

Afterthoughts About Election Day 2012

☒ It's been almost a week since the Election. Even though I knew my vote didn't count – each candidate I voted for lost and just about every issue on which I either voted yes or no went the other way – here in Washington, I voted nonetheless.

Of course, I'm very unhappy about the results of the election. Although I was hoping I wouldn't have to, I reset my computer countdown clock to Inauguration Day 2017. Since President Obama's inauguration in 2009, I watched my clock count down the years, months and days to last Tuesday. It helped.

Since last Tuesday, I've heard plenty about what Gov. Romney "coulda, shoulda, woulda" done differently, but I'll leave that analysis to those far smarter than I am.

What struck me though in this election was the issue of the "undecideds." I'm always amazed when I read about polls and there's always 57% for, 39% against and the ubiquitous "don't knows" at 4%. Now, I guess if you asked me whether I thought Pluto should've been removed from the list of planets, I'd have to say "I don't know," but, on just about anything else, I'd have an opinion.

It's mind-boggling to me that there could be even one person "undecided" coming into this election cycle, let alone going into the voting booth not knowing how they were going to vote last Tuesday. The choices were never clearer and I'm not going to waste space here talking about those differences. They're as obvious as the nose on my face.

Bernie, in his article, Obama Wins – And Loses, remarked about "Chris Christie's embrace of President Obama after Hurricane Sandy hit New Jersey." Bernie said it didn't mean the

Republican governor endorsed the President, "but it's a safe bet that it came off that way to independent and undecided voters." I commented that it's frightening to think that a photo op for both President Obama and Gov. Christie playing kissy-face could, even with the President's track record, sway an undecided voter.

But Bernie was right. According to exit polls reported on The O'Reilly Factor, 42% of voters said Obama's response to Hurricane Sandy was an important part of their decision. And when asked "when did you finally decide for whom to vote in the Presidential election?" 9% said in the last few days, 11% said in October, 9% said in September and 69% said before that.

When I saw the President with Gov. Christie, I chuckled because the first thing I saw was Mr. Obama wearing the same Presidential jacket all Presidents seem to wear after a disaster and my husband and I wondered whether President Bush actually left this one in the First Family's bedroom closet. Gov. Christie had to make nice with the President because he had his hand out for federal funds. It all seems so obvious.

So, my bottom line is, although I can't imagine one voter who could still be undecided when he or she woke up on November 6th, I can't even begin to fathom why a photo opportunity for two politicians could make an impact on someone's vote. Even if the Messiah (as President Obama is referred to Sean Hannity) waved his hand and parted the waters and was able to make the waters of Hurricane Sandy recede, I still wouldn't have voted for him. But then that's me...

And by the way, shame on each and every Republican and Conservative who stayed home last week. No candidate is perfect, but not voting for Mr. Romney, for whatever reason, insured Mr. Obama a second term.

In the meantime, if anyone is interested, it's 4 years, 2

months, 8 days, fourteens hours, 52 minutes.... to Inauguration Day 2017.

President Mitt Romney

The title of my latest book, *Barack Obama, You're Fired! (And Don't Bother Asking for a Letter of Recommendation)*, is more than an example of wishful thinking. I am convinced that this year, Christmas will fall on November 6th when Santa Claus, recognizing who's been naughty and who's been nice, will do the right thing and fill our Christmas stocking with Mitt Romney and a Republican Senate.

The part I don't get is why politicians who have been voted out of office in early November are then allowed to hang around until the third week of January, creating all sorts of mischief. What takes them so long to pack up and clear out? If you're fired from a job in the real world, you're expected to leave the premises and not let the door hit you in the backside. That being the case, why is a politician allowed 75 days to clean out his desk and hand over the keys? I mean, if we really wanted the stiff to keep voting, we wouldn't have elected the other guy.

Speaking of other guys, back in 2006, someone who seemed to have his head screwed on right said, "The fact that we are here today to debate raising America's debt limit is a sign of leadership failure. It is a sign that the U.S. Government cannot pay its own bills. It is a sign that we now depend on ongoing financial assistance from foreign countries to finance our Government's reckless fiscal policies. Increasing America's debt weakens us domestically and internationally. Leadership means 'the buck stops here.' Instead, Washington is

shifting the burden of bad choices today onto the backs of our children and grandchildren. America has a debt problem and a failure of leadership. Americans deserve better.”

Who would have ever guessed that Senator Obama would ever wind up being a speechwriter for Mitt Romney?

When it comes to currency manipulation, I have tried to figure out why it’s so terrible when China does it, but not equally despicable when Ben Bernanke and the Federal Reserve engage in it in order to help finance Obama’s profligate ways.

