

“Jumping the Fence” and “Clarity About Charity”

Recently, Omar Gonzalez and Kevin Carr were arrested for hopping over the White House fence. Gonzalez made it all the way inside, proving that Ronald Kessler wasn't just whistling Dixie when he wrote in “The First Family Detail” about all the corners the Secret Service has been cutting over the past several years, just so that the directors can take bows for cutting costs.

On the other hand, when you realize how Obama and the Democrats have conspired to erase our borders, it seems hypocritical that they can encourage millions of aliens to trespass in America, but feel entitled to throw the book at a couple of guys for daring to trespass in Obama's temporary digs.

Some people have been astonished at the ease with which Gonzalez and Carr carried off their stunt. But that's nothing compared to the ease with which Barack Hussein Obama managed to sneak into the White House.

Recently, a city in Florida passed an ordinance that banned the wearing of low-riding trousers that exposed at least two inches of underwear or buttocks. But the NAACP got it rescinded, claiming it profiled black men. Being a fan of irony, I live for such moments, because I would say that the real profiling was done by the NAACP. After all, it wasn't the city fathers who said that only blacks would be precluded from making that stupid fashion statement. It was the NAACP that jumped to the conclusion that blacks would be the group the council specifically had in mind. The real question is why the NAACP would wish to embarrass itself by endorsing black brats flashing black butts in public.

Speaking of embarrassing, John Harding recently let me know that in 1830, there were 3,400 black slave owners in America. I have no idea how many descendants they had over the next 184 years, but it does raise the very real possibility that when a black thug mugs a white person in 2014, it could very easily mean that someone whose ancestor was a slave owner is beating up someone whose ancestor fought and possibly died to free the slaves.

But, then, Democrats don't really mind embarrassing themselves because they have no sense of shame. Otherwise the Chairwoman of the Democratic National Committee, Debbie Wasserman-Schultz, wouldn't have ever dreamed of describing conservatives as wife-beaters. For the life of me, I don't know how people like Wasserman-Schultz, Harry Reid and Nancy Pelosi, wind up being the public face of a major political party. With her out of control curls, Debbie resembles a Jewish Medusa. Come to think of it, she is every Jewish guy's nightmare, reminding him of the one and only blind date he ever let his beloved grandmother arrange.

Being Jewish myself, it's a constant source of shame that so many of my fellow Jews bring ridicule and scorn on their fellow religionists. I can't tell you how many times I've had gentiles ask me how it is that we seem to have an endless source of people like Ms. Wasserman-Schultz, Barney Frank, Henry Waxman, Chuck Schumer, Brad Sherman, Barbara Boxer, Al Franken, David Axelrod, Rahm Emanuel and Rahm's brother, Ezekiel.

In case Ezekiel Emanuel isn't as well known to you as the others, he is Obama's go-to guy when it comes to the Affordable Care Act. He helped create it and he has spent the past few years defending it. Without actually coming out and admitting that ObamaCare calls for death panels, he has said that it would shave medical costs and save health care for the young, if the elderly would make do with pain killers and refrain from having life-saving operations performed. Emanuel,

who is 57, claims he plans to die when he hits 75. But I don't believe him. After all, he also said ObamaCare would save people a ton of money and that, if they liked them, people would be able to keep their doctors and their insurance policies. (Where do you think Obama first heard it?)

It so happens I'll be turning 75 this January (the 5th, in case some of you like to get your gift –shopping done early), but even if I were turning 25, I'd find his remarks revolting. But what I'd really like to know is what his parents think about it. You see, Ben and Marsha are well up in their 80s. If their other sons ask them what they'd like for Chanukah, they might consider asking for a food-taster.

The thing that surprises me the most about liberals is how stupid they are. I don't just mean they're wrong on all the issues. That's a given. But they really are ignorant. For instance, they seem genuinely unaware that if you raise the minimum wage from \$7 to \$10 or even \$15, as the pinheads have done in Washington, most employers are going to fire a majority of their low-skilled workers rather than shell out \$20,000- \$30,000-a-year.

They also seem surprised to discover that if employers are going to be penalized under ObamaCare for having more than 50 employees working more than 30 hours-a-week, they will simply limit their employees to 49 and make certain that nobody works more than 29 hours-a-week.

