

Lucy At The Candy Factory

**Burt's Webcast is every Wednesday at 1 PM Pacific Time.
Tune in at K4HD.com His Call-in Number is: (818) 570-5443**

In one of her classic comedy bits, Lucille Ball, as Lucy Ricardo, once got a job working on the conveyor belt packing chocolates. Every few seconds, the belt would speed up and she started packing the chocolates in a panic. Some went into boxes, others went into her mouth and still others went down the front of her dress.

There are times I feel like poor, bedraggled Lucy. The news just keeps getting worse and worse and it keeps coming our way faster and faster, and none of it tastes anything like chocolate.

For instance, people call Obama a dictator, and with good reason. After all, he keeps trampling on the Constitution, treating the House as if it were more like a motel. And with a disregard even for the optics, he employs the IRS and the EPA as his personal bully boys, using them to punish conservative groups and those companies whose owners have neglected to contribute to his political campaigns.

But he is a dictator unlike all others. Whereas Hitler, Mussolini, Stalin, Mao, Pol Pot, Chavez and Putin, all wanted to make their countries stronger, this schmuck has done his best to weaken America by destroying our economy, mucking up our health care system and dividing us along racial, class and gender, lines.

And lest we didn't get the message, he's not only made us the laughingstock of the world by constantly drawing red lines in invisible ink, but he appointed as his Secretary of Defense Chuck Hagel, a knucklehead who had a truly undistinguished career in the Senate, marked only by contempt for Israel, and a bias against the military that is nearly the equal of

Obama's. So nobody should be too surprised that Hagel is leading the charge to cut the Army back to its pre-World War II numbers. But, then, who wants to squander tax dollars to finance a robust military when Russia, Iran, China, Syria, Yemen and North Korea, all have shown themselves to have only our best interests at heart?

Domestically, we could be making major advances if only companies stopped demanding or even requesting that their potential employees come armed with college degrees.

For one thing, colleges no longer help teach their young charges how to think. In fact, the opposite is true. Unless the students are prepared to regurgitate the nonsense fed them by socialist pinheads, they run the risk of not even graduating.

For another thing, most jobs can be mastered in a matter of months, if not weeks.

For a third thing, outstanding student loans now total \$1.2 trillion, and, frankly, there aren't that many outstanding students. Why do people who are going to be nursery school or grammar school teachers, social workers or, in fact, any liberal arts major, need to spend four or five years in college?

For that matter, the first four years of college are merely a way to separate parents from their hard-earned savings. Those who wish to become scientists, doctors, dentists, architects or engineers, should go directly from high school to high tech trade schools, saving themselves a lot of time and money.

I say if a person can learn to fly a military jet in a matter of months, a human being should certainly be able to learn how to be an accountant or an insurance agent in less than a year. And if a person intends to become, God forbid, a politician or go to work for the State Department, I would think he or she could master lying, cheating and stealing, without wasting

three years in law school.

Finally, I read a study that confirmed something I've been saying for years; namely, that older people start forgetting things not because their brains are rotting away, but because they're jam-packed with so much stuff.

It's like moving into a house with an attic. Early on, everything is stored neatly and is easily accessible. But over the years, as the family begins tossing old clothes, photo albums, board games and furniture, up there, things start getting messy. For all their good intentions, old magazines start getting mixed up with picnic hampers and Nehru jackets. Neatness becomes clutter, clutter morphs into chaos. So good luck when you actually need to find something. Eventually, assuming you're not one of those unfortunates plagued with dementia, you will come up with the long-discarded item – or the misplaced word – you're searching for, but it might take a while.

Democrats, of course, don't have the same problem. Their attics tend to remain as pristine as the day they moved in, completely empty, except, perhaps, for a few old Jimmy Carter bumper stickers, a stolen copy of Saul Alinsky's "Rules for Radicals" and a lot of spider webs.

