

Obama's Moral Belittling Won't Be Missed



Since the election, “*This is why Trump won*” has been popular social-media response to the self-righteous liberals who continue to scold those who don’t subscribe to their politically-correct *social justice* orthodoxy. Many on the Right (including those who aren’t Trump fans) have enjoyed taunting the Left’s incessant demagoguery, because while the frequency of it hasn’t slowed down, its effectiveness and societal appeal undoubtedly have.

In fact, some of the leftist rants of the past few months (from Hollywood, the Democratic party, and political activists) have been so hysterically ridiculous that it’s hard to imagine how such sentiment was ever mainstreamed in the first place. Thankfully President Obama reemerged at the John F. Kennedy Library earlier this week to answer that question.

After accepting the JFK “Profile in Courage” award, Obama

expanded on the topic of *courage* in a speech to attendees. To the surprise of no one, he applied the noble term to himself and those who supported his presidential agenda – specifically his signature piece of legislation, Obamacare.

“I hope that current members of Congress recall that it actually doesn’t take a lot of courage to aid those who are already powerful, already comfortable, already influential,” the former president told the audience. “But it does require some courage to champion the vulnerable and the sick and the infirm.”

He added, “I hope they understand that courage means not simply doing what is simply politically expedient, but doing what [people] believe in their hearts is right.”

In other words, the Democrats were brave and compassionate for supporting *Obama’s* vision of health care reform (complete with dishonest rhetoric, skyrocketing patient costs, and overall unsustainability), and the Republicans were cowardly and cruel for opposing it, and now working to repeal and replace sections of the law.

Much can be said about Obama’s well-documented sense of moral superiority in matters such as these, but I’m not sure anyone could have put it better than syndicated columnist, Charles Krauthammer, did Monday on *Fox News*:

“It’s been a full hundred days, but it was nice to be reminded of why we should be grateful as a nation that [Obama’s] gone. There are a lot of arguments you can make, on either side, of the debate about Obamacare, but notice how it was complete moral condescension. *The other guys are cowards because I, and the people who support me and oppose this legislation, stand with the poor*

and afflicted and all that, and the others are on the side of the rich and the powerful. That's nonsense.

What the [Republicans] have done is practically commit political suicide to support a measure with 17 percent support in the population, that does what we know has to be done, which is to curtail entitlements, or starting to curtail, by doing a curtailment of Medicaid. It's inevitable, it's in the future. Obama had eight years. He didn't want to touch it. You can say that this is something necessary, something people are entitled to, but to pretend that you are the one who's advocating a courageous position when it goes completely against what the public wants, it's complete nonsense.

Obama did that all through his presidency, always assuming he was on the side of the angels, and always the one who was willing to go against public opinion, when it was completely the opposite. He reminded us, reminded me – it's been a hundred days – but good riddance, Mr. President. That is sort of the restrained version of my reaction to that condescension.”

Condescension is right. For eight years, President Obama presented himself not just as our nation's leader, but also as our moral conscience. If you agreed with him, you were doing right by America. If you disagreed with and opposed him, you were a bad, petty, uncaring person who was doing deep harm to our country and its citizens.

Obama and members of his administration sometimes referred to their opposition and critics as people who were “betting

against America” or “on the wrong side of history” (two of the nicer phrases they used). And over their eight years in office, the media was more than willing to substantiate that narrative, and treat the president’s promoted principles as how things *should be* in our country.

Ironically, that alone undermines the notion that Obama was a particularly courageous president. When the media generally approves of whatever you’re doing, political courage is neither required nor exercised.

In fairness, President Trump has also been guilty of these *moral high-ground* arguments. We’ve seen them when he casts unfair aspersions on (and assigns false motivations to) his political opponents on both sides of the aisle. The differences are that he does it far less frequently, and that he doesn’t put the *electorate* in the cross-hairs (as Obama liked to). And really, he couldn’t reach *Obama-levels* of condescension even if he tried, because the media would never give him a free pass on it.

Regardless, such conduct is not an example of *courage*.

