

# **“Putin on the Ritz” and “Obama, the Impaler”**

**Burt’s Webcast Starts on March 12, 1PM Pacific Time!**

**The phone number is (225) 209-6188**

Ever since Vladimir Putin decided to restore the former Soviet Union, I have admired his restraint. I’m serious. I mean thus far, all he’s done is venture a little way into Georgia and, as of this moment, into a small section of Ukraine. Surely, judging by the response from Obama and the various garden gnomes heading up the nations affiliated with NATO, I see no good reason why he hasn’t taken back Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, the eastern section of Germany or all of Europe, for that matter.

Obama’s defenders like to say that it wouldn’t matter who was in the Oval Office because Putin would do whatever he likes because he’s Putin. I beg to differ. It was Obama who refused to supply Poland and Czechoslovakia with promised missile defense systems because he didn’t wish to irk Russia’s dictator. It was also Obama who let Putin get away with consorting with the mullahs in Iran and Assad in Syria. And that was after decreasing our nuclear arsenal at Putin’s request. Every school kid knows all too well that if you give in to a bully even once, he’ll just keep taking your lunch money.

When Mitt Romney, during the 2012 presidential debates, identified Russia as our major geo-political foe, Obama, the NY Times and Chris Matthews, all ridiculed him, pretending he was Rip Van Winkle and had been asleep for 50 years. But he knew what any sentient human being who has paid attention to Russia through the years knew; namely that Russia is less a piece of geography than an evil and vicious state of mind. It’s Hannibal Lector, but without Anthony Hopkins’ soothing

tones.

Hillary Clinton, who is every bit as stupid as Patty Murray and Barbara Boxer, but comes across as forceful because of all that extra testosterone, made a big deal about presenting her Russian equivalent with a restart button, pretending that the Russian grizzly had turned into a pussy cat. The fact is that Russia has changed its name, but has changed nothing else over the years, and it hasn't mattered if the guy calling the shots was a czar, Joe Stalin or an unrepentant Cossack named Putin.

I suggest that in place of those silly Nobel Peace Prizes, they should be handing out Nevilles in honor of Neville Chamberlain. They would come in the form of a little furled umbrella, and would be bestowed on the world's leader who showed the greatest amount of cowardice when it came to facing down a bully. And because the bullies are dispersed in such far-flung places as Russia, Syria, Iran, Uganda, Venezuela and North Korea, just about every national leader would have a fair shot at taking home a Neville.

The thing about Russia is that it is, with the possible exception of North Korea, the most paranoiac nation on earth. Although it has well over 200 million people and a land mass that dwarfs just about every other country on earth, it is always carrying on as if invasion is just around the corner and that it requires more and more buffers to safeguard its sovereignty. The fact is that in 200 years, it's been invaded only twice, and on those occasions it was by Napoleon and Hitler, and neither got very far. It's also a fact that it's Russia that has made it a practice to invade and dominate its neighbors.

One of the many things that Obama says that annoys me no end is when he makes reference to the international community and pretends, one, that it actually exists and, two, that it possesses moral authority. Until he got the house key to the White House, one could argue that whatever morality existed in

the world was mainly possessed by the United States. But he has seen to it that when he said that America was no more exceptional than any other nation, he fully intended to prove it by transforming it in his own repulsive image.

When one looks at the world, it's obvious that most nations could disappear tomorrow and the world would be the better for it. If you disagree, check out the membership roll of the United Nations. By comparison, even the freaks in the Occupy Wall Street movement, personal hygiene aside, don't look all that bad.

Of course I could be wrong, but I'm betting that the editors at Time Magazine have already begun putting together the year-end edition naming President Vladimir Putin "Person of the Year."

But, all is not lost. Call me a cockeyed optimist, but I think the odds look awfully good that our own president will be bringing home the Neville!

### **Obama, the Impaler**

Vlad III was a 15th century Romanian prince, whose cruelty was legendary and whose chief claim to fame is that he served as Bram Stoker's inspiration for Count Dracula.

