

# 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!***

---

## **"The Cesspool at 1600 Pennsylvania Ave" and "Cruel & Unusual Punishment"**

A friend of mine, after taking note of Obama's approach to foreign affairs, has decided that his doctrine is to speak softly and carry a big grudge. But if you stop and think about it, that also sums up his domestic policies, which seem aimed at burdening the middle class with additional taxes; a health system that will be the envy of nobody on earth, including the folks in Bangladesh; and an EPA and IRS that are out to target

anyone who didn't contribute to Obama's re-election campaign.

In other news, John Hinckley, 58, would-be assassin and would-be swain of lesbian actress Jodie Foster, is now a free man. It's only a rumor that in his rush to appoint left-wing dingbats to the federal bench, Obama is considering appointing Mr. Hinckley to the 9th Circuit Court of Appeals, where he would be right at home with the other liberal nutburgers. After all, he established his bona fides by trying to off conservative icon Ronald Reagan.

As I appreciate anything that saves my doing heavy lifting, I'd like to share an email I received from a reader named Juan Motie. He was writing in response to a piece in which I stated that Harry Reid owed his political career to Nevada's unions and casino owners. He wrote: "You're not entirely correct. In the general election of 2010, the establishment GOP Party in Nevada abandoned its own candidate, Sharon Angle, and came out vocally and financially in support of Harry Reid. Those traitorous Republicans formed a PAC, calling themselves "Republicans for Reid." That was because these turncoats were upset that their fair-haired girl, Sue Loudon, had lost the primary election to Ms. Angle, the Tea Party favorite.

"In 2010, another unhelpful factor was Wayne LaPierre of the NRA sharing a stage with Reid at the grand opening of a shooting range in southern Nevada. There was LaPierre shucking and jiving with Reid, acting as if he and Reid were the best of friends. While it seems that the NRA made no formal endorsement of Reid, I'm sure LaPierre's actions swayed a large number of wavering voters."

So it would appear that Chris Christie isn't the only loony tune who doesn't think twice about betraying the Republican Party.

There's a good chance you missed the news about Benghazi, considering how disinterested the media is in exposing the

truth about Obama and his stooges. Ironically, it seems there is finally a smoking gun covered in dirty fingerprints belonging to members of this rabidly anti-gun administration that sheds new light on the 2012 massacre that left four dead Americans in its wake.

In a memo written seven weeks before the presidential election by the Deputy National Security Advisor to the President, Ben Rhodes reminded everyone in the White House that "...the purpose of the talking points" Susan Rice was to deliver on five Sunday morning news shows "were meant to underscore that the protest was rooted in an Internet video, and not a broader failure of policy."

A dozen senior members of Obama's inner circle were copied. Among them was serial liar Jay ("Don't call me Pinocchio") Carney, who looks like a choir boy, but lies like a sleazebag running for office.

Sen. Ed Markey (D-MA) wants the government to track down hate speech wherever it can be found. One, I doubt if the senator and I would agree on what constitutes hate speech. But, two, I am quite willing to admit I hate Sen. Markey and every other self-appointed censor who is looking to trim the 1st Amendment to suit his partisan agenda, while pretending that they're just being sensitive to the bruised feelings of their liberal base.

But in the unlikely event that Markey is having a difficult time tracking down the haters, I would suggest that he pay closer attention to what the likes of Obama, Pelosi, Reid, Rangel, Durbin, Schumer and Debbie Wasserman-Schultz, have to say about Republicans in general and Tea Partiers in particular.

It's possible that you are already aware that the U.S. pays the lion's share of the bills, between two and three billion dollars a year, keeping the U.N. afloat. As stupid and as

essentially immoral as that is, considering what a gang of cockroaches and cut-throats inhabit the place, and that Russia has the authority to veto anything they like or, rather, dislike, that's only the tip of the scum-covered iceberg. It seems we also send foreign aid to 145 nations, and that among those with whom we share this largesse are – if you're standing, please be seated, and if you're seated, please lie down – Cuba, Venezuela, Iran, Rwanda, Turkey, Mexico, Sudan, Pakistan, Iraq, Brazil, Cambodia, Yemen, Afghanistan, China, Russia, North Korea and those folks in Gaza who go by the name of Hamas.