Whether or not you’re a Trump fan, it’s a safe bet that our president’s sense of morality won’t be presented as the moral compass of our nation (from which its citizens are to be judged) anytime soon. Those days are likely over for a while, and I, like Krauthammer, am relieved.

Thirty years ago, Sean's father mysteriously abandoned his family in the Colorado mountains. He was never seen again. **This October, the truth comes home.**



“If I Were Emperor” and “A Bush League Candidate”

For several years, Barack Obama insisted that he didn't have the constitutional authority to change our immigration laws. No matter how Hispanics put the question to him, his answer was always the same. He kept pointing out he was the president, not the emperor. Then one morning he woke up, discovered an ermine robe hanging in his closet, and decided that he was either the star attraction in a gay musical revue or he was the emperor, and decided that either way he had the authority.

Well, I don't have anything better than a flannel bathrobe in my closet, but I would certainly like to be able to make or remake the laws to my liking. And to start with, I would pass a law ensuring that no congressional bill would ever run more than two pages or deal with more than a single issue.

It is simply too easy to shove everything including the kitchen sink into one of those 1,500 page monstrosities, knowing that nobody in Congress is about to spend a month reading the damn thing, meaning that, in the immortal words of Nancy Pelosi, people will simply have to pass it to find out what's in it.

We all know that these gargantuan pieces of legislation are merely Trojan horses used by both parties to conceal pork and to play politics. How many times have we heard that the Democrats will tie, say, military allocations into bills dealing with things they need Republican support to pass? And, let me add, vice versa. I say let each and every bill stand alone. If either party can't muster the votes to pass its pet legislation, we can probably live without it.

For the longest time, I was aware that certain high-profile people have only a passing acquaintance with the English language. I mean, it's downright embarrassing listening to most Hollywood celebrities, professional athletes, members of the Black Congressional Caucus and pinheads like Patty Murray, Barbara Boxer and Debbie Wasserman-Schultz, attempt to express a single coherent thought.

Recently, I had occasion to add to the list Bill Cosby, who chose to refer to the two dozen accusations of rape as "innuendo," and Jonathan Gruber, who dismissed the numerous occasions when he called Americans stupid for believing the lies about ObamaCare as his attempt at "glibness." As any dictionary would have been only too happy to explain, being glib is to be facile and linguistically fluent. I, Herr Gruber, am glib; you, on the other hand, are a lying piece of egotistical chicken poop.

Speaking of liars, Obama strove to put the best possible face on partisan hack Sen. Feinstein's CIA-flaying report by declaring, "When we do something wrong, we acknowledge it." Come again? This putz hasn't even come clean about his travel

visa or his college application from 35 years ago, let alone Benghazi, the IRS targeting of the Tea Party or his unconstitutional reversal on amnesty.

While the widow and the daughter of Eric Garner have gone out of their way to state that in their opinion, the unfortunate death of their husband and father at the hands of white police officers had nothing to do with racism, we had Obama and his lackey Eric Holder leading a crusade against so-called racial profiling. The irony is that if such profiling is a sin, it's one the president and his attorney general never tire of committing, so long as those being profiled are white men wearing blue uniforms.

Instead of attacking racial profiling, how about suggesting to those allegedly being profiled that Muslims stop waging war against all us Jewish and Christian infidels; that Hispanics stop sneaking across our border and making themselves wards of the American taxpayer; and that urban blacks stop committing violent crimes at a rate far exceeding their percentage of the population?

Something else that I would like to see changed is the kid glove approach that the media adopts with our presidents. I didn't like it when the press pretended that FDR wasn't an invalid. I also didn't approve of the media's concealing the fact that JFK, who not only suffered from back problems that had him addicted to pain pills, still managed to carry on like an over-sexed fraternity boy. It didn't help that in addition to winking at his sexual shenanigans, they propagandized on his behalf by showing him posing for Hallmark cards at the Kennedy compound, pretending there was nothing he enjoyed more than playing touch football with his dysfunctional clan.