So far as I know, Obama has limited his own impaling to our Constitution, but he has certainly done his utmost to drain the life blood out of America. In five short years, he has managed to undermine our economy, destroy our health care system, betray our allies, coddle our enemies and, perhaps most contemptuously of all, driven wedges between Americans based on race, religion and class.

Over the past couple of centuries, America has faced and defeated any number of foes, but we have never faced this type of menace, one seemingly dedicated to destroying us from within, a cancer with a political agenda.

There have been many movie comedies that dealt with guys – Buster Keaton, Dennis O’Keefe and Richard Pryor, come to mind – who had to unload millions of dollars, thanks to stipulations in the wills of very eccentric relatives, before they could lay claim to their inheritance. Except that Obama doesn’t have their logical motivation, he has a lot in common with them.

After all, Obama started out by blowing a trillion dollars on a stimulus that resulted in no shovel-ready jobs. Then came another billion dollars or so squandered on green energy companies owned by his cronies that quickly, and predictably, went belly-up. Now, he intends to burn through \$684 million promoting the ill-named Affordable Care Act in 2014, after wasting a similar amount on the disastrous rollout of his signature piece of legislation.

I have grown almost as weary of looking at the human stiffes who stand behind Obama every time he gives a speech as I am of listening to the speeches. It would be difficult to find a more moronic-looking group of nonentities outside of the White House press corps, which, with the exception of Fox’s Ed Henry, have never stopped taking dictation long enough to ever ask a serious question of Robert Gibbs or Jay Carney.

The Democrats have once again circled the wagons to defend Obama from the charge that he is acting as a dictator when he unilaterally changes the law through executive fiat in order to bolster his party’s chances of hanging on to the Senate in the midterm elections. Proving that, as usual, liberal partisanship trumps principles, they keep insisting that Reagan, Clinton and Bush, all issued more executive orders than Obama. They ignore the fact that his delays in implementing ObamaCare are major affronts to the letter and spirit of the Constitution.

By concentrating on mere numbers, they hope to disguise the fact that it’s a lot like suggesting that a jaywalker is a

bigger menace than a serial killer simply because the first guy crossed against the light a hundred times, whereas the killer only committed a dozen murders.

Here in California, as you may have heard, we're having a drought. The truth is we're nearly always having a drought because so much of the state is or was a desert, sort of like Israel. But the lack of water in the Central Valley has far less to do with Mother Nature than it does with such groups as the Sierra Club, which uses certain critters on the endangered species list as an excuse to prevent water from being moved from where it is to where it needs to be.

But so long as environmental fascists continue funneling cash to the likes of Jerry Brown, Barack Obama and the DNC, liberal politicians, be they in Sacramento or Washington, D.C., will always stand ready to do their bidding—whether the issue is water for the farmers in the San Joaquin Valley, the Keystone pipeline or oil drilling in ANWR and our coastal waters.

California's farmers, who are responsible for feeding a nation, are begging for water, but California's smelt are splashing away or whatever the hell it is that smelt do. It's all thanks to well-heeled Hollywood elitists who care about nothing really, except being invited to Obama's next \$35,000-a-plate fund-raising dinner, where the only smelt to be found aren't on the menu, but seated at the dais.

As much fun as it is to ridicule progressives, I'd be remiss if I didn't occasionally chastise my fellow conservatives. In spite of all my railing on the subject, you folks continue to send your offspring to liberal arts colleges, where not only will they learn no marketable skills, but will be indoctrinated by left-wing simpletons.

But I can understand your predicament. What I would call showing some backbone, others, including, no doubt, your offspring, would label child abuse.

But what possible excuse do you have for continuing to subscribe to your local newspaper when, no matter where you happen to live, the chances are that its primary function is the daily promulgation of liberal talking points?

