

Playing the Blame Game

When you look at the state of the nation, clearly someone is to blame. If you're a Democrat, you blame Republicans. If you're a Republican, you blame Democrats. If you're Barack Obama, you blame George W. Bush. If you're at least halfway sane, you blame Barack Obama and his stooges in Congress, in the EPA and the Department of Justice.

If you spend any time at all on the Internet, you have probably received the electoral map of the United States that tries to convince you that Obama's re-election is a done deal. Fortunately, the map is all wet. For one thing, it concedes Missouri, Iowa, Wisconsin and Indiana, to Obama. For another, it insists that Florida, Virginia and Ohio, are toss-up states, while I'm convinced they're all going for Romney.

Frankly, the question that comes to mind is whether it was drawn up by Curly, Moe or James Carville. How is it that the mapmaker manages to ignore all the elections that have taken place since Obama was elected in 2008? How is it that no consideration is given to the fact that a mere two years into his term, the Democrats lost six seats in the Senate and 60 more in the House?

Why was no attention paid to the fact that Scott Brown won Ted Kennedy's Senate seat, that a conservative Catholic won Anthony Weiner's House seat and that Marco Rubio knocked off Charlie Crist? Shouldn't it make any difference this November, that within the past two years, Republicans named Kasich, Christie, O'Donnell, Walker, Haslam, LePage, Corbett, Snyder, Brownback, Fallin, Mead, Martinez and Scott, all took over the governor's mansions formerly held by Democrats in Ohio, New Jersey, Virginia, Wisconsin, Tennessee, Maine, Pennsylvania, Michigan, Kansas, Oklahoma, Wyoming, New Mexico and Florida?

Are we supposed to assume that it makes no difference at all

that, thanks to the 2010 census, while the liberal northeast has been losing House seats, and therefore Electoral College votes, the conservative southwest has been picking them up?

It doesn't help Obama that he vetoed the Keystone pipeline, that he wasted nearly two years steamrolling ObamaCare through Congress, and that he squandered about a trillion dollars on a stimulus package that stimulated nothing, but helped cost us our triple-A credit rating.

You really think that Obama's Department of Justice, with its record of turning a blind eye to blacks intimidating white voters and "Operation Fast & Furious," is going to garner Obama support among independent voters? Forget about tying Obama to Jeremiah Wright, Tony Rezko and William Ayers; Eric Holder is albatross enough.

Even people who have trouble balancing their checkbooks know that a \$16 trillion dollar deficit and record unemployment are sucking the economy dry.

Obama is so desperate that he is running a TV ad that attempts to make out Bain Capital's Mitt Romney to be the mustachioed villain in an old-fashioned melodrama, tossing widows, orphans and a few disgruntled steelworkers, out into the snow. The fact that Bain Capital, not having been either a major bundler for Obama's campaigns or the UAW, couldn't count on being bailed out with taxpayer dollars the way that Solyndra, GM and Chrysler, were, bears out the rewards and pitfalls of the capitalist system.

Only the lamebrains on the Left would try to make a case against an honest businessman by pointing out that he occasionally suffered a setback. Because the Left consists mainly of academics, state and federal bureaucrats, sluggards, media leeches and college kids, they have no actual concept of how the private sector works.

That's why they fail to see that Bain could invest in a steel

plant in good faith and nine years later, because of competition and circumstances, the plant could go bankrupt. At the same time, they fail to acknowledge that putting a free-spending Marxist in the Oval Office would inevitably lead, a scant three years later, to a nation's being on the verge of bankruptcy.

Still, if you personally oppose a system that rewards risk takers and entrepreneurs, you might find life more to your liking in China, Cuba, Venezuela, France or Greece. A few of those locales even boast pleasant climates, perfect for cultivating citrus fruits and socialist fruitcakes.

A recent poll suggested that 46% of American leftists believe that rich people do the country no good. I suppose a case could be made if you exclude the businesses wealthy people create and develop; the paychecks they sign; the schools, museums and opera houses, they underwrite; the taxes they pay; and the medical research institutes they endow.

Now if they broke down those rich people by political affiliation, I just might go along with the crowd, because there's very little societal good for which I could credit the wealthy likes of Warren Buffet, George Clooney, Rosie O'Donnell, Michael Bloomberg, Danny Glover, Jane Fonda, Sean Penn, David Letterman, Bill Maher, Timothy Geithner, Michael Moore, Barack Obama and George Soros.

In the wake of Obama finally giving up the charade and coming out of the closet for same-sex marriage, I hear liberals making the claim that most Americans now favor it. If that were the case, you would think that at least one state out of 50 would have voted for it. Instead, the voters in 38 states have opposed it. In fact, the only places where it is legal are those states where either left-wing judges or state legislatures decided to cave in to homosexual hissy fits.

I have even heard liberals discount those 38 resounding

defeats by insisting that some of those elections took place years ago, before America had reversed itself on the issue. Those knuckleheads naturally choose to ignore the recent election in North Carolina, where 61% of the voters chose to restrict marriage to one man and one woman. The indisputable fact is that it is mainly thanks to blacks, usually the most left-wing voting bloc in America, that homosexuals keep losing these elections.

There is a rumor floating around that Hillary Clinton might replace Joe Biden on the ticket. I don't think that's likely. First of all, I am not convinced that she would add to his vote total, whereas it would definitely cost Obama Biden's vote. After all, the folks who adore Hillary already adore Obama. Two, I am convinced that Michelle despises Hillary, regarding her as a white hussy, and will never forgive her for giving rise to the "birther" movement during the 2008 primaries.

Even psychologically, it doesn't make sense. By dumping Biden, Obama would be acknowledging that he might have made a mistake in naming him in the first place. He would also be sending an obvious signal that he actually needed Hillary's help in order to win re-election. That doesn't sound like the narcissist-in-chief so many of us have come to know and hate.

Finally, Biden has spent nearly four years proving his devotion to Obama. At times, when Obama gazes at his vice-president's wagging tail, he's probably reminded of the Cocker Spaniel he noshed on back in Indonesia.

Biden locked his lips on Obama's derriere in 2008 and he hasn't let loose since. The only display of public affection that even comes close is the one that Bill O'Reilly shows towards himself when he insists that at least half the letters he posts at the end of The Factor are from readers gushing about "Killing Lincoln."

©2012 Burt Prelutsky. Send your comments to
BurtPrelutsky@aol.com.