The media also provided cover for Clinton, who was not only a sexual predator, but had a foul mouth and a hair-trigger temper. But the media conspired to portray him as a good old boy who was all "shucks" and "golly gee whiz," and could have

stepped right out of a Norman Rockwell painting.

The only reason I now know that Barack Obama behind closed doors is even more appalling than the one I'd come to despise over the years is because news reporter Ann Compton is retiring after 40 years of underreporting the news for ABC, and finally let on that Obama hurls obscenities at members of the media who even dare refer to his numerous scandals as scandals.

For reasons that elude me, my wife and I continue to receive requests, seemingly on a daily basis, to donate to Ben Carson's bid for the presidency. As I've written in the past, I have nothing against the man. He has a pleasant voice, we agree about ObamaCare, and he seems like a nice guy. But, heck, the very same things can be said about me, and I know I'm not qualified for the job.

I'm sure Dr. Carson would advise people who haven't attended medical school not to perform surgery, but he thinks someone who has never even been a mayor is just what we need in the Oval Office. Isn't it enough that we've gone down this amateur road before with Herman Cain and Barack Obama?

Finally, every time I see Arabs and Muslims firing their guns into the air, I'm reminded once again that these schmucks are so backward, they've never even heard of gravity.

A Bush League Candidate

I must confess I wasn't surprised that Jeb Bush announced that he is considering making a run for the GOP nomination in 2016. When properly translated from politician-speak that means that nothing short of a nuclear bomb will derail his ambition. But when all is said and done, I can't help being fascinated by

his apparent strategy.

Inasmuch as he has essentially rubberstamped Obama's granting clemency to illegal aliens and endorsed Common Core, his plan, I take it, calls for him to receive the nomination after losing every single Republican primary and then going on to win the general election when a lot more idiots are allowed to vote.

I imagine the Democrats are as anxious for Jeb to head up our ticket in 2016 as we are to have Hillary Clinton carrying the banner for the pinheads. If both sides get their wish, it could be the first time in history that "None of the Above" receives more votes in a presidential election than either of the candidates.

Speaking of wretches named Clinton, someone should remind Bill that Eric Garner isn't dead because he sold untaxed cigarettes, any more than Hillary's husband was impeached and disbarred for having sex with a White House intern. In Garner's case, he wound up on a slab because he resisted arrest. In Clinton's case, it was because he committed perjury while testifying before a grand jury.

But I guess when you've spent your entire adult life spinning the truth and sucking up to minority voters, those are tough habits to break.

It seems a court affiliated with the European Union has concluded that Hamas, whose charter calls for the extinction of Israel, is not a terrorist organization, as we've all been led to believe...mainly by their terrorist activities. But, then, most of the European nations have had a warm place in their hearts for any group, no matter how odious, that hated Jews as much they did.

In related news, the member states of the EU have determined that Adolph Hitler wasn't really evil, but merely misunderstood.

A reader, Brian Harmon, sent me a report that measured the business ethics in four nations, Mongolia, Japan, Korea and the United States. The respondents were business leaders who were asked to compare the rise or decline of ethics over a 10 year period. In the case of Mongolia, they were comparing 2010 to 2000; the Japanese were comparing 2004 to 1994; the Koreans, 2005 to 1995; and the Americans, 2000 to 1990.

The Mongolians were split 50-50 between those who felt things had improved or remained the same and those who saw a decline. In Japan, the good outweighed the bad 84% to 16%. In Korea, a mere 0.8% thought ethics were getting worse, while a resounding 99.2% thought things were getting better or at least staying the same. In the U.S., however, a scant 14.3% saw improvement, 50.3% thought things were getting worse.

Keep in mind that the polling of our business leaders took place in 2000. One can only imagine how awful the numbers would be today, with the schools, the media and a great many parents having had an additional 14 years in which to undermine traditional values, compounded by six years of Obama's cynical, self-serving lies and immoral scandals.

Consider that in New York City, Mayor Bill De Blasio (born Warren Wilhelm, Jr.), who, like Obama, is a former community organizer, has accused the NYPD of being a gang of racists, even though, in the words of the old American Express slogan, he never leaves home without them. But it just goes to prove that once a community organizer, always a putz.