I mean, you can easily get grocery coupons, baseball scores and the weather report, off your computer. And whereas in the old days, the comics might be your excuse, these days, with Doonesbury leading the way, they're about as politically balanced as a New York Times editorial. Just not nearly as funny.

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

---

## Should the Media Point Out the “I Told You Soss?”

☒ It sure has been fascinating over the past couple of days to turn on Fox News and see clip after clip of President Obama and other prominent Democrats mocking Mitt Romney, during the 2012 campaign, for recognizing Russia as a serious geopolitical threat.

“The 1980s are calling to ask for their foreign policy back,” chided the president in one of his debates against Romney. “The Cold War has been over for 20 years.”

John Kerry (now our Secretary of State), with his arms flailing in condescension as he addressed the audience at the Democratic National Convention, went even further. He called Romney's notion that Russia was our number one geopolitical foe “preposterous,” adding that “Mitt Romney talks like he's only seen Russia by watching *Rocky IV*.”

Well, I'd hate to break it to Mr. Kerry, but with all that's going on right now between Russia and Ukraine, Vladimir Putin is looking an awful lot like Ivan Drago while our president appears to be portraying the part of Apollo Creed.

*No one could have predicted this*, some on the left would probably insist. The only problem is that someone did. Back in 2008, vice presidential candidate Sarah Palin observed Senator Obama's reaction to the Russian Army invading the nation of Georgia. She called it "one of indecision and moral equivalence" and went on to say that it was the kind of response "that would only encourage Russia's Putin to invade Ukraine next."

Her comments were widely derided at the time, much as her famous "death panel" remarks were that liberal journalist Mark Halperin later felt compelled to concede had some validity.

Now, I'm the first to admit that Sarah Palin was not (and still isn't) an expert on foreign policy. She was, however, echoing the sentiment of the man at the top of her presidential ticket, John McCain. McCain never made any bones about how seriously he took Vladimir Putin as a threat. He was calling the Russian leader out at a time when people like Barack Obama and Hillary Clinton were still daydreaming about "reset button" props and cancelling missile defense shields with Poland and the Czech Republic in exchange for absolutely nothing from Russia. McCain was widely criticized for his strong words on Russia as well.

It sure seems that Republican leaders had a far better understanding of Vladimir Putin and the Russian geopolitical threat than the Obama administration ever has, despite the abundance of snide criticism they received at the time. Yet, Fox News seems to be the only national media outlet that is pointing this out.

Does stuff like this matter? Does the media have a

responsibility, or even a professional obligation, to take a look back at pivotal times in our history, analyze past statements and proposed directions, and vindicate those who had it right but were flayed at the time?

If such an obligation did exist, the media would certainly have their hands full.

One of the first on the *vindication list* would have to be the Tea Party movement. You know, those small government folks who the media and the Democratic part alike regularly portray as a bunch of bitter, old, white racists who hate our president and hate the country. It's all part of a political tactic by the left, of course, but that doesn't mean the smear-job hasn't been successful.

The truth is that, despite the Tea Party's poor political judgement in certain situations, the movement has gotten it right far more often than it's gotten it wrong.

The Tea Party spoke out against the federal stimulus package's *infrastructure spending* long before President Obama enjoyed a smile and a chuckle over shovel-ready jobs not being as *shovel-ready* as he expected. They spoke out against the government's picking of *winners and losers* long before the *Solyndra's* of the country crashed and burned and took a lot of taxpayers' money with them. They spoke out against unfair targeting by the IRS long before Lois Lerner plead the Fifth. They spoke out against the false promises of Obamacare long before millions of people were tossed off their health plans, lost their doctors, and witnessed their premiums and deductibles shoot through the roof.

Mitt Romney certainly deserves a prominent spot as well. After all, he got more than Russia right.