©2014 [Burt Prelutsky](#). Comments? Write BurtPrelutsky@aol.com.

Chuck Hagel Unveils Both a Budget and Why He Was

Nominated

✘ Last year, when President Obama nominated Republican Chuck Hagel as secretary of defense, there were actually quite a few people in the media who suggested that he did so in the interest of bipartisanship.

Reid J. Epstein of *The Politico* even went as far as [writing](#) that the decision “appeals to Obama’s bipartisan spirit.”

I think anyone who has observed President Obama with even an iota of objectivity knows how comical such a statement is. After all, we’re talking about a man who spent his entire first term in office blaming his Republican predecessor for all of the country’s problems. We’re also talking about someone who has committed himself to engaging in a perpetual campaign against his Republican opposition in congress. He’s demonized them as obstructionists and hostage-takers, he’s inferred that they’re bigots, and he’s pretty much portrayed them as unpatriotic people who simply want to see the country fail.

The president, who has demonstrated a disdain for conservatism in all of its forms, isn’t interested in bipartisanship. He never has been. He also wasn’t interested in nominating a qualified individual to hold the position of U.S. Secretary of Defense. Chuck Hagel’s confirmation hearing last year was nothing short of embarrassing. Republicans and Democrats alike were aghast as they listened to him bumble his way through answer after answer, displaying an astonishing lack of competence and an inability to defend his own positions on issues directly relevant to the job he was applying for.

I think it’s safe to say that the real reason for the president’s nomination became apparent this week when Hagel announced a military budget that will reduce the size of the U.S. Army to pre-World War II levels. What better way to run

cover for such a drastic proposal than having an individual from the Republican Party (the party traditionally most trusted to defend our country from foreign threats) directly attached to it?

Former Defense Secretary Robert Gates certainly wouldn't have gone for it. Gates has gone as on record saying that he would have quit his job if such mindless military cuts were forced upon him while he held that position.

Hagel, however, is no Gates. He's an outspoken, [anti-war guy](#) with a history of making [anti-Israel comments](#) and denouncing his party for supporting the Iraq War (after he first voted for it). In 2012, he even went as far as saying that the Republican presidential primary candidates "can hardly race to say who would bomb Iran first." Did I mention that Hagel also refers to Iran's repressive government as "elected [and] legitimate"?

I certainly respect Chuck Hagel, primarily for his honorable service in Vietnam for which we all should admire and be grateful for. His value as our Secretary of Defense, however, is little more than a public relations stunt. He's a tool being used to pursue the only form of government shrinkage that committed liberals like President Obama are ever interested in: Cuts to our military.

Along with cuts to major equipment programs and military benefits, the plan calls for reducing our total number of troops to under 450,000. That's 120,000 less than the number of troops that fought in Iraq and Afghanistan.

Rich Lowry of the *National Review* did a good job of [conveying why](#) that's such a bad idea:

"Understandably, we don't want to fight another grinding ground war. But this doesn't mean we won't have to, or we won't experience other nasty surprises. It is an unfortunate part of the American tradition to convince ourselves, when we

find it convenient, that the world is not a dangerous place that always demands our attention, or else."

The truth is that we live in a very dangerous world – one that's much more dangerous now than it was the day President Obama took office. Anyone sitting in the Oval Office would obviously know that. Yet, President Obama's lifelong, liberal sensibilities prevent him from recognizing the prescription for best preparing our country for that world because he is (and always has been) far more concerned with pursuing a domestic, social agenda.

Liberalism is largely about trying to achieve a goal of *social justice* within society. It's not about maintaining an influential role in global issues. Thus a smaller, less consequential part for the United States to play on the world stage is actually seen as a good thing among liberals. The idea is that it will allow for more resources to be diverted toward the pursuit of *domestic bliss*.

