

Two Successful Governors Gone; Take That, GOP Congress!



Monday afternoon, in a move that surprised many, Republican presidential candidate Scott Walker ended his bid for the White House. He now joins Rick Perry as the second GOP leader to have to bow out of the race, due to a lack of support. Both have been very successful governors, and were once considered two of the most qualified candidates vying for

the Oval Office.

Few people would have predicted this turn of events just a few months ago. Walker was an early favorite, having earned strong popularity among conservatives and moderate Republicans alike for his principled leadership as the governor of Wisconsin. There, he successfully took on public unions (something most Republican politicians only talk about), dealt effectively with state budgetary problems, and demonstrated an ability to win multiple elections in what has traditionally been a blue state.

Much the way Rick Perry entered his first presidential race in 2011, Walker struck the right tone with the Republican base, and managed to stand out among the crowd as an “outsider” with solid messaging and strong conservative achievements.

What neither candidate could have predicted, however, was the anti-establishment earthquake of 2015. This political

conundrum, triggered by voter frustration with the Washington DC establishment, has somehow extended far beyond Washington, and is now beginning to hammer nails into the coffins of any candidacy tethered to a public record.

We seem to be at a point in time when government experience (even if it's rich with achievements) is strangely seen as a detriment to one's candidacy. In a metaphor that Rick Perry might use, we're shooting at John Boehner and Mitch McConnell, and hitting the kinds of leaders we've been saying for years that we need in the White House.

I can't help but find this troubling...very troubling.

I get that Walker and Perry weren't the most polished of candidates, and some of the problem is certainly attributable to the size of the Republican field. A number of these candidates, after all, are running purely for the notoriety, which is far from helpful. Walker and Perry weren't two of them, however. They were serious contenders who became early victims of a vendetta they were never even a part of.

The anti-establishment sentiment in this election-cycle has been off the charts. A good portion of the Republican electorate is so eager for a political novice that they can't even bring themselves to evaluate such people as actual candidates. They overlook their obvious weaknesses, and refuse to hold them to the high level of scrutiny they impose on the rest.

For example, many people point to Donald Trump's stance on a border-wall as the reason his candidacy caught fire. There's probably some truth to that, but the reality is that Rick Perry was a strong, effective advocate for border security long before Trump ever opened his mouth on the topic. Perry, in fact, earned a great deal of national publicity for his outspoken rhetoric against President Obama's inaction on the border, and even took some gutsy border-security measures

himself.

Yet, because Perry is a politician, he will forever be identified as the guy who suffered through a painful moment of absent-mindedness during the 2012 campaign, and thus shouldn't be seriously considered for the Oval Office.

When you're a total outsider with no public record, however, it's a different story. You can pretty much say anything at all right now, and not pay any kind of political price for it. You can mock American POWs for being captured, make up stories about Mexican rapists, say that "prison sex" makes people gay, talk about journalists' menstrual cycles, etc. None of it matters. In fact, the rhetoric will likely *help* you, because in these *anti-establishment times*, being politically-incorrect equates to *authenticity*, even if it's factually inaccurate.

Heck, you really don't even have to demonstrate any knowledge of serious global issues when you don't have a public record. You just have to display some personality, promise you'll study up on the policy stuff later, and then switch the topic over to something you're more comfortable talking about.

That doesn't work with experienced politicians – not right now, anyway. If it did, Chris Christie and Marco Rubio would be sitting at the top of the polls, based on their charisma alone.

You know, I feel a little strange writing this column, because I'm not someone who believes that an individual necessarily *has* to have a distinguished public record in order to be an effective president. I think a few people can pull it off. I do believe, however, that there is no substitution for relevant experience, and it seems ridiculous for voters to discard candidates for having the gall to practice governance before running for the presidency. Yet, that's exactly what we're doing, and we're doing it because we're dissatisfied with people who aren't even running for the office.



Breaking: Presidential candidate Donald Trump endorses John A. Daly's new novel.

The result has been the loss of two effective leaders, more than a year out from an incredibly important election. Are we better off because of it?