Black thugs and white morons clog up New York's streets, chanting "What do we want? Dead cops! When do we want it? Now!" And the best that the city's mayor can muster is a resounding "Yeah, me, too!" It's no surprise that a great many New York police officers are now signing documents in which they state that if they should die in the line of duty, De Blasio is forbidden from attending their funeral services.

But none of this should come as a surprise to the voters in New York, who knew that this schmuck was a communist lamebrain when they gave him 73% of their votes, and would no doubt do the same today. Some of us assumed that New Yorkers couldn't do much worse after electing Michael Bloomberg to three terms, but it just goes to show that one should never be too quick to overestimate the intelligence of the New York electorate.

Speaking of morons, even though I try to avoid watching football and basketball games on TV, there has been no way to avoid seeing LeBron James of the Cleveland Cavaliers and a bunch of Cleveland Browns players wearing their "I Can't Breathe" t-shirts. Clearly they can all breathe. Therefore, a more appropriate sentiment would have been "I Can't Think."

The world of technology has now come up with the Luce X2 Touch TV vending machine. Apparently it has the ability to identify customers and remember their snacking patterns. That enables the machine to deny would-be customers certain items it deems unhealthy for them. It sounds as if the folks at Luce have somehow managed to turn nanny Bloomberg into a annoying little vending machine.

It's reassuring to know that some research scientists have retained their sense of priorities and aren't wasting all their time seeking a cure for cancer.

Finally, I am happy to report that I have received hundreds of holiday greetings from my readers, some of whom take pains to wish me a Happy Chanukah instead of a Merry Christmas. For the record, I actually prefer Christmas, which has been a national holiday for as long as I've lived and will continue to be one, no matter what the ACLU claims to the contrary.

What's not to love? The music, both sacred and popular, is great. The decorations are beautiful. The classic Christmas movies are among the best films ever made. Plus, the sense of universal brotherhood is quite moving, even for those of us who actually had older brothers and should know better.

Let's face it – you Christians know how to throw a holiday!

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@fastmail.com.

“Hip Hip Horray for Kryptonite!” and “A Mulligan Stew”

For nearly five years, I waited and wondered if anything would ever puncture the Teflon shell surrounding Obama. Nothing seemed capable of even denting the fortress erected by the media, the DNC and all his henchmen in Congress. The irony is that it was a weapon of his own making, the Affordable Care Act, that finally exploded the man and the manufactured myth.

I mean, when you consider all the things that had been successfully deflected, starting with the Stimulus and all those shovel-ready jobs; Cash for Clunkers; Operation Fast & Furious; the frequent multi-million dollar family vacations, deriding millions of Americans as “those who cling to their guns and their religion;” the tapping of phones here and abroad; the targeting of conservatives by the IRS; the Benghazi massacre and the ensuing cover-up; the coddling of enemies and the betrayal of allies; the redistribution of wealth; and the war on coal and oil; you could easily get the idea that Obama was as impenetrable as Superman.

But the fact is that just about every despot seems unbeatable,

be it a Hitler, a Mussolini or a Saddam Hussein, until he finally gets his comeuppance.

In response to one of Barbara Walters' patented softball questions, Obama said that Michelle would make a much better president than he. That gave the missus the opportunity to modestly deny it by insisting that she lacks his patience.

Actually, it's the American people who have displayed enormous patience, putting up with this lazy amateur who has a Marxist agenda and a voice box where other people would be expected to have brains and character.

Still, if Obama was alerting Ms. Walters and the rest of us that Michelle plans to run in 2016, I couldn't be happier. It would shape up as a great cat fight for the Democratic nomination. Michelle has height and reach, but Hillary has a lower center of gravity, sharp claws, and, what's more, she will have had eight years in which to stoke her fury against those who rained on her coronation.

In other news, those who have built careers out of promoting the horrors of "global warming" and then "climate change" have seen their fantasies run smack into reality. It seems that for the first time in over 30 years, not a single Atlantic hurricane hit the U.S. mainland during the hurricane season, which officially ended at the end of November. Perhaps they'll have to change the terminology once again to something along the lines of "climate change change."