But, then, their grasp of economics is so pathetic that they've never understood that if you raise the rate on corporate taxes, the corporations will merely pass the burden on to those paying for their products and services.

How stupid are liberals? Well, it seems that 2% of them believe Obama's been too tough on the Islamic State. Too tough? How can anyone be too tough when it comes to those beheading Americans and Brits on TV?

In one of his biggest lies, Obama announced that the Islamic State was neither Islamic nor a state. As proof, he provided the bromide that no religion condones the killing of innocent people. For good measure, we had the prominent theologian John Kerry parroting the refrain that Islam is a religion of peace.

Whether it's Muslims, Hispanic intruders or black race hustlers, our leaders are reluctant to ever speak truthfully about bad behavior when it involves people of color.

It led some wag to refer to the African-based Ebola epidemic as the disease of peace.

Clarity About Charity

I acknowledge that charity is one of the virtues, but I have a hard time accepting the way it works. For one thing, I don't know why people often insist that it be anonymous. To me, a critical part of accepting charity is to express gratitude to the giver. Otherwise, or so it seems to me, people will inevitably come to accept it as their due.

I also do not understand that which strikes me as charity in perpetuity. For instance, every time I turn on my radio I'm hearing commercials calling for donations to feed the poor in Haiti. I'm told how little it will cost me to feed x-number of Haitian kids for x-number of months for x-number of dollars. But inasmuch as I've been hearing these same commercials for years now, I keep wondering how it is that nobody has ever taught Haitians how to fish and how to grow their own crops. Is this an entire nation that relies entirely on the generosity of American radio listeners in the same way that generations of Americans have come to depend on the largesse of the American taxpayer?

When I heard that two people had actually breached security at the White House, my first thought was that my friend, Ronald Kessler, had bribed them in order to hype sales of his recent "The First Family Detail." I even sent him an email accusing him of coming up with a great marketing strategy. After all, if you take anything away from his terrific book, aside from confirmation that Jimmy Carter and the Clintons are as putrid a trio of human beings as you can imagine, it's that the most recent directors of the Secret Service will gladly take a cleaver to the department's budget in order to make themselves look good. In that respect, they are exactly like the administrators at the V.A., who didn't care how many military veterans died, so long as they could make themselves look efficient.

My idea of a great administrator was the late Admiral Chester Nimitz. Richard Ryan called him to my attention after reading a book he purchased at the shop connected to the USS Arizona Memorial in Hawaii. The book, Nimitz's "Reflections on Pearl Harbor," relates how Nimitz was attending a concert in Washington, D.C., on December 7th, 1941, when he received a phone call from FDR, telling him he was to assume command of the Pacific Fleet.

When Nimitz landed at Pearl Harbor on Christmas Eve, he found such devastation that it would have been easy to imagine the Japanese had already won the war in the South Pacific. After touring the harbor and cataloging the sunken battleships and naval vessels cluttering the waters, a disheartened young helmsman asked Nimitz what he thought.

The Admiral said, "The Japanese made three of the biggest mistakes an attack force has ever made. Mistake number one was that they attacked on a Sunday. As a result, ninety percent of the crewmen were ashore on leave. If the same ships had been lured to sea and been sunk, we would have lost 38,000 men instead of 3,800.

“Mistake number two: When the Japanese saw all those ships lined up in a row, they got so carried away with sinking them, they never once bombed our dry docks. If they had destroyed the docks, we would have had to tow every one of those ships to America to be repaired. Instead, the ships are in shallow water and can be raised, and a tug can haul them over to the docks. They can be repaired and back at sea in the same time it would have taken us to haul them back to the States.

“Mistake number three: Every drop of fuel in the Pacific theater of war is in top of the ground storage tanks five miles away on the other side of that hill. One attack plane could have strafed those tanks and destroyed our entire fuel supply.

“I’d have to say God was looking out for America.”

One of the ironies of life is that we have a president who spends most of his time at fund-raisers, hitting up liberals at \$35,000-a-plate dinner at the same time that Democrats whine about people like the Koch brothers and Sheldon Adelson destroying the republic and the election process by doing what they can to level out the playing field. But the fact of the matter is that the Obama campaign out-spent John McCain by \$300 million in 2008 and out-spent Mitt Romney by \$150 million in 2012. The sad fact of the matter is that while the Democrats continue to claim theirs is the party of the poor and the middle class, the only time they care about anyone but themselves and their fat cat supporters is at election time. And don’t think for a minute that they don’t resent having to bow and scrape to those they regard as suckers and bumpkins in pursuit of their votes.