I don't know... Maybe I'm a *pro-establishment* guy for thinking it's important to have a strong bench of candidates to choose from. Maybe I'm a *RINO* for expecting those candidates to be vetted using a single standard. Maybe I'm a "cuckservative" (or whatever the latest *traitor Republican* catchphrase is) for wanting someone who's well-read, informed, and passionate about policy.

All I know is that any message we're trying to send to congress by adapting to this new methodology for selecting presidential candidates is totally incoherent. If anyone can explain it to me, please do so.

Why the Small Stuff Will Matter With Scott Walker



Likely Republican presidential candidate Scott Walker has been getting a lot of attention lately. Much of it has been good, including his rising popularity in national polls, a close second-place finish in the CPAC straw poll last weekend, and taking first place in a recent Quinnipiac poll of Iowa caucus-goers.

Some of the attention hasn't been so good. He gave a couple of pretty awkward answers (or non-answers) to media *gotcha* questions, and invited sharp criticism by citing his history with Wisconsin unions when describing how he would be an affective leader against the terrorist group, ISIS.

Regardless, conservatives are gravitating toward Walker in larger numbers, and Walker believes he knows why. In an interview aired Sunday, Walker told Fox News's Chris Wallace: "Well, I think a lot of people admire what we did in Wisconsin, where we were just fighting for the taxpayers, when we were winning for the taxpayers."

Winning. That really is the appeal.

You see, Walker comes from a very rare breed of politician. He not only says what constituents want to hear, but also accomplishes the big, difficult things they elected him to accomplish. He's an effective leader who has defied the odds (in a blue state) to build a record of success as a governor, and that's the kind of person that conservatives like and

expect in a candidate. That's the kind of person that will do well in a Republican primary. The fact that Walker managed to get elected multiple times doesn't hurt either.

Liberal voters are different. They tend to lend their support to candidates based almost entirely on rhetoric. If a candidate can produce soaring speeches on topics like inequality, social justice, and the environment, thus convincing the base that they speak their language, a record of success is of little relevance. The political rise of people like Barack Obama and Elizabeth Warren are perfect examples of this. And if you still don't believe me, try asking one of your liberal friends – even one who actively follows politics – why they think Hillary Clinton has what it takes to be a good president. I'll save you the suspense: Their answer won't have anything to do with her record.

Now, it's easy for conservatives to mock liberals for valuing style over substance, but the reality is that liberals aren't the only voters who couldn't care less about a candidate's record of leadership or success. Barack Obama had essentially no record of either, prior to him becoming our president. Four years later, after scoring fewer wins than the Washington Generals basketball team, he was re-elected.

While a record of success is the mark of a good leader, it isn't necessarily the mark of a good candidate – not in today's political environment anyway. As sad as it is, the small stuff often outweighs the big stuff in politics.

In a general election, Walker can tout his very real achievements until he's blue in the face, but it won't amount to a hill of beans if he doesn't become more comfortable in addressing combative questions and refining his rhetoric. Unlike the Democratic candidate, he won't have the mainstream media to run cover for him when he makes verbal gaffes. They'll be more than happy to exploit the in-artful comments of *any* Republican candidate, just like they did with Mitt

Romney's "47 percent" remark in 2012.

And don't think Walker's Republican rivals won't be looking to do the same thing in the primaries. Rick Perry came into the 2012 race as strong leader with a strong record, and he quickly became the Republican front-runner. Unfortunately, he eliminated himself from contention with his sloppy work in front of the microphone.

Walker has some time to polish up his presentation, and he'll have to do so if he hopes to be considered a good national candidate by people other than conservatives. I'm hoping he gets there, because true leadership is something we desperately need in the Oval Office. The more strong leaders we have vying for the presidency, the better.

Sale! If you're interested in a signed, personalized copy of my novel "From a Dead Sleep" for \$18, which includes domestic shipping, please email me at johndalybooks@hotmail.com. It also makes a great gift!

"They Protesteth Too Much" and "Walker & Martinez, 2016"

As I have written on other similar occasions, it's a protest when you toss the tea into the harbor; when you grab the tea or, rather, the TV sets, liquor and sports equipment and take it home, it's a riot and those who take part are not patriots, they're thugs.

