

“Reading the Polls” and “Another Job For Clarence Odbody”

I don't recall a time when it was so profitable to be in the polling industry. It seems as if there's a new one every five minutes, and most of them, you've probably noticed, show Obama cratering at the speed of light. As a result, Republicans can hardly conceal their glee. I, on the other hand, look at the numbers and I feel like tearing my hair out. That is, I would if I had hair. Instead, I'd settle for tearing out someone else's; perhaps Chuck Hagel's or Harry Reid's.

I know I should celebrate the fact that 59% of the electorate think Obama is doing a lousy job, but that means that 41% don't see it that way. How can I feel good as an American knowing that 83% of the people believe that our country is weaker and less powerful than it was six years ago? For one thing, that's not a situation in which I ever want America to find herself, but for another, it means 17% think we're stronger and more powerful since Obama took office, and they can't all be smoking pot in Colorado.

There are even 9% of our friends and neighbors who think Obama has been too tough with the Russkies! One of those nincompoops, I'm happy to say, is neither a friend nor a relative of mine; he is, however, Rand Paul's old man.

Speaking of Rand Paul, I am happy to see him peaking in 2014 because I'm hoping that by 2016, he'll be “Rand Who?” during the GOP primaries. I don't think he's a bad fellow, and I wouldn't want to misjudge him because his father is an anti-Semitic nincompoop. But I do believe his crusade against the NSA is a cheap and dangerous political stunt. I think that anyone who actually believes the government is eavesdropping

on several billion monotonous phone calls every day or monitoring tens of billions of email messages every 24 hours is either a paranoid schizophrenic or is addicted to pornography and is terrified that the NSA is going to snitch him out to his wife.

Even Paul's receiving 31% of the votes cast at the annual CPAC convention isn't all that great when you actually break down the numbers. I mean, when your platform involves legalizing pot and other illegal substances; accepting same-sex marriages as the norm; opposing a military draft; and turning a blind eye to any evil taking place outside our borders; and you realize that a totally disproportional 46% of the CPAC voters were very young, garnering a mere 31% of the vote has to be regarded as a massive underachievement.

While listening to radio host Dennis Prager the other day, I heard him mention that at Harvard, they have come up with a notion that anything that is said about a specific group, even if it's positive in nature, should be regarded as bigotry. So if someone assumes that an Asian got a high-paying job as a computer programmer because Asians are widely assumed to be technically proficient, that's racism.

And if someone assumes that I'm one thing or another because I happen to be Jewish, that's a sure sign of religious bigotry. So if you decide I'm smart or dumb because I'm a Jew, you're a bigot. So, as I see it, you may as well decide I'm smart. At least that way I'll put in a good word for you when you're put on trial for being politically incorrect by the knuckleheads at Harvard.

Speaking of academic knuckleheads, one of the great mysteries of life involves the way so many professors and their young liberal charges have opted to side with the Arabs and Muslims in the conflict between Israel and the Palestinians. I mean, if you believe in free speech, equal rights for women, equal protection under the law and religious tolerance, on what possible basis, aside from anti-Semitism, can anyone identify

with those opposed to those democratic virtues and who, instead, side with the rabble that applaud the jackals who blow up school buses and pizza parlors?

As for the trouble being fomented by Vladimir Putin, my question is why Europe has become so totally dependent on Russian oil that this cheap thug can so easily turn them all into sniveling little eunuchs? Has Saudi Arabia run dry? Have France, Germany and England, all heard nasty things about Canadian oil? Has Mexico been caught watering their product? Or is it that, like Americans, the poor dears are simply war-weary? After all, it's only been 69 years since the end of World War II.

Speaking of which, Ukraine asked Barack Obama for weapons with which to defend itself against a Russian invasion. Instead, he gave them MRES (Meals Ready to Eat). Or in other words, food stamps; thus increasing the number of recipients in the blink of an eye from 50 million to 95 million.

At this point, it's only a rumor that he's arranging to sign up all 45 million Ukrainians for ObamaCare by the end of April.

Another Job For Clarence Odbody

Because it's so easy and so much fun to belittle politicians, and because the fun isn't limited to just Republicans or Democrats, we often lose sight of the fact that these folks are not members of royal families who inherit power the way others may inherit a farm or a family photo album. They actually have to run for office and be elected, even if their names are Bush, Clinton or Rockefeller.

That being said, can you even imagine how stupid people have to be to elect Sheila Jackson Lee to represent them in Congress for the past 19 years? In spite of having a BA from Yale and a JD from the University of Virginia's Law School, Ms. Lee recently said, "We have survived for 400 years under a

Constitution that defines what is constitutional and what is not." Even if you overlook the fact that she hasn't uttered a single negative word about the way Obama has trampled on both the Constitution and the House of Representatives, you would have assumed that a member of Congress would be aware that the Constitution is only 227 years old, not 400. I guess it's safe to assume that those degrees owe far more to affirmative action than to Ms. Lee's scholarship.

In New York, the recently-elected mayor, Bill de Blasio (born Warren Wilhelm, Jr.) has declared war on one of NYC's few educational successes, charter schools. The reason is elementary. People like de Blasio and his fellow Democrats are so deep into the pocket of the teacher's union there isn't even room for lint.

The mayor would be a fascinating subject for a clinical psychiatrist. He decided to adopt his mother's maiden name for his own, to forsake Catholicism for atheism and to marry a black woman who had previously been a lesbian. They met while both were serving in the administration of Mayor David Dinkens. (Dinkens, by the way, was such a disaster that from the time he left office in 1993, the liberal capital of America didn't put another Democrat in the mayor's office for 20 years. Strange as it may seem, Michael Bloomberg, a lifelong Democrat, ran all three times as a Republican.) Bill and the missus naturally honeymooned in Cuba.

In other news, Iraq's Shiite majority, which came to power once we eliminated Saddam Hussein, is now looking to legalize marriage for men to girls as young as nine, and to allow husbands the right to have non-consensual sex with their wives.

The idea that a single drop of American blood was spilled in the defense of these creeps is obscene. If in the future, we have cause to fear attack from Muslims, we should be prepared to bomb them off the face of the earth, but never again should

an American soldier's life be risked on their behalf.

Closer to home, Warren Buffet is once again the world's second richest man, having overtaken Mexico's Carlos Slim. His worth is now estimated to be \$63.4 billion, having increased by 4.3% just since the first of the year, proving that even in this pathetic economy, it's still possible to do well if you're a pal of Barack Obama's.

Speaking of he who seems intent on being Putin's favorite bitch, Obama has managed to become the biggest scofflaw to have ever had the key to the White House. For in addition to his obvious contempt for the Constitution's clearly specified separation of powers, he has personally seen to it that various federal agencies don't enforce laws regarding drugs, marriage and illegal aliens.

In one of my favorite movies, "It's a Wonderful Life," Clarence Odbody, Angel Second Class, decides to grant George Bailey's wish to have never been born as a way to show him what a difference his seemingly nondescript life has made in the lives of others.

The differences range from his uncle winding up in a mental asylum and George's wife Mary ending up a spinster. It also includes a thousand American G.I.s dying when their troop ship is sunk, because George's brother, Harry, whose own life had been saved by George years earlier, wasn't around to save theirs.

I feel that for the past five years, thanks to Obama, we Americans have been living in the hellhole Bedford Falls became once George wasn't around to do battle with the town's evil banker, the corrupt and soulless Mr. Potter.

Over the years, a lot of American presidents have been depicted on screen. Off the top of my head, I recall mediocre movies devoted to Andrew Jackson, both of the Roosevelt's, Wilson, Truman, Nixon and, of course, Lincoln. It seems to me

that if they ever get around to devoting one to Obama, they might consider calling it the third version of "Despicable Me."

Burt's Webcast is every Wednesday at 1 PM Pacific Time.

Tune in at K4HD.com His Call-in Number is: (818) 570-5443

©2014 Burt Prelutsky. Comments? Write 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.