

Off the Cuff: Looking for Enemies to Cancel



If the woke crowd looks hard enough, they'll always find enemies to cancel.

That's the topic of my **Off the Cuff** audio commentary this week. You can listen to it by clicking on the *play* (arrow) button below.

<http://bernardgoldberg.com/wp-content/uploads/OTC-Feb-3-FINAL.m4a>

Editor's Note: If you enjoy these audio commentaries (along with the weekly columns and Q&A sessions), please use the Facebook and Twitter buttons to share this page with your friends and family. Thank you!

Side note: If you're a Premium Interactive member (the \$4 tier), and have a question for this Friday's Q&A, make sure to get it to me before Wednesday night at midnight. You can use

this form on my website.

“You Call This Torture?” and “Cruz Control”

Some people have been wondering about the timing of Sen. Dianne Feinstein’s release of her committee’s report condemning the CIA’s interrogation of Islamic terrorists. After all, the practice of waterboarding had ceased several years ago, so why bring it out when one knew it would lead to the U.N. condemning the practice and insisting that those who took part be indicted and tried by the World Court? They also had to know that it would endanger the lives of our spies around the world.

There is nothing odd about the timing. One, the Democrats had to release it before the end of the year when the GOP would take control of the Senate, and relegate the report along with Mrs. Feinstein to the nearest dustbin. But, two, and even more essential to the Democrats, was that it be released on the very same day that Jonathan (“The American people are stupid and had to be conned into supporting ObamaCare”) Gruber would be testifying before a Republican-controlled House committee.

Anyone who believes that was just a coincidence must also believe that it was coincidental that Clinton ordered the bombing of a benign Sudanese pharmaceutical plant in the midst of the Lewinsky scandal. You can carve it in stone that there is no such thing as a coincidence in Washington.

As for the report itself, I would like to point out that our constitutional rights and protections do not apply to our enemies and even the Geneva Conventions don’t protect illegal

combatants, aka terrorists. As for those who keep hollering about the Conventions, the fact is that they were first drawn up in order to guarantee for both sides that one's captured soldiers would be treated humanely by their captors. However, in the case of Islamic terrorists, one, they are not signatories to the Conventions; and, two, they not only don't have POW camps, but they torture and murder those, including civilians, who suffer the misfortune of falling into their hands.

In short, the Conventions were never intended to be a suicide pact.

Furthermore, while I don't happen to believe that most Americans are blood-thirsty, even if our legitimate motive hadn't been to extract information from those villains who were waterboarded or deprived of sleep, I doubt if many of us would have minded their being gnawed on by rats. That would especially have been the case with the memory of 9/11 and of innocent people leaping from the roofs of the Twin Towers to escape the flames fresh in our minds.

I know it's not entirely fair to just pick on Feinstein and her liberal cohorts. After all, John McCain has long been a loud critic of enhanced interrogation techniques, and because he was a POW during the Vietnam War, he is believed to hold the high moral ground on this issue. Unfortunately, Sen. McCain has never seemed capable of differentiating between the Vietcong torturing Americans for the hell of it and the CIA torturing jihadists in order to extract information that could prevent a repeat of 9/11 or lead to the extermination of Osama bin Laden.

I realize that Fox pundit George Will happens to agree with Sen. McCain, but that's because he believes that whereas others merely rent the moral high ground, he holds the actual deed.

When it comes to Sen. Feinstein, whom I have heard even some conservatives describe as a non-partisan grown-up in the Senate, I have to question the integrity and even the patriotism of someone who thinks it's essential to rehash events from long ago that serve no other purpose than to give America a black eye and endanger those currently trying to protect the homeland.

On top of that, the self-righteous senator has managed to ignore every scandal connected to Obama, ranging from Operation Fast & Furious, through the Benghazi massacre, the IRS targeting of conservatives, the Affordable Care Act, Obama's bias against Israel and his promoting the alleged rights of illegal aliens while ignoring those of American taxpayers.