There will, of course, *never* be any true restraints placed on spending by politicians who consider years of trillion dollar deficits to be an [Era of Austerity](#). With our nation approaching a national debt of \$18 trillion, and no other meaningful spending cuts (only increases) being proposed, one can only laugh at Hagel's statement about recognizing "the reality of the magnitude of our fiscal challenges." 

As Rich Lowry also pointed out in his column, the only *real* austerity we've been seeing has been to our military, first in the form of sequestration cuts and now in the military budget unveiled by Chuck Hagel.

Instead of spreading the *wealth* around, why can't we spread the *cuts* around?

By concentrating only our military, we're reminding the rest of the world just how weak and increasingly inconsequential

our country is right now. That's the legacy that Chuck Hagel is creating for himself as Secretary of Defense. Something tells me he doesn't mind, however, because even he knows that it's the reason he's holding the job.

The Little President Who Cried "Wolf!"

You have to wonder just how many times Obama is going to announce that, thanks entirely to Republicans in Congress, this nation is on the verge of going over the cliff or ending up in a ditch. I also wonder how many people still give a darn if Operation Head Start simply disappears or how it is that cops and firefighters, who all collect a city or county paycheck, will suddenly be unemployed if the federal government has to cut two cents from every dollar it currently squanders.

And why is it that instead of ever coming up with a plan to avoid emergency measures, Obama always pretends that he has no choice in such matters but to fire food inspectors and air traffic control agents, people who actually perform vital services, but never mentions his own batalion of butt-kissing aides and Mrs. Obama's ladies-in-waiting?

Apparently Chuck Hagel will be the next Secretary of Defense. Not only can he count on all 55 Senate Democrats voting for him, but a large number of Republicans. In spite of the fact that he is an anti-Semite and the best friend Iran has in America, the feeling, as expressed by Sen. Saxby Chambliss, is that the president should be allowed to pick his own cabinet members. Why any Republican senator should feel that way is a

mystery to me. Not only is Hagel not the best man for the job, he may very well be the worst.

But I also could never figure out why the Republicans allowed Ruth Bader Ginsberg, who had been the chief counsel of the ACLU and an outspoken feminist, to sail through her confirmation hearings in 1993 even though she refused to answer questions from those who wondered how she planned to make the transition from left-wing advocate to being a justice on the Supreme Court. And over the past 20 years, we've all come to realize that she never had the slightest intention of transitioning. The final vote, by the way, was 96-3.

And yet it had only been a scant six years earlier, in 1987, that the Democrats prevented Ronald Reagan from appointing Robert Bork to the Supreme Court.

And, again, in 2004, the Democrats prevented George W. Bush from appointing either Charles Pickering and, later, Michael B. Wallace, to the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals, often a stepping stone to the Supreme Court.

Clearly, it's Democrats who know how to play hardball. Republicans don't even know how to put on their jockstraps.

I am guessing that the Democrats will get the massive immigration reform bill passed just the way they want it. That means, as happened with Reagan, who signed the first amnesty bill, they will promise to build an enormous fence with barbed wire and electricity running through it, and then renege once they have all the illegals registered as Democrats. And by "all," I am not referring to the 11 million they keep yakking about. That is the exact same number that was being tossed around over a decade ago. So unless Mexicans stopped sneaking in since then, stopped having babies or have taken Romney's suggestion to heart and started self-deporting, I think it is safe to assume the number is much closer to 20 million.

Wouldn't it make for a nice change if the next time Obama

started in about needing higher taxes in order to finance work on our infrastructure, he quit yakking about bridges, roads and those damn trains that nobody wants, and instead started making plans to build that fence?

I always found it odd that Reagan, who made the line "Trust but verify" so famous when talking about the Soviet Union, was so easily flimflammed by the Democrats.

I am quickly losing patience with those conservative pundits who don't believe that Obama is out to destroy our economy in order to re-create it in the image of the failed socialistic economies of Europe. But, some of these pundits argue, even he can see that those countries are all on life support. Of course he can. But what they fail to recognize is the size of the man's ego. None of those countries, after all, has had his masterful hand at the helm.

