

# Poll: Will The Mueller Report Be Released?



**Do you think Robert Mueller's final report on the Russian investigation will be released, and who do you think will get to see it?**

Take the poll below...



## Will the Mueller Report be released?

- Yes, the full version to both Congress and the public
- Yes, the full version, but just to Congress
- Yes, a redacted version to both Congress and the public
- Yes, a redacted version, but just to Congress
- No

---

Results Vote

## Will the Mueller Report be released?

---

Yes, the full version to both Congress and the public 2 ( 6.25 % )

Yes, the full version, but just to Congress 0 ( 0 % )

Yes, a redacted version to both Congress and the public 26 ( 81.25 % )

Yes, a redacted version, but just to Congress 3 ( 9.38 % )

No 1 ( 3.13 % )

---

[Back](#)

true	FTTB	85	5		15
1	center	true			Coming Soo
Thank You !					

---



---

## **“Is It Murder Or Suicide?” and “Education, Politics & Racism”**

There are times when I suspect that people like Obama, Reid, Pelosi, Schumer, Boxer and Durbin, should have their photos on the wall of the post office as suspects in the killing of America. Other times, I remember that all of these people, along with the likes of Elijah Cummings, Brad Sherman, Henry Waxman, Sheila Jackson Lee and Debbie Wasserman-Schultz, have all been elected numerous times, so perhaps it's America that's chosen to commit suicide.

As many of you recall, a doctor named Jack Kevorkian was generally reviled for assisting the terminally ill achieve a painless death. Some people called him a vulture. I was not one of them. It seems to me that if a person chooses to end

his pain and suffering by ending his life, he shouldn't be denied that which we bestow, ironically, on both our beloved pets and the vilest serial killers.

But some of us aren't yet ready to go, and we certainly aren't complacent about the homicidal impulses of the so-called Progressives. Everywhere we turn, we see them actively attempting to destroy America. We see them weakening our military, alienating our traditional allies, destroying the economy and erasing our borders. And none of these things are happening accidentally or as the result of unfortunate circumstances.

A friend of mine, Dr. Harry Maller, suggested that because Obama attended Columbia, perhaps he got his agenda from Cloward and Piven, two Columbia professors, rather than from Chicago's Saul Alinsky. My own guess is that all three of them influenced young Obama.

Those of you who only know the names of Richard Cloward (1926-2001) and his wife, Frances Fox Piven, born in 1932 but still alive, from Glenn Beck might not know that their claim to fame was an article written in 1966, titled "The Weight of the Poor: A Strategy to End Poverty," that appeared in The Nation. At the time they were both professors at the Columbia University School of Social Work.

Basically, the plan they proposed called for overloading the U.S. welfare system in order to precipitate a crisis that they believed would inevitably lead to replacing it with a guaranteed annual income. As they saw it, the bonus is that it would shore up support for the Democratic Party.

In recent years, we've seen signs of this strategy all around us. It is no accident, after all, that there are 48 million Americans now receiving free food through SNAP, that millions more are receiving extended unemployment benefits, that Medicaid is ballooning to the bursting point thanks to the

Affordable Care Act, and that disability checks are being mailed out every month to a legion of shameless liars and cheats.

To see the strategy at work before your very eyes, you need only look to the southern border, where every day hundreds of illegal aliens, many of them children, are throwing themselves on the mercy of our welfare system. And the reason they keep coming is because this administration keeps inviting them, and because, like every other previous administration, it refuses to build a wall.

But it's not the politicians alone who are guilty of this outrage to our sovereignty. They are aided and abetted by the Catholic and Evangelical churches. Priests and ministers collude in claiming they are merely following Christ's teachings when they collect the illegal aliens, feed them, clean them, and then bus them to outlying cities and even other states.

Funny, but I don't recall reading where Jesus told anyone to over-run America by destroying our schools, undermining our economy and over-taxing our social services. They can put all the lipstick, mascara and rouge, they like on this particular pig, but their main purpose in flouting the law and common sense is to fill their respective pews.

As for the liberal politicians who condone this scandalous behavior, I find it peculiar that at the same time they promote diversity – at least when it comes to pigmentation and sexual proclivities – they're encouraging one specific group, Hispanics, to invade this nation.

For this reason, and so many more, I would like to see Barack Obama impeached. But not now, when it would only serve to draw attention away from all the scandals bedeviling the Democrats. But once the midterm elections are over and the Republicans have taken control of the Senate, I want to see Obama tried

for high crimes and misdemeanors. It's bad enough that this bum has managed to conceal all of his essential documents. But it would be criminal if he didn't face prosecution for turning the IRS, the FBI and even the U.S. Patent Office, into his own personal attack dogs, and for violating both the letter and the spirit of the U.S. Constitution.

