

Monkey Business

The worst thing about liberals is not that they're wrong on the issues, but that they are hypocrites and liars. The basis for my claim is that the same things they thought were hanging offenses when Bush was president are perfectly okay with them so long as one of their own is the guy keeping Gitmo open, extending the Patriot Act and attacking Syria even though they haven't attacked us. I could list other acts of hypocrisy, but of course I already have in hundreds of earlier articles.

The notion that Syria is really expected to hand over its chemical arsenal and that Russia is going to compel al-Assad to do so at the best of times is laughable. The idea that he's going to do so in the midst of a civil war is even more ludicrous. Combine all that with a deadline of mid-2014 and the threat of a U.N. resolution if they don't comply is proof the whole thing's a farce.

Why the United States or any other democracy feels it has to keep pretending that an organization that is jam-packed with gangster states and in which Russia has veto powers has any moral standing is beyond me. What, after all, will the U.N. do if Syria doesn't surrender its poison gas? The likeliest guess is that Secretary General Ban Ki-moon will threaten to hold his breath.

If John Kerry, aka Mr. Ed, wasn't such a pompous oaf, I would probably feel sorry for him. After all, there he was, delivering pep talks calling for our attacking Syria, and the next thing he knew Obama yanked the rug out from under him. If I were Kerry, I would probably decide that Hillary Clinton had the right idea when she took advantage of the travel allowance that went with the job, but otherwise did nothing in four years, up to and including sending Libyan Ambassador Chris Stevens the additional security he spent months requesting.

With mid-term elections less than 14 months off, it is not too soon to start urging Republicans to get out the vote for any Republican who winds up on the ballot. Always keep in mind that unless you happen to be lucky enough to live in certain states or certain congressional districts, you will not have a Ted Cruz or a Paul Ryan on your ballot. What you will surely have is a Democrat who will fall into line behind Harry Reid or Nancy Pelosi and do whatever he or she can to push ObamaCare and help Obama seat the likes of Sonia Sotomayor and Elena Kagan on the Supreme Court.

In fact, whenever I hear conservative purists insist they'd rather stay home than vote for a Mitt Romney, I find myself wondering just how deluded they are. Are they unaware that, while governor, Ronald Reagan raised my state taxes twice and signed the most liberal abortion bill in the nation, and that as president, he signed the amnesty bill that opened the floodgates to illegal aliens?

Even George Washington would have a tough time winning an election if he happened to find himself on a ballot in 2016. For one thing, he was in his time as rich as Romney. He was too religious for some, not religious enough for others. Moreover, he had a military background and owned slaves.

I have long argued that even in America, it is absurd that everyone can vote. It seems to me that instead of there being a minimum age requirement, at the very least proof should have to be shown that a voter had paid taxes for at least three years, and not merely filed a return. Otherwise, as we see time and again, too many people merely vote for the cluck who promises them the most, with no concern over the source of the goodies and with no concern over the cost.

A great many people were upset that Obama, on the same day that we all learned that 12 people were murdered at Washington's Navy Yard by Aaron Alexis who, by the way, looked something like Trayvon Martin, decided to give a speech

lambasting Republicans. Mr. Alexis, a paranoid loon with a criminal record, was allowed to join the Navy by the very same military that chose to turn a blind eye to Nidal Hasan and Bradley Manning. Is it just me or do other people also notice a pattern here?

As lousy as the timing of Obama's speech was, it showed what an absolute ingrate the man is. Just a week or so earlier, Speaker of the House John Boehner voiced his support for Obama's decision to attack Syria, even though it cost Boehner plenty of capital in his own party. It's time for House Republicans to take off the gloves and to start treating Obama with the disrespect he's worked so hard to deserve. Keep in mind that all of you were elected with larger margins than Obama's measly 51% mandate.

Finally, some people – and I use the term loosely because I'm referring to liberals – will leap to the conclusion that because I titled the piece "Monkey Business" and then went on to attack Obama, I was engaging in racial politics. That of course is untrue. I would attach that same title to an article dealing with Biden, Reid, Pelosi, Waxman, Schumer, Durbin or Mrs. Clinton, if any of them, God forbid, happened to be turning the Oval Office into the moral and political equivalent of a pigpen.

Besides, why on earth would I compare Obama to a monkey? I happen to like monkeys.

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

Illegals in Our Military

✘ Since President Obama handed down his ruling that he will ignore immigration law, and will stop deporting people who came to this country illegally while under 16 years old, there has been greater attention paid to the provisions of The Dream Act. This was a proposal to allow people to have a path to citizenship if they met certain criteria. The bill as a whole was controversial, and did not pass. One provision that seemed to have bipartisan support was the provision to allow those who had served honorably in the military to get special consideration when it comes to being granted citizenship. Many conservatives have spoken out recently about special treatment of these individuals. On the face of it, that does seem appropriate. If one looks deeper, however, no one seems concerned about the fact that our military apparently has no ability to confirm citizenship during enrollment? Put another way...We are a nation at war, and have no way of avoiding letting foreigners into our military.

There is no doubt that there are stories about people who thought they were citizens that have served admirably in our military. These people by all accounts are special, and should be treated that way. Having said that, what is the checking process that let these people get in the military in the first place? Do you just show up with a recent electric bill at the recruitment office, and "You're in the Army Now"? Whatever inadequate process that allows someone foreign born to become a member of our Armed Forces, would also logically allow in those who intend to do us harm. Isn't it reasonable to believe that a terrorist can be admitted to any branch of our military, learn vulnerabilities for future attack, and get free training in sophisticated weaponry to use against us?

Back when all that we had for security was a wax stamp, and a notation on a document from a quill dipped in ink, we thought it was important to not enlist foreigners in our military.

Imagine if George Washington had been presented with this question of what to do about foreign born non-citizens who have served honorably in our military. His first reaction would not have been how do we deal with these honorable soldiers, it probably would have been to fire the Armed Forces personnel director. I'm sure it is no longer that easy, but why haven't any of our current leaders raised this concern?

Our media loves to get to the human interest part of any story, tugging at heart strings seems to get a lot of viewers. That does not remove the responsibility of those in power to investigate the possibility of foreigners in our military. The fact that we are publicly discussing this issue seems to confirm that these people exist. We have a background check problem at a minimum, with a total breakdown and possible national security concerns at a maximum. We ignored the first attempt to blow up the World Trade Center much to our peril. Must we continue to draw the wrong conclusions when presented with a set of facts until another tragedy?