The one thing you can count on is that they won't ever admit that their fears were groundless and their draconian solutions were not only prohibitively expensive, but intended to destroy business and industry. You might as well ask the fellow with a money tree to chop it down for firewood or the guy with a golden goose to roast it for Christmas dinner as to expect the weather lobby to confess its lies.

Perhaps the main victim of the weather hoax has been science,

itself, because its practitioners have, by and large, shown their willingness to lie in order to feather their own nests with federal grants and professorships.

I liken the treaty Obama and Kerry are trying to make with Iran to the foolishness of the parole system. It's only because the sanctions against Iran are finally taking effect that these schmucks have agreed to negotiate. But instead of unconditional surrender, we are showing a willingness to not only accept a slight slowdown in their race to a nuclear bomb, but to give them seven billion dollars.

If a bank robber or pervert doesn't rob a bank or rape a child in prison, we knock years off his sentence and say it's for good behavior. Good behavior should not be confused with lack of opportunity. The way it should work is that each prisoner serves his full sentence, and if he misbehaves, time is added on.

So it should be with Iran, which has never displayed good behavior in the 34 years the Islamics have controlled the government. From the day they overthrew the Shah, the mullahs have sponsored terrorism around the globe. I say, if the sanctions are working, the proper response is to ratchet them up until the Iranians destroy their centrifuges and turn over their uranium, not to negotiate in what makes a farce of good faith.

The fact that Obama and Kerry, along with their European stooges, are willing to overlook Iran's stated intention to exterminate the Jews in Israel, thus completing the job begun by their favorite western leader, Adolf Hitler – should have stopped negotiations even before they began. Instead, considering how widespread anti-Semitism is in Europe and within this administration, I'm betting it provided them an added incentive to cut a deal.

Finally, as happens at the end of every year, the studios are

sending DVDs to the members of the various guilds, hoping to garner our votes for the various awards that will soon be handed out. In my case, as a member of the WGA, I have thus far received 10 DVDs. In my estimation, not one of them is deserving of a writing award. Probably the best of them is "Blue Jasmine," in which Woody Allen essentially takes "A Streetcar Named Desire" and sets it down in San Francisco, proving he is only slightly better at channeling Tennessee Williams than he was at channeling Ingmar Bergman.

The worst of them is "The Butler," in which we are shown a racist version of American history from the mid-1950s through Obama's election, as seen through the eyes of a black butler serving in the White House. There are so many things wrong with the movie, I won't go into them now, except to say that, as with "The Color Purple," this is a movie in which you are hard-pressed to find a single decent white character. So it is no surprise that Oprah Winfrey has a featured role, especially considering that she recently said that the only way for racism to disappear from America is for the older white generation to die away.

I can't help wondering how all those older white women who spent years kissing her butt and making her a billionaire feel about Oprah now that she no longer needs them for ratings.

A MULLIGAN STEW

Thanks to Obama and his army of liberal pinheads, I'm never allowed a moment's peace. Even with my bad wing, I'm constantly scribbling little notes to myself, reminding myself of their mischief. In no time at all, so many notes pile up that I have to clear the decks, lest I be buried in an avalanche of paper.

So, for openers, I would now very much like to see Obama impeached for committing financial fraud, which I believe falls under the heading of high crimes and misdemeanors. We

have proof from as far back as his filmed exchange with Rep. Eric Cantor back in 2010 that he knew the Affordable Care Act would deprive people of their health insurance and their personal physicians, although he continued to lie about it on at least 40 occasions in his attempt to bring socialized medicine to America, while simultaneously gobbling up a sixth of the economy.

Also, why haven't any Republicans filed a suit with the Supreme Court questioning Obama's constitutional authority to arbitrarily excuse business owners and unions from paying a federal tax that's being levied on the rest of us?