Finally, a friend suggested that I poll my readers. It makes sense. After all, we are always being asked to pay attention to polls conducted by the likes of Fox News, the NY Times, Gallup, Frank Luntz, Zogby and Pew. So while I understand that my readers don't actually represent a cross-section of the American public because they tend to be both conservative and literate, I would be very interested in hearing from you.

The poll consists of four and a half questions: (1) Which of the TV commentators do you trust the most? (2) What do you consider to be the biggest problem facing America today? (Please limit it to a single issue, and not just say the creep in the Oval Office. That's a given.) (3) Do you agree that Obama should face impeachment in 2015? (4) Who would you most like to see the Republicans nominate in 2016? (4a) Who would you least like to see at the top of the GOP ticket?

Please reply to me at [BurtPrelutsky@aol.com](mailto:BurtPrelutsky@aol.com).

At least now you'll have to quit bad-mouthing polls simply because no pollster has ever asked for your opinion.

### **"Education, Politics & Racism"**

I never want people to assume that just because I have questions about colleges and universities, I oppose education. It's just that the current system makes no sense. For one thing, the cost of a college education has increased by 1,200% over the past three decades. That is twice the rate at which the cost of health care has soared. But at least until Obama tossed the monkey wrench known as the Affordable Care Act into the works, health care just kept getting better. Is there

anyone who would suggest that's been true about education, which has come to be better known as indoctrination?

That is why I keep suggesting that universities be turned into parks, and that higher education be turned over to trade schools, where not only carpentry, plumbing and auto mechanics are taught, but medicine, law and architecture.

The lie that's usually brought forth by the status quo crowd is that students need all those pricey undergrad classes in order to be well-rounded. But the fact is that it's only the bank accounts of professors, administrators and football coaches, that have become fatter and the endowments that are bloated to the breaking point.

Republicans have become somewhat accustomed to being called racists whenever they object to affirmative action, increased welfare or to any of Obama's unconstitutional edicts. At the same time, they are labeled racists if they merely call for photo I.D.s at polling places.

The obvious fact is that it's liberals who are the true bigots. They're the ones who keep insisting that even 50 years after the passage of the Equal Rights Amendment that blacks can't be expected to compete in schools or in the workplace. It is also liberals who lump the members of all minorities together, whereas conservatives have no trouble at all making the distinction between the bottom feeders who keep electing the likes of Barack Obama, Maxine Waters, Charles Rangel and Sheila Jackson Lee and people like Dr. Ben Carson, Thomas Sowell, Condoleezza Rice and Clarence Thomas.

For most Americans, the tragedy of slavery is two-fold. One, the enslavement of blacks left an indelible stain on the nation. Two, the endless guilt has left tens of millions of black Americans with a sense of victimhood and entitlement that has resulted in the economic enslavement of hundreds of millions of white people.

As I see it, the only good that can possibly come from the swapping of five Islamic terrorists for one Army deserter is that even some Democrats are getting fed up with Obama's arrogance and lack of patriotism and commonsense. It can only make it easier for Republicans in 2014 to take back the Senate and send Harry ("I'm glad we got rid of those terrorists") Reid out to pasture.

The reason that's so important is that it may be the only way to prevent Barack Obama from replacing one of the elderly justices on the Supreme Court with another Sonia Sotomayor or Elena Kagan, thus reversing the 5-4 majority that conservatives currently have.

Too many Republicans seem to lose sight of the fact that the Supreme Court is the legacy that presidents leave behind so that they can continue screwing the country decades after they've left the White House. That is why I find it so vexing when Republicans stay home during presidential elections for no better reason than that their personal favorite didn't garner the nomination. I mean, how stupid and irresponsible did someone have to be in 2012 to allow Obama to win a second term simply because Rick Santorum, Rand Paul or Newt Gingrich, wasn't on the ticket?

At this time, my biggest problem with the Court is that Americans who merely wish to protect the letter and the spirit of the Constitution lack the standing to bring a case before the Supremes. Unless an individual can prove that he personally – and not just the nation at large – has been harmed by a law or by a president who sees no reason to abide by the specific limitations on his authority, he's powerless to state his case, even if he or she is a member of Congress.