At the very least, you would think that a U.S. senator would object to a president who, for all his denials of having the power and authority of an emperor, has chosen to ignore the separation of powers enumerated in the Constitution that both he and Mrs. Feinstein have sworn to defend. In addition, he has made it a practice to lie to the American people and has turned Robert Gibbs, Jay Carney and now Josh Earnest into real life Pinocchios to fabricate on his behalf whenever he had a round of golf to play, a fund-raiser to attend or simply wasn't in the mood to face the press and do his own lying.

In other news, I wasn't even slightly surprised that Harvard, Columbia and Georgetown, law schools have all agreed to allow students who claim to have been traumatized by the grand jury decisions in Ferguson and Staten Island to postpone taking their exams, knowing that college administrators have the spines of jellyfish.

Still, can you imagine how these self-indulgent young milksops will react when a few years down the road a judge or jury rules against them? Will they burst into tears, faint dead away, take to their beds with a case of the vapors or merely

insist on a re-trial?

Finally, the way Bowe Bergdahl has disappeared from the radar, in spite of his news-worthy exchange for five high-ranking jihadists, you might think he had been aboard Malaysian Airline flight 370.

Is it any wonder that Obama has come to believe he can get away with absolutely anything when even the newshawks at Fox never ask about the Army's alleged investigation of Bergdahl's desertion?

In my opinion, it isn't only members of the military who should stand trial for dereliction of duty.

Cruz Control

I know that for a lot of my readers what I'm about to say is sheer blasphemy, but I wish that Ted Cruz would stop seeking the spotlight. More and more he reminds me of a creature from a sci-fi movie, but instead of turning into a giant fly, Cruz morphs into a giant moth. The only difference is that in his case, it's a TV camera not a flame that serves as the object of his obsession.

I realize that for a great many conservatives, Cruz represents their ideal, but that's because they place a premium on symbolic gestures, no matter how futile they happen to be. In fact, they celebrate that very futility because they believe it confirms the senator's purity of purpose. I, on the other hand, who am every bit as conservative as Cruz, believe that politics should be rooted in reality and that before setting out on a crusade, one should not only have a specific and achievable goal in mind, but should be aware that failure often comes at a very steep price.

In Sen. Cruz, I see a man possessed of such naked ambition that his primary goal is self-promotion. I don't happen to care for showboats in any field. I never liked football players who pranced around after sacking the quarterback or spiked the ball after scoring a touchdown. I never liked Barry Bonds or any other baseball player who stood in the batter's box watching in awe as his home run cleared the wall. In short, I admire professionals who get the job done with a minimum of fuss and self-aggrandizement.

Cruz, on the other hand, seems interested in maximizing the fuss even if it accomplishes nothing more than garnering him TV exposure. In 2013, his prominent role in closing down the government achieved nothing except that it helped the Democrat, Terry McAuliffe, win the gubernatorial election in Virginia.

This year, Cruz was at it again. This time, his pigheadedness allowed Harry Reid to get liberal zealots Sarah Saldana appointed to head up Immigration and Customs Enforcement and Tony Blinken to be the new deputy secretary of state. In addition, Cruz provided Reid with the opportunity to appoint a number of left-wing judges to the federal bench and saddled us with a surgeon general, Vivek Murthy, an anti-gun zealot who believes that the Second Amendment is the single greatest threat to the health of Americans.

Ted Cruz is an egotist who subscribes to the loony notion that whatever furthers his personal agenda is what's best for the nation. It's a psychosis he happens to share with Barack Obama.

I understand that some of my readers regard it as traitorous when I attack Republican politicians, whether it's a conservative like Ted Cruz or an idiot like John McCain. I happen to believe that if you can't write honestly about those in your own party, nobody should trust you when you write about your political opponents. On the other hand, I happen to

sympathize with all of them, Republicans and Democrats alike. I mean, imagine if your employment depended entirely on really dumb people deciding every two, four or six years, if you get to keep your job. It's no wonder that most of them wind up as crazy as poodles.