Speaking of liberals, back on September 11th, I wrote a letter to Governor Jerry Brown. After all this time, I have to assume he has chosen not to reply. If he changes his mind, I’ll let you know. In the meantime, this is what I wrote:

“Dear Governor Brown: You seem like a bright enough fellow, and yet in spite of polls showing that most people in the state now oppose the construction of a train running between San Francisco and L.A., you continue to push for it.

“Why on earth would you want to squander billions of dollars on a train that very few people will ever use because, one, the drive only takes about six hours and, two, once you reach your destination, you still need to rent a car.

“The train seems to be nothing more than a make-work project to keep the unions happy. But why waste the time and money on a project you must know will ultimately be referred to as ‘Jerry’s Folly’ when you could do something useful with all that money and still satisfy the unions by building a system of dams?

“After all, drought, as even you must be aware, is a recurring problem for everyone in California, except, perhaps, for the folks at Sparkletts.”

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. Comments? Write BurtPrelutsky@aol.com.

Obama’s De-Nile

I would like to spend a little time wandering through those weird cavernous echo chambers that pass for brains in the skulls of Obama, Kerry, John McCain and Lindsey Graham. But only if I knew I could get out and not be trapped inside with all those stalagmites.

While the Republican pinheads speak of reconciliation of all

parties in Egypt, the Democrats wring their hands over the “rolling back of human rights” and the refusal of the military to allow for “peaceful demonstrations.” On what bizarre planet do these ignoramus live? And is there sufficient oxygen to support human life?

For McCain and his mini-me, Lindsey Graham, to spout off insisting that all sides agree to form a united Egypt borders on the psychotic. Just exactly how are the opposing parties in Egypt – those who yearn for a secular democracy and those who crave a nation governed by Sharia law – supposed to come together? What sort of compromise would McCain suggest? A government run sanely three-and-a-half days a week, with Islamic lunacy controlling things the other 84 hours?

But never let it be said that the Democrats will ever allow the Republicans to hog all the foolishness. It is, in fact, the one area in which bi-partisanship carries the day in our nation’s capital. Let the Republicans insist on mortal enemies coming together and setting aside their mortal differences, and you can count on the Democrats referring to “peaceful protest,” while turning a blind eye to the rampant vandalism by the Muslim Brotherhood and their burning nearly two dozen Coptic Christian churches in Egypt.

As for those precious human rights that Obama is convinced the military is denying to 85 million Egyptians, it didn’t seem to faze him when those rights were being denied by Mohamed Morsi during the year after he was narrowly elected. Did Obama think that millions of Egyptians had taken to the streets because they didn’t like Morsi’s beard? Did it never even enter his puny little mind that it might have had something to do with the fact that Morsi was shredding the Egyptian constitution, imprisoning journalists and imposing a theocratic dictatorship?

To be fair, those might seem to be trivial matters to a president who used the IRS to punish his political foes and

the Justice Department to snoop on reporters and lie about it to Congress; while he, himself, has shown only contempt for the laws of our nation, whether they involve shipping arms to Mexico, ignoring drug-related felonies or abandoning even the pretense of guarding our border.

Still, why is it that so many of our politicians, on both sides of the aisle, insist on pretending that the Muslim Brotherhood is just another political party? It is clearly a terrorist organization, no more benign than Al Qaeda or Hezbollah. And any politician who feels himself compelled to pay it lip service should be viewed with the same contempt that would have accrued to an American politician who spoke out on behalf of the Nazis during the 30s and 40s.

When I hear our politicians boohooing over the deaths of 50 or 60 rioting members of the Muslim Brotherhood, I would remind them that 72 Egyptians were killed in Port Said recently when a riot broke out over nothing more than a soccer match!

Just because the bad guys in the Middle East don't wear uniforms or swastikas doesn't entitle anyone to defend them as innocent civilians. The Egyptian military is the only thing keeping Egypt from morphing into another Iran, whereas the Muslim Brotherhood is strictly in the business of spreading Islamic fanaticism, and has about as much to do with promoting brotherhood as the Aryan Nation or the NAACP.