What further confounds me is that, in spite of a corrupt media that never tires of singing Obama's praises, you would think that people would recognize in their own lives and those of their friends and relatives what a disaster he has been. And what a hypocrite! He rails against the rich and privileged – you know those millionaires and billionaires with their private jets – as if he were a member of the proletariat. But not only is he worth several million dollars, and will be worth hundreds of millions once he's out of office and able to cash in on books to which he'll lend his name and speeches for which he'll be paid a king's ransom, but look at who he hangs out with. If he's not breaking bread with the likes of Paul McCartney, Tom Hanks, George Clooney and Sarah Jessica Parker, he's giving campaign speeches at gatherings where tickets go for \$35,000 apiece or playing golf with Tiger Woods or footsies with Warren Buffet and Jeffrey Immelt.

The only poor people he ever even lays eyes on are the Marines who have to salute him when he dances off Air Force One and those silly buggers who provide a background curtain for him

every time he delivers a speech.

Finally, have you ever noticed how many left-wingers, especially those who accuse conservatives of being fascists, relish the company of real life dictators? For openers, there's Oliver Stone and Michael Moore, who can't get enough of guys like Fidel Castro and Hugo Chavez. Steven Spielberg said that the seven hours he spent with Castro were the highlight of his life. Sean Penn, who's not only enamored of Castro and Chavez, but also had very warm feelings for Saddam Hussein.

Woody Allen wished that Obama didn't have to answer to Congress or the Supreme Court, and Harry Belafonte wants Obama to toss his Republican critics in jail. Even that's not enough for Bill Maher, Will Ferrell and Chris Matthews, who wanted George Bush dead and would like to see the rest of us in the terminal ward.

But that's nothing new. George Bernard Shaw, an avowed socialist, had nice things to say about Hitler and Mussolini. Charlie Chaplin, Lillian Hellman, Paul Robeson, and half the self-labeled intellectuals in Hollywood and New York, thought that Joseph Stalin was the cat's pajamas.

Although, nobody seems certain whether it was Marx, Lenin or Stalin, who first dubbed those radical zealots who blindly promoted communism as "useful idiots," the fact is he was only half right.

©2013 [Burt Prelutsky](#). Comments? Write BurtPrelutsky@aol.com.

Haggling Over Hagel

Frankly, I don't think it will make much difference whether or not Chuck Hagel is confirmed. After all, he will be taking his marching orders from the single greatest menace America has ever had to endure. Still, that's no reason to confirm the man who has made a career out of demeaning Israel and sucking up to Iran to such an unseemly extent that Iran's foreign minister has applauded his nomination. If nothing else, when your nation's archenemy gives a big thumbs-up to the guy who's being considered as your Secretary of Defense, it should give even Democrats pause.

Not only has Hagel displayed an open bias against American Jews, insisting that something he refers to as the Jewish/Israel lobby intimidates members of Congress into doing dumb things, but when Sen. Lindsey Graham asked him to identify a single senator who's been intimidated or to mention even one of those dumb things, Hagel turned into Porky Pig.

What's more, as a member of some goofy outfit that calls itself Global Zero, he says he's opposed to nuclear bombs, but insists he's also opposed to unilateral disarmament by the United States. That can only mean that he believes that he and his merry band of pinheaded pacifists are convinced that they can use their moral authority to make Iran, Russia and North Korea, see the error of their ways.

In addition to all that, Rick Santorum, who served in the Senate with Hagel, claims that Hagel not only never introduced a piece of legislation during the dozen years he represented Nebraska, he rarely if ever even showed up for a party caucus. So, on top of being a confirmed anti-Semite, a man opposed to war or even meaningful sanctions where Iran is concerned, he's as lazy as Barack Obama.