As I watched what was taking place in Ferguson after the Grand Jury returned its rational verdict, the thing that surprised me was that after Gov. Nixon had announced he was calling in

the Missouri National Guard as a backup to the St. Louis and Ferguson police departments, the only people I saw on the streets were black punks smashing windows, burning down businesses and carting off stolen loot.

In the bad old days, cops down South would turn dogs and fire hoses on black people who were protesting peacefully and it spoke to the consciences of white Americans. But over the past 40 years or so, it seems the order of the day is that every time black hooligans take to the streets, the cops are told to stand around and watch, only stopping short of passing out matches, gasoline and baseball bats.

So far as I can tell, St. Louis County Prosecutor Robert McCulloch and the nine members of the Grand Jury took their responsibilities seriously and did an admirable job. However, after reading his detailed statement to the press, one of the reporters asked if witnesses who had done so much to inflame the situation on Day One by claiming that Officer Wilson had shot Michael Brown in the back or had shot him when he was standing still with his hands raised above his head would face perjury charges. To my astonishment, McCulloch basically blew off the reporter's question.

Even though McCulloch said that most of those "eye witnesses" finally got around to admitting that they hadn't even seen the shooting and were only passing on rumors as fact, he was obviously willing to give them the benefit of the doubt. What doubt that would be, he failed to explain. For my part, I have no doubt at all that they not only committed perjury, but were the major reason that Ferguson became a war zone in the first place.

In fact, I read the next day that Chief of the St. Louis County Police Jon Belman initially ordered his officers "to back off" and to treat the mob as they would the crowd at "a festival or a ballgame."

Even at festivals and ballgames, I've seen barricades. But in Ferguson, they didn't even block off the main drag, which had been the flash point of the riots back in August.

Clearly, the protests had nothing to do with the Grand Jury verdict. As it was with the Rodney King riots here in L.A., the verdict merely served as an excuse for black teenagers and young toughs to run wild because they know that the same shit that would get them a stiff prison sentence if they did it alone or with a buddy will be essentially ignored when done as a mob.

I did not have a business burn down and I was about 1,500 miles west of Ferguson, so for me, the worst part of the evening was listening to commentators, including Barack Obama, attempt to be balanced, talking about the racism that is still part of our culture and especially the culture of the police. It reminded me of the moral equivalence he always seems to find when comparing Israel to its vile Middle East neighbors.

What Obama and the media pundits should have been talking about was the culture of black communities that accepts record numbers of illegitimate births, black crime and welfare as a generational tradition, as the norm.

We've had half a century of black kids being raised by young black females, of black men who have unburdened themselves of familial responsibilities and of racists like Al Sharpton and Jesse Jackson stoking the embers of racial animosity by scapegoating white society.

The mere fact that a creep like Sharpton is still allowed to host his own show on MSNBC and be welcomed like a long-lost brother to Obama's White House should tell you all you need to know about what the once honorable Civil Rights movement has come to in America.

If I owned a store in Ferguson that was burned or vandalized by the mob, I should be allowed to sue not only Gov. Nixon and

the various police chiefs who basically gave the thugs carte blanche, but Sharpton and the various black politicians who all played an essential role in allowing it to happen. I would also be allowed to target Barack Obama and Eric Holder, who inflated the regrettable, but defensible, shooting of a thug into not only a national spectacle, but, if you recall Obama's reference to it during his U.N. address, an international incident.

One element of the case left me scratching my head. As we heard in the aftermath, Officer Darren Wilson had been alerted by a police call that Michael Brown and his buddy were wanted for swiping cigars from a local convenience store and roughing up the store's clerk. But the description apparently only mentioned that one of the two thugs – Michael Brown, as we came to learn – was wearing a red baseball cap and yellow socks.

What if he had tossed the cap and changed his socks? Would he still be running loose? In Ferguson, is it against police policy to mention that a perp happens to be black or that he tips the scales at 320 pounds?

Understand, I've never worked in law enforcement, but I can only imagine that it would make it a lot easier to find a needle in the haystack if you knew the needle was as big as a Volkswagen.