As many might recall, there was more media outrage in September of 2012 over Mitt Romney's criticism of the administration's handling of the Benghazi attack than there

was over the attack itself! Early on, Romney blasted the administration for offering a harsher condemnation of an American filmmaker for creating an anti-Islam video than they did the extremists who actually committed the violence. The media absolutely excoriated Romney for his comments and accused him of politicizing the event. We now know, however, *why* the administration was pushing that narrative, and that any political advantage Mitt Romney might have sought from the attack paled in comparison to the intricate charade put on by the administration.

Whether or not the rules for integrity in journalism  (insert your joke here) call for seeking redemption for those who were wronged, it seems to me that special circumstances should warrant it. By *special circumstances*, I'm referring to instances in which people had their words brutally mocked and dismissed as pure fantasy by either our country's leadership or a national media consensus.

Being ultimately being proven right when prevailing wisdom was wrong – especially in regard to a highly consequential issue – seems to me to warrant a news story by itself.

---

## Surrounded By KnuckLeads

If I were only as oblivious to the news as so many of my fellow Americans are, I have no doubt I would sleep a lot better than I do. For instance, when I bet on Mitt Romney last year, it wasn't because I was unaware that Obama was leading in the polls, but because I couldn't accept that in spite of a gruesome economy, a foreign policy that benefitted our enemies and harmed our allies, and a socialized medicine plan that would destroy the best health care system in the world, the

electorate would ignore the evidence and re-elect Obama.

Proving it was no fluke, recent polls indicate that two out of three Americans think the treaty with Iran that gains us nothing, but serves to legitimize their nuclear program and free up seven billion dollars that they can use to sponsor terrorism around the world, is reason to celebrate.

As cynical as I tend to be, even I find it frightening that so many millions of my fellow countrymen clearly have excrement for brains. In a way, this level of stupidity is truly breathtaking and, in a very bizarre sense, more impressive than anything else about Obama's minions.

Although I like to think I have a well-developed sense of prescience, I can't swear that I knew for certain that the fellow who heckled Obama when he was delivering his 498th speech about immigration reform was a plant, but I sure suspected that it was at least as non-kosher as a cheeseburger and didn't smell nearly as enticing.

My suspicions were based on a few things. The first is that he was standing behind Obama, playing his role as a human prop. Nobody winds up serving as a background curtain who hasn't been totally vetted. For another thing, nobody but a shill would be treated so patiently. As you recall, Obama, whose skin is thinner than a blade of grass, was the epitome of patience, encouraging the young man to vent so that he could sadly explain that there are some things even a despot can't do without the cooperation of Congress. Never mind that none of those things include giving billions of tax dollars to his major contributors, postponing ObamaCare for unions and businesses or cutting deals with Iranian mullahs.

As it turns out, the heckler was a Korean named Ju Hong who had recently graduated from the University of California, at Berkeley, and is probably on Obama's short list for judicial appointments. In the meantime, he gets to take his proud place

alongside those young women who pretended to faint at Obama's campaign stops in 2008, and whose great-grandmothers used to be paid by PR flacks to "swoon" at Frank Sinatra's performances in the early 40s.

The amount of fraud perpetrated by Obama must make every conman in America gnash his teeth in envy. It even sets the bar high for his fellow politicians. But that doesn't stop some from trying. Bill de Blasio, the new mayor of New York City, pretends that by eliminating the Stop and Frisk program devised and carried out by the NYPD under both Rudy Giuliani and Michael Bloomberg, civilization will make a belated return to Gotham. But, short of Batman coming out of retirement, Del Blassio has to know that the murder rate and overall crime rate will soar. But because he's an old school leftie, he knows that in a city such as his, perception trumps reality, and that all of New York's Jews and Puerto Ricans will regard the new policy as compassionate.

As an outsider, I can only hope that the inevitable victims will not be innocent tourists, but, instead, will be limited to the balmy liberals who elected this weasel. But, to be fair, they only voted for Del Blassio because Hugo Chavez, Che Guevara, Fidel Castro and Saul Alinsky, weren't on the ballot.