One of the fascinating things in the recent brouhaha over guns

is that Harry Reid has been called by Wayne LaPierre, the head of the NRA, "a true champion of the Second Amendment." Mr. LaPierre has also said of Sen. Reid that "no one has been a stronger advocate for responsible gun ownership than him."

In 2010, the NRA was a major contributor to Harry Reid's campaign against Sharron Angle. Could that possibly explain why, in the wake of the Aurora, CO, movie theater shootings, Sen. Reid blocked any debate about gun control, insisting that the Senate schedule was too packed to do anything about it. This is the same Senate, let us not forget, that's also been too busy for the past four years to come up with a budget or to do anything about cutting the deficit or paying down the national debt. I guess there must be a Senate bowling league I haven't heard about.

I wouldn't want anyone to get the idea that I am in conflict with the NRA. In fact, this is the one area where Harry Reid and I are in agreement. I just thought it was fascinating to discover that Reid doesn't owe his political career entirely to Nevada unions and Vegas casinos. And I can't help wondering if Joe Biden and Dianne Feinstein realize that if Harry Reid ever loses his Senate seat, he might be in line to replace Wayne LaPierre.

Lately, I've been hearing a lot of back-and-forth regarding the U.S. Constitution. Ruth Bader Ginsberg told the world that if she were writing some nation's constitution today, she definitely wouldn't use ours as her model. That, alone, should have been reason enough to boot her off the Supreme Court. But I also hear various politicians and even law professors claim that the Founding Fathers weren't all-seeing and all-knowing. They generally take this approach when they're defending Roe v. Wade or some sneaky thing that Obama is trying to pull off in order to put the legislative branch of government out of business.

Whenever these punks try to subvert the Constitution, they say

the document is so vague that just about any interpretation can be placed on it. Or they say that the Constitution should be a living document, and that we shouldn't be bossed around by a bunch of dead white guys.

To which I say, the Constitution served us awfully well for most of our history. It's odd that it has suddenly grown old and senile since Obama's election.

I'm not a constitutional scholar, but I think what they intended is pretty clear and easily understood. I agree it's a living document, but that's because its authors were bright enough to understand that with changing times, it might require amending. But they spelled out how that process would work, and it did not have anything to do with the election of a former community organizer. George Washington was offered the crown and he turned it down. He didn't say, "I'm not worthy. Hang on to it until some Chicago tinhorn comes along."

They were very clear about separation of powers and states' rights, and anyone who pretends otherwise is out to con you. Those would be the sort of ne'er-do-wells who pretend that "separation of church and state" appears in that sacred document. Unlike politicians, it says what it means and means what it says. The Constitution, let us always keep in mind, was not written in Greek or French or invisible ink.

Speaking of Chicago tinhorns, it is not only dumb that Obama would claim we don't have a spending problem in America, it's downright terrifying. One might say that we have a debt of \$16.4 trillion and counting, but this boob doesn't even bother counting. Instead, he's spending his time adding and multiplying, both our debt and our problems.

When Michelle comes home from a shopping spree bearing those funny-looking dresses she seems to favor, I wonder if Barack ever complains she's busting their budget, and if she, in turn, replies, "You said we don't have a spending problem. And

drop that sugar donut before I smack you!"

©2013 [Burt Prelutsky](#). Comments? Write BurtPrelutsky@aol.com.

Alchemy, Al Gore & Jazeera

People who have blind faith in science would do well to recall that during the Middle Ages, a time not all that different from our own, especially in the Middle East, not to mention Chicago, Detroit and Hollywood, there were those who regarded alchemy to be a science. They were convinced that base metals such as lead could be magically turned into precious metals such as gold. In modern times, we find remnants of those earlier pinheads in left-wing circles, where it is widely accepted that a community organizer, by virtue of winning an election, can be transformed into a savior.