Walker & Martinez, 2016

Recently I announced that my dream ticket for the 2016 presidential election would be the governors of Wisconsin and New Mexico. I explained that Scott Walker and Susana Martinez represented a nice geographical balance, representing the upper Midwest and the Southwest.

In addition, both are proven winners. In Walker's case, in

spite of the unions squandering millions of dollars of their members' dues to defeat him in two regular elections and a recall, he has won three times in four years. For her part, Governor Martinez is both Hispanic and female, and could be counted on to draw a great deal of support from both voting blocs.

But being a fair-minded fellow, I invited all of you to come up with your own dream ticket. In all, 57 readers took me up on my offer. Over half of them, 31, seconded my nominees. The other 26 named 20 different potential candidates in addition to Walker and Martinez, whom they saw fit to split up to form other combinations.

In one case, I was Gov. Walker's running mate. The voter spelled it out in no uncertain words that it would be my job to insult our opponents. It's a role I would cherish, but I'd also want to have a say in laying out our foreign policy, which, basically, would consist of being a loyal ally to our friends and a resolute foe of our enemies. In case of war, the Prelutsky policy would be the same as that laid out by Ronald Reagan: We win, they lose. No playing for ties.

Most of those mentioned only received one or two votes, sometimes offered as president, sometimes as vice-president. The second most popular duo was Ted Cruz and Trey Gowdy. That combination received four votes.

I know that there are those who don't believe that Gov. Walker scores high enough on the charisma meter to be a viable presidential candidate. It so happens that I agree that Walker doesn't set hearts aflutter, but I regard that as a plus. Charisma is what Democrats offer, as exemplified by rock stars and divas like Obama and the Clintons. That's because Democrats have nothing but bells and whistles to offer the uninformed and idiotic. Their policies don't work because, essentially, they consist of taxing those in society who are productive in order to subsidize their base; namely those who

tend to be ignorant, shiftless and ungrateful.

Judging by the recent midterms, I believe that Americans are fed up with a massive federal government controlling their lives. They have seen for themselves that liberals depend on lying and cheating in order to get around commonsense and the Constitution. I believe they are hungry for leaders who offer competence and character. Leaders, I suggest, like Walker and Martinez.

In the old Soviet Union, every May Day, Joseph Stalin and those in his inner circle would pose on a balcony as the Soviet's military might was paraded past the grandstand. And because Stalin was a paranoid butcher, every year a few of those who had been there the previous year would be gone. And to be gone in the Soviet Union meant being gone from the face of the earth. It also meant being removed from the official photos of previous years. One year, whoever was in charge removed a certain person from the previous year's photo, but he neglected to remove the guy's shoes. It was pretty funny, unless, of course, you were that guy.

What brings it to mind is the rate at which Democrats have been losing elections ever since the passage of the Affordable Care Act. It makes me wonder if that famous photo of Obama signing his favorite piece of legislation in the Oval Office will soon face the same fate, so that all we'll see one day are Obama, the little black kid and Henry Waxman's tiny shoes.

For some time now, I've been receiving a cockeyed message that has gone viral on the Internet for reasons I can't imagine. It goes this way: "Barack Obama, not feeling well and concerned about his mortality, goes to consult a psychic about the date of his death.

"The psychic closes her eyes and, after a few seconds, says, 'You will die on a Jewish holiday.'

Shaken by her response, Obama nervously asks, "Which one?"

“It doesn’t matter,” replies the psychic. “Whenever you die, it’ll be a Jewish holiday.”

I can’t imagine who thought that made any sense at all. I mean, perhaps it would play in Israel, but here in America, 70% of my fellow Jews still support the man and his destructive agenda. So for them it would, alas, be a day of mourning.

In closing, I’ll share a joke I just heard. A panhandler stops a passerby and says he needs money for food. The guy shakes his head and says, “I know you’ll only spend it on drugs.”

“Not so,” says the bum. “I already have money for drugs; it’s money for food I need.”

I can’t think of anything that sums up the welfare state that Obama’s America has become better than that.

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.