Inasmuch as most Americans seem to believe our Civil War, which resulted in 700,000 dead, was worthwhile, I'm at a loss to understand why so many folks get upset when far fewer are dying in Syria or, if it comes to pass, would die in an Egyptian civil war. At least in Egypt, we'd finally have a side worth rooting for.

So, naturally, that's the side Obama and McCain are bad-mouthing.

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

The U.N. Human Rights Council – and other Jokes

✘ I don't know why those nasty conservatives are always taking cheap shots at the United Nations. I mean, the U.N. cares about stuff, important stuff. Don't the delegates who leave the comfort of their homes in places like Zimbabwe and Bangladesh only to endure the hardships of Manhattan and Geneva do really important work?

Why yes they do. Here's just the latest example. The U.N. Human Rights Council is meeting in that aforementioned hellhole called Geneva, Switzerland taking up a matter brought to the council's attention by the NAACP. The civil rights group says that laws in the United States that require voters to show photo IDs before casting their ballots hurt poor folks in general and black folks in particular. Photo ID laws, according to the NAACP are discriminatory because they disenfranchise voters who don't have the wherewithal to get a picture ID, and, that, the argument goes, suppresses the minority vote.

I don't know about you, but that sounds like a human rights violation to me.

Want to know how bad it is? I'll tell you anyway. Eight states passed photo ID laws in just the past year and similar laws are pending in 32 more states. Talk about your crimes against humanity.

"This really is a tactic that undercuts the growth of ... democracy," according to Hillary Shelton, the NAACP's senior vice president for advocacy, speaking about those photo ID requirements. Ms. Shelton told Fox News that such a

burdensome requirement “undercuts the integrity of our government, if you allow it to happen. It’s trickery, it’s a sleight-of-hand. We’re seeing it happen here ... and we are utilizing the U.N. as a tool to make sure that we are able to share that with those countries all over the world.”

So who’s going to listen to these cries for help? Well, let’s start with the delegates from Saudi Arabia, a nation that cares deeply about voting rights. Unless you’re a woman. Then you’re not allowed to vote.

Then there are those two beacons of light that care so very much about “the growth of democracy” – China and Cuba, one-party dictatorships where it’s not a good idea to criticize the government for anything, especially for trampling on the human rights of its citizens. Oh yeah, that lighthouse of enlightenment, Libya, is also a member of the Human Rights Council.

So what’s going on here? That’s easy. The NAACP is trying to embarrass the United States in front of the whole wide world because it’s losing the argument here at home. Most Americans figure if they have to present an ID to rent a movie at the strip mall or check into a hotel ... or buy a gun, which is a right granted under the Constitution, then is it really oppressive to require citizens to show a government-issued picture of themselves before voting?

But as the saying goes, reasonable people may disagree. So the NAACP may have a case.

But to take that case to delegates who represent tyrants and thugs who wouldn’t recognize a human right if it kicked them in the rear end ... well, that is embarrassing. Not for the United States. For a once proud civil rights organization.

Delay Execution, But Not Abortion

☒ A couple of stories caught my eye this week. One was about those whacky, naked kids over at People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals (PETA), protesting in Seattle against fishing because fish are intelligent, sensitive animals that feel stress and pain when they are hooked or hauled up in nets.

On a more somber note, the fate of convicted murderer, Troy Davis, hung in the balance hoping that somehow, some way, he would be spared a lethal injection in Georgia for the 1989 killing of off-duty policeman, Mark MacPhail. After twenty-two years of legal maneuvers, including a new trial granted by the U.S. Supreme Court for the first time in fifty years, he was executed on Wednesday night.

On one end you have the loons at PETA concerned about the pain fish feel and on the other you have the worldwide protests outside our embassies in Paris and London as well as here in the States, to spare a man who was lawfully convicted and afforded every appellate procedure allowed under our system of justice. Like it or not, twenty-two years later, Mr. Davis had a tenacious group of defenders who exhausted every avenue of review on his behalf.

Among Davis' numerous supporters were the NAACP, and, of course the ACLU.

Should that surprise any of us? Probably not. But while they shout at the top of their lungs about why a convicted murderer should be spared, they also vigorously oppose the rights of the millions of innocent unborn babies being aborted by the

millions in this civilized country.

