

Parsing Liberalism

by Burt Prelutsky

I believe it was Freud who was first got credit for saying he didn't know what women wanted. Frankly, I don't think he was half-trying. Quite simply, women want a man who is rich, handsome, sexy, is as interested in fabrics and color as they are, who can get weepy at sunsets, tear up at Judy Garland singing "Over the Rainbow," and whose favorite movie is "The English Patient." In short, they're looking for a very successful interior decorator. I say, good luck to them. But it's no wonder that so many married women feel they wound up settling.

The folks who mystify me are liberals. For instance, consider the way they speak. Without even blushing, they refer to the "peace process" whenever they're slapping down Israel. No matter what that little tiny country does – be it defending itself against missile attacks and suicide bombers or building houses in Jerusalem – the lunkheads on the left will insist the Jews are jeopardizing the peace process.

And just what exactly is the peace process to which Arabs, Muslims and just about every U.S. president since Carter pay lip service? When you get past the P.R. spin, it's the extinction of Israel!

Another term the leftists toss around is the "international community." That has a high-sounding ring to it, which is why the nincompoops love it so much. In fact, if by that particular community, one is referring to the members of the U.N., one is referring to a gang of chiselers, cowards and incompetents, representing the interests of gangsters, rogues and butchers.

Frankly, I wouldn't trust the creeps at the U.N. to run a 7/11, let alone the world. Only a mushy-headed liberal would endow the organization with moral authority. In fact, between the two groups, if I had to pick one, I'd vote for the Mafia, if only because it doesn't rely on American tax dollars to survive.

Another term liberals like to use is "misspeak." Recently, Richard Blumenthal, candidate for the U.S. Senate, claimed he misspoke when he went around claiming he'd served in Vietnam. It seems he'd never even been there for a vacation, let alone a war.

When a person says, "They is coming over for dinner," he has misspoken, using "is" for "are." What Blumenthal did was lie. Then to compound his sin, he held a press conference after his lies were uncovered by the NY Times, and claimed he was taking complete responsibility. Yet another lie. If this schlimiel was taking complete responsibility, he would have said, "I have lied to all of you. I have shamed my friends and family. At no point in my life have I possessed even an ounce of the courage displayed by the men who actually served and suffered in Vietnam. If I stood on my tiptoes, I couldn't reach their shoelaces. I stand here today completely disgraced by my past words and actions in order to announce that I have tendered my resignation as attorney general of Connecticut and to withdraw from the Senate race."

Instead, this punk told the world that he was proud of his years of public service. What's more, he was applauded by several of the liberal yahoos in attendance, thus turning what was supposed to be his public confession into just another campaign speech.

Years ago, liberals hated those who had served in Vietnam. Back in the 1960s, mollycoddled left-wing kids who tried to make a virtue of the fact that they'd lacked the guts to serve in the military actually spat on returning vets and called

them the vilest of names. Flash forward and you have the disgusting spectacle of presidential candidate John Kerry donning a military jacket and announcing to cheering yahoos that he was "reporting for duty" and now you have Senate candidate Richard Blumenthal lying about having faced not only the horrors of war, but the public vilification by people exactly like himself!

Yet another thing that liberals love to lie about, on behalf of the corrupt teachers union, is the importance of a public school education. For one thing, no politician in Washington, D.C., would think of sending his own children to a public school – and that means every beneficiary of the union's slush fund, including Obama and the members of the Black Congressional Caucus.

Also, if education is so bloody important, why is it that the Democrats seem to have turned Capitol Hill into a no-read zone? First there were all those 2,000-page bills being voted on by people who bought into Nancy Pelosi's suggestion that there would be plenty of time to figure them out after they were passed; and there was Arizona's immigration bill that had the liberals in a proper tizzy even though such administration heavyweights as Eric Holder, Janet Napolitano and P.J. Crowley, all admitted weeks after its passage that they'd all been too busy to read it.

I mean, as lies go, this one probably isn't quite as egregious as Blumenthal's. Besides, it was so darn blatant, it actually made me laugh. I mean, did anybody in America really believe that the attorney general, the head of homeland security and the assistant secretary of state, couldn't spare five minutes to read a bill that was just slightly longer than a menu, before attacking it with pitchforks?

The really embarrassing thing about this particular lie is that it highlights just how contemptuously these airheads regard those of us who aren't Obama's acolytes.

Otherwise, wouldn't Holder, Napolitano or Crowley, at least have said, "I took it home, fully intending to read the bill, but my dog ate it."