Left-wingers are always nattering on about separation of church and state, pretending that they’re quoting verbatim from the Constitution, but they’re never the least bit concerned about the actual gulf that exists between socialist policies and the Constitution.

Liberals are like those little toys that, once wound up by the media, their professors or political hacks like Bill Clinton, Dick Durbin and Al Franken, will shuffle off until they bump up against a wall of reality and logic. Because they can’t get through the obstruction and because they refuse to learn from the experience, they just keep butting their tiny heads against the wall until they wind down and topple over.

It is for that reason that even after four years of the worst administration in America’s history, they continue to rally around an arrogant, incompetent, flop like Obama. Who else but Obama would go on *The View* and actually refer to himself as “eye candy”? Who else but Obama would kill an annoying fly during a TV interview and boast, “That was pretty impressive, wasn’t it? I got the sucker.”

On the other hand, all things considered, bringing down the pesky insect was a lot more impressive than hogging all the glory after the Navy Seals risked their lives taking out Osama bin Laden.

I, along with most normal people, thought it was pretty creepy when Chris Matthews confessed, after listening to an Obama speech, that he had felt a thrill running up his leg.

Not to be outdone, left-wing columnist David Brooks once reminisced, "I remember distinctly sitting on Obama's couch, looking at his pant leg and its perfect crease, and thinking he's going to be president and, moreover, he'll be a very good president."

I wonder what it could possibly be about Barack Obama that leads left-wing pundits to channel their inner Barney Frank.

Finally, as much as I enjoyed the old-fashioned walloping that Romney gave Obama during the Denver debate, I got a lot more laughs out of guys like David Axelrod and Al Gore trying to explain it all away as if it had merely been a bad dream. The biggest kick of all was hearing Gore insist that the reason Obama appeared to be in a coma was because he had arrived in the Mile High City mere hours before the event.

Apparently, Gore was under the impression that Obama had walked the entire way.

I suppose at the very least we should all be grateful that for the first time ever, the big goof refrained from blaming a natural disaster on global warming.

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

Should Mitt Talk to Bill?

✘ So I'm on with Bill O'Reilly and he says both Mitt Romney and President Obama should go on his program before Election Day. He knows the president won't take him up on the

offer, but he says Romney's people say they find the invitation "intriguing."

"Intriguing," we both agree translates into "No way, Jose!" But then Bill says he thinks it might happen.

Bill thinks it would be smart for Romney to go on the Factor, where he'd get 30 minutes to tell his story to a lot of people. I say, you're wrong Bill.

Here's why I would advise Romney to decline the offer. First, despite all the flak he takes, Bill is a journalist at heart. He's smart and fair and he won't ask softball questions like some others might. There'd be no "Obama is a jerk, right?" Or "don't you think Obama is even worse than Jimmy Carter?"

Bill would ask real questions. Let's say Romney hits them all out of the park for 29 and a half minutes. Then, Bill asks a question that neither Romney nor anyone else sees coming. A good, hard question. Let's say Romney muffs it, and in the process says something reminiscent of "I like firing people." He quickly explains what he really meant, maybe even apologizes for the awkward way he answered Bill's question ... but, alas, it's too late.

The Obama campaign jumps all over the "gaffe," which is a word used to describe what happens when a politician slips and tells the truth, usually about something controversial. What happens next? Right! Obama's loyal base – the so-called mainstream media – jump all over the gaffe too.

So here we are with a few days left in the campaign and everybody is focused on Romney's lone "mistake." That's all reporters write and talk about.

Should Romney have gone on the Factor earlier in the campaign? Maybe. But now the potential upside just isn't worth the potential downside.

That's why Romney should not go on the Factor. What say you?

The Occupy Pennsylvania Avenue Movement

Some people were surprised that in their desperation to recover from some of the damage that Romney inflicted on Obama during the Denver debate, the Democrats sprang to the defense of Big Bird. Frankly, I saw it coming as soon as Romney told Jim Lehrer that as much as he liked Big Bird and Lehrer himself, he saw no good reason for the American taxpayer to subsidize Public Broadcasting.

It figured that when recent events in the Middle East confirmed that Obama's foreign policy is every bit as awful as his fiscal policy, the Great Pretender was going to throw up some silly smokescreen. One time, it was Sandra Fluke and her birth control pills. The next time, it was accusing Romney of being the Grim Reaper where cancer victims are concerned. It stood to reason that David Axelrod would send his hand puppet off to defend the world's tallest Muppet.

What Obama and his liberal enablers refuse to explain is why an outfit as rich as PBS requires a federal subsidy, financed with money borrowed from China. To suggest that PBS is any more educational than the Discovery channel or the History channel or Turner Classic Movies, for that matter, is absurd. The only thing that makes PBS stand out from the crowd is that it is as liberally biased as David Letterman and Joy Behar.