“A Gruber By Any Name” and “A Survival Plan For The GOP”

If you’ve been watching Fox recently, you would think Prof. Jonathan Gruber had been given his own show. He’s been on more often than Juan Williams. While normally that would be a good thing, Gruber is no improvement over Obama’s fav Fox commentator.

In case you only watch the major networks, you wouldn’t even

know that Gruber existed, let alone that, after helping to create the Affordable Care Act, he spent years bragging about how he helped the Democrats peddle chicken poop to the American people by calling it chicken fricassee.

What fooled me when I first heard about Prof. Gruber was that he was connected to the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. In my mind, I connect MIT to very brainy people who know all about science, math and engineering; namely, the college classes you can't bluff your way through by regurgitating left-wing pap. But then I found out he was a professor of economics, and it all made sense. Economics is to actual science what sausage links are to haute cuisine.

Gruber was paid \$390,000 by this administration to provide "impartial" testimony on behalf of ObamaCare to Congress, the Federal Budget Bureau and the media, and millions more for consulting on state exchanges. Inasmuch as he freely admitted that he lied and lied and then lied some more, the arrogant elitist definitely earned his money, while sacrificing his soul.

I'm not sure if he got paid extra to say that Barack Obama's own series of lies about people being able to keep their doctors and their health plans under the ACA "constituted a profile in courage." But I would have thought it was worth at least an extra fifty grand, especially as Obama was using our tax dollars.

All in all, I don't think it's a stretch to say that it has to be more than mere coincidence that "Gruber" sounds like "goober" and that Adolf Hitler's birth name happened to have been Schicklgruber.

The irony is that he did his job so well that in a very real sense, he is one of the people most responsible for the GOP's taking back control of the House and Senate. If not for all the work Gruber did promoting ObamaCare, Republicans might

have been forced to spend the next 40 years wandering in the wilderness.

Ironically, when Gruber repeatedly said Americans are stupid, he was only referring to Democrats. For their part, Republicans, both in and out of Congress, knew from the start that ObamaCare was one huge pile of socialist manure.

Gruber reminds me of every schlemiel in junior high who was convinced he was the smartest kid in school, and based that belief on the fact he was the only boy who didn't know how to throw a football. It's now been about 30 years since he was last pantsed and shoved head first into a trashcan. It's time once again.

Trey Gowdy, one of the shining jewels of the House, in referring to such enormous, power-grabbing pieces of legislation as Dodd Frank, the Affordable Care Act and Obama's Comprehensive Immigration Reform, suggested that "Comprehensive is Latin for full of bad stuff."

Speaking of immigration, being American should never be the end result of sneaking across our border in order to give birth. Sneaking in is against the law, and in no other circumstance are people permitted to benefit from the commission of a crime. If that's too complicated for Obama and the self-righteous members of the Congressional Latino Caucus to grasp, it would be tantamount to an illegal alien robbing a bank and his family getting to keep the money.

What's more, in 2011, Obama told an audience that he lacked the constitutional authority to grant any form of immunity to illegals. Although he's done his best to ignore the fact, the Constitution hasn't changed over the past three years.

Although Chris Christie is one of a very few Republican governors I wouldn't wish to see on the GOP ticket in 2016, I do appreciate that he did yeoman's work in helping several of his colleagues get elected or re-elected in the midterms. In

appreciation of his service, I will offer him a piece of free advice. While it comes as a breath of fresh air when a politician reacts to hecklers like a normal human being, you should ask some stand-up comic to provide you with a better line than "Sit down and shut up!"

What plays in New Jersey doesn't work so well on the national stage. So while coming on like a street thug will get you face time on TV, it will not get you to the White House, except as a member of a tour group.

In other news, the FDA has announced it's lifting its ban on homosexuals donating blood because of what it refers to as "an infinitesimal" chance of the blood being contaminated with the HIV virus. Far be it from me to question their definition of infinitesimal, but is it asking too much that the blood be clearly labeled and only used to transfuse gays and those straights who agree to sign a waiver?

Finally, Barack Obama's net-neutrality is, as usual, a benign-sounding term to disguise a program intended to squelch conservative twitters. According to Michelle Malkin, while urging the FCC to "keep the Internet free and open," Obama paid a million dollars to some professor named Filippo Menczer to develop a twitter-snooping database. (Am I the only person who feels a chill run down his spine every time I come across some hooker with a Ph.D servicing this administration?)