Speaking of those who feel free to abide by their own rules, a group calling itself HALT (Help Abolish Legal Tyranny) has turned a spotlight on the legal profession, and come to the conclusion that the Mafia does a far better job of policing itself than do the state Bar Associations. Probably no group, with the possible exception of Congress, is likelier to turn a blind eye to the misdeeds committed by its members. (Speaking of which, I recall a few years ago that the House found Rep. Charles Rangel guilty of 10 or 11 charges, including income tax evasion. His punishment, if I recall correctly, is that they postponed a testimonial dinner in his honor.)

On its state-by-state report card, HALT bestowed no grade higher than a B. Those went to Arizona, Colorado and Vermont. The majority of states, including California and New York, earned Ds. Utah, where I can only imagine lawyers are allowed to cheat at cards and literally get away with murder, received an F.

In Sioux Falls, South Dakota, the board of education decided there wasn't time during a school day for high school students to recite the Pledge of Allegiance. They have time to hold pep rallies for their sports teams, but not the time to hold one for the nation for which their fathers and grandfathers fought and often died. I suppose the members of the board decided it

wouldn't be fair to ask the kids to postpone texting "Luv ur nu nose ring" for even 10 seconds a day.

Liberals were always pressing George Bush to come clean on his mistakes, as if they were a combination of an old-fashioned school marm and Cotton Mather, but they, themselves, never acknowledge their own shortcomings because they always believe they are not only right, but smarter than everyone else and invariably on the side of the angels. Thus, when their inept tinkering with the economy, health care, immigration, green energy or gun laws, don't turn out the way they envisioned, it never even occurs to them that a different approach might be called for; instead, they assume that all that's required to change the outcome are, one, a better set of lies and, two, a larger expenditure of our tax dollars.

To give you a fair idea of how deviant most liberals are, you merely have to notice how disturbed they are by traditional displays involving Christmas and Chanukah, while remaining calm, cool and collected, when it comes to pornography, obscenity and the worst excesses of a fascistic administration.

They are equally copacetic when it comes to the black mobs terrorizing just about every major American city, where the robbery, murder and rape, stats among black teenagers are soaring. What's worse, the crimes were inevitable. After decades of Democrats turning a blind eye to absentee fathers, contempt for education, a 70% illegitimacy birth rate and a culture that promotes misogyny, obscenity and drugs; while all the while race pimps like Al Sharpton and Jesse Jackson constantly reminded them they were the innocent victims of crackers and honkeys, it's no wonder we've wound up with "Lord of the Flies" in black face.

Because he was assassinated 50 years ago, John Kennedy has recently come in for a great deal of renewed attention. The thing that has set off alarm bells for me is the contention by

left-wing radicals that he was one of them. Even though he was religious, promoted a strong military and favored lower taxes, left-wingers would have you believe he wasn't a conservative. There was in fact little in his record that would have differentiated him from Ronald Reagan, aside from the fact Kennedy took an active role, not acting roles, during World War II.

When he pushed for Civil Rights legislation, Kennedy actually had more in common with Republicans than he did with his fellow Democrats. But of course when JFK was speaking about those rights, he meant equality under the law when it came to employment, education and voting. It was only after he was killed that Lyndon Johnson was able to hijack the issue as political currency for himself and future generations of political hacks.

When it comes to labeling JFK a liberal, lunkheads such as Jeff Greenfield and Oliver Stone have to channel their inner Nostradamus and predict what he would have done in the future, while ignoring what he had done during the first three years of his administration. They're convinced, for instance, that he would have pulled out of Vietnam even though he increased our military presence when he was alive. They also believe he would have unilaterally ended the Cold War even though his greatest achievement had consisted of risking a war with the Soviet Union, the nation he referred to as "the Evil Empire" 20 years before Reagan did the same, by facing down Nikita Khrushchev and forcing him to pull his nuclear missiles out of Cuba.

Greenfield and Stone should also keep in mind that just four months prior to his assassination, JFK flew to West Germany, not East Germany, to announce, on behalf of freedom-lovers everywhere, "Ich bin ein Berliner," four little words that totally frosted the Russkies.