Recently, I was reading about painters and it got me thinking about the astronomical prices that some paintings fetch. It doesn't bother me that some people can afford to pay \$75 million for a single work of art any more than it bothers me that some people own their own jet planes or own mansions on three or four different continents. I readily admit that there are some very wealthy people I despise – people such as George Soros, Ted Turner, Tom Steyer and Warren Buffet – but it's not their bank balance I resent, but the issues and individuals they choose to promote with their money.

I understand that the cost of most things is determined by the price people are willing to pay for them. It's just that while I understand why mansions and jet planes cost a fortune, I'm at a loss when it comes to paintings.

After all, the paint, frame, canvas and varnish, are not very expensive, so that doesn't explain it. And unlike sculpting, which requires intensive labor, painting is so easy, it can easily be done while sitting in a chair.

One painting can't cost more than another because of its rarity because even an amateur's work is unique. Also, most paintings aren't even what you would call aesthetically beautiful. And what's more, even the greatest forgery, no matter how faithfully rendered, is essentially worthless once it's found out. In a way, that's something of a shame. After all, whereas the original painter merely used the materials at hand, the forger is required to duplicate it centuries later, while disguising the fact that his own work only dates back to last Thursday.

So what is it that makes some paintings – paintings such as Da Vinci's "Mona Lisa," Van Gogh's "Sunflowers," Gainsborough's "The Blue Boy" or Edvard Munch's "The Scream" – worth tens of millions?

All I can come up with is that they're famous. In a sense, they're the equivalent of our own celebrities, people like Paris Hilton, Justin Bieber and people named Kardashian, who are famous for no other or better reason than that they're famous.

In a logical world, or so it seems to me, a painting of a bowl of fruit would be worth far less than an actual bowl of fruit because you can't eat a painted banana.

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

©2014 Burt Prelutsky. Comments? Write
BurtPrelutsky@fastmail.com.

"Our Constitutional Scowler" and "Kim Jong-Un, Movie Critic

I think it's high time the media stopped referring to Barack Obama as a constitutional scholar. Judging by the contempt he has displayed towards our most sacred document, he is better described as a constitutional scowler. I am probably being overly generous, but I think a case can be made that over the past six years, Obama has ignored or acted in violation of at least eight Amendments, the first, second, fourth, sixth,

seventh, tenth, fourteenth and fifteenth.

The reason I spend so much time denigrating liberals isn't simply because it's so much fun, but because I sincerely believe they are working overtime to destroy America. To maintain a polite silence in the face of it is my idea of moral cowardice.

For instance, Obama and his hand maidens in Congress have long maintained that Gitmo must be shuttered because it is used as a recruiting tool by Islamic terrorists, although they themselves refrain from referring to our existential enemies in such clear terms. However, they didn't hesitate when it came to releasing a partisan report that tarred the CIA. One may agree or disagree with what the CIA did in defense of the country, but both sides acknowledge that the techniques ceased five years ago.

Therefore, the report will have little or no effect aside from leading to countless hours of handwringing by the self-righteous likes of John McCain, Juan Williams and George Will, and endangering the lives of those engaged in intelligence gathering on behalf of our nation.

It seems that Sen. Feinstein was deeply troubled that the CIA apparently spied on her Senate intelligence committee, and determined it was a violation of the separation of powers. Inasmuch as she and her liberal colleagues then went on to release a damning report on the Agency, one can see that the CIA had good reason to fear and distrust the committee. That was especially so when we learned that the senators never bothered interviewing anyone connected either in the past or currently to the Agency.

However, when, in clear violation of his enumerated powers, Obama legislates with his pen and his phone from the Oval Office, the sanctimonious Mrs. Feinstein doesn't utter a single word in defense of the Constitution she has sworn to

defend and protect.

