

The Final Days

After you've read this article, Burt hopes you'll enjoy Rancid Rhetoric.

I won't beat around the bush. I watched all of the GOP debates, I watched the Biden-Ryan debate and I even sat through all three of the presidential debates, and I don't think it's fair that I only get one vote that can be canceled out by the vote of one of those louts who got a free cell phone, thanks to Obama, or one of the guttersnipes who befouled our streets as a member of the Occupy Wall Street movement.

In spite of that, I am feeling pretty confident about the upcoming election. It's not just that Romney buried Obama in the first debate and more than held his own in the final two, or that Joe Biden, when confronting Paul Ryan, came across like one of those bizarre-looking characters who were always menacing Batman and Dick Tracy. I just figure that when Big Bird tells Obama not to use his name in vain and even the AARP tells Team Obama: "While we respect the rights of each campaign to make its case to voters, AARP has never consented to the use of its name by any candidate or political campaign. AARP is a nonpartisan organization and we do not endorse candidates nor coordinate with any candidate or political party."

I know, I know. I, too, started chuckling when I got to the part where they claimed to be nonpartisan. You sure could have fooled me when they worked harder to push through ObamaCare than Harry Reid, Nancy Pelosi and Henry Waxman, put together. Still, if I were Obama, my blood would have run cold when I realized that even the AARP was deserting me.

Like a great many conservatives who were tuned in to the final debate, I kept waiting for Romney to nail Obama to the wall

over all the lies that he, Biden and Susan Rice, have told regarding the attack on the Libyan consulate. But I then realized that if the moderator, Bob Schieffer, wasn't going to bring it up, Romney was wise to leave it alone. For one thing, even the lap dogs in the mass media are finally pressing the issue, no longer leaving it to Fox News to demand answers. The bottom line is that the media simply won't allow left-wing politicians to treat them with the same contempt that both display towards the American public.

For another thing, if it had been Romney who brought up the White House cover-up, it would have wound up like the petty squabbling that broke out during the second debate, when Romney pushed Obama to come clean about there being a reduction in the number of oil leases that had been granted on federal land over the past few years. After all, when a guy is running for president, he doesn't want to come across like a seven year old yelling "You did so!" while the other brat is yelling "Did not!" in rebuttal.

The Democrats spent six months painting Romney as a wealthy robot who didn't concern himself with the plight of others, but all Romney had to do in the first debate was to speak honestly without having his words filtered through the liberal media. Once he did that, the voters got to see a man who was decent, compassionate and, best of all, ready and able to restore America's greatness.

On the other hand, the Obama they saw was the one that the rest of us had seen since Day One: an arrogant, lazy, narcissistic, incompetent, who wanted nothing less than to radically transform America in his own socialistic image.

Prior to the third debate, David Axelrod and the rest of Obama's handlers had attempted to win back the female vote by portraying Romney as a warmonger. Watching the propaganda roll out, I was reminded of 1964, when LBJ destroyed Barry Goldwater by pretending that the Arizona senator only wanted

to be the president because he yearned to get his finger on the nuclear trigger.

It took people a while to wake up to the fact that Goldwater had more character in his big toe than Lyndon Johnson had in his entire body. As for warmongering, it was sweet irony that Johnson met his own Waterloo over his mishandling of the Vietnam War. He went from garnering over 61% of the vote in 1964 to failing to get his party's nomination four years later.

Something that far too many Americans can't seem to grasp is that a robust American military doesn't cause wars, it helps prevent them. Still, when war is inevitable, winning is a far better option than losing.

One of the problems with Democrats is that they still believe, as they did during the frostiest days of the Cold War, that a unilaterally disarmed America sets an example that will be copied by our enemies. It was idiotic when our enemy was the Soviet Union, an evil empire that had already gobbled up all of Eastern Europe, and it is no less idiotic when we have to deal with enemies in North Korea, the Islamic world and a Russia governed by a neo-Stalinist like Vladimir Putin, who learned everything he knows about diplomacy while heading up the KGB.

