

A Rogue's Gallery

These days, thanks to all the two-legged vermin scurrying around our nation's capital, it's easy to overlook the fact that those on the left were creating tons of mischief and mayhem long before Obama, Pelosi, Reid, Biden, Dodd and Frank, took control of the government and the propagandists at the New York Times, the Washington Post, ABC, NBC and CBS, showed the boys at Pravda how it's done when true professionals decide to ballyhoo their glorious leader.

For instance, during World War II, Vidkun Quisling made his last name synonymous with treason when he showed Hitler that even a Norwegian could be a loyal Nazi. On the other side of the world, Iva Toquri D'Aquino, better known as "Tokyo Rose," was an American who, as a radio broadcaster for the Japanese, attempted to destroy American military morale in the South Pacific. What made these two individuals so contemptible was that in a time of war they collaborated with their nation's enemies.

The question isn't why it was that Ms. D'Aquino eventually went to prison and Mr. Quisling was executed by a firing squad. The answer is obvious. They had it coming.

The real question is why Jane Fonda, who used her celebrity status to support the North Vietnamese at the same time they were torturing and killing American soldiers, went on to win a couple of Oscars and make a few hundred million dollars off her exercise videos; and why Walter Cronkite, who worked 24/7 to ensure that North Vietnam would emerge victorious and ultimately subjugate and slaughter our allies in South Vietnam, went on to garner the adoration of fawning viewers and colleagues, didn't suffer similar fates.

If I had my way, I would change the dictionary so that if you looked up Quisling, Vidkun, it would say See Cronkite. And if

you Googled Fonda, Jane, you would discover that "Hanoi Jane" wound up serving a life sentence at Leavenworth.

Speaking of Vietnam, let us not forget Lyndon Baines Johnson. Having gone to Washington, D.C., as a young congressman during FDR's administration, it figured that he would try to model himself after his mentor. Unfortunately, he succeeded. When it came to economics, Roosevelt was such a dunce and such a devoted socialist – or do I repeat myself? –that, taking his cue from nutty English economist John Maynard Keynes, he decided the best way to deal with the Great Depression was by taking control of the economy and raising taxes. As a result, the depression that began in 1929 was still going strong until, thanks to Hitler, Mussolini and Hirohito, World War II put the country back to work.

Johnson's approach was to proudly proclaim a War on Poverty. Unfortunately, he was no better suited to wage that particular war than the one in Vietnam. Over the intervening half century, something in the neighborhood of 15 trillion dollars has been squandered in that endeavor and, partly thanks to Obama, it's safe to say Poverty won.

But as bad as all of these weasels have been, no list of left-wing menaces would be complete without mentioning the current weasel-in-chief. I must confess that I have more patience with people who tell me they agree with Obama's policies than with the knuckleheads who tell me they think he's a swell guy, a great orator and a cool dude.

For instance, in his usual clumsy attempt to make himself sound like a devout Christian, Obama used a prayer breakfast to say, in support of his demand that taxes be raised, "Unto whom much is given, much shall be required." As soon as I heard that, my first reaction was to recall Shakespeare's line about the devil being able to cite Scripture for his purpose.

My second reaction was to recall that Jesus was a religious

teacher, a rabbi if you will. The “much” to which he was referring was not money, it was the Gospel. Yes, he believed that providing for the poor was a virtue, but he certainly wasn’t calling for higher taxes, as Obama arrogantly and ignorantly suggested. Instead, he was urging the faithful to spread the Word.

Furthermore, unlike Obama, he was not the head of state with the authority to tax the rich as a form of punishment or to distribute their wealth among his favorite voting blocs.

The fact is, Obama’s administration far more closely resembles the Roman government in ancient Judea than he resembles Jesus Christ.

It goes without saying that Obama has a ridiculously high opinion of himself. As a result, when he was told that Jesus had once advised people to render unto Caesar that which was Caesar’s, and render unto the Lord that which was the Lord’s, he naturally assumed, being a combination of the two, that everything should therefore be rendered unto him.

That is why it’s so imperative that not just Republicans, but Democrats and Independents also vote for Romney in November. It would not only be an act of patriotism, by preventing America from tumbling over the precipice, but an act of compassion by showing Obama that we don’t really want to see him ending up on the cross, but merely back in Chicago.

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

A Goofy Question, Racial

Provocation, and Hollywood Jubilation

☒ A few thoughts on some news stories that popped up within the past week...

Rick Santorum Crying Foul

While Rick Santorum has a habit of publicly displaying hypersensitivity that makes some of us conservatives uncomfortable, I think it was completely appropriate for him to go off on New York Times reporter, Jeff Zeleny the other day. The exchange between the two took place after a campaign rally where Santorum told attendees that Mitt Romney was “the worst Republican in the country to put up against Barack Obama”, because Romney can’t sufficiently debate the dangers of Obamacare with it too closely resembling Romneycare.

In a highly publicized moment caught on camera, Santorum took animated exception to the following question from Zeleny: “You said that Mitt Romney is the worst Republican in the country. Is that true?”

