

Cookies, Kooks and Calamities

Even being incarcerated isn't enough to make some hardened cases walk the straight and narrow. O.J. Simpson, who, among his other sins helped make household names out of creeps like Johnnie Cochran and Robert Shapiro, was recently busted by prison guards while trying to smuggle a dozen oatmeal cookies from the mess hall back to his cell.

In related news, Nabisco is negotiating with Simpson's representatives to make him their corporate spokesman. And, if he gets paroled, "Sesame Street" is considering making him their Cookie Monster. After all, nobody answers the job description better.

The new Iranian president, Hassan Rhumani, gives new meaning to diplomacy every time he opens his pie hole. Without even winking or giggling, he actually said, "Iran is a country that loves culture and peace." He also said, "We have never pursued a nuclear weapon."

What gets me about mooks like Rhumani and Bashar al-Assad is that they spend half their time denying they have or are attempting to produce weapons of mass destruction and the other half offering to come to the negotiating table to discuss disposing of them.

One would wish that the United States was in a position to tell these people to stop lying, but when you have a president and secretary of state who can match them lie for lie and then some, the old adage about people living in glass houses invariably springs to mind.

Every time some nutcake runs amok and starts shooting up a mall, a school or a military installation, the usual gang of hypocrites can be counted on to start declaring war on the Second Amendment. What they can't be counted on to do is recognize the real problem with gun violence. If they did,

they would first have to recognize that the occasional crazies like Jared Loughner, Adam Lanza and Aaron Alexis, get the headlines, but they only account for a small fraction of the innocent victims. But if you think for half a second, that the liberals will ever send the National Guard into the hood to separate the black and Latino gangbangers from their artillery, you're clearly non compos mentis.

Furthermore, if you think the ACLU is going to idly stand by and let the folks who use the sidewalks as their bedrooms and toilets be institutionalized against what passes for their free will, you simply haven't been paying attention for the past several decades.

Unfortunately, because politicians and celebrities spend their lives being protected by men with guns, they can afford to be oblivious to the dangers faced by the rest of us. Still, every time you see Dianne Feinstein bloviating about how awful guns are, keep in mind that a while back, she was found to have a license to carry a concealed gun, and carry one she did. She claimed she had been threatened by a group of terrorists and was therefore justified to be a pistol-packing mama. After 9/11, Aurora, Newtown, Boston and the Navy Yard, not to mention all the teenage punks packing heaters, she has a fat lot of nerve pretending that we're in any less danger than she ever was. The only difference, as I see it, is that she has scores of armed guards protecting her work environment.

Because I receive so much email from readers, I am often in the right place to notice certain trends. For instance, the most obvious mistakes I used to find in these communications were those that confused "to, too and two" and "their, there and they're." Of late, hardly a day goes by when someone isn't confusing "loose" with "lose."

When these errors appear in messages taking me to task, I merely nod and think, "Well, of course. No wonder they disagree with my analysis." But when I find them lurking in

email intended to give me a well-deserved pat on the back, it merely makes me sigh.

I was recently sent some amendments to Murphy's Law. Among my favorites were: "Light travels faster than sound. This is why some people appear bright until you hear them speak." "A fine is a tax for doing wrong. A tax is a fine for doing well." "Change is inevitable, except from a vending machine." "Those who live by the sword get shot by those who don't." "A flashlight is a case for holding dead batteries." "It is said that if you line up all the cars in the world end-to-end, someone from California would be stupid enough to try to pass them."

Finally, I've been seeing way too much of Henry Waxman on my TV recently as he's split his time between railing against the Second Amendment and demeaning Republicans for trying to defund ObamaCare. The thought that has occurred to me is that he looks like the love child that would have resulted from the mating of two baseball mascots, possibly San Diego's Chicken and Milwaukee's Sausage.

Burt has two personal appearances!

