

# Well, This is Embarrassing!



*by Miles Mathis*


*First published November 10, 2024*

Women were expected to vote overwhelmingly for Harris to make her the first woman President. . . but they didn't. Women were expected to vote for Harris because they support abortion. . . but they didn't. After the election, many women are claiming Harris lost due to misogyny. Is that true?

Before we find out, why don't you try to guess what percentage of all women voted for Harris. I did and I came up with a guess of 70%. Then try to guess what percentage of white women voted for Harris. I did and came up with 60%. I suppose I have been trained by the media like everyone else, **because I wasn't even close.**

[In this article from CNN](#), which was pro-Harris the entire election, we see that Harris only managed an eight-point lead among women of all ages and races. That's the same as 54 to 46.

## Women lean toward Harris, and men lean toward Trump



Not quite the “lean” you were expecting, is it? Note that Biden did better among women than Harris


did, with almost twice her gender gap. What? Biden did better among women than Clinton did. What?

So are 46% of women misogynists? Is that the claim? No, that can't be it, so it must be that 46% of women are racist, voting against Kamala because she is part black or Indian. Except that, 8% of black women didn't vote for her, so I guess those women are racist against Indians. Yeah, that must be it, because we all know black women have a strong prejudice against East Indians. It is in the news all the time, where we see black women mobilizing on the streets in support of the Apu stereotype, the character on the Simpsons.



But it gets worse, and we can already see that by that statistic about black women. 92% voted for Harris, which is pretty good. About what we would expect. Latina women also did their job, with 61% voting for Harris. That's a 22-point gap, 61-39. Again, about what we would expect, or a bit less. But hold on to your panties, because that means white women must have voted for Harris by a very small margin.

Yeah, a *negative* margin:



Hello, are you still there? If you aren't too good at reading graphs, I will do it for you: white women

voted for Trump by 54 to 46. As you see they did the same thing in 2016 with Hillary. **White women didn't vote for Hillary.** Did you know that? I didn't. I am as shocked as you are by these graphs.

So all the crap we have heard over the past years about the Democratic Party being the party of single white cat ladies sipping wine is a complete and total fabrication. The truth is, it is white women who swung the election to Trump. White men, on the other hand, voted for Harris in greater numbers than they voted for Hillary. There was no white male surge in 2024, just the opposite. Trump was +31 with them in 2016, but only +23 in 2024.

In fact, of all the categories, white men come off most smelling like a rose (for Dems) in this data. They actually embraced Kamala like no one else. **They are the only category that voted more for Kamala than Hillary.**

It reminds me of the recent Bill Burr monologue where he is talking about the WNBA and Women's Soccer. He had seen Meghan Rapinoe blaming men for the lack of support for women's sports, calling us sexist for not showing up to games. Burr skewers her, pointing out that it is *women* who aren't interested in watching the WNBA or most other women's sports. Despite being more than half the country, most women don't even know the name of the WNBA or WNT team in their city. So why is it up to men to watch those games for women? Somehow that logic always gets lost with those such as Rapinoe, who think everything is the fault of men. Same here, where you would think women would be most to blame for not supporting a female candidate. Nope, it's our fault. The women want gender wars, but they want us to fight on their side. We aren't supposed to lobby, argue, or vote for ourselves, we are supposed to spend all our time bowing to them.


Another claim that is upside down to this data is the claim black men were sexist, avoiding Kamala for that reason. No, since they loved Hillary. 84.5% of black men voted for Hillary, while 78% voted for Kamala. They liked Hillary far more than Biden, at 80%. So I don't see how you can get either sexism or racism out of that. Obviously, they failed to like Kamala because she isn't likable. They found her even less likable than Hillary, which is saying a lot.

Incredibly, Harris even lost ground with black women, compared to Hillary. 95% voted for Hillary, and only 92% voted for Harris. **So black women threw the election to Trump.** You have to laugh. Next time you come across someone like John Fetterman claiming the election was thrown to Trump by a .3% segment of white-ins or Jill Stein voters, remind them of this 3% swing to Trump with black women.

Latina women also threw the election to Trump, by an even larger margin. Latinas voted for Hillary at 72%, but for Harris at 61%. An 11 point drop, or a 35 times larger swing than any third-party candidate vote or write-in. So the misogyny claim completely falls apart. It is upside down to the data.