“What speech did you listen to?” Santorum angrily rebuked. “Stop lying.” He then told Zeleny that his question was “bullsh*t”.

Now, Santorum certainly didn’t come across as *presidential*, but I have to admit that I liked his calling out of what was indeed a bullsh*t question. Zeleny annoyingly feigned ignorance of the clear context of Santorum’s actual remark. He did this for the sole purpose of trying to make Santorum squirm under the scrutiny of a claim that he never made. It wasn’t all that different than when lefty attack-groups like Media Matters create false narratives based on partial statements from the people they choose to slander. Even for an

outlet as agenda-driven as the New York Times, this was strikingly immature.

Interestingly, this isn't the first time that Jeff Zeleny has received a lot of media attention for a question he has posed. He's the guy who, in 2009, fawningly presented President Obama with this hardball: "During these first 100 days, what has surprised you the most about this office, enchanted you the most about serving in this office, humbled you the most and troubled you the most?"

Clearly, Zeleny wasn't as *enchanted* with Santorum as he was with Obama.

Trayvon Martin and the Media

I originally intended on writing a full column this week on the media's handling of the Trayvon Martin story, but after reading Bernie's excellent column on the topic, I felt that he echoed my thoughts so precisely that it I didn't have much more to add. I will just say that the knee-jerk presumption of racism in this country is extremely harmful to reasonable and rational thinking. Racism absolutely exists in America. It probably always will to some degree. But the media does a great disservice to our society with their over-eagerness to leap to conclusions of racism whenever tragedy befalls a minority at the hands of a white person (in this case a *white Hispanic*, as the New York Times so interestingly phrased it).

James Cameron Back in the News

The last time James Cameron made national headlines, it was back in early 2010 when he partook in a heated rant against conservative talk radio host, Glenn Beck and those who he considers to be *global warming deniers*. A self-proclaimed environmentalist, the uber-successful film director has long been an outspoken voice on the danger of man-made global warming. He even admitted in 2009 that his science fiction movie, *Avatar* was created to bring attention to man's

destruction of the environment on our own planet.

This past week, he made headlines again when he completed a submarine dive down to the deepest point of the ocean. In a privately funded, one-man sub that he helped design, Cameron descended nearly seven miles down to the floor of the Pacific Ocean's Mariana Trench where he observed what he described as an "alien world".

I've always admired people who are passionate about their personal interests, especially in the realm of exploration. Cameron is unique from many in that he has the means at his disposal to pursue such extravagant, grandiose dreams. It's a true testament to the power of capitalism – a system that rewards successes (for which he has had many) and gives individuals endless opportunities to achieve truly amazing things.

How interesting it is, then, that Cameron has on numerous occasions blasted greed and wealth, and once told Newsweek that the "evils of the world" can be attributed to the "concentration of wealth and power with a few."

Personally, I'm all for people doing whatever they want with the money they've earned, and I think it's great that Cameron is living large.

But if I were a member of the outspoken, leftist elite, I might find myself questioning how many children could have been fed or sheltered with the *concentrated wealth* that was spent on the four year project. After all, deep sea exploration is incredibly expensive. So expensive that it's usually funded by governments or oil companies. And speaking of oil companies... If I were a self-proclaimed environmentalist, I might find myself questioning what kind of carbon footprint the admittedly self-indulgent project left behind.

Fortunately, I'm neither of those people.

Will a Republican Ever Be Portrayed By Someone Who Doesn't Hate Republicans?

It's no secret that actors in Hollywood overwhelmingly lean left in their political views. That being said, not all of them are chronically angry, attention-seeking provocateurs who take every opportunity to bash *everything conservative*. They may not be any less liberal than the bigmouths... They're just less sanctimonious about it.

Wouldn't it be a nice change if one of *those* people portrayed important Republican figures in film? I ask this question because I find it absolutely remarkable that anytime the role of a well-known Republican leader is cast in a movie, the actor or actress chosen to play the part consistently ends up being one of the hardest left and most self-righteous of the bunch.

This week, it was announced that Hanoi Jane Fonda will be portraying Nancy Reagan in an upcoming movie entitled "The Butler". Playing Richard Nixon in the same film will be John Cusack. This is the same John Cusack who has starred in Republican smear commercials for far left website MoveOn.org, has called for "the satanic death" of GOP leaders, and has compared the notion of repealing minimum wage laws to slavery.

These two are merely the latest additions in a line of participants in this long held tradition that includes James Brolin as Ronald Reagan, Josh Brolin as George W. Bush, Richard Dreyfus as Dick Cheney, and the entire cast of HBO's *Game Change* taking up John McCain's 2008 presidential campaign team.

For these actors, they must relish the opportunity to propagandize to an international audience by demonstrating just how inherently *evil* or *stupid* the objects of their loathing are. Either that, or maybe they're just happy to be getting any kind of work at this point in their careers.