The fact that even now so many academicians are touting the benefits of ObamaCare proves conclusively that as someone, possibly George Orwell, once observed, "There are some ideas that are so stupid, only an intellectual would take them seriously."

Recently, in Sweden, a 65-year-old man was acquitted after being arrested for jacking off on a public beach. The court ruled that he had committed no actual offense because he wasn't directing his activity at any one person in particular. I suppose, using that logic, Obama could actually beat the rap for the Affordable Care Act, but only, I trust, if he was lucky enough to have Judge Svenssen on the bench.

---

# Coulter, Krauthammer & Me

As many of you know, I spent a good part of 2012 trying to get the Mitt Romney campaign to give me a shot at writing, co-writing or re-writing his speeches. Alas, I never managed to scale the castle wall. So it wasn't my fault that the only things he said that anyone ever remembered were that 47% of the people would never vote for him and that 20 million illegal immigrants should self-deport.

Over the past 12 or 13 years, I have written over 1,300 articles and six books from a conservative perspective, but every time I turn around, it's Ann Coulter or George Will or some shmoe from the NY Times who is being quoted on talk radio or over at Fox News.

Charles Krauthammer writes a book that is basically old columns with a smidgen of autobiography mixed in, and it immediately goes to number one at Amazon. However, my last book, "67 Conservatives You Should Meet Before You Die" includes an interview with Krauthammer in which he discusses his own story at length. But in addition, I got him to talk about the book that has had the greatest influence on him; his favorite movies; his favorite columnists; the eight people, living or dead, he would invite to a dinner party and the role that religion plays in his life.

What's more, the book also includes equally fascinating interviews with the likes of Rick Santorum, Gary Sinise, Phyllis Schlafly, Hugh Hewitt, Newt Gingrich, Walter Williams, Rick Perry, Andrew Breitbart, David Limbaugh, Pat Boone, Ralph Peters, Paul Ryan, Pat Robertson, Bernard Goldberg, Michele Bachmann, Pat Sajak, Mike Gallagher, Joe Wambaugh, myself and 47 others. Still, after a year, and even after it became

available on Kindle, fewer than 500 copies have been bought.

Why am I complaining? Well, for one thing, I can use the money. But for another, the Republican Party needs as much help as it can get, just as Mitt Romney did. And the help it gets shouldn't be totally dependent on who gets to show up on Fox and whom Rush Limbaugh deigns to mention.

There is a war on in the United States, and I feel like one of those guys during WWII who couldn't enlist because he had flat feet. Only I don't have flat feet. And just as there were those left on the sidelines who wanted more than anything to kill Nazis, I want the largest possible podium from which to ridicule Obama and his Marxist toadies. I want to make the whole bunch of them the laughingstocks they deserve to be.

Speaking of which, some dopes have actually tried to put a good face on the fact that Obama hasn't fired Kathleen Sebelius. They want to pretend it's because he has so much loyalty to his friends and colleagues. They insist that's the same reason he didn't fire Eric Holder over Operation Fast & Furious or any of Hillary Clinton's State Department flunkies who had anything to do with the massacre at Benghazi.

It isn't loyalty with Obama. It's the psychological failing of a narcissist who simply can't bring himself to acknowledge he made a mistake in the first place, giving authority to people even less competent than himself.

What makes liberals so despicable isn't simply that they're wrong on all the major issues; it's that they are such insufferable hypocrites. For instance, they will always voice their support for higher taxes. But only, you may have noticed, for other people. Why do you think so many movies are shot outside California, either in Canada or southern right-to-work states? Verisimilitude? Not likely, unless you're one of those people who believe that Toronto looks more like Philadelphia and New York City than Philadelphia and New York

City do. The movies leave California for the same rational reason other businesses do: exorbitant taxes!

Finally, it is the height of irony that thanks to all the smart electronic gizmos on the market , never have so many dunderheads had the opportunity to let the entire world know how stupid they are, 140 characters at a time.

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

---

## 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](mailto:BurtPrelutsky@aol.com).