So is the racism claim, as we have already seen. White men were actually *more* likely to vote for a black woman than a white woman, by a considerable margin, 38.5% to 34.5.

Here's another shocking pair of graphs that destroy the racism claim:




Dem support by voters of color has crashed, and it can't be racist because I assume most of them accept Harris is of color twice. Nor can it be sexist, since these same voters had no problem voting for Hillary. That's a 26-point collapse in just eight years, in the Democratic party's main base. An absolute bomb that is being completely ignored beneath all these cries of sexism and racism. A change of that magnitude and speed confirms my theory it was manufactured on purpose. Not faked or staged, but created with design by tanking the Party in a planned fail.

But I want to return to the white women voting for Trump by +8. I really can't get over that. I keep going back to the graphs, thinking I must have misread them. I have been monitoring the MAGA and alternative sites pretty closely for the past four years, so I know how big a story the “liberal white women” thing has been. Even J. D. Vance was involved in that, as you know, repeating the cat/wine trope. But while it is true there are many women like that in the Democratic Party, the story was spread across far more bread than that because we were led to believe **a majority of white women** are like that. We were led to believe that MAGA “trad wives” were an ignorant and backwards minority, made up mostly of poor white trash. We were led to believe that liberal white women were the central pillar and ideological gyre of the Dems, with abortion the black hole at the center of the star, drawing all towards it. But by looking at real data, we see none of that was ever true. The majority of white women don't vote Dem at all, by a pretty large margin, and they haven't for many years. And the white women voting Red can't be mainly poor white trash because those people don't vote at all, for the most part. It is known that the poorest segments of society vote the least, and that is because they are so downtrodden they don't think it could make any difference. They don't have enough HOPE in the system to even stand in line. Yes, a fair percentage of middleclass blue-collar women must be voting Trump, but probably the greatest percentage of women voting Republican come from the same place they always did: upper-income country-club wives and upper-income boardroom women and upper-income professional women and upper-income bankers. Those women also drink a lot of wine and have a lot of cats, but it's funny, you don't hear much about them. Or I least I haven't. I don't watch *The View* or any mainstream TV, but I haven't seen country-club wives or anyone else like that taking any heat. Maybe I am just naive or out of the loop, but it seems like the blue-collar “garbage” on the Republican side has been taking most of the heat. Curious, isn't it?

**[November 12:** Speaking of *The View*, Joy Reid said yesterday that black women were breaking with white women completely over this and not to ask them for help at anti-Trump rallies. What? So this is like [liberal white women allegedly not sleeping](#) with *any* white guys, even if they are liberal and voted blue. If white women are at anti-Trump rallies, they must liberal and blue, having voted for Harris, but that isn't good enough for Joy Reid, who now damns them categorically by color and sex, regardless of

their beliefs or actions—the very definition of sexist and racist, by the way. No matter how liberal and Blue you are, Joy Reid now lumps you in with the “garbage” white women who voted Trump. If you are a white woman, you might as well be wearing a white pointed sheet on your head. In my 61 years on this planet, I have never seen such a vicious example of allies turning on one another and chewing each other into little bits in a wild fit to pass the blame and avoid facing facts. For students of human nature, it is a real feast for the eyes.]



That seems to confirm the liberal white women story, as well as the story that colleges are all blue, but on a closer look it doesn't. +16 is the same as 58 to 42, meaning 42% of college-educated white women are Red. Following the current scripts, you would have guessed about 90% of them were Blue. We do see a 9-point move to Blue in just eight years, which means the indoctrination in the universities is having an effect on women, but it isn't as dire as we are led to believe. It is a drop from 46.5% Red to 42% Red. Concerning, but not a landslide. Nothing like the landslides in the other direction.

As another example, the shift in voters aged 18-44 away from the Dems should also be frightening for them, since these are the voters of the future. They have lost 9 points versus Hillary, among a group that previously skewed Blue. Makes no sense, because you would assume the younger voters would lean to the younger, hipper Hollywood candidate over the fat old fuddy-duddy “sexist and racist” golfer. But they didn't, indicating they were actually comparing platforms—again death to the Dems and their various planks.