On Thursday, Oct. 17th, at 12:30, he will be addressing the Palm Springs Republican Women Confederated, at 7 Lakes Country Club, 1 Desert Lakes Drive.

On Saturday, Oct. 19th, Burt be speaking to the Mountain View Republican Club at the Calaycay Ranch, , 1555 W. Baseline Road in Claremont, sometime between noon and 4 p.m.

©2013 Burt Prelutsky. Comments? Write BurtPrelutsky@aol.com.

Guns, Gats, Rods & Heaters

By this time, everyone in America has commented on the massacre in Newtown, Connecticut, so I suppose I might as well toss in my two cents worth. It was a heart-wrenching event and I personally hope that there is a Hell and that young Mr. Lanza will spend eternity being roasted over a slow fire. But I don't blame his guns. I don't blame the NRA. I don't even blame the movies. I blame him. I also blame society.

Unlike some, I don't blame society because Americans love their guns and, as a result, there are millions and millions of guns running around loose. I fault society because there are so many evil lunatics like Mr. Lanza being allowed to run around loose.

Every time I hear about a person who requires meds in order to achieve something resembling mental stability, lest he lapse back into schizophrenia or paranoia, I say to myself, that person should be institutionalized because crazy people can't be depended upon to faithfully take their medications. And anyone who thinks it's a good idea to let them roam free is crazier than they are. Quite often, these self-righteous oafs are card-carrying members of the ACLU.

I am not suggesting electric shock treatment or lobotomies for people like Mr. Lanza or Jared Loughner, the cuckoo who shot Rep. Giffords. I simply think that they should have been institutionalized long before they finally called public attention to themselves by killing large groups of innocent strangers.

The way things are stacked these days, you have a better chance of getting Barack Obama recalled than you have of committing a ticking time bomb before he detonates.

Speaking of Obama, there's only one bright spot in the economy that he can take credit for: gun sales. Smith & Wesson, along

with every other gun manufacturer, is enjoying – you should pardon the expression – booming sales. There are a number of possible reasons for this. To begin with, some people are afraid that Obama, a big fan of the U.N., is about to go along with the group's desire to confiscate firearms. Some people fear that Obama, who has shown an unhealthy appetite for ruling by presidential fiat, is establishing a banana republic without the bananas. Others just want to be able to confront the IRS on something like equal terms once push comes to shove over ObamaCare.

What I find fascinating about the current war on guns is that the person who has come up with the latest piece of legislation is none other than Sen. Dianne Feinstein, who had led an earlier crusade against gun ownership until it was discovered that she, herself, regularly carried a gat in her purse. If I were a senator, especially one who had vowed to get to the bottom of the security leaks that wound up in the NY Times and then never did a thing about it, I'd probably lug around a shotgun. After all, some people take it personally when America's national security is jeopardized for no better reason than to make Obama's foreign policy look good on that rag's front page.

One hears that the schools should teach gun safety. It's safe to assume that teachers, 99% of whom are liberals, would merely try to convince the kids that guns are intrinsically evil. Only a pinhead would fail to recognize that guns are the best way to confront those who are doing most of the killing these days, they being jihadists employing car bombs and land mines.

Besides, teachers can't even teach their young charges to read, write and do math. Instead of trying to make schools weapon-free zones, and inevitably failing, they should have off-duty cops on patrol, ready at a moment's notice to gun down armed nut-jobs, drug dealers and schoolyard bullies.

Some of the anti-gun advocates have called Hollywood on the carpet for romanticizing violence. I'm all for chastising Hollywood, but we all grew up watching westerns and war movies, and most of us didn't end up popping our corks. We recognized that we were watching John Wayne, Gary Cooper, Jimmy Stewart, Humphrey Bogart and Gregory Peck. They were the good guys and when somebody had to deal with bad guys, whether they were cattle rustlers, bank robbers or Nazis, hot lead was what they were asking for and hot lead is what they got.