I keep hearing that America longs for a Congress that works in a bi-partisanship fashion, but I don't believe it. Liberals have no desire to see Democrats compromising with Republicans, and conservatives certainly have no wish to see Republicans compromising with Democrats. As I see it, the only people who call for bi-partisanship are the know-nothings who have so little understanding of the major issues that they think that it is only mulishness that keeps members of the two parties from joining hands and singing a few choruses of "Kumbaya."

When one party is convinced that the federal government should control everything from education and health care to the environment and the economy, and the other party thinks the single greatest threat to our freedom and liberty is that very same central government, which is basically that which existed with such disastrous results in the Soviet Union, bi-partisanship is merely another word for treason.

In other news, the liberal media is beside itself over an alleged epidemic of rape taking place on college campuses. They keep referring to a poll that suggested that one in five coeds is sexually assaulted. What they don't do is make it clear that the poll, which only had a 40% participation rate, was limited to two campuses and included such "assaults" as compliments, ogling and kissing.

I'm not going to suggest it's not possible that under certain circumstances, all of these things can be mildly distasteful – although I must confess I've never felt personally assaulted by a compliment – but they hardly constitute rape, and by including them, the feminists trivialize a despicable crime that, frankly, I would make a capital offense.

Far from supporting the poll that indicated 20% of coeds are being raped, government statistics claim the rate is about .6%, which translates to six coeds in a thousand being

victimized by campus rapists, not 200!

In news from the Orient, I have heard that most of the prescription drugs we use in America are being produced in China. Keep in mind those clodhoppers can't even manufacture non-toxic dog food. Knowing they're probably responsible for my rheumatoid arthritis pills is enough to make my blood run cold. Still, I think I'd prefer to suffer from terminally chilly blood than have to trust a product made in China to warm it up.

On the other hand, I owe North Korea a shout-out for hacking the computers at Sony Pictures. Otherwise, I'd never know that in an ill-advised email, a well-known producer called Angelina Jolie not only a mediocre actress, which I already knew, but a spoiled brat, which I merely suspected.

I also found out that even those Hollywood elitists who line up to attend Obama's \$35,000 fund-raisers can't resist making racist jokes about him when they think nobody's around.

In exchange for my tax dollars, that's the sort of stuff I want to hear from the government snoops at the National Security Agency. I mean it's bad enough I have to depend on the damn Chinese to fill my prescriptions without also having to rely on that schmuck Kim Jong-un for my Hollywood gossip.

Kim Jong-Un, Movie Critic

I've had some bad months in my life, but none has been quite as gruesome as the one that Sony just endured. First, there was the leak of those embarrassing emails in which uber-producer Scott Rudin trashed Angelina Jolie, and Sony head Amy Pascal made racist comments about Obama's taste in movies. Ms. Pascal made it even worse by then going to Al Sharpton,

begging him for dispensation. Frankly, I'd fire her for that alone.

If Rudin and Pascal have one reason to envy me, it's that I can never be embarrassed by leaked emails. You see, whenever I have a politically incorrect thought to share, I don't waste it in an email; I work it into an article.

Anyway, as bad as the leaks were, the studio made things worse when it backed down in the face of North Korean threats. I guess Sony was afraid that Kim Jong-un was going to have his pal Dennis Rodman set off stink bombs if "The Interview" was released. Frankly, judging by earlier Seth Rogen comedies, I'm sure this one didn't need any help when it came to stinking up movie houses.

For weeks on end, every news report claimed that North Korea was allegedly behind the hacking. Allegedly? I kept wondering who the other suspects might be. Who else might object to the chubby guy with the bad haircut being humiliated on the world's movie screens? Luxembourg? Monaco? The Vatican? The word, itself, has become something of a joke. Simply because nobody has stood up, like on an old "Perry Mason" episode, and confessed in open court, doesn't automatically turn the perfectly obvious into the alleged.

Considering how little it took to make Sony chicken out, we shouldn't expect to see a comedy in which the Ayatollah Khomeini mistakenly eats a ham sandwich, thus damning his soul to the eternal flames any time soon.