At any rate, we can now see that this “white woman” project was just that: another project to divide us. They have long been trying to divide men and women—it is what I have called the Men-are-Pigs project. They are trying to split us in all races, but this project is aimed mostly at whites, since we are still a majority. Job one is splitting white men from white women. And as we just saw, the center-most ring of that target is liberal white men and liberal white women. But they have divided the work, with the mainstream media attacking white men all the time, inclusive of liberal white men—who are given no bye and are hardly admitted to exist ([see the new 4B project](#) which treats liberal white men as a subset of slave-eunuchs)—while the alternative media is given the job of blackwashing the liberal white women.

This Men-are Pigs project has been around a long time. I first came across this project in 1973 when I had just turned ten. That is when Billie Jean King played Bobby Riggs in the hugely hyped Battle of the Sexes. King was praised to the skies while Riggs was sold as a sexist pig. Just what you would

expect from the project. It has ballooned since then, taking over everything, though few have noticed or understood its greater importance. But this “liberal white woman sipping champagne and petting her cat” story is just one more arm of the octopus, aimed at white men like me. It is the Women-are-Pigs analog, created to make guys like me hate women. And it was built to serve double-duty, not only moving me away from women and any satisfaction they might provide me, but to move me right into the waiting arms of the Republican Party.

You may say “mission accomplished”, given my last paper on Trump. Except that, as you know, I *haven't* moved right, since I still don't like Trump or the Republican Party. I still call myself a liberal. All they have accomplished in that regard is making me hate the Democratic Party even more. But that was cake, since I have hated them since the time of Clinton. And what they don't want you to realize is that it isn't that they have tricked us—**we have tricked them**. To get us to move to the Republican Party, they had to move it a long way LEFT. To get elected, Trump had to become a flaming populist, and **populism is a LEFT ideology**. His anti-War stance is leftist, by the old definitions. His attack on the deep state and the status quo and Washington insiderism is leftist. His attack on the crony capitalism that drives the conflicts of interest at FDA, CDC, NIH, and other agencies is leftist. His promise to tap Kennedy as Health Czar is wildly leftist, since it would be a huge attack on big business. It is also a new form of regulation, which is leftist. *Deregulation* has been the battle cry since Reagan. Trump's battle with Google, Facebook, and those places is leftist in the same way, since they are naked bastions of fascism and fronts for big money. As I have said, it is doubtful Trump will actually do any of that, but in making the promises he was moving toward us, not the reverse. At any rate, those promises are now on the table and he will have to deal with that. The government will have to deal with that, no matter what.

Funny how you never hear from the alternative press that Trump's populism is leftist, though it is pretty obvious. Well, it is also obvious why you don't hear anyone but me saying that: it doesn't fit the current script. The current script is one of total division, and on the right everything good is conservative and everything bad is liberal. On the left, everything good is liberal or progressive and everything bad is conservative or reactionary. All the original definitions of these words have been ignored or overwritten. The entire history of the US and of Western Civ has been ignored or overwritten to fit the current manufactured schism. Which is why I spend so much time reminding you of history, of definitions, and of actual data.

In closing, I want to draw your attention to CNN's graphs on abortion, near the bottom of that page. They pretend their graphs tell you something about support for abortion, but they don't. They only tell you how much *relative* support Trump and Harris have from different categories. In the text they tell you support for abortion has gone from 50% in 2020 to 67% in 2024, but notice they don't show you any graphs for that, tell you any methodology, or even give you a link. It is just a raw claim embedded in a pretty raw sales pitch for abortion. Very strange. So let me just ask you this: no matter how you feel about abortion—I myself have been on both sides—does that claim make sense to you? Do you really think there was a 17-point swing on this issue in the past four years? Based on what? What changed in that argument in the past four years? Yes, there was the Supreme Court ruling, but that wasn't a ruling on whether abortion was good or bad. No major new facts have come to light since 2020. We haven't witnessed a soul entering a fetus at conception, the fifth month, or at birth. The Pope has not changed his mind on the subject, nor has any other religion. And the women on the streets with their signs saying that “they love abortion” have not moved 17% of Americans to their side. Just the opposite, surely, since they helped move me to the other side. So my assumption is the usual one: CNN just made this up. I don't believe any large-scale poll would find 2/3 support for abortion in all or most cases.