Instead of attacking Hollywood because of phony violence, I would prefer to see people like Jamie Fox being ridiculed for referring to Barack Obama as "our lord and savior," or Matt Damon and Gus Van Sant for turning out *Promised Land*, an anti-fracking piece of cinematic propaganda. Because Hollywood already takes itself so seriously, the worst thing you can do is to follow their example and make them feel even more important than they already do.

In closing, I would like to leave you with these three thoughts: One Henry Ford, is alleged to have said, "Any man who thinks he can be happy and prosperous by letting the Government take care of him, better take a closer look at the American Indian."

Two: Susan Ertz said, "Millions long for immortality who don't know what to do with themselves on a rainy Sunday afternoon."

Three: I say that it's not easy to be a Pollyanna when two of the biggest human disasters are sitting in the Oval Office and running the U.S. Senate, but I feel compelled to say that I for one am extremely grateful that it's been ages since I've seen those two obnoxious caveman in a TV commercial.

Although, if I were given the choice, I'd prefer to see the two cavemen running things in Washington and those other two Neanderthals, Obama and Reid, trying to sell me precious metals or wart removers on the tube.

The Face of Evil

✘ The sun hadn't set December 14th, and the left was already screaming for gun control. It seems that every time a tragedy hits, the left's knee-jerk reaction is more gun control. I often wonder how these people function in the world without having any common sense – they haven't yet figured out you can't legislate behavior.

The only way to describe the horrific events on that day perpetrated on the small community of Sandy Hook, Connecticut by Adam Lanza is "evil." Period. And, if you don't believe evil exists, sit down with me for a couple of hours and I'll tell you about my 20+ years in dependency court dealing with parents who abuse and neglect their own children. The kind of behavior I've seen would give you nightmares. So, if you don't think the killing of tiny children is evil, think again.

But getting back to the issue of gun control. I heard Sen. Dianne Feinstein intends to introduce new gun control legislation next year. She's the last person I'd listen to when it comes to crime prevention. This is the same idiot who, when she was mayor of San Francisco, revealed vital information to the press about the Night Stalker, Richard Ramirez, angering her local and Los Angeles Police Departments. During one of her press conferences, she displayed the model of Avia shoes Ramirez had been wearing to each of his murder scenes. After he saw the press conference, it was reported he threw the shoes off the Golden Gate Bridge, went back to Los Angeles and killed again. And she went on to

be Senator and re-elected over and over since 1992. I don't get the people of California (for a number of reasons).

But, Sen. Feinstein's pledge "to do something" is the same blah, blah, blah we heard from the left after Columbine, Virginia Tech, Tucson, and Aurora. What the Senator and many don't get is that evil behavior started with a man named Cain and will continue no matter what laws are put in place. Anders Behring Breivik killed 69 people, mostly teens, in Norway in 2011. (He killed an additional 8 people with a bomb.) And yet, Norway has very strict gun control laws. In 1996, Martin Bryant, killed 35 people in Australia; that same year, Thomas Hamilton, killed 16 kindergarten children and their teacher in Scotland; in 2002, Robert Steinhäuser killed 13 teachers and two former classmates in Germany; in 2008, Matt Saari, killed 10 people and burned their bodies in Finland. I'm sure these countries have far stricter gun control laws that we have in this country.

What the left doesn't seem to get is that our Constitution gives us – the people – the right to defend ourselves. I don't believe that chipping away at that right – by banning so-called assault weapons (which were banned in 1994, by the way) – will solve the problem. What you'll have are law-abiding citizens without them and criminals with them. Because that's what criminals do – they commit crimes and if having a weapon is a crime, they don't care and would still have them.

Every time I hear the left screaming for gun control, I ask myself, where were they when O.J. Simpson knifed his ex-wife and Ron Goldman to death? (Yes, O.J. Simpson killed Nicole and Ron and when someone else is convicted of those crimes, I'll be very happy to send a heart-felt "I'm sorry" card to O.J. in his Nevada prison cell.) I didn't hear anyone screaming to ban knives. Or how about when we read about an entire family being wiped out because of a drunk driver? Does anyone advocate to stop manufacturing cars? (The unions would

have a lot to say about that.) Does anyone yell to ban alcohol? (We tried it and it didn't work, remember? The bad guys were still making the stuff.) And how about when someone is killed, like the pedestrian in Vancouver, WA, by a jerk under the influence of marijuana? No one is demanding the repeal of our recently-passed law legalizing this crap; instead the "Weed Blog" is actually blaming the pedestrian for not walking in a crosswalk and not carrying a flashlight. The writer would prefer to "chalk it up to natural selection."

I think if more states allowed people concealed weapon permits, we'd have fewer incidents like the one in Sandy Hook, or, at least, fewer deaths. I'm not advocating that anyone, including teachers, be forced to carry weapons. I'm saying if there were more average, law-abiding citizens, with valid CWP's, present in schools, at theatres or walking down the street, I believe these massacres could've been mitigated.

And for those who don't like the idea of having armed security guards in school, please think again. We're past the age of innocence. When I was a kid, 7 or 8 years old, I'd go outside and play with my friends all day until my mother yelled out the window for me to come home for supper. I doubt this happens much anymore, especially in the cities. Why, because we living in a very different time. Now, parents arrange "play dates" for their children in a controlled environment. As a society, we have to re-think about a lot of things, especially the protection of our children, and make sure the "good guys" are in control of the school environment.

As far as I'm concerned, more gun control will only take weapons out of the hands of law-abiding citizens – it will not keep evil at bay.

I don't get it, but if you do, God bless you.

Please Take the “Need” Factor Out of the Gun Control Debate

✘ In the wake of the horrific school shooting that took place last week in Newtown, Connecticut, we’ve heard a common question asked by supporters of increased gun controls: *Why does anyone need the type of guns used by the shooter?*

For me, it’s a simple question to answer: The average citizen probably *doesn’t* need them. What I don’t understand is how that answer is relevant to the debate.

It irritates me whenever I hear someone begin a legal argument with, “Why does anyone need...” In a free society, it’s not up to me or anyone else to be the arbiter of what someone *needs*. It’s an extraneous question. The legality of private ownership shouldn’t be tied to necessity.

Let’s face it...Most of us own plenty of completely unnecessary things. A lot of those things are even dangerous. We buy cars that are built to reach speeds that far exceed safe, legal limits. We buy samurai swords and large knives at shopping malls. We buy propane tanks and rat poison at supermarkets. We buy alcohol.

Whether or not we *need* these things isn’t a determination that should be made by the government or anyone else who isn’t involved in the purchase. They’re not our spouses, parents, or whoever holds the purse-strings on our family budget. Consumers shouldn’t be compelled to defend to society or the government their reasoning behind buying products, even when those products are firearms.

If someone likes to shoot at cans or paper targets in the

woods with a semi-automatic firearm, or feels safer in their home with one, it's not my place to say that they can't own it because I don't think they "need" it. It's none of my business.

If the argument is truly about a public safety concern (and it certainly is to many), let's just come out and say that. *That* should be the debate. Imposing a legal limitation on property by playing the *need card*, on the other hand, is nothing more than a self-affirming, symbolic mechanism for penalizing people who are simply enjoying their freedoms.

When peddlers of class warfare target rich people for tax hikes, they often ask the question, "Who *needs* that much money?"

When a city mayor feels compelled to dictate the dietary habits of his citizenry, he asks questions like, "Who *needs* to drink more than 16 ounces of soda pop?"

The only answer that such questions warrant, in the United States of America, is: "It's none of your business."

If the government is not the entity providing the product or service, it's not their role to cast judgement over our rationale for consuming it. It's certainly not their role to create legislation based on it.

There are real arguments to be made for how we can best protect our children from people like Adam Lanza. The "need" factor isn't one of them.