

A Few Sad Truths

Only a liberal dunce could seriously contend that the exclusion of four of 20 contraceptive options constitutes a war on women. And yet in the wake of the Supreme Court ruling in the Hobby Lobby case, that is exactly what people like Hillary Clinton, Sandra Fluke and the three politically partisan harpies on the Court, Kagan, Ginsburg and Sotomayor, would have you believe.

As I see it, the fact that young women actually expect that people with whom they're not having sex should provide them with free birth control pills is clear evidence that the real war is the one being waged on the American taxpayer and commonsense.

I realize that Sen. Thad Cochran's primary victory in Mississippi is being appealed by his challenger, Tea Party favorite Chris McDaniel. If I lived in that state, I very likely would have voted for the challenger. But the real mystery is why on earth registered Democrats are allowed to cross over and vote in a Republican primary. I'm not asking as a conservative. After all, I assume Republicans are also allowed to vote in Democratic primaries. But how dumb is that!

It's bad enough when the Democrats financially support the Republican candidate in a primary because they assume he or she will be the easiest to defeat in the general election or when they run a fake Republican in the general election, hoping to fool a sufficient number of dummies into splitting the vote with the actual nominee. But a state really has to be addicted to stupid pills to have open primaries, which negates the whole purpose of having primaries in the first place. What's next, declaring the winner of a Mississippi election to be the candidate who receives the fewest number of votes?

Recently, after encountering "ISIS" in one of my articles, a

reader wrote, asking what I was referencing. I explained that the scumbags currently overrunning the cesspool known as Iraq started out calling themselves the Islamic State in Iraq and Syria before, like certain show biz celebrities, shortening their name to the Islamic State. But my first reaction to being asked to define ISIS was to channel my inner Bill Clinton. I then immediately took a shower.

Speaking of congenital liars, it occurred to me the other day that the only time Barack Obama can be trusted to tell the truth is when he's telling his fellow jihadists the date upon which the U.S. will be withdrawing its troops from a war zone.

I wasn't a great fan of either George H.W. Bush or his son, but even compared to them, Obama is the ultimate bush leaguer. For the life of me, I can't imagine why his approval ratings remain in double figures or how it is that any Democrat in the House or Senate can refrain from calling him out over Benghazi, the VA, the IRS or his constant trashing of the Constitution. Is it conceivable that Satan has worked out the traditional swap of eternal damnation for successful careers with each and every one of them?

Somewhere in this formerly great nation not only is there a young slacker who looks at Obama and says to himself, "If he can be elected president, so can I," but somewhere else there is a young ne'er-do-well who is perfecting his or her lying skills so that one day he or she might be Hillary Clinton's press secretary.

If you dare point out that black politicians are among the dumbest and most corrupt in Washington or that most of the problems plaguing black Americans are self-inflicted, you will be labeled a racist. That's the case even if you happen to be a black American. That is one of the reasons that I so admire Jason Riley, a black man who is an editorial writer for the Wall Street Journal and an occasional panelist on Bret Baier's "Special Report." In his recent book, "Please Stop Helping

Us,” a scathing indictment of white liberals, Mr. Riley makes a strong and logical case against both affirmative action and the minimum wage.

In one of the book’s more memorable lines, Riley writes that “having a black man in the Oval Office is less important than having one in the home,” summing up in 17 words something that too many liberal Americans – black and white – don’t like to talk about, not publicly anyway, fearing it would just be giving ammunition to the “enemy.”

Finally, my recent poll was such a rousing success that I have decided to conduct my own version of a recent national poll. People were asked to name the worst of the 12 presidents since the end of WWII. I, on the other hand, will ask that you rate the three worst in order, with the worst being #1. Your choices are Harry Truman, Dwight Eisenhower, John Kennedy, Lyndon Johnson, Richard Nixon, Gerald Ford, Jimmy Carter, Ronald Reagan, George H.W. Bush, Bill Clinton, George W. Bush and Barack Obama.

You are also invited to vote for the Best of the dozen.

The voting deadline will be 48 hours after the posting of this article. Send your votes to me 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](http://BurtPrelutsky.com). Comments? Write BurtPrelutsky@aol.com.

Hobby Lobby Hysteria and

Unchallenged Hyperbole

✘ It didn't take long, following the Supreme Court's ruling in favor of Hobby Lobby earlier this week, for many liberals to explode into full-fledged hysteria mode.