Still, if I have to choose between an administration run by either Amy Pascal or Barack Obama, I'll take Amy. As dumb as she may be, I doubt if she would explain reopening diplomatic relations with Cuba by saying that "If you keep doing the same thing for 50 years and not getting anywhere, it's time to try something new." After all, if Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy, Johnson, Nixon, Carter, Reagan and Bush, hadn't realized that there should never be a time table when it comes to doing the

right thing, the Soviet Union might have won the Cold War.

When asked if this détente meant that Raul Castro might soon be visiting the Obamas, Liar-in-Chief Josh Earnest didn't say yes and he didn't say no. Instead, he said that Castro wouldn't be the first Communist leader who has ever set foot in the White House. And, so far as I know, he wasn't referring to Barack Obama.

In other Washington news, the Pentagon has decided that simply because someone is a member of the Taliban doesn't mean he's an enemy of ours. Heck, no. Not when the EU decides that Hamas isn't even a terrorist organization. And not when you have Obama rushing to the financial aid of a dictatorship in Cuba that is barely hanging on because its two major sponsors, Russia and Venezuela, are suffering the effects of freefalling oil prices.

Speaking of boneheads, the one person who agrees with the EU when it comes to Hamas is our own Jimmy Carter, who followed up four disastrous years in the White House by spending the next 34 years reminding us of the debt the nation owes Ronald Reagan for giving the sanctimonious creep his walking papers.

It seems that once, when asked why he believed Hamas was a group dedicated to peace even though its charter calls for wiping Israel off the face of the earth, Carter replied that when he met with its leaders, he gave them DVDs that featured pacifists like Martin Luther King and Mahatma Gandhi, and they thanked him. I guess when you're an anti-Semite with the brains of a mashed potato, it doesn't take much to persuade you that the killers of babies and rabbis are the good guys.

It also doesn't hurt when most of the money donated to build your presidential library was contributed by Arabs and Muslims, grateful that a former U.S. president would condemn Israel as an apartheid state, while turning a blind eye to those dedicated to murdering Christians as well as Jews.

As for Gandhi the pacifist, let the record show that he hated African blacks, was an anti-Semite and, for good measure, chose not to take sides when it came to World War II. Respect him if you like, but where I come from it takes more than wearing an adult diaper to prove you're one of God's nobler creatures.

Finally, I should let you know that I have received several emails from people affiliated with the Wounded Warrior Project. They claim that I slandered the enterprise when I shared a report that indicated that they misspent a sizable portion of the charitable contributions they receive on things other than wounded warriors.

If the report I quoted didn't have the numbers right, I sincerely apologize. But even the new set of numbers didn't really change my overall opinion. I should explain that, except for the Salvation Army, I don't entirely trust big name charities. I'm not saying they're dishonest. What I am suggesting is that once an organization is taking in well over a hundred million dollars a year, you'll inevitably find that it's spending a huge amount on inflated salaries, travel, promotion and general overhead. I'm not claiming that anyone is fiddling with the funds. It just strikes me that donating to major charities is a lot like sending tax dollars to the federal government and expecting the money to be spent prudently.

Perhaps I'm naïve, but it seems to me that, like the Salvation Army, which relies mainly on volunteers, the Wounded Warrior Project could call on millions of older Americans, especially patriotic veterans, to volunteer to do a lot of the heavy lifting. It seems to me that would save millions of dollars that could then be spent exactly the way the donors intended, to serve the needs of those brave Americans who sacrificed so much on our behalf.

And now it's time for one last poll before the end of the

year. I would like to know which Fox News personality, be it a host or a regular contributor, is your favorite and who is your least favorite. Please send the two names to me as soon as possible at BurtPrelutsky@aol.com.

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

©2014 Burt Prelutsky. Comments? Write BurtPrelutsky@aol.com.