Finally, every time I see Joe Biden turn his loving gaze on

Barack Obama, I'm reminded of the way that wives of politicians are trained to look adoringly at their hubbies – especially after one of the pigs has been caught up in some sleazy sex scandal.

Of course in Biden's case, he may have perfected his routine by simply watching how Obama reacts whenever he happens to pass a mirror.

©2013 [Burt Prelutsky](#). Comments? Write BurtPrelutsky@aol.com.

Mariano Rivera For President

If you're not a baseball fan, you might not know who Mariano – Mo to his friends, fans and teammates – Rivera is. He is the closer for the New York Yankees, the fellow they've been calling on since the mid-90s to protect leads in the late innings. Nobody has ever come close to being as good at what he does as Rivera. This past season, as he's announced his retirement, every team the Yankees have played against has honored him. Even the Boston Red Sox gave him testimonials and gifts. Several teams have given him checks for his foundation. And every member of the opposing teams has stood and applauded the man and his accomplishments.

But Mo deserves it. In addition to displaying unmatched talent for 17 seasons, he has performed under the largest spotlight in baseball with grace and humility. When people ask how this native of Panama has been able to pitch the way he has even into his 40s, he credits God first and foremost, and then mentions his family, his teammates and the Yankee organization.

When I saw him recently on TV making his farewell appearance

at Yankee Stadium, I found myself wishing we had someone of his caliber in the Oval Office. Can anyone even imagine a Republican having a good word to say about Obama, who ran as a great uniter, but has spent five years demeaning the loyal opposition, accusing them at various times of being racists, obstructionists and traitors?

What I don't understand is how Obama gets away with arbitrarily postponing the Affordable Health Care mandate for business owners. Harry Reid and Nancy Pelosi keep telling us ObamaCare is the law of the land, but Obama keeps ignoring the embarrassing parts of it. According to the Supreme Court, ObamaCare is legal because they decided it's a tax, the very thing Obama spent two years denying it was. But if it's a tax, where does Obama get off insisting that only some people have to pay it?

It may not have been noticed in some places, but Obama, Biden and Hillary Clinton, all stayed away from Margaret Thatcher's funeral. However, Obama sent an official delegation numbering 14 when socialist dictator and all-around swine Hugo Chavez was laid to rest.

Although I rarely disagree with my friend Bernie Goldberg, he recently devoted an article to comparing the civil rights of gays to the religious rights of Christians. Bernie was entering the fray on behalf of gays, who had been denied wedding cakes and floral decorations by evangelical business owners who oppose same-sex marriages.

He pointed out that such marriages are now legal in several states, and that takes precedence in a nation of laws. I have a different take on things. One, I happen to think that if someone is willing to forego the profit, he should have the same right to withhold service as storeowners who refuse to deal with shirtless or shoeless customers.

In addition, there are always florists and bakers who would be

only too happy to supply cakes and flowers, so it is hard for me to imagine that the homosexual couples wanted either as much as they wanted to create problems for those whose religious beliefs offended them.

Moreover, it doesn't seem that long ago that I was reading about Muslim taxi drivers who were allowed to refuse rides to people carrying packages out of liquor stores and blind people if they were accompanied by their Seeing Eye dogs. It just seems to me that Christians shouldn't have fewer religious rights in America than Muslims.

Recently, someone sent me a list of high-profile shootings. Starting in 1865, we had a Democrat named John Wilkes Booth killing Abe Lincoln. In 1881, a left-wing radical shot James Garfield. In 1963, a socialist shot John F. Kennedy. In 2010, a registered Democrat named Jared Loughner shot Rep. Gabby Giffords and killed six others. In 2013, a registered Democrat named Adam Lanza shot and killed his mother before killing 26 others at a local school.

The point being that guns don't kill people; left-wingers kill people.

In closing I will quote H.L. Mencken, who wrote: "The urge to save humanity is almost always only a false face for the urge to rule it" and Mark Twain, who observed: "Whenever you find yourself on the side of the majority, it is time to pause and reflect."

For my part, whenever I find myself in that unlikely position, I demand a recount.

©2013 [Burt Prelutsky](#). Comments? Write BurtPrelutsky@aol.com.