The Internet predictably flared up with venom-fueled, breathtakingly irresponsible claims of companies now having the right to ban their female employees from using birth control. The assertion was utter nonsense of course, but that didn't stop people like actor James Morrison (from the television show 24) from [making statements](#) like this:

"SCOTUS ruling is as perverse/abusive as a man who beats his wife/girlfriend. Crime of ignorance, violence, assertion of male power/dominance."

God bless Hollywood.

So let me get this straight... Ruling that a company shouldn't be forced to provide free birth control to its employees is the same as a man physically beating up a woman? How could someone so intellectually bankrupt have ever been in charge of CTU?

The reality, of course, is that the Supreme Court's ruling did *not* deny contraception access to anyone. What the court ruled was that the owners of a closely held company, who have religious objections to providing contraceptives or abortifacients through their insurance policies, can't be forced to do so by the government. Employees of companies who choose not to provide them are free to acquire the desired contraceptives or abortifacients on their own – just like before the Affordable Care Act (when few felt they were being *victimized* by the inconvenience).

In Hobby Lobby's case, the company was *already* providing contraceptive coverage to their employees before the

Affordable Care Act ever mandated that they do so. Their objection wasn't to contraceptives (of which they are perfectly willing to continue covering 16 types), but rather to abortifacient (causing an abortion) drugs.

Now, I wouldn't expect people like Mr. Morrison and the rest of the unenlightened-and-angry Internet crowd to be held accountable for their hyperbole, other than simply being mocked by others on the Internet. It would be a waste of time. Their words might be infectious to like-minded ideologues, but such people have relatively little public influence.

But what about those people who *do* have great influence in our society, like our elected leaders? If they aren't challenged when *they* make the same type of completely over-the-top statements, by the people whose job it is to do so, how can that be anything but dangerous to a democracy?

Senator Elizabeth Warren wrote that she couldn't believe "we live in a world where we'd even consider letting big corps deny women access to basic care based on vague moral objections."

Fortunately, we *don't* live in that world. What Warren said was an outright fabrication – one that I've seen no one outside of the conservative media challenge.

Senator Patty Murray called the ruling "a dangerous precedent and takes us closer to a time in history when women had no choice and no voice."

Has Murray been asked by anyone in the media to qualify that remark? How has the ruling, in any way, taken us closer to that era?

Even Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg herself, in her written dissent, outright lied about what the ruling meant: "In a decision of startling breadth...the exemption sought by Hobby Lobby and Conestoga... would deny legions of women who do not

hold their employers' beliefs access to contraceptive coverage that the ACA would otherwise secure."

Why isn't this line of bologna a story in itself? No woman will be denied whatever contraceptives she chooses to purchase. And shouldn't the fact that *Planned Parenthood* is using this very quote to build political support and raise contributions also get some press?

Speaking in my home state of Colorado on Monday, former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton [made this comment](#) on the Hobby Lobby ruling at the Aspen Ideas Festival: "It is a disturbing trend that you see in a lot of societies that are very unstable, anti-democratic, and frankly prone to extremism... Where women and women's bodies are used as the defining and unifying issue ... because of their religion, their sect, their tribe, whatever."

One would think that a likely 2016 presidential candidate comparing the inconvenience of having to pay for one's own contraceptives to Sharia law would be a major new story. Nope. Crickets.

This of course all goes back to the prevalent problem of liberal media bias in this country. The mainstream media makes Republican leaders answer for their hyperbolic statements, as well they should. When an elected leader spreads utter, vitriolic nonsense to the public, they absolutely *should* be challenged. By not extending that level of scrutiny to the Democrats, however, the media lets completely false narratives saturate down into the electorate, and become accepted talking points that are repeated to no end. And the media, unfortunately, sees nothing wrong with that because they like the results.

If they *did* see something wrong with it, and did their job, no one could conveniently omit the word "illegal" from the term "illegal immigration" and still be taken seriously. No one

would snidely call the Benghazi YouTube video and the IRS targeting of conservative groups “phony scandals,” and still be respected. Lying to the public a couple dozen times about the Affordable Care Act letting people keep their insurance plans and doctors wouldn’t be a forgivable offense. Accusing someone of being a racist would trigger requests for evidence of such, beyond merely a hunch. Basing a “Republican War on Women” on the moronic comments of two candidates, who were immediately castigated afterward by the GOP, would be met with eye-rolls.



To me, the notion that the Supreme Court ruled to ban women from using contraceptives sits at the same level of lunacy as the notion that President Obama was born in Kenya. Yet, there’s a stunning discrepancy in the way the media’s treating it.

The further accepted wisdom drifts from the truth, the worse off we are as a society. Unfortunately, the conveyers of news in the mainstream media only recognize this when those who are being untruthful have an “(R)” next to their name.