Although Prof. Menczer claims he only wishes to eliminate hate speech from the twitter universe, he has proclaimed his support for such left-wing purveyors of hate as Barack Obama's Organizing for Action, Moveon.org, Greenpeace, the Sierra Club, Amnesty International and True Majority.

Clearly, Prof. Menczer is as politically neutral as Lois Lerner and every bit as fair-minded as George Orwell's Big Brother.

It sounds to me like we need another trashcan.

A Survival Plan For The GOP

Although England has its own problems, there are things about their political system that I'd like us to adopt. First of all, I wish we, too, had a clear delineation between the royal family and the world of politics. In the U.S., we have combined the two so that the President and his family live like royalty while the President simultaneously serves as the Commander-in-chief and the very partisan head of his Party. It's simply too much to expect of any one man.

Another aspect of the English system that I prefer is that when the Prime Minister's policies seem unpopular and he wants to guarantee that he is still leading the nation in the direction it wishes to be led, they conduct a vote of confidence. If the opposition then wins a majority of the seats in Parliament, that party selects a new Prime Minister. After the midterm election results, if we had a similar system in place, there is no way that Obama would remain in power for an additional two years.

Speaking of the midterms, isn't it high time we got rid of the two month lame duck session? By what right should people who lost their elections in early November remain in office until early January?

Perhaps in the old days, when it could take a long time for the newly elected to reach Washington, D.C., it made sense. But now, when even those who won in Alaska and Hawaii can get to the nation's capital in a matter of hours, and those who lost can pack up their belongings in even less time, the two-month gap is not only unnecessary, but should be unconstitutional.

In other news, a 2013 video of Jonathan Gruber, an architect of the Affordable Care Act, addressing a panel at MIT recently turned up. Mr. Gruber is heard admitting that he and everyone else involved in pushing ObamaCare down our throats knew they had to lie about it as far back as 2009 in order to get the bill passed. That speaks badly about Obama, Reid, Pelosi and all their trained chimps in Congress, but it also speaks volumes about those voters who elected and then re-elected those same schmucks. But, then, Mr. Gruber did go on in his remarks to concede that the plan probably wouldn't have worked if Americans weren't so stupid.

Recently, someone sent me a two-panel cartoon. In the first panel, a reporter is asking Obama: "Why are you planning to grant amnesty to millions of illegals?" Obama replies, "Because they will do the jobs Americans don't want to do." In the second panel, the reporter asks: "Like what?" and Obama answers: "Voting for Democrats."

In another email, a friend asked me why our fellow Jews continue to vote overwhelmingly for liberals, and went on to wonder why American Jews adored FDR, even though he refused to expand immigration for European Jews trying to escape the Nazi ovens and even refused to oblige his Air Force generals who begged to be allowed to bomb the train tracks leading to concentration camps.

I replied "Jews loved FDR because he was the first actual socialist elected to the White House. Some would say that honor belongs to Teddy Roosevelt or Woodrow Wilson, but it was FDR who actually adopted the socialist agenda as his own. It was no accident that between 1908 and 1932, the Socialists kept running presidential candidates, averaging 1.1 million votes in seven elections. But once FDR served his first term, the Socialist candidate never again garnered more than 187,000 votes. In 1948, starting with former FDR V.P. Henry Wallace, the Communists started running their own candidates, calling them Progressives.

When you grasp that for most of my fellow Jews, Liberalism is their true religion, you can begin to fathom why even during the recent tsunami for GOP candidates, 67% of Jewish voters voted the straight Democratic ticket. And that was in spite of the fact that Obama is the most anti-Semitic president we have ever had, dropping the vile Jimmy Carter into second place. Obama is a weasel who has had anti-Semitic mentors like Frank Marshall Davis, Jeremiah Wright and Valerie Jarrett, ever since he was a teenager, so it should come as no surprise that today he curries favor with despots in Russia, Iran and China, but dismisses Israel's Bibi Netanyahu as a pile of chicken poop.