Selective Apologies

✘ The recent firing by NPR of Juan Williams (one of two of my favorite liberals) brought to mind, once again, something that I've seen over and over again in the media – public apologies.

Not from Mr. Williams. His statement about Muslims on airplanes requires no apology – his opinion is shared, I'm sure, by many Americans in these post-9/11 days. I'm talking about the public apology from NPR President Vivian Schiller. The day after his firing, Ms. Schiller said Mr. Williams' comments should've been "between him and his psychiatrist or his publicist" implying that his views were so out there that he must have mental problems. Only after such comments received negative press did she issue a statement, "I spoke hastily and I apologize to Juan and others for my thoughtless remark."

There was no problem with the firing of Mr. Williams because his remark about Muslims on airplanes was politically incorrect, was not in line with NPR's left-wing bias and his frequent appearances on Fox News didn't sit well with the powers that be. I don't believe the far left's sugar daddy George Soros' \$1.8 million donation to NPR on the same day Mr. Williams was fired is just a coincidence.

To prove my point, remember in 1995 when Nina Totenberg said, if there was retributive justice, Jesse Helms or one of his grandchildren would get AIDS from a transfusion. That vile comment obviously didn't bother NPR because Ms. Totenberg is still its legal affairs correspondent.

I'm convinced public apologies are made for a couple of

reasons. One, the person got caught doing something he or she shouldn't, or two, the negative press was just too overwhelming and someone had to backtrack. If no apology is given, it's because the statement, no matter, how reprehensible, is the politically correct way of thinking.

This past summer, a producer for an NPR-affiliated radio station said in an email she would "laugh loudly like a maniac and watch his eyes bug out" if she were to see Rush Limbaugh suffering a heart attack. Only because of the fallout over the exposed emails did Sarah Spitz issue a statement she "made poorly considered remarks about Rush Limbaugh to, what I believed was, a private email discussion group from my personal email account."

In the spring, a memo from the Bergen County Education Association, a teacher's union in New Jersey, surfaced which said, "Dear Lord this year you have taken away my favorite actor, Patrick Swayze, my favorite actress, Farah Fawcett, my favorite singer, Michael Jackson, and my favorite salesman, Billy Mays. I just wanted to let you know that Chris Christie is my favorite governor." Association president, Joe Coppola, said the "prayer" was a joke and was never meant to be made public. Christie didn't see any humor in the memo.

Who can forget Julianne Malveaux's statements about Justice Clarence Thomas, "I hope his wife feeds him lots of eggs and butter and he dies early like many black men do, of heart disease." No apology necessary because he's a conservative.

Bill Maher, never one to hide his disdain for Christianity, regularly rants against religion and says things like Christians are "part of a dress-up cult that hates sex and worships magic." He preaches to the choir so he's not going to get any huge public outcry over his remarks.

Rosie O'Donnell said on The View that "radical Christianity is just as threatening as radical Islam in a country like

America." And after saying 9/11 was an inside job, she's still getting her own talk show on Oprah's new OWN network. Why O'Donnell continues to have job offers is beyond me.

Jesse Jackson, thinking he was speaking with a (like-minded?) Washington Post reporter when he referred to Jews as "hymies," issued the following apology, "It was not done in the spirit of meanness. However innocent and unintended, it was wrong."

When he made the comment, "I wanna cut his n^*s off," unwittingly into an open microphone about then Presidential candidate Obama, he had no choice but to apologize for his crude comment.

And then, of course, there are the politicians who issue soul-searching apologies – after they're caught – like Bill Clinton, South Carolina Republican Governor Mark Sanford, former New York Democratic Governor Eliot Spitzer (who now has his own talk show, by the way), former Colorado Democratic Senator, Gary Hart, Louisiana Republican Senator David Vitter, and the list goes on and on and on.

One apology I and many others will not accept is from Jane Fonda when she said, "I will go to my grave regretting the photograph of me in an antiaircraft gun, which looks like I was trying to shoot at American planes. It hurt so many soldiers. It galvanized such hostility. It was the most horrible thing I could possibly have done. It was just thoughtless." Nice try, Jane.

Of course, there are the celebrity apologies – Tiger Woods, Kobe Bryant, Mel Gibson, Jesse James, Ted Haggard, Michael Vick, Mark McGwire, Michael Richards, and John Mayer. Again, always after their deeds have been exposed in the media.

And, finally, last but not least, the winners for the all-time, most transparent, most insincere, most dishonest apologies – criminal defendants. Has anyone ever seen a less contrite "I'm sorry" than one coming from the mouth of a

criminal defendant right before sentencing? I've yet to see a defendant who wasn't reading from a little piece of paper, no doubt written by his defense attorney, how very sorry he is to the family of his victim(s) and that if he could, he would surely trade places with them. Yeah, right. When was the last time you heard of someone walking into a police station saying, "I'm sorry, I just robbed/raped/murdered my neighbor"?

Perhaps it's just human nature. Still, a lot of it, I don't get but, if you do, God bless you.