When I first heard that Obama and his stooges were demanding that gun magazines be made smaller, I naturally assumed they wanted the NRA monthly to be condensed. When I discovered they actually believed that the answer to violence in America was fewer bullets, I found myself wondering if they had put Michael Bloomberg, the idiot who thinks smaller soft drink containers is the answer to obesity, in charge of the crusade.

The irony of the situation is that, thanks to the perceived threat that this administration is apparently more concerned with confiscating our weapons than it is with denying Iran the ability to wage nuclear war, Obama has done more to increase gun sales than the NRA and Eric Holder's Operation Fast and Furious put together.

Because I have zero tolerance for blather, if I were a senator I would vote against Chuck Hagel because when Obama nominated

him to be Secretary of Defense, he said he wanted to advance global freedom, decency and humanity, as “we help to make a better world for all mankind,” and I would nix John Brennan, Obama’s nominee to head up the CIA, because, on the same occasion, he said he wanted to make sure that” the CIA always reflected the liberties, the freedoms and the values we hold so dear.” I don’t want the guys heading up those two offices sounding like mushy-mouthed social workers. I realize they can’t help how they look, but I want them to at least try to sound like John Wayne, vowing to destroy anyone who gets between his thirsty cattle and the nearest water hole.

Frankly, I haven’t heard such unmitigated hoey since the 11th grade when Seymour Schwartz promised to bring about an era of world peace if only we’d elect him class president.

Recently, I sent an email to Sen. Lindsey Graham. It was one of those rare occasions when I was praising a politician. I was commending him for refusing to allow Obama and his stooges in the media to sweep the Benghazi massacre under the carpet. But instead of a polite acknowledgment, I received an email informing me that due to the volume of email he receives, he is only able to respond to inquiries from South Carolinians.

In response, I wrote: “I really do think that you and other senators should be open to comments from out-of-staters inasmuch as your decisions affect us all. In this instance, I was complimenting you. But even if I had been taking you to task, I deserved the right to make my feelings known. God knows I can’t expect a reasonable response from my own senators, Boxer and Feinstein. But I should be able to contact any one of you hundred “public servants.” It’s not as if it’s only the taxes paid by South Carolinians that go to pay your salary and the salaries of your staff.”

It’s bad enough being stiffed by left-wingers without being shunted aside by conservatives. Is it any wonder that in a recent poll, members of Congress were deemed to be less

popular than root canal, head lice, colonoscopies, cockroaches and France!

But even Congress is more popular these days than Al Gore. For the past decade, the human dirigible has been piling up money and honors, everything from Oscars to Nobel Prizes, by running around like a demented Chicken Little, screaming that not only is the sky falling, but that the oceans are rising, and all because of those evil fossil fuels. And then, after refusing to even entertain an offer from Glenn Beck, he turns around and peddles his TV network to Al Jazeera, the pro-terrorist media outfit owned by the oil sheiks of Qatar. It would be like Michelle Obama, after making all of us endure her silly crusade against baked goods, agreeing to do TV commercials for Twinkies and Ho-Hos.

Compared to all the money that the Democrats waste in other areas, the half billion dollars or so that they funnel to Planned Parenthood is a drop in the bucket. But for lying about their mission and pretending that the group is anything other than a massive abortion mill, they should be put out of business. In 2011, for instance, in spite of insisting that they offer prenatal services to the poor, they referred only 2,300 women to adoption agencies, while performing 334,000 abortions. But I guess in the wacky world of liberals, an abortion is regarded as a prenatal service.

In what might be regarded as related news, some outfit calling itself the National Father's Day Council decided that Bill Clinton was Father of the Year. It will probably come as no surprise that the 2007 honoree was none other than John Edwards. But at least Mr. Edwards earned the title the old fashioned way, by impregnating his mistress while his wife was dying of cancer.

Rumor has it that Arnold Schwarzenegger, who certainly appeared to be the early odds-on favorite, is crying "Foul!" and demanding a recount.

©2013 [Burt Prelutsky](#). Comments? Write BurtPrelutsky@aol.com.