“If I Like Your Health Care Plan” and “The Piltdown Man Signs Up for Obamacare”

Years ago, I wrote a TV movie. It was that semi-mythical thing known as a docudrama. That means the basic premise was factual, but names were changed and, more importantly, characters and dialogue were invented so that you would sit there through the last commercial. As it happens, the movie was never produced, mainly because one set of NBC executives were fired and, typically, an inferior group was brought in to replace them.

In any case, the reason I am referring to “Johnson vs. the World” is because it applies to what is going on with the Affordable Care Act. An old man went in to a clinic to have his eyes checked out, but was told that his insurance policy no longer provided coverage for such exams. Instead, his insurers had “improved” his coverage behind his back by providing him with pre-natal care. In my movie, as in real life, the fellow sued and won a two million dollar judgment.

Today, we see Obama and his stooges deciding that people who were smart enough and successful enough to afford their own health insurance are too stupid to tell a good policy from a sack of manure. Instead, because the Democrats insist that any policy that doesn't cover mammograms for men, pre-natal care for women in their 70s and substance abuse treatment for people who have never and would never use cocaine, booze or marijuana, have obviously been buying their insurance from someone selling policies from the trunk of his '94 Buick.

And while everyone is transfixed on the disaster that the Affordable Care Act rollout has been, more attention should be paid to all the lies that Obama repeatedly told us. We should also note who is now defending the Liar-in-Chief. Kathleen Sebelius, the person most responsible for the fiasco, tells us she doesn't work for us, meaning that although we have to pay her salary and provide her with unlimited perks, she only has to answer to Obama. She even has the audacity to channel her inner teenage brat when being questioned by a congressional oversight committee, muttering "Whatever," in response to a legitimate question, just like a 14-year-old who's being chided by a parent for getting bad marks or turning her bedroom into a pig sty.

But she's not the only one. Ever since the debacle began on Oct. 1st, we have had one Democrat after another trying to pretend that Obama's mantra (If you like your health care plan, you can keep your health care plan. Period. If you like your doctor, you can keep your doctor. Period.) means something along the lines of "You poor dumb sap. I'm Obama, the Great and Powerful, and I know best."

Apparently, where Obama went wrong was in his punctuation. It was all those damn periods he kept tossing around. He should have used commas, so we'd have had an inkling that there was more and worse to come.

But you have to admire his disciples. The way they're prepared

to take a bullet for the putz puts the Secret Service to shame. There's no lie they won't tell, no depth to which they won't stoop, in their attempt to shield Obama from honest criticism.

One of their favorite games is to repeat one after another that the insurance policies the ACA will replace are "lousy." It amazes me how liberals inevitably glom on to a single word, and then repeat it ad nauseam, although there are any number of words, such as "inadequate," "rotten," "second-rate" and "stinky", that convey the same thought.

Another thing the leftists have been doing is downplaying the number of people who were blindsided by Obama's campaign of lies, and have lost their coverage. If you've noticed, the Democrats keep dismissing them as a trivial five percent of the population. That means 15 million law-abiding, self-sufficient, Americans could be kicked to the side of the road by the end of the year. On the other hand, when Obama, Pelosi and Reid, were pushing this legislative turd through Congress, they insisted they were consuming one-sixth of the national economy on behalf of 30 million uninsured people, a mere 10% of the population; which, by the way, was a number that the creeps only managed to achieve by counting illegal aliens and young people who preferred spending their money on booze, drugs, clothes and electronic toys.

Nevertheless, I don't hold Republicans blameless. After all, some of us are aware that even before HillaryCare bombed in the 90s the Democrats have been pushing for socialized health care; a scheme, by the way, that, not too surprisingly, was not based on RomneyCare, but on the programs in England, Canada and Cuba, that have made such a colossal mess of health care in those countries.

The biggest laugh these days is provided by those Democrats who keep feigning outrage over conservatives, even at this late date, wanting to kill the Act. Well, duh. Inasmuch as the

libs took great delight in passing the Bill without a single Republican vote, while ignoring 85 amendments that Congressional Republicans tried to get the Senate to consider, why should it surprise anyone that most of us wish that the coroner of Oz could confirm that ObamaCare is “not only really dead, but really most sincerely dead”?