If PBS is so absolutely essential to American culture, I say let the same goofballs who are donating hundreds of millions of dollars to Obama's re-election campaign send their checks

to Big Bird, c/o *Sesame Street*. He can then further feather his extremely plush nest, proving once again that fowls and their money will soon be parted.

What Team Obama doesn't wish to discuss is why they denied additional security to the American consulate in Libya when Ambassador Stevens and others begged for protection leading up to 9/11, and why this administration then spent the week after the terrorist attack left the consulate in flames, the ambassador sodomized and murdered, and the al-Qaeda flag flying from the smoldering ruins, lying to the American people.

What is particularly revolting about what occurred in Benghazi is that nobody was actually surprised that the jihadists staged the attack on 9/11. What's more, it could have been easily averted. If Mrs. Obama had decided to take one of her countless vacations in Libya, instead of in Spain, Manhattan or Martha's Vineyard, and thrown a celebrity bash at the consulate, I can assure you that the Muslim thugs would never have breached security.

For that matter, is there any question that if Secretary of State Hillary Clinton had been in the neighborhood, the mob would not have gotten within a mile of Ambassador Stevens and his three colleagues?

They tell you that America isn't a monarchy, but don't you believe it.

For that matter, they also tell you that America is a democracy or, depending on the time of day, that it's a republic. But in either case, the voice of the majority is supposed to be the trump card. However, that didn't prevent judges from overturning photo ID laws, although the overwhelming majority of Americans are in favor of anything that prevents voter fraud from corrupting our elections.

Not too long ago, one judge threw out parts of Arizona's

immigration law and another over-ruled Wisconsin's legislation involving the negotiating rights of public sector unions. Over the past few decades, judges here in California have over-ruled honest elections involving capital punishment, illegal aliens and same-sex marriages.

When judges decide whether something is legitimate not on the basis of the Constitution, but merely on whether it squares with their personal bias, the ultimate victim is respect for the law.

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

When so many people objected to Obama's placing people like Sonia Sotomayor and Elena Kagan on the Supreme Court, it wasn't because we think a woman's place is in the home and not on the bench, but because during their hearings, they mentioned they thought they would be wonderful additions to the Court because of such things as their race, their gender and their overriding concern for social justice.

The significance of Lady Justice being blindfolded is because justice is supposed to be race, class and gender, neutral. And as I have written elsewhere, once you start augmenting justice with adjectives such as "social," you destroy the very thing that makes America exceptional. It means that you believe that there should be one sort of "justice" for whites and another for blacks, one sort for the poor and another for the rich, one sort for men and another for women or the sexually bewildered.

Finally, this just in: In news that has stunned the nation's capital, Barack Obama today announced that he is dropping Joe Biden from the ticket and replacing him with Big Bird.

In a prepared statement, Mr. Obama said, "My advisors think I'm nuts, but I've been hearing from millions of my fellow Americans. The folks are telling me they want the Bird, and I'm just the guy to give it to 'em."

Romney Won It on Points

After you've read this special bonus article, Burt hopes you'll enjoy Deciphering the Left.

If the second presidential debate had been a prize fight, the ringside announcer would have said, "In the right corner, wearing white trunks, is Mitt ("The Gentleman Pugilist") Romney. In the left corner, wearing black trunks, are Barack ("The Low Blow Kid") Obama and Candy ("I Wuv You, Barack") Crowley.

I know that people were complaining about the replacement referees, who officiated at the first few football games this season, but at least they were merely incompetent, they didn't play favorites.

It figured that at a debate where the live audience was asked not to cheer or boo, the agreement would be broken by Michelle Obama, when she led the applause after Ms. Crowley backed up Obama's lie about referring to the Benghazi attack as an act of terrorism, in the Rose Garden, on 9/12.

In my eyes, Romney won the night. But he won on a decision. He would have scored a clear knockout if he had been more verbally aggressive. Instead, he came across weakest when he tried to come across strongest, as when he engaged in childish face-to-face squabbling with Obama. It was then that he lowered himself to his opponent's level.

If I had been prepping Romney for the debate, I would have made certain that he blasted Obama for lying about his plans for immigration reform. During his first two years in the White House, Obama had super majorities in the House and Senate. He didn't need a single Republican vote, as he proved

all too well when he shoved through ObamaCare. In 2008, he lied to Hispanic voters and they rewarded him with two-thirds of their votes. We will have to wait and see if they are equally gullible this time around.

