

# The Nattering Nabobs of the Left

Whenever I think about liberals, I feel the wires in my brain begin to sizzle. What in the world makes them say and do such absurd things? For instance, why do journalists insist on lying about their political affiliation? When half of them claim to be Independents and only 20% confess to being registered Democrats, whom do they think they're fooling? After all, their friends and relatives, as well as their colleagues, know better. But so do the rest of us.

Last year, after spurning several years of invitations to attend a monthly gathering of former L.A. Times employees, I broke down and drove out to Pasadena for one of the geezer luncheons. Because even though I had written a weekly humor column for the paper for 11 years, I had always been a freelancer (no pension, no health insurance) and therefore only knew one person at the get-together. After we ate, the few of us who were first-timers were asked to stand up and describe what we had been doing since leaving the paper.

Because, unlike nearly everyone else in the room, I hadn't severed the connection because I had reached retirement age, I spoke about the movies and TV shows I had written. If I had stopped there, all would have been well. But, throwing caution to the wind, I mentioned some of the books I had written.

Even though this was supposed to be a collegial affair, the mere fact that some of the titles were "Liberals: America's Termites," "Barack Obama, You're Fired!" and "67 Conservatives You Should Meet Before You Die," was enough to have these seemingly civilized ladies and gentlemen start booing and hissing me.

Now keep in mind, these were people in their 60s, 70s and 80s.

For most of their careers, the Times wasn't, as it has been for the past two decades, a propaganda outlet for the radical left wing of the Democratic Party.

So don't let anyone tell you that journalists are even slightly objective when it comes to politics. Even after they've retired, they remain partisan pinheads.

The results of a Gallup poll should be a matter of some concern to Republicans. It seems that only 42% of us are looking forward to the midterm elections, while 50% are less enthusiastic than usual. While it's true that the numbers are even less encouraging for Democrats, I simply don't get it. Why wouldn't Republicans be chomping at the bit when it comes to having the opportunity to turn Harry Reid, currently the second most powerful politician in America, into just another cantankerous old jerk from an irrelevant state?

On top of that, with two years left in his term, if the Democrats maintain control of the Senate, Barack Obama might very well have the opportunity to replace one of the aging conservative justices on the Supreme Court with another Kagan or Sotomayor clone, providing the liberal clodhoppers with a 5-4 majority that could serve as a toxic reminder of Obama for the next 30 or 40 years.

The president of Nigeria is named Goodluck Jonathan. If we were given to bestowing similar names on our own offspring, we might have someone named Cursed Obama in the White House, although I grant "Barack" is bad enough.

Those who claim that the problem with our foreign policy is that Obama is a peacenik have overlooked the fact that three times as many American soldiers have died in Afghanistan over the past five years under Obama than had died in the previous seven years under Bush. Part of the reason is that Obama provided the enemy with a deadline for our withdrawal. But another, even more despicable, reason is that he changed the

rules of engagement. Under Obama, as Katie Pavlich pointed out in Townhall magazine, our soldiers are forbidden to shoot and kill an Afghan seen planting an improvised explosive device, although most American deaths in that Muslim cesspool are the result of IEDs.

Another element of Obama's plan to win the hearts and minds of the enemy at the price of American lives is forcing unarmed American soldiers to work alongside armed Afghan troops and police officers on our military bases. This bit of lunacy has predictably led to soaring numbers of what are euphemistically referred to as green-on-blue murders.

Those who claim that Obama's major failing is that he is such a saintly character that he simply can't bring himself to wage war as aggressively as is required to be victorious overlook the fact that he doesn't seem to have any problem waging war on the oil and coal industry, the military and America's middle class. Apparently all that's required is an enemy he can really hate.

Speaking of murders, Eleanor Clift, ex-sister-in-law of Montgomery Clift and resident knucklehead on "The McLaughlin Report," recently announced that Ambassador Chris Stevens wasn't really murdered in Benghazi. Instead, she claimed he died of smoke inhalation, without bothering to mention where all that confounded smoke came from.

In Nathaniel Hawthorne's "The Scarlet Letter," Hester Prynne was placed in the pillory by her Puritan neighbors and forced to wear an embroidered "A" after committing adultery and bearing an illegitimate baby.

By modern standards, a bit harsh, I'd say. Still I can't help wishing that Democrats had to wear a scarlet "D" on their chests when they ventured out in public so that the rest of us could take the proper precautions to avoid direct contact. That's because I have come to believe Democrats are infected

with a virus and are extremely contagious. I just wish there was a way to cure Liberalism.

Medical science should definitely get to work on a vaccine.

**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](mailto:BurtPrelutsky@aol.com).

---

## Shame on You, Eleanor Clift

✘ There's not a lot that Democrats and Republicans, liberals and conservatives, agree on these days. They don't see things the same way on taxes or climate change or affirmative action or abortion or a lot of other issues. But there is one item that should garner bipartisan support. And that is that Eleanor Clift, the long time liberal commentator, is a fool.

On the McLaughlin Group the other day, when the subject turned to Benghazi, Ms. Clift, who these days is a columnist for The Daily Beast and a contributing editor at what's left of her old magazine Newsweek, said, "I'd like to point out that Ambassador Stevens was not murdered; he died of smoke inhalation in that safe room in that CIA installation."

This raises a question: Are you kidding??? That's like saying JFK died in a car accident, someone tweeted.

It's embarrassing to even point this out, but the only reason Ambassador Stevens was in that safe room is because if he didn't go there he would have been killed in a hail of gunfire by the terrorists who had stormed the consulate. That they set the whole place on fire and that he died of smoke inhalation doesn't mean he wasn't murdered. A kid in middle school would

know that.

But all of us, at one time or another, have said things we wish we could take back. And Ms. Clift had that opportunity to set the record straight a few days later when she was interviewed by radio host Steve Malzberg, who asked her to clarify her earlier remarks. "I was taking issue with the sort of glib use of the word 'murdered,'" she said. "I think dying of smoke inhalation in the safe room of a CIA outpost has a slightly different feeling, and my point is that it was a very chaotic event."

And when Malzberg asked the direct question, whether the victims who died during the September 11, 2001, terror attacks were murdered, Clift said: "I was just trying to add a little bit of complexity, and I'm going to stick with what I said."

Malzberg then asked one more perfectly reasonable question. "If he was, God forbid, your relative, would you tell people that he was murdered or not?" "I would say that he died of smoke inhalation," Clift replied.

Perhaps we should be grateful. At least she didn't say, "What difference does it make?" how he died.

So, given the opportunity to say she had made a mistake, that she didn't really mean what she said, or at least, that the words came out wrong, she chose instead to stand firm. Eleanor Clift is that special kind of liberal who gives liberals a bad name. But we can't ignore her politics, her left-of-center view of the world – because that is at the heart of her heartless statement.

Liberals in and out of the media just want Benghazi to go away. The so-called mainstream media has pretty much been AWOL on the story, covering it the way President Obama would like it to be covered – barely, or not at all. So, to even acknowledge the obvious, that Christopher Stevens was murdered by terrorists, is too much for a liberal like Eleanor Clift.

Somehow that would be giving ammunition to the enemy. To immovable types like Ms. Clift, Stevens wasn't killed. He simply died.

In sports, the fans know when it's time for a player to retire. He slows down. He makes mistakes. He can't keep up. It's not unusual that the player himself is the only one who doesn't know it's time to leave the stage. Eleanor doesn't know either. But it's time for her to go. Not because she said something controversial. Rather because she said something shameful and is incapable of admitting how shameful it was.

Her liberal friends need to tell her how reprehensible her comments were. Surely they know. Everyone but Eleanor knows.