It's bad enough when a little kid gets bullied out of his lunch money. But for America to voluntarily cough up tens of billions of dollars, especially, when we're already in the hole for 17 trillion bucks, you'd think someone in Washington would not only insist we stop digging, but would hide the damn shovel.

### **CRUEL & UNUSUAL PUNISHMENT**

It's an odd paradox, but I understand those who commit cold-blooded murder better than I do those people who attend vigils outside prisons where killers are being executed. The murderers, after all, are evil, making their acts, along with those of rapists and child molesters, comprehensible. When such a crime is committed and people say, "How could anyone do such a thing?" conservatives know the answer is: "They're the evil spawn of Satan."

Liberals, on the other hand, assume that nobody, except conservatives are truly evil, and that bad behavior can inevitably be traced back to capitalism. If it weren't for money, they're convinced we'd all be living in condos in the Garden of Eden. They never bother explaining how money or the lack thereof motivates rape or the sexual abuse of children, but logic, as you may have noticed, is never their strong suit.

Therefore, it was no surprise to me that when the lethal injection given to Clayton Lockett wasn't as painless as advertised, the pinheads had a major hissy fit.

The fact that Lockett was guilty of murder, rape and burying a 19-year-old woman, Stephanie Neiman, alive was of no concern to the self-righteous loons, but they were morally outraged that the monster had experienced some discomfort while being executed.

Well, I'm outraged by their outrage. The fact that he took 43 minutes to finally die of a heart attack hardly compares to the time it took Ms. Neiman to suffocate in a shallow grave. The 15 years Lockett got to live after killing the only child of the Neimans is the thing that should offend the sensibilities of normal human beings.

If it had been up to me, Lockett would have been spared the chemical injection. Instead, if we were truly a moral society, he would have been locked away in a dungeon shortly after he was convicted, where he would then be gnawed to death by rats.

Speaking of immorality, it took about 70 years for elderly American G.I.s to finally receive the medals they were entitled to after being interned in a World War II POW camp. It seems the problem was that they weren't in a camp run by Nazis, but by the Swiss. Because we generally think of Switzerland, if we ever think of Switzerland at all, as the happy land of chocolate and cuckoo clocks, we tend to overlook the fact that they are as corrupt a nation as any place on earth.

When you consider their stringent banking laws, which, in the main, serve little purpose other than to safeguard the accounts of Nazis, drug dealers and various dictators – tyrants ranging from Idi Amin to Yasser Arafat, from al-Assad to Vladimir Putin – their death grip on the pilfered funds of Jews who were herded off to the German death camps; and their

much-flaunted, extremely profitable neutrality, the only clean thing about them are their streets!

A reader, Tom Halleck, shared an item he'd come across on the Internet: "The way Obama is slashing military defense, Putin might decide to take over New York City instead of eastern Ukraine. In fact, if he displaced Mayor Bill de Blasio, it would result in less communist control of that city."

With the current administration, just when you think it couldn't get worse, it gets worse. Ever since the 9/11/2012 attack on our consulate in Benghazi, Barack Obama, Hillary Clinton, Susan Rice and the State Department, have told us one lie after another, trying to conceal their involvement in the massacre. Because the narrative, constantly parroted by Obama in his presidential campaign that GM was alive, but Osama bin Laden was dead and Al Qaeda was on life-support, they had to pretend that the assault was an impromptu response to an anti-Islamic video nobody had ever seen. Then, to better sell the charade, they sent an armed response to arrest and imprison the producer of the video, after refusing to lift a finger to save American lives in Libya.