Still, the Republicans, to their eternal shame, did nothing to fix the obvious problems with health care when they controlled Congress and the White House during George W. Bush’s first two years in the White House. All that was really required was to allow people to purchase health insurance across state lines, which should have been a no-brainer for the Party that allegedly promotes competition and free enterprise; and forced every health insurance company that does business in the U.S. to contribute to a pool that would cover any previously insured person who came down with a catastrophic disease.

Finally, I am sick and tired of hearing Washington bureaucrats, such as Kathleen Sebelius, telling us to hold them personally accountable, which are perhaps, at least next to “the check’s in the mail,” the five most meaningless words in the English language.

Whether those words are spoken by the Secretary of Health and Human Services, the head of the IRS, the Secretary of State, the Attorney General or the President, I want them to be followed up by an indictment, a speedy trial and, one would hope, a hanging.

“The Piltdown Man Signs Up For Obamacare”

The language of liberalism is the language of liars. They pretend that the Affordable Care Act was divinely inspired and handed down in the form of stone tablets when everyone who doesn’t have his head in the sand knows that it only got passed because Harry Reid and Nancy browbeat or bribed their left-wing colleagues to get it enacted.

Even then, they had to promise that no senator or House member would be lumbered with the worst thing that's come down the pike since unsliced bread. Obama might as well have said with a nod and a wink, "Don't worry, my amigos, this is strictly for the suckers."

A while back, my wife wrote to Sen. Dianne Feinstein, complaining about ObamaCare. The very day that Obama went on TV to try to explain how it is that a computer program that he blew \$400 million of our tax dollars setting up has turned out to be something Rube Goldberg might have whipped up in his basement, Feinstein responded.

In her email, she stated among other fibs that "The ACA creates important benefits for health insurance customers, expands access to care, and protects Medicare while reducing the federal deficit."

The truth, of course, is that none of those claims is supported by fact, unless you call providing men with pre-natal care and mammograms as important new health benefits, and if you accept that reducing Medicare by \$700 million is a form of protection totally unlike any other.

One politician who has a saner perspective on the issue is Mrs. Feinstein's colleague, Sen. James Inhofe of Oklahoma. After being successfully operated on for blocked arteries, he said that if he'd been insured under ObamaCare, "I probably wouldn't be here today."

As Inhofe points out and as Harry Reid stated during a recent TV interview, ObamaCare is merely a baby step on the way to single-pay socialized medicine, the system that inevitably leads to interminable waits for patients requiring surgery or any other sort of medical attention.

If you're going to identify yourself as a socialist, you have to swear allegiance to the cockeyed notion of government-controlled health care, but I guarantee you that, in spite of

going so far as to make a movie praising the Cuban health system, when Michael Moore, or, for that matter, the simpleminded members of the Congressional Black Caucus, have a health issue, they go to New York or Bethesda, not to Havana.

It also works that way when it comes to public education. Those politicians, including Obama, who praise these propaganda mills to the skies can always be relied on to have their own kids enrolled in private schools. After all, their own children don't need to leave the house to be indoctrinated in leftist doctrine.

Speaking of the imposter in the Oval Office, it wasn't that long ago that liberals used to insist that George W. Bush was avenging his father by going after Saddam Hussein. And yet they never even mention the far likelier scenario that Barack Hussein Obama is avenging himself on his drunken, communist, father's sworn enemies; namely, the white race, western civilization, Christians, Jews, all non-Muslims and capitalists.

"Chicago," Obama has said with a straight face, "is the ideal blueprint for national gun laws."

Even after five years, I had no idea that Obama possessed such a whimsical sense of humor. I mean, unless there's a Chicago I've never heard about, the one in Illinois is to murder what Milwaukee is to beer, Wisconsin is to cheese and Washington, D.C., is to bovine excrement.

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

The Morphing of America

I keep hearing from older Americans that the best thing about getting closer to the end is that they got to live most of their lives in an earlier and much better version of America.

A lot of that can be attributed to having lived during a time when you could trust what you read in newspapers so long as you discounted what ran on the editorial page. These days, just about every page reads like an editorial dictated by Barack Obama to his favorite ghostwriter, William Ayers.

One example of journalistic bias can be found in the way that the media covered the war in Afghanistan when Bush was the president and the way they've covered it since 2009 when Obama moved into the Oval Office. Over the course of seven Bush years, 575 American soldiers were killed in that war, and another 3,000 were wounded. Under Obama, the numbers soared to nearly 1,500 dead and 15,000 wounded. But if you judged by the coverage the war has received, you would imagine those numbers were reversed.

I still recall that when the war in Iraq was going strong, Garry Trudeau would occasionally devote an entire Sunday strip of "Doonesbury" to listing the names of the fallen warriors. Evidently, when they die with a Democrat in the White House, they don't matter quite as much.

Something I can't get my head around is how quickly public opinion can make a U-turn. Take gun laws. In December, 2012, 57% of those polled wanted them made stricter. In March of this year,, the number dropped to 47%. I am certainly not arguing for more legislation, but how it is that 10% of the people can do a complete reversal in three months? I mean, even the likes of Obama and the Clintons didn't have the gall to switch their stance on same-sex marriages quite that quickly. Instead, they evolved, which is political-speak for

checking which way the wind's blowing.

Speaking of guns, the Second Amendment distinctly states that the federal government will do nothing to infringe on the rights of the people to own them. Clearly, when the government passed Dianne Feinstein's ban on assault rifles in the 1990s, it was definitely infringing. But, then, ever since Lincoln decided to ignore writs of habeas corpus, politicians, as well as Supreme Court justices, have increasingly come to regard the Constitution as nothing more than a list of suggestions.

Sen. Feinstein, who certainly has earned her place among the most hypocritical members of the U.S. Senate, last year insisted she would get to the bottom of the scandal that saw this administration passing along security secrets to the NY Times...until she realized it could only be Barack Obama or one of his flunkies.

In a somewhat related matter, Richard Blum's firm was recently assigned the task of selling off 56 buildings housing post offices, meaning millions of dollars in commissions. In case his name doesn't ring a bell, Dianne Feinstein is Mrs. Richard Blum. (Have you noticed there's never an assault rifle around when you really need one?)

One of my readers, Randall Slafsky, called my attention to an article in the Washington Post. It stated that the Arctic Ocean is warming up, icebergs and glaciers are disappearing and in some places, the seals are finding the water too hot for their usual activities.

It went on to report that no white fish are being found in the eastern Arctic, while vast shoals of herring and smelts which have never before ventured so far north, are being encountered in the old seal fishing grounds. Moreover, within a few years it is predicted that due to the ice melt, the sea will rise and make most coastal cities uninhabitable.

The AP news story actually ran in the Post on November 2,

1922. Who would have ever guessed Al Gore was that old?

Apparently, I'm not the only person who has noticed that liberals are constantly giving new meaning to the word "hypocrisy."

Cartoonist Dixon Diaz pointed out in his takeoff on "Peanuts" that liberals oppose people having the right to smoke; drink large sodas; eat cookies; use gas, oil and coal; celebrate Easter and Christmas; use incandescent bulbs; or own guns. The only area in which they're truly pro-choice is when it comes to abortions.

In another strip, he had his version of Lucy telling Linus that he and his fellow conservatives are racist, sexist, homophobic, gun-toting, religious fanatics. When Linus points out that she and her fellow liberals support Muslims, who are racist, sexist, homophobic, gun-toting, religious fanatics, she replies, "That's their culture. You have no right to judge them."

To which I and most conservatives can only say, quoting that eminent philosopher, Charlie Brown, "Good grief!"

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