The midterm elections, though, are only a prelude to the all-important presidential election two years down the road. Possibly I'm being too optimistic, but it seems to me that if the Democrats can't come up with a better candidate than

Hillary (“What difference does it make?”) Clinton to succeed Barack (“America leaves no deserters behind, no matter the price”) Obama, it’s time for the Party to file bankruptcy.

**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).

---

## **You Know the Difference Between Genius and Stupidity?**

☒ Sometimes I wonder why pollsters ask the American people about anything. What’s the point? I mean, would Gallup ask someone from Uzbekistan if he thinks Mickey Mantle was a better centerfielder than Willie Mays? Would the NBC/Wall Street Journal polling outfit ask the average man on the street in Kabul if he prefers Canali or Hugo Boss? So why would a pollster ask Americans about almost anything not having to do with Dancing with the Stars?

If you think I’m channeling H.L. Mencken, who believed you’ll never go broke underestimating the intelligence of the American people, give yourself a gold star.

Still, we poll Americans on just about everything – even though a lot of folks don’t know much about anything.

Take several recent Rasmussen polls. In one, only 29 percent of likely voters said incumbent members of the House and Senate should be re-elected. That sounds smart, given that we now have more respect for bank robbers than politicians. Except come November, just about everybody in Congress will

be re-elected – *by these same people who told Rasmussen that that they wanted to kick the bums out.*

This is from Politico after the 2012 elections: “Despite rock-bottom congressional approval ratings, voters reelected their incumbents at near-banana-republic levels in 2012.” And what were those “near banana republic levels”? Try 90 percent. That’s right, 9 out of 10 members of the House and Senate who sought re-election were re-elected.

So the Rasmussen poll tells us nothing because the people Rasmussen polled are either duplicitous or don’t know what the word “incumbent” means.

Then there was the question about taxes. A whopping 69 percent of the Americans polled said the middle class pays a larger percentage in taxes than do the rich.

Here are the facts: The top one percent pays about 37 percent of all federal income taxes and the top five percent pays almost 60 percent.

So what’s the point, I ask again, in polling people who don’t know what they’re talking about? Are we supposed to learn something from their *lack of knowledge*?

And then there’s this: despite the fact that most Americans give the president low grades on his handling of the economy; despite the fact that most Americans say they don’t like ObamaCare; despite the fact that according to Rasmussen only 29 percent of likely voters think America is heading in the right direction – *despite all of that*, about half (49 percent) still approve of the job Mr. Obama is doing, according to Rasmussen. Huh?

Rush Limbaugh has a name for Americans who don’t know what’s going on. He calls them “low information” voters. Why in the world would a pollster ask these chuckleheads their opinions, for example, about how the president is handling the crisis in

Crimea – a place many of them undoubtedly never heard of or probably think has something to do with crime.

I have long thought that dolts should not be allowed to vote. But that's a discussion for another time. For now, let's simply agree that Rasmussen, Gallup, Quinnipiac and all the others who ask low information Americans what they think about complex issues are wasting our time.

But I don't want to leave any of you with the wrong impression. There most certainly are plenty of smart Americans out there whose opinions matter. And I would never suggest that most Americans are stupid. That would be rude. So I'll leave the last word to some guy named Albert Einstein, who once said: "Two things are infinite: the universe and human stupidity; and I'm not sure about the universe."

I for one have never heard of this Einstein fellow, who also said that the difference between genius and stupidity is that genius has its limits.

I don't get it – which makes me a perfect candidate to answer any questions Mr. Gallup or Mr. Rasmussen might have for me.

---

## **If Obama Thinks He Inherited a Mess Four Years Ago ...**

☒ I was part of a political panel over the weekend on the upcoming election. The first question was this: Given the weak economy, given the large number of Americans who can't find a job, and given that most Americans think the country is on the wrong track, why isn't Mitt Romney way out ahead?

Good question. One possibility is that the polls are tainted. No conspiracy to hurt Romney, just bad science. Maybe they're over-polling Democrats. Maybe they're assuming that the same number of Obama supporters will show up this time just as they did in 2008, which is not likely

But let's say the polls are accurate. Then why, given the state of the economy, an issue most voters say is most important to them, isn't Mitt Romney leading by 5 points or more?

Don't underestimate the likeability factor. Every poll has President Obama leading by a mile when asked which candidate is more likeable. That matters. I went back to every presidential election since Eisenhower-Stevenson in 1952, and the more likeable candidate won every time, except when Richard Nixon beat the Happy Warrior Hubert Humphrey.

That could explