

I Bring You Good News About the Race for President. And Bad News.

In a country of more than 300 million people Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton are currently the two frontrunners in the race for the White House. This raises an important question: *WHAT?*

As one website put it, "Clinton and Trump combine for the most-hated frontrunner duo in favorability polling history." And in the wisdom of the American people, these are the two they're currently picking to win their respective party's nomination for president – the two with the lowest favorability numbers? This raises another question: Is that because Justin Bieber wasn't eligible since he's Canadian?

Here are the average Favorability ratings for Hillary Clinton collected by RealClearPolitics:

Unfavorable: 54.2%

Favorable: 40.2%

Margin: -14%

But there's a sliver of sunshine in those numbers for Hillary. And the sliver has a name: Donald Trump. Here's what the voters think about him:

Unfavorable: 64.5%

Favorable: 29.4%

Margin: -35.1

Trump, who makes a lot of promises he can't actually keep, says Hillary Clinton would be "easy to beat." But that's not what the polls say. The RealClearPolitics average has Hillary

beating Donald 49.6 percent to 39 percent.

That's no surprise since Donald has offended just about every group he'd need to win the presidency.

In critical times it's not only important to state the obvious, but to state it often. So here goes, again: **This will not end well for the Republican Party.**

I say that with total confidence – *as of this moment*. If Donald starts acting like a grownup and Hillary gets indicted, then, who knows? I might – repeat might – change my forecast.

So let's end with some good news/bad news about our choices this time around. The good news stems from a memory I have growing up in the South Bronx. Grownups used to tell us kids that in this great country of ours, anybody could become President. The bad news is ... it looks like it's true.

The Democratic Party's Stereotyping of Muslims



Here's a question for you: If one person speaks out against "radical Islam," and another person insists that the first person's condemnation be taken in the context of *all* Muslims, which of those two people is stereotyping Muslims?

If your answer is the second person, it's probably because you noticed that the first person is describing a highly distinguishable subset of a particular faith, whose categorization is based on their actions.

If your answer is the first person, you're probably a Democrat – or even more likely a Democratic politician.

Earlier this month, at the CBS Democratic presidential debate, a moderator asked candidate Hillary Clinton if she agreed with Senator Marco Rubio's statement that the United States is at war with "Radical Islam."

Clinton answered, "I don't think we're at war with Islam. I don't think we're at war with all Muslims."

Of course, that wasn't the question she was asked. Neither Rubio nor any of the other Republican presidential candidates have claimed that we're at war with Islam or all Muslims. Yet, Clinton chose to twist Rubio's statement into an indictment of everyone of the Muslim faith.

Clinton is by no means alone in her assessment that a critique of 'radical Islam' is a critique of Islam. Much of her political party wholeheartedly agrees. In fact, the DNC put out a [YouTube video this week](#) entitled "Inciting fear isn't presidential," that features clips of GOP candidates speaking

out *specifically* against radical Islamic terrorists. Following each clip is a caption like “equating Islam, all Muslims, with terrorists...”

The video is truly extraordinary in its insulting attempt to convince viewers that they didn't really hear what they just heard leaving the candidates' mouths. It's a technique I actually use quite regularly with my children in my car when they ask if I can turn down the radio, and I respond by saying, “Turn it up? No problem!”

The video goes on to show clips from old George W. Bush speeches, in which the former president is careful in his wording not to equate Islamic terrorism with all Muslims. The intent of the video-makers is apparently to draw a contrast between Bush's rhetoric and that of the 2016 candidates, even though there's no notable difference. In all cases, Republicans are singling out the radical elements, while the Democrats are assuring they all be lumped together.

Going back to Secretary Clinton's answer at the CBS debate, she was surprisingly (and refreshingly) called out by the moderator for her misrepresentation of what Marco Rubio had actually said. She was then forced to start her response over, and she finished her answer this way:

“We are at war with violent extremism. We are at war with people who use their religion for purposes of power and oppression. And yes, we are at war with those people, but I don't want us to be painting with too broad a brush.”



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

The problem is that Hillary Clinton and her fellow Democrats **do** want Muslims to be painted with that *broad brush*, at least when it serves them politically. Much like how the Dems willfully omit the word "illegal" from the term "illegal immigration," they've once again created a bigoted straw man that they have applied to the opposition party, in hopes of garnishing votes.

Whether the topic is terrorism, immigration, law enforcement, or the War on Women, people like Hillary Clinton are, in fact, enthusiastic proponents of stereotyping ethnicities. It's something they take pride in, and it's the lifeblood of the grievance culture for which they rely on to stay in power.

Adjectives matter, and the calculated omission of adjectives by the *party of diversity* says a lot about how it views its supporters.

A Few Sad Truths

Only a liberal dunce could seriously contend that the exclusion of four of 20 contraceptive options constitutes a war on women. And yet in the wake of the Supreme Court ruling in the Hobby Lobby case, that is exactly what people like Hillary Clinton, Sandra Fluke and the three politically partisan harpies on the Court, Kagan, Ginsburg and Sotomayor, would have you believe.

As I see it, the fact that young women actually expect that people with whom they're not having sex should provide them with free birth control pills is clear evidence that the real war is the one being waged on the American taxpayer and commonsense.

I realize that Sen. Thad Cochran's primary victory in Mississippi is being appealed by his challenger, Tea Party favorite Chris McDaniel. If I lived in that state, I very likely would have voted for the challenger. But the real mystery is why on earth registered Democrats are allowed to cross over and vote in a Republican primary. I'm not asking as a conservative. After all, I assume Republicans are also allowed to vote in Democratic primaries. But how dumb is that!

It's bad enough when the Democrats financially support the Republican candidate in a primary because they assume he or she will be the easiest to defeat in the general election or when they run a fake Republican in the general election, hoping to fool a sufficient number of dummies into splitting the vote with the actual nominee. But a state really has to be addicted to stupid pills to have open primaries, which negates the whole purpose of having primaries in the first place. What's next, declaring the winner of a Mississippi election to be the candidate who receives the fewest number of votes?

Recently, after encountering "ISIS" in one of my articles, a

reader wrote, asking what I was referencing. I explained that the scumbags currently overrunning the cesspool known as Iraq started out calling themselves the Islamic State in Iraq and Syria before, like certain show biz celebrities, shortening their name to the Islamic State. But my first reaction to being asked to define ISIS was to channel my inner Bill Clinton. I then immediately took a shower.

Speaking of congenital liars, it occurred to me the other day that the only time Barack Obama can be trusted to tell the truth is when he's telling his fellow jihadists the date upon which the U.S. will be withdrawing its troops from a war zone.

I wasn't a great fan of either George H.W. Bush or his son, but even compared to them, Obama is the ultimate bush leaguer. For the life of me, I can't imagine why his approval ratings remain in double figures or how it is that any Democrat in the House or Senate can refrain from calling him out over Benghazi, the VA, the IRS or his constant trashing of the Constitution. Is it conceivable that Satan has worked out the traditional swap of eternal damnation for successful careers with each and every one of them?

Somewhere in this formerly great nation not only is there a young slacker who looks at Obama and says to himself, "If he can be elected president, so can I," but somewhere else there is a young ne'er-do-well who is perfecting his or her lying skills so that one day he or she might be Hillary Clinton's press secretary.

If you dare point out that black politicians are among the dumbest and most corrupt in Washington or that most of the problems plaguing black Americans are self-inflicted, you will be labeled a racist. That's the case even if you happen to be a black American. That is one of the reasons that I so admire Jason Riley, a black man who is an editorial writer for the Wall Street Journal and an occasional panelist on Bret Baier's "Special Report." In his recent book, "Please Stop Helping

Us,” a scathing indictment of white liberals, Mr. Riley makes a strong and logical case against both affirmative action and the minimum wage.

In one of the book’s more memorable lines, Riley writes that “having a black man in the Oval Office is less important than having one in the home,” summing up in 17 words something that too many liberal Americans – black and white – don’t like to talk about, not publicly anyway, fearing it would just be giving ammunition to the “enemy.”

Finally, my recent poll was such a rousing success that I have decided to conduct my own version of a recent national poll. People were asked to name the worst of the 12 presidents since the end of WWII. I, on the other hand, will ask that you rate the three worst in order, with the worst being #1. Your choices are Harry Truman, Dwight Eisenhower, John Kennedy, Lyndon Johnson, Richard Nixon, Gerald Ford, Jimmy Carter, Ronald Reagan, George H.W. Bush, Bill Clinton, George W. Bush and Barack Obama.

You are also invited to vote for the Best of the dozen.

The voting deadline will be 48 hours after the posting of this article. Send your votes to me at BurtPrelutsky@aol.com.

**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](http://BurtPrelutsky.com). Comments? Write BurtPrelutsky@aol.com.

State of the Union, Why Don’t

They Ask?

✘ The President laid out his agenda in the State of the Union Address, and it was filled with initiatives and statements similar to what he has said before. It gives the media the opportunity to ask questions that they have neglected in the past. Statements that were presented as facts also need clarification. Up until now, the President and the White House press secretary have escaped answering important questions. We should continue to wonder why the following clarifications and challenging questions are not asked.

Mr. President: In your speech you spoke about universal preschool. Almost every study concludes that there can be temporary effects, but by the 3rd grade there is no lasting impact of preschool. In these challenging budgetary times, why are you pushing for increasing a program that has shown such a universally agreed lack of results?

Mr. President: With your interest in raising the minimum wage, can you show any time this policy has led to more employment? Didn't unemployment increase when you and a Democratic Congress raised the minimum wage in 2009?