Even after they lied about the cause of the bloody event and the reason they hadn't sent the additional security Ambassador Stevens had pleaded for, they lied to the parents of the murder victims in the presence of four flag-draped caskets, insisting that they would do everything in their power to capture or kill the Islamic jihadists responsible for the carnage. They not only knew they were lying, but compounded the sin by then concealing the truth from Congress.

It is only now that, thanks to Judicial Watch obtaining previously concealed and/or redacted documents and emails, that we are finding evidence that after the initial cover-up, Obama and his cohorts have been as busy as psychotic beavers covering up the cover-up.



To answer Hillary Clinton's plaintive question, it makes a hell of a big difference, and anyone who would still consider voting for the arrogant shrew in 2016 would be better off holding moonlight vigils for convicted killers.

Most of them, after all, only have the blood of one innocent victim on their hands, not four!

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

---

## **The Language of Weasels**

Some group or other recently voted on words and terms they would like to see banished in 2013. The top five vote-getters were "trending," "spoiler alert," "superfood," "guru" and, predictably, "fiscal cliff." I must confess that I had not been overly aware of "guru" in 2012 and had not heard a single reference to "superfood," which would explain why I have no idea what it means. And while I think that pepperoni pizza fits the description, I have a hunch that whatever TV chef was tossing the term around willy-nilly doesn't. I'm guessing it will turn out to be some overpriced item like truffles, which nobody would have the slightest interest in if it sold for a dollar-a-pound and didn't require trained pigs to dig it up.

As you might have guessed, I have my own list. I would do away with "distinguished" when referring to a politician. And I mean any politician. So far as I'm concerned, the word is employed far too often and applied far too generously to people who do nothing more than vote for a living. In a sane world, it would only be applied to military heroes, firemen

and conservative columnists, especially those residing in such left-wing bastions as California.

I would also do away with the word "revenue." West of the Potomac, the correct word is "taxes." But politicians, especially one named Obama, realizing that there are four-letter words that have greater acceptance in polite society than that five-letter obscenity, have found it safer to say they merely want to raise revenue. Unless I miss my guess, even that seemingly benign word will disappear, as more and more people catch on, and be replaced by one that from early childhood we have all come to love. Therefore, I suspect that in 2013, we will hear liberals insisting that it's our patriotic duty to send "gifts" to the federal government on April 15th.

Another word I like to see go the way of the dodo is "unions." Although my particular bugaboo is public sector unions, it recently came to my attention how dangerous private sector unions are to society. In December, we came very close to the nation's longshoremen shutting down 14 major ports on the Atlantic and Gulf coasts. For all intents and purposes, 14,000 dock workers could have shut down our economy, as if Obama and his stooges in Congress need any help in that area. At this point, we're enjoying a one month moratorium, but the strike could still take place before the end of January.

I don't know what the cargo handlers are asking for, but I'm betting that the answer is to be found in the immortal words of Samuel Gompers, the founder of the American Federation of Labor, who, when asked what labor wants, answered, "We want more, and when it becomes more, we shall still want more and we shall never cease to demand more."

The man who led the AFL for half of his 74 years also said, "It is impossible for capitalism and labor to have common interests." The proof of that particular pudding can be seen in the recent demise of Hostess Brands, Inc. At the cost of

18,500 jobs, the union had the satisfaction of bringing the maker of Twinkies, Wonder Bread and America's favorite cupcakes, to its knees and then putting a bullet in its head. Come to think of it, perhaps "superfood" was a reference to Hostess's line of bakery products.

I used to believe that perhaps the most ignominious title one could cart around was New York Times editorial writer, MSNBC host or Nobel Peace Prize recipient, but by now I have to regard Secretary of State as a strong contender. After all, in just the past 30-odd years, we've had the likes of Ed Muskie, Alexander Haig, Madeleine Albright, Colin Powell, Hillary Clinton and, presumably, John Kerry, serving as the guiding lights of our foreign policy. Let's face it – that's a group you wouldn't trust to babysit your cat.