For example, in Atlanta where 60% of abortions are of black babies, the NAACP repudiated the Radiance Foundation's billboard campaign with the message "The 13th Amendment Freed us, Abortion Enslaves Us" yet openly supports Planned Parenthood and NARAL.

Even more surprising is the about-face taken by the NAACP on a bill in Georgia which would've made it a crime to abort a child because of its race or gender. While the local NAACP initially endorsed the bill, it later had a change of heart. Looks like when it comes to abortion, politics trumps race every time.

This past summer Planned Parenthood along with the ACLU opposed a state law that required women to wait three days and receive counseling before aborting the baby.

Arkansas' "Unborn Child Pain Awareness and Prevention Act" which requires doctors to give patients seeking abortions at 20 weeks or older information on fetal pain 24 hours before the procedure was opposed by the ACLU. It also opposed Wyoming's law which required doctors to provide mothers with ultrasound information.

Both the ACLU and Planned Parenthood similarly opposed Alabama's recently enacted "Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act." California's "Unborn Child Pain Awareness Act of 2006" was also opposed by the ACLU.

The PETA loons are so concerned about the stress and pain of fish, I'd really like to know what they think about the stress and pain an unborn child feels during an abortion.

The ACLU, while supporting endless motions, petitions, writs and other legal maneuverings, requesting the judicial system to take a moment, sit back and reflect on the fate of this convicted murderer, it supports no such time for introspection

when it comes to abortion— it opposes every bill which would require the mother to take a moment, sit back and reflect on the fate of her unborn child.

I don't get it, but if you do, God bless you.

I Thought Affirmative Action Was a Good Thing

✘ If affirmative action was such a great idea, then why is the left branding anyone a racist who might suggest that President Obama benefitted from the policy?

Donald Trump has brought the President's academic record into the spotlight by asking how he gained admittance to Columbia University and Harvard Law School after having less than a stellar academic record at Occidental.

Because of that simple query, he's now been branded by the left as a racist because he has the audacity to question the President's academic credentials.

Ed Schultz over at MSNBC called Mr. Trump a racist because "he's questioning the academic prowess of one of the smartest Presidents we've ever had."

When Mr. Trump called on the President to release his college records, Bob Schieffer, host of Face the Nation, said, "That's just code for saying he got into law school because he's black.

Then there's the Rev. Al Sharpton who's upset with Mr. Trump's statements because it suggests that President Obama got into two Ivy League schools because of affirmative action.

Well, I found all these statements very enlightening because each one firmly believes Mr. Trump is saying that President Obama had to have been admitted to Columbia and Harvard, not based on his grades, but because of affirmative action.

Assuming that's true, what makes Mr. Trump a racist? I thought the left loved affirmative action. What's the problem with President Obama benefitting from the policy?

Rev. Sharpton supports it. So, why the outcry that the President benefitted from something Al Sharpton always supported and thinks is good for the country?

The African American Forum Policy advocates for affirmative action as does the ACLU, and the NAACP is opposed to any constitutional amendment that would do away with affirmative action programs. President Obama's own Justice Department just recently filed an amicus brief in support of the University of Texas, Austin, which includes a component that considers race and ethnicity in its admissions decisions.

So what's making the left so outraged? If President Obama gained admittance to Columbia University or Harvard Law School through affirmative action, why should that be a negative?

It sounds as if the left now views a person who gets into a university because of his skin color differently from someone who gets in because of merit. It seems a bit hypocritical for the left to be calling foul play when the African American Policy Forum, for instance, believes that "race-conscious affirmative action remains necessary to address race-based obstacles that block the path to success of countless people of color of all classes." So why's the left making such a fuss?

It's interesting to see some on the left backing up from their decades-long support of affirmative action. Maybe it's because they're starting to wise up to the fact that affirmative action isn't all it's cracked up to be. I'm in

Justice Clarence Thomas's camp who believes that affirmative action has created a "cult of victimization" and implies blacks require "special treatment in order to succeed."

It sounds as if affirmative action is coming back to bite the collective left on the butt. Maybe they're finally realizing that affirmative action makes victims of people and those that benefit from it are actually stigmatized by the policy.

It's really no surprise I don't get the left in this country. But if you do, God bless you.