What's Wrong With Polygamy

✘ For the first time ever we are about to have a Mormon nominated for president by a major political party. By a strange coincidence, we also are beginning to see a flurry of posts on liberal blogs telling us what a bizarre and deplorable religion Mormonism is. Mormons don't smoke, or drink alcoholic or caffeinated beverages, and they oppose sex before marriage and marital infidelity. What a bunch of boobs!

On one liberal blog a woman who formerly belonged to the Mormon Church complained bitterly because church officials have persisted in their attempts to bring her back into the fold. No matter how many times she tells them to buzz off (I am using a phrase suitable for use in the presence of Mormons), they keep buzzing back.

I happen to have witnessed this phenomenon first-hand. It is true that the Mormons don't like to take no for an answer when a lapsed member of their church insists on staying lapsed. They do make return visits to the lapsed person's home, unbidden. Furthermore, they are extremely intimidating in their methods. They send out pairs of decrepit, white-haired old men to make their case. These guys arrive on foot, gasping for breath, and if the lapsed Mormon chose he could blow them over even if he has weak, wasted lungs from breaking the Mormon rule against smoking.

Imagine how bitterly the female blogger would complain if she were garroted, or burned at the stake, or stretched on the rack, or buried up to her neck in sand and stoned. Lapsed Mormons really have it rather easy by comparison.

I thought that after the election of John F. Kennedy, our first Roman Catholic president, religious attacks had become passé in presidential campaigns. Despite the fears of many, JFK did not bring the Pope over to run the executive branch,

although I will concede that we don't know what his plans might have been for a second term.

By 2000, when an Orthodox Jew ran for vice president on the Democratic ticket, there was scarcely a murmur. I almost never heard people speculating that Joe Lieberman planned blood sacrifices of Russian children to help him bake matzoh for Passover. But again, I have to concede that we will never know for sure, because Joe (and running mate Al Gore) lost.

But with Romney in the field, religion is back as a political issue.

Some liberals are trying to tar Romney with the specter of polygamy, even though polygamy was outlawed by his church in 1890, and the last polygamous marriage ended nearly sixty years ago with the death of one of the wives. The Democratic governor of Montana, for example, recently made a fuss because the parents of Romney's late father, George, fled to Mexico more than a century ago in protest against U.S. anti-polygamy laws. They did this even though they themselves were in a monogamous marriage. It was strictly on principle. Those wacky Mormons!

I am here to tell you that I don't care whether Romney himself is a polygamist, although it appears that he is not. If he were, the Democrats would be ungallantly besmirching more than just the one wife, Ann.

But really, what is wrong with polygamy? Does it strike you as any stranger than gay marriage? And let me interject here that gay marriage is absolutely the most wonderful idea ever conceived by mankind, and gays are, and should be, treated as sacred cows.

Polygamy can be an excellent idea under the right circumstances. Suppose you marry a woman who is a hot babe, but she can't cook. Why shouldn't you be allowed to also marry a dull, homely woman who cooks like a master chef? I don't

see this as selfish on the man's part. Quite the contrary. How else would the second woman find a husband? If she were only entitled to a monogamous marriage, she would be pretty much limited to blind gourmets.

I do see some practical problems. In a community-property state, for example, how would one divide the assets if any of the wives decided to bow out? (I am limiting the discussion to marriages involving multiple wives, because even in the heyday of polygamy marriages involving multiple husbands were extremely rare.) In a community-property state, divorcing couples are supposed to split the legally eligible assets evenly, but in a marriage with, say, two wives, it seems unfair to let the departing wife walk off with half the assets. It's a problem, but probably not insuperable.

Legalizing polygamy would simply institutionalize relationships that already exist off the books, just as has been the case with gay marriages. Come on, tell me that you have never heard of threesomes that are living together indefinitely. Why shouldn't such relationships be sanctified by the law? So please, liberals, drop the religious bigotry. Let's see some of that famous tolerance for aberrant behavior that characterizes so many of your flock. You can learn to live with polygamy, in case a Romney presidency brings it back.