With 2015 looming on the horizon, when serious presidential candidates will begin making their intentions official, I am prepared to announce that my dream ticket is Scott Walker and Susana Martinez.

By way of explanation, I will point out that both have been successful governors with proven executive ability, having run on their records and been re-elected. In Walker's case, having had to weather a nasty union-financed recall attempt, he's actually been re-elected twice.

Geographically, Walker of Wisconsin and Martinez of New Mexico are well-balanced, and both are youthful. At least they are from my perspective. Walker is 47, Martinez is 55. Even when you add their ages together, they're only 35 years older than Mrs. Clinton.

Inasmuch as I believe that we are best governed by people with executive experience, I prefer to have governors rather than senators or House members in the Oval Office. What sense is there in electing a president whose only experience consists of voting and giving speeches? Besides, we need all the Republicans we can get in Congress. No need to deplete our numbers by having them run for offices above their pay scale.

It might be in bad taste to mention that Gov. Martinez just happens to be a Latina, but the fact remains that it would provide the GOP with a convenient inroad to the Hispanic vote, and would have the added benefit of not having to pander by promoting their own pathetic version of amnesty or the Dream Act.

If you prefer to see two other people running in 2016, let me know by sending your dream ticket to me at BurtPrelutsky@aol.com.

What's more, I promise to report the results truthfully even if you're goofy enough to mention people like Jeb Bush, Rick Santorum and Chris Christie.

**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.

Is There Anything Debbie Wasserman Schultz Wouldn't Say?



Back in January of 2012, when George Stephanopoulos of ABC News asked GOP presidential candidates their thoughts on states banning women from using contraception, the question was met with total confusion. No one on stage at the Republican primary debate seemed to know what Stephanopoulos was talking about. Mitt Romney answered that

he had never heard of a candidate, let alone a state, who wanted to do such a thing. Even very socially conservative candidates like Michele Bachmann and Rick Santorum, in interviews conducted after the debate, scoffed at the notion of a contraception ban.

Yes, the first shot in the Republican Party's so-called 'War on Women' resulted in a dud. The Democratic Party, however, refused to give up on the political narrative they had clearly put a great deal of thought behind.

A month or two later, when Rush Limbaugh made some truly over-the-top comments about liberal activist Sandra Fluke and her crusade to force other people to pay for her birth control pills, Democrats saw it as a second opportunity to ignite the war they so desperately wanted.

It didn't matter that Limbaugh's repugnant rhetoric was no different than that routinely used by Bill Maher (Democratic Party darling and million-dollar donor for President Obama's re-election) to describe Sarah Palin. The media and the DNC made Limbaugh's remarks the *embodiment* of the Republican Party. Later, they did the same thing with Todd Akin after the U.S. senatorial candidate made his idiotic, nonsensical comment about "legitimate rape." Again, it didn't matter that the GOP denounced Akin, called for him to end his senate bid, and pulled their funding from his campaign. As far as the

media was concerned, Akin was the Republican Party. They beat that narrative as hard as they could into the American electorate, and they made it stick.

Since then, the *War on Women* campaign strategy has continued to be wildly successful. It has shored up the unmarried, female vote for the Democratic Party with a media-substantiated theme of *misogynistic Republicans, from the era of 'Mad Men', who want to ban birth control, keep women from earning equal pay, and even take away a woman's right to vote!* The animated rhetoric has at times crossed into the arena of pure lunacy, with willfully false and totally irresponsible accusations tossed around like candy at a parade.

It's been so bad that you have to wonder if the people who've been spewing the nonsense have been, in some demented way, trying to test just how far they can push the vitriol without facing significant political ramifications. That's exactly what I was thinking the other day when I read the words spoken by Debbie Wasserman Schultz in Wisconsin, as she campaigned against the state's Republican governor, Scott Walker.

"Scott Walker has given women the back of his hand," said Wasserman Schultz. *"I know that is stark. I know that is direct. But that is reality."*

She then added, *"What Republican tea party extremists like Scott Walker are doing is they are grabbing us [women] by the hair and pulling us back."*

Likening one's political record to physical violence against women is certainly despicable, and particularly offensive to victims of actual physical abuse, but it's actually quite consistent with Wasserman Schultz's reputation. She's a U.S. congresswoman from Florida, the Chair of the Democratic National Committee, and an individual who has long demonstrated a perverse eagerness to say absolutely anything – and I mean *anything* – to keep her political party in power.

