

# Pravda, Izvestia & The New York Times

*Once you've read this article, Burt hopes you'll enjoy O'Reilly, Obama & Oh Brother!.*

Recently, one of my readers, George Gunning, reminded me that in the bad old days of the Soviet Union, there were two major newspapers. One was Pravda, which translates to Truth; the other was Izvestia, which means The News. The joke on the streets of Moscow was that there was no pravda in Izvestia and no isvestia in Pravda. Today, the same could be said about the New York Times, and just about every other major media outlet in America.

Meanwhile, back in Russia, Vladimir Putin recently celebrated his 60th birthday. The former head of the KGB is known to friends, relatives and any other Russian who doesn't want to end up dead, as "The Most Kind Hearted Man." I'm serious. No doubt, he envied the late dictator of North Korea, Kim Jong-il, who, among various other pet names, answered to "Brilliant Leader," "Superior Person," "Father of the People," "Sun of the Communist Future" and, my own personal favorite, "Glorious General Who Descended from Heaven."

But far be it from me to only ridicule foreign leaders. It wouldn't be right when here at home, we have the likes of Rep. Elijah Cummings, formerly the head of the Congressional Black Caucus, who, these days, is the senior member of the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. That position offers him the opportunity to attack Rep. Darrel Issa, the chairman of the committee, for daring to question the administration's cover-up of the attack on the Benghazi consulate.

Clearly, the downside of the GOP taking control of the House

in 2010 is that committee chairmen such as Issa and Peter King will still have to constantly deal with the likes of Cummings, Maxine Waters and Sheila Jackson Lee. Frankly, they couldn't pay me enough.

I find it ironic when liberals claim that the reason that sane people oppose Barack Obama is because of his race when, clearly, if you see the way that House blacks and Fox's Juan Williams defend his every word, it's they who are far more concerned with his pigmentation than they are with his pathetic record.

It seems to me that a stronger case could be made by those who believe the earth is flat, that Elvis is working the night shift at a Nashville 7-11 or that James Dean, now that he's all healed up, is getting ready to stage a comeback, than by those who are convinced that Barack Obama deserves a second term.

I mean, when his own Treasury Department reports that for every \$7.00 we take in, Obama has spent \$10.95, how much additional evidence of his incompetence does anyone need? To put it in basic terms, it's like a family making \$70,000-a-year and spending \$109,500. Is there anyone who really believes that at that rate, whether we're speaking about an individual or a nation, bankruptcy isn't waiting right around the corner?

When I see polls showing a 3 or 4% differential between Romney and Obama, and they then tell me that it's within the margin of error, I think what they're really saying is that it's within the margin of cheating. That's why it disturbs me so much when I hear people arguing against photo IDs being required for those wishing to vote. The only possible reason anyone would oppose such a law is that it would make it more difficult for Democrats to commit election fraud.

As goofy as politicians are, it would be naïve to think that

judges are any more sensible. For instance, a military judge ruled that terrorist Khalid Sheik Mohammad would be allowed to wear a U.S. military uniform at his trial. The only stipulation was that it couldn't be a uniform that is presently being worn. If I had been the judge, I would have granted his request, and I would have decked him out as a World War II WAC. No disrespect to the women in the military, but I think that faced with the prospect of looking like a drag queen, Sheik Mohammad would have quickly confessed and saved us the time and expense of a trial.

Knowing how unaccustomed Obama is to losing, I would have advised him to quit the race after the first presidential debate. Like the character Algernon Moncrieff in Oscar Wilde's *The Importance of Being Earnest*, he could have blamed his departure on Bunbury. In the play, Bunbury is a fictional invalid invented for those occasions when Moncrieff wished to get away from his boring relatives. He would simply announce that he had received word that poor Bunbury had taken a turn for the worse, pack his bags and be gone on a mission of mercy.

Would any of us dare to question His Fatuousness if he suddenly flew off in order to ease his friend's last days, however long it might take for dear old Bunbury to finally get his ticket punched?

Finally, speaking of Obama, a notion that has begun to plague me is that people really do get the government they deserve. As a result, I may not get a good night's sleep until the election. And unless Romney wins, not even then.

*Now that you've read this article, Burt hopes you'll enjoy Pravda, Ivestia & The New York Times.*

©2012 Burt Prelutsky. Comments? Write [BurtPrelutsky@aol.com](mailto:BurtPrelutsky@aol.com).

*Now that you've read this article, Burt hopes you'll enjoy O'Reilly, Obama & Oh Brother!.*