Romney missed a great chance during their exchanges on energy by neglecting to mention that not only had Obama done what he could to destroy the coal industry, to cut oil leases on federal land and doing nothing to counteract soaring gas prices, but he squandered billions of tax dollars investing in solar and wind companies like Solyndra, which quickly went belly up. Apparently, the only collateral these outfits required was proof that their CEOs had donated big money to Obama's war chest.

What's more, when asked about the reason that gas is two or three times more expensive in 2012 than when he entered office, Obama said it's because the economy was so weak in 2009. That is perhaps the looniest answer to a question I've ever heard. If the state of the economy had anything to do with the price of gas, shouldn't the price be the same or even lower in 2012?

Romney also goofed when he let Obama get away with defending Planned Parenthood for providing cancer screenings. They do not offer those services. They merely refer women to places where they are done. Planned Parenthood, which, on top of everything else, flies under false colors, and should be called Planned Non-Parenthood, is in fact the world's largest abortion mill.

He might also have pointed out that the actual "War on Women" is being waged in the Obama White House, where women doing the exact same job as men, and not an arbitrarily determined comparable job, are paid less than their male counterparts.

When it comes to capitalism, Romney would have done well to point out that Obama is vehemently opposed to the free market

version. It's only crony capitalism that makes his eyes light up and his tail wag.

I also thought that Romney should have done more with the first question from the audience. When 20-year-old Jeremy Epstein, who is apparently a college sophomore, asked Obama what sort of job market he could expect two years down the road, Obama gave one of his canned speeches about the way he planned to improve manufacturing in America. Romney should have pointed out that not only had Obama overseen the loss of many such jobs during his term in office, but, as nice and as necessary as factory jobs are, neither Jeremy nor anyone else goes to college in order to wind up working on an assembly line. But because so many of those jobs require union membership, they are the only ones that Obama really cares about.

Finally, although Romney mentioned the fact that the middle class has been buried for the past four years, it would have been nice if he had mentioned that he heard this from none other than Joe Biden.

As everyone knows or should know by now, the reason that Obama bailed out GM with our tax dollars is because he could then screw the bond holders and turn the company over to his groupies at the UAW.

The most offensive moment during the entire debate came when Obama claimed he had described what occurred at Benghazi as a terrorist attack the day after it occurred, and when Romney tried to rebut, the moderator chimed in to say that Obama was telling the truth. If Obama had actually been telling the truth, we wouldn't have needed Ms. Crowley to tell us so. The tipoff would have been the moon turning blue and hell freezing over.

Romney's best moments came when he described his five point plan for restoring America to her full potential and when he

described Obama's agenda as "trickle down government."

Where Romney's handlers have let him down is in not providing him with a Reagan-like "There you go again" line with which to underscore every lie Obama tells.

On the other hand, the big story of the evening wasn't anything Romney said. It was the one-two combination of Obama lying and Candy Crowley backing him up.

If Obama had actually described the attack on our Libyan consulate as a terrorist act, why would he have sent out UN Ambassador Susan Rice five days later on five different Sunday news shows to lay the blame on some dumb video? And why would Obama go to the UN a week later and blame the murder of four Americans on that same video?

For that matter, why would Jay Carney deny the true nature of the attack for two entire weeks, pretending that they needed an FBI investigation to get to the bottom of things, when the consulate cameras and Ambassador Stevens' own journal told us everything we needed to know about the non-existent demonstration that allegedly led up to the al-Qaeda attack.

And, finally, why 30 days after 9/11, was smarmy Joe Biden still lying about what had taken place in Libya during his debate with Paul Ryan?

Still, I shouldn't complain. After all, the media has spent four years providing cover for Obama, propping him up and whitewashing his endless lies to the American public. But the one thing they will not abide, we belatedly discovered, is Obama and his stooges lying to them. As a result, instead of the media helping him bury the mess in Libya, they are now helping to bury him.

I found it fascinating that Secretary of State Clinton agreed to go through the motions of falling on her sword for Obama. But that sword was more like a wet noodle. It seems to me that

once the Secretary of State takes responsibility for removing security from a consulate and it leads directly to the murder of four members of the diplomatic service, a letter of resignation is called for, and not just a phony pledge to learn from her mistakes and to do better next time.

As we rush towards Election Day, I am reminded of a story a reader sent me a while back. It seems that the director of human resources at a large company was told to hire a black man named Barry to fill an executive position. It was soon discovered that he lacked the necessary skills to do the job, and the director was told to fire him.

When he called the guy into his office to break the bad news, Barry accused him of being a racist.

Patiently, the human resources director explained to Barry that whereas he had been hired because he was black, he was being fired because he was incompetent.

Perhaps during the third debate, Mitt Romney could find the time to share this anecdote. It strikes me as highly relevant. *Now that you've read this special bonus article, Burt hopes you'll enjoy Deciphering the Left.*

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