Mr. President: You said that you have cut two and half trillion dollars of the \$4 trillion that economists say is needed to show a sustainable path. If it is assumed that part of your \$2.5 trillion claim is the \$1.2 trillion sequester, then why are you advocating delaying and reducing these cuts, before they're even implemented, while counting them toward this goal? The figure of \$4 trillion was put out more than three years ago. With your delay in dealing with this problem, many groups have changed it to \$6 trillion to make up for the time squandered. Are you aware of this? Is there going to ever be a year in our government's future where we will spend less than the year before?

Mr. President: You have said that you are waiting for Congress to act on climate change, and if they don't, you will. If climate change is truly as devastating to our future as you have expressed, and you have this power that you stated in the speech, then why won't you act now?

Mr. President: You said that none of your proposals will add one dime to the deficit. Certainly, most of these proposals cost money. Can you tell us what you are proposing to cut or what taxes are you proposing to increase in order to pay for each of these new initiatives?

Mr. President: You continue to reference the Cayman Islands and people having bank accounts offshore as a loophole in the tax code. Can you tell us the loophole in the tax code that you're referring to, and your proposal to eliminate it? Could you be misstating the fact that other countries have lower taxes, and it is wise for a company to locate their headquarters outside the United States for that reason?

Mr. President: You had a very emotional appeal on gun control in your speech. Gun control has not proven to be effective in reducing gun violence anywhere that it has been tried. What is your reason for supporting the proposed gun-control legislation?

Mr. President: You implied in your speech, and have stated in the past, that the Washington "dysfunction" and arguing over policy are causing the economy to underperform. A time period that you often refer to in terms of economic success is the 1990's. During that time, Newt Gingrich was Speaker of the House, and the Republicans controlled the Senate as well. Their disagreements with President Clinton led to two government shutdowns. This shows how the "dysfunction" in Washington was much worse at that time than it is now. Shouldn't we look at your policies and actions to explain the lack of economic performance rather than the fact that there are continuing arguments in Washington?

Perhaps some adventurous reporter will now have the opportunity to ask for clarification on these issues...but probably not.

Was This Rubio's Fatal Sip?

☒ Did Florida Senator Marco Rubio, a likely Republican contender for president in 2016, destroy his political career by taking a sip of water on national television? CNN and some of the other slavishly Democratic-liberal news outlets seem to think so – or at least hope so.

Rubio was giving a speech rebutting President Obama's State of the Union message the other night, and as public speakers often do, he decided to wet his whistle. His fatal error, it appears, was to have placed his water bottle out of reach, rather than in front of him, as is customary. So he had to cross the screen to reach his bottle and take a swig.

I'm not exactly sure why, but the news commentators are calling this a "bungle." Will potential voters in the next presidential election ever be able to take Rubio seriously, now that he has revealed that he gets thirsty and drinks water? Worst of all, did he demonstrate an inability to plan ahead?

Obviously he did, so how can we even consider him for President?

If the time comes when Rubio, sitting in the situation room, has to launch a nuclear attack against one of our enemies – say, Israel – will he forget to bring the military aide with the codes into the room with him?

This reminds me of how the media managed to turn the fact that the Mormon Mitt Romney was a teetotaler into a black mark against him. Who would want a president who wasn't manly enough to throw back a drink or two with his buddies? To be certain that all bases were covered, it also was suggested that Romney's claims of being a non-drinker may have been bogus. We all know Mormons who don't take their church's anti-drinking mandate seriously, so why should we believe Romney's declarations of purity?

Clearly, Rubio has a few things to learn before he can be considered for the Top Spot. First of all, no more water. Gordon's gin, perhaps, to win over East Coast limousine liberals, or some moonshine to solidify his party's grip on voters in the Ozark states.

There are nearly four years left before the next presidential election, so I am hoping that Rubio will learn what it takes to be President of the United States in the modern era. What we used to think of as the mainstream in this country is the mainstream no longer. If Rubio wants to bond with the American majority, here are some things he will have to do.

- 1.) Cheat on his wife with a man, then marry him.
- 2.) Hire an underage female intern to help out in his senatorial office, and engage in oral sex with her.
- 3.) Dispense with the water bottle when he is on the podium and replace it with a mirror covered with half a dozen lines of cocaine. Learn the street meaning of "smoke" and "blow," both essential to any President's vocabulary.
- 4.) Instead of hugging and patting on the back the politicians who introduce him to campaign crowds, take them in a firm embrace and give them a deep French kiss. This works best with men.
- 5.) Renounce his U.S. citizenship, establish residency in

Mexico, then illegally cross the border into the United States and refuse to speak English. If anyone asks, say he was born in Hawaii.

6.)Cut a rap record, calling for the murder of police officers. Suggested title: "The Ballad of Christopher Dorner."

7.)Make a well-publicized campaign visit to a Planned Parenthood clinic, and help the medical team carry out an abortion while the flashbulbs, among other things, pop.

8.)Declare that religion is a crock, that there is no God, and then show how he can prove it.

He may find it difficult to stomach some of these tactics, but they are his best chance of establishing an image that today's American majority considers beyond reproach.