If you'll recall, Wasserman Schultz initially blamed the Tea Party for the Gabby Giffords shooting, using the plight of the victims as an opportunity to vilify her political opposition who had nothing to do with it.

She's the same person who declared in 2011 that Republicans wanted to *"drag us all the way back to Jim Crow laws and literally and very transparently block access to the polls to voters who are more likely to vote for Democratic candidates than Republican candidates."* What was the comment in response to? Republican Governors signing voter ID laws which 80% of the American public support.

A week before the Jim Crow statement, Wasserman Schultz announced that the GOP was backing a Medicare reform plan that would allow insurance companies to *"throw you to the wolves"* and *"deny you coverage and drop you for preexisting conditions."* In reality, no such plan existed.

In response to a Paul Ryan plan designed to control government spending, Wasserman Schultz said, *"We see a clear attempt for the government to back out of its commitment to seniors. As a result, many seniors in America will be forced into poverty, and worse. Some seniors will end up dying because they are forced to put off getting that pain checked out due to huge out-of-pocket costs that will skyrocket for them. ... This plan would literally be a death trap for some seniors."* Wasserman Schultz was later forced to admit that Ryan's plan didn't even apply to senior citizens.

Wasserman Schultz stated that Republicans opposed the United States having a car industry. *"If it were up to the candidates for president on the Republican side, we would be driving foreign cars,"* she said. It came out shortly after that Wasserman Schultz's own car was a 2010 Infiniti FX35 – a Japanese car.

Wasserman Schultz insisted to Fox News Sunday that she had no

idea what the political affiliation was of *Priorities USA*, the top Democratic-affiliated, fundraising super PAC that every Democrat in Washington is familiar with. They're the ones that put out the infamous ads of a man blaming Mitt Romney for his wife's cancer death, and Wasserman Schultz played dumb to avoid having to answer for it.

Did I mention that Debbie Wasserman Schultz is the head of the Democratic National Committee? I did, but it was worth repeating because it seems that the media doesn't quite understand the significance of her position. Maybe if they could pretend once in a while that she was a former Alaska governor who ran on a Republican presidential ticket back in 2008, they'd pay closer attention to what she says, and maybe even try and hold her accountable for her words.

Since 2012, Wasserman Schultz has been the Democratic Party's most outspoken voice when it comes to taking those dirty Republicans to task for their apparent hatred of women. If I recall correctly, she's the person who actually coined the term "War on Women," and has really been the heart and soul of the propaganda campaign. As we saw with her comments on Scott Walker, there really are no boundaries to what she'll say. And from her perspective, why should there be?

The mainstream media will always give their like-minded cohorts *far* more leniency than they would to any conservative. If a conservative says something truly outrageous (as Limbaugh and Akin did), it's headline news for days (maybe weeks) and *indicative of a greater conservative philosophy*. Denunciations are demanded, but they're generally not recognized once they come. On the other hand, if a liberal makes an outrageous statement, the thought is that *they just got a little carried away, and don't at all reflect the feelings and principles of the Democratic Party*. Apologize... Don't apologize... It really doesn't matter.

Perhaps more disheartening than the media double-standard,

however, is the number of people who continue to embrace the misinformation that gets created by it. The War on Women, for example, was not designed to be a long term political strategy for the Democrats. It was merely a useful mechanism for stirring emotion and distracting voters in 2012 from a poor economy and a poor president. It was an act of hyperbolic fraud that should have had a short shelf-life.

Unfortunately, it's still with us in 2014... And it's been fueled by a Hobby Lobby case ruling that critics of it don't even want to try to understand.

The left's efforts to turn American women into perpetual victims are embarrassing and insulting. In that sense, I suppose Debbie Wasserman Schultz was the perfect person for the job. You can't shame someone who has no shame. All you can do is hope that the marks eventually realize they're being conned.