

“Notes From My Bunker” and “To Impeach Or Not To Impeach”

One of my readers is given to sending me messages fraught with anger and frustration over news items related to the ever-increasing amount of madness in the world. In his last communique, he let me know that it was getting to be too much for him to bear and that he had resorted to listening to more music and less news. I wrote back to report that my wife, who is addicted to Fox News, will sometimes switch it off in order to lower her blood pressure by watching cooking shows and old movies.

I then acknowledged that I'm lucky because when the bad news begins to overwhelm me, I sit down and write another article ridiculing liberals or Muslims. And lately, I added, it's become increasingly difficult to distinguish between the two villainous groups.

Speaking of those who should be bombed back to the Stone Age, except for the fact that they've never really emerged from it, I have noticed that even Fox has focused far more sympathetic attention on the Palestinians than on the Israelis. That might be the inevitable result of their stationing their Middle East correspondent Conor Powell in Gaza rather than in Tel Aviv. I have begun to suspect that Mr. Powell, who wears a helmet to protect himself from Israeli bombs, has become a victim of the Stockholm syndrome. Inevitably, he has begun to empathize with those who are being bombed today instead of those who have been under missile attack for the better part of the past decade. But, then, we know that even Fox is not impervious to the media motto that dictates that if it bleeds, it leads.

If the Israelis want to start garnering a little sympathy,

they have to stop using the Iron Dome defense system to bring down Palestinian missiles. And if they station women and children in targeted zones, I'm sure they'll do even better in the PR war.

Of course if they really want the world's pity, at least for a week or so, they can simply roll over for the Muslims in Gaza, Syria and Iran, and allow themselves to be wiped off the face of the earth.

In what passes for stupid even by her own Olympian standards, Nancy Pelosi had the gall to say: "According to Qatar, Hamas is a humanitarian organization." So, even though most of the civilized world, including the United States, has declared Hamas a terrorist organization, the House minority leader is willing to go on TV and seriously parrot the words of one group of Muslim terrorists about another.

But, then, in what must go down as one of the oddest moments in human history, we have America's Secretary of State John Kerry siding with Hamas and the terrorist gang's supporters in Qatar and Turkey, while Egypt, Saudi Arabia and most of the Middle East, sides with Israel.

The fact that there are demonstrations against Israel in particular and the Jews in general all over Europe is no surprise. For one thing, many of the demonstrations are led by the demented followers of Islam. For another, anti-Semitism is part of Europe's DNA. Far more troubling is the fact that there have been scores of similar demonstrations here in America.

It makes me wonder about some of you parents: When you see your college-age sons and daughters out in the streets carrying signs condemning Israel for trying to protect herself from enemies sworn to destroy her, some of their signs equating Israel with Nazi Germany, do your hearts swell with parental pride? Do you pat yourselves on the back because

you've allowed leftwing, anti-American, Jew-hating professors to fill their heads with sewage?

Were you too busy playing golf or watching "The Survivor" to pay any attention to the crap with which they were being indoctrinated as far back as grade school? Did it not give you pause when over 70% of young people voted to re-elect Barack Obama? Did you at least have second thoughts about having spared the rod and, instead, applied discipline through time-outs, which consisted of exiling the kids to bedrooms that could pass for Toys-R-Us outlets? Did you waste time pumping up their self-esteem while neglecting to even consider their lack of values, logic or commonsense?

Finally, I have come up with what I think is a vast improvement on the tax system. Whether it's a Fair Tax or a Flat Tax, I think we'd all be a lot happier if we could direct our payments to those parts of the government we personally support. So, for instance, conservatives could apply theirs to building up the military and providing more generous pensions for our veterans.

For their part, liberals could apply theirs to, say, financing Barack Obama's vacations or Nancy Pelosi's Botox injections.

TO IMPEACH OR NOT TO IMPEACH

Even before Sarah Palin called on the GOP House to institute impeachment proceedings against Barack Obama, I suggested it, so long as they held off until after the mid-term elections. That's because I didn't want anyone to be distracted from the Affordable Care Act or any of the numerous scandals associated with this administration.

It wasn't that I believed the Senate, whether controlled by

Harry Reid and the Democrats or by a post-January GOP majority would actually vote Obama out of office. What I wanted was for all those millions of people who manage to get through life while paying no attention to politics to finally have no place left to hide. When a president is being impeached, even those who spend most of their time watching "American Idol," "Perry Mason" re-runs and fishing shows can't help but absorb some unpleasant facts through osmosis.

I see no other way for these human ostriches to learn that all those scandals – ranging from Operation Fast & Furious to the Internal Revenue's targeting of Republicans, from the Benghazi massacre to Obama's shredding the Constitution in order to legislate from the Oval Office – aren't as phony as Obama keeps insisting they are.

One of my readers, Joe Vincent, agrees with me. Quoting religious leader Max Lucado, he wrote to say: "It is never wrong to do the right thing." Even so, timing matters, which is why I want to wait until 2015 to have the right thing done..

I understand that there are those, including Charles Krauthammer, John Boehner and Michael Medved, who disagree with me when it comes to impeachment. They believe that such an action could bite the Republicans in the butt because the Democrats would label them racists. To which I say, so what else is new? If a conservative so much as admits he prefers white meat to dark meat at Thanksgiving, he's called a bigot.

It's time for Republicans to grow up and quit sniveling every time a demented liberal calls them names. My suggestion is to consider the source, pull on your big boy pants and move on.

I realize that the impeachment of Bill Clinton proved disastrous for the GOP and did a lot to help the Democrats gain congressional seats in the 1998 mid-terms. But that was then and this is now. For one thing, the economy was zipping

along in 1998, and although that had less to do with Clinton than with Newt Gingrich and the House Republicans, it accrued to his benefit. For another thing, say what you will about Clinton, he comes off as a good old boy. Obama comes across as an arrogant schmuck whose domestic agenda has put a brake on our economic recovery and whose foreign policy has alienated America's friends and emboldened our enemies.

In addition, although he was guilty of perjury, Clinton's defenders in Congress and the media could make it appear that he was being persecuted by Puritans over his sleazy private life. The proceedings quickly took on the appearance of a French sex farce, with the prosecutor, Kenneth Starr, in the role of a vengeful wife, while Hillary Clinton cast herself as Bill's loyal drinking buddy, ever ready to provide an alibi, while simultaneously blaming a vast rightwing conspiracy and trashing every woman who ever dared complain about his boorish antics.

Finally, while it's quite true that Clinton's impeachment made him a sympathetic character for a great many people and helped fuel the Democrats' unprecedented mid-term victories in 1998, Krauthammer, Boehner and Medved, seem to have overlooked the fact that it hardly proved fatal to the GOP, which managed to win the presidency two short years later against the incumbent vice-president.

Speaking of the Clintons, Hillary is still kicking herself in the backside for trying to come off as a typical housewife worried sick over the future when she insisted that she and Bill were flat broke in 2001 – or at least as broke as two people could be when they had tens of millions of dollars' worth of impending book deals and speaking fees just waiting for them to turn off the lights and put the key under the White House welcome mat.

The same golden future, I regret to say, will face the post-presidential Obamas. But even they wouldn't have the audacity

to claim they're broke when they check out because they already had about ten million bucks when they checked in, and we taxpayers have been picking up the tab ever since.

Although the Obamas won't be leaving their current digs for another two-and-a-half years, I think it's safe to predict that, come January, 2017, while they'll be far from broke, they'll still be as morally bankrupt as the day they moved in.

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.