programs he can think up, which means we won't have to. Plus, we all get free catsup for the next four years.

Now for the negatives. Sen. Kerry is from Massachusetts. That is too close to Vermont, where Howard Dean lives. Howard Dean is the little guy with the dilated pupils who screamed a lot during the Democratic primaries. His elevator doesn't even go up as far as Ralph Nader's. Living that close to him could be contagious.

John Kerry's biggest negative is that most folks in Georgia aren't going to vote for him. They are going to vote for George W. Bush. Georgians are much smarter than most folks, and when we don't like somebody enough to vote for him, something has got to be bad wrong with him. It'll be interesting to see if the rest of the nation picks up on that, although we generally don't care what the rest of the nation thinks.

I predict that George W. Bush is going to be re-elected president of the United States. I also predicted that Roy Barnes was going to be re-elected governor of Georgia. Being a political genius is no walk in the park.