Frankly, the notion that Secretary Clinton appears to once again be first in line to run for the presidency in 2016 fills me with angst, which is a ten dollar word for nausea. We have all grown accustomed to women being held in high regard for no better reason than they got some fellow to marry them. The politically incorrect list includes everyone from Coretta King and Winnie Mandela to Imelda Marcos, Madame Nhu, Evita Peron and Michelle Obama. But nobody ever seriously referred to any of them as the smartest person in the world.

But aside from marrying Bill, Hillary's not so distinguished resume consists in having been a corrupt lawyer in Arkansas, a mediocre senator from New York and the Secretary of State who oversaw the murder of her ambassador to Libya and three other gallant Americans, and then mimicked the three monkeys in the shameful aftermath.

Other than that, so far as I can see, her only notable accomplishment consists in having done for pants suits what Muammar Gaddafi did for movie usher uniforms.

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

---

# The Perfect Metaphor: Unions Tearing Down ‘Prosperity’

☒ Very rarely does the perfect metaphor present itself, but it sure did on Tuesday when videos started surfacing online of an incident that took place in Lansing, Michigan.

On the lawn of the Michigan State Capitol, union supporters protesting “right to work” legislation turned into an angry mob and attacked a large tent owned by *Americans for Prosperity*, a conservative group that is supporting the legislation. With several people inside the tent, the protesters began tearing it down and slashing it apart with knives. One of the videos shows conservative activist, Steven Crowder, being punched in the face by one of the protesters while someone else is heard shouting, “I’ll kill the mother f\*cker with a gun. I’ve killed plenty of mother f\*ckers with a gun.”

Unions tearing down ‘Prosperity’. I can’t think of a more accurate visual representation of the modern day role of organized labor.

Of course, this isn’t the only recent example we’ve seen of unions-gone-wild. It was just last year that union supporters busted into and vandalized the Wisconsin State Capitol after Governor Scott Walker’s bill to limit collective bargaining rights was passed. The result was \$8 million in damage, billed to Wisconsin taxpayers.

It’s moments like this that really point out the glaring hypocrisy of not just the mainstream media, but liberalism as a whole.

For years now, the media has gone to great lengths to paint the Tea Party movement as a group of angry, extremists who are inherently dangerous to the country. Yet, all along they've been a peaceful movement standing on a simple message. They don't vandalize property. They don't physically assault anyone. There's never been any such thing as *Tea Party mob violence*.

*Big Labor* is clearly another story. To the media, however, the plight of the union protester is a romantic one – the little guy standing up to the rich and greedy CEO. Very rarely do we ever see major news outlets spotlighting union violence. And when they do, they often try to rationalize it as a forgivable reaction brought on by passion. That's because the media largely believes that the *end justifies the means* when it comes to the unions. And if the *means* include some broken property and some black eyes, so be it. Nothing to see here...Move along.

You know, it's interesting to hear what these angry protesters have to say when a microphone is held in front of their faces. Their fury comes from the notion of co-workers being given the choice of whether or not to join their union. Rather than viewing the option as an incentive for the unions to make themselves more attractive to workers, they lash out at those who decide that belonging to a union is not in their best interest. They call those people "scabs" and express outrage over them enjoying *union benefits* without paying *union dues*.

People enjoying benefits at the cost of others... Hey, that sounds kind of familiar.

How is it anything but completely hypocritical for the media, President Obama, and other liberals to sympathize with organized labor's viewpoint, when they go absolutely ballistic over Mitt Romney pointing out that half the country doesn't pay taxes, yet is afforded the services paid for by those who do? How is it anything but hypocritical for them to vilify the

top-earning Americans who pay the vast majority of the country's taxes, while victimizing the fifty percent of people who don't pay a cent, yet enjoy government-provided services for free?

The selective outrage is remarkable, yet not all that surprising.

The good news is that Michigan now has a chance to demonstrate once again what other "right to work" states have already proven: Side-stepping organized labor is a positive path toward prosperity. It's time to take that tent and pitch it back up.