The idea that, in spite of the fact that Obama's own Secretary of Defense, Leon Panetta, has stated that a cut in our defense budget would threaten our national security, Obama could only defend the cuts by telling Romney that we no longer need horses and bayonets. But, then, this is the same creep who pulled security out of the Benghazi consulate because the impression that things were stable in Libya was more important to his re-election campaign than the lives of Ambassador Stevens and his three colleagues.

As of the first of the year, thanks to sequestration, the

military budget will be automatically slashed by half a trillion dollars. And anyone who believes Obama when he says the Pentagon is just fine with those cuts shouldn't be allowed anywhere near sharp objects, heavy machinery or a voting booth. In the present circumstances, sequestration is a fancy term for castrating the U.S. military. During the debate, however, Obama, who did absolutely nothing to avert the lunacy in the first place, confidently announced that it would never take place.

For a brief moment, I was reassured. But then I remembered that in 2008, he vowed he would slash the national debt by five trillion dollars; that he would work to bring people together, including Democrats and Republicans in Congress; and that he would lower the unemployment rate to 5.6% by the end of his first term.

Fool Americans once, shame on you. Try to fool us twice, you better remind Michelle to start packing up Bo's chew toys along with the kids' video games and the White House silverware.

And don't forget to leave the key under the mat.

Now that you've read this article, Burt hopes you'll enjoy Rancid Rhetoric.

©2012 Burt Prelutsky. Comments? Write BurtPrelutsky@aol.com.

I Thought Affirmative Action Was a Good Thing

✘ If affirmative action was such a great idea, then why is the left branding anyone a racist who might suggest that

President Obama benefitted from the policy?

Donald Trump has brought the President's academic record into the spotlight by asking how he gained admittance to Columbia University and Harvard Law School after having less than a stellar academic record at Occidental.

Because of that simple query, he's now been branded by the left as a racist because he has the audacity to question the President's academic credentials.

Ed Schultz over at MSNBC called Mr. Trump a racist because "he's questioning the academic prowess of one of the smartest Presidents we've ever had."

When Mr. Trump called on the President to release his college records, Bob Schieffer, host of Face the Nation, said, "That's just code for saying he got into law school because he's black.

Then there's the Rev. Al Sharpton who's upset with Mr. Trump's statements because it suggests that President Obama got into two Ivy League schools because of affirmative action.

Well, I found all these statements very enlightening because each one firmly believes Mr. Trump is saying that President Obama had to have been admitted to Columbia and Harvard, not based on his grades, but because of affirmative action.

Assuming that's true, what makes Mr. Trump a racist? I thought the left loved affirmative action. What's the problem with President Obama benefitting from the policy?

Rev. Sharpton supports it. So, why the outcry that the President benefitted from something Al Sharpton always supported and thinks is good for the country?

The African American Forum Policy advocates for affirmative action as does the ACLU, and the NAACP is opposed to any constitutional amendment that would do away with affirmative

action programs. President Obama's own Justice Department just recently filed an amicus brief in support of the University of Texas, Austin, which includes a component that considers race and ethnicity in its admissions decisions.

So what's making the left so outraged? If President Obama gained admittance to Columbia University or Harvard Law School through affirmative action, why should that be a negative?

It sounds as if the left now views a person who gets into a university because of his skin color differently from someone who gets in because of merit. It seems a bit hypocritical for the left to be calling foul play when the African American Policy Forum, for instance, believes that "race-conscious affirmative action remains necessary to address race-based obstacles that block the path to success of countless people of color of all classes." So why's the left making such a fuss?

It's interesting to see some on the left backing up from their decades-long support of affirmative action. Maybe it's because they're starting to wise up to the fact that affirmative action isn't all it's cracked up to be. I'm in Justice Clarence Thomas's camp who believes that affirmative action has created a "cult of victimization" and implies blacks require "special treatment in order to succeed."

It sounds as if affirmative action is coming back to bite the collective left on the butt. Maybe they're finally realizing that affirmative action makes victims of people and those that benefit from it are actually stigmatized by the policy.

It's really no surprise I don't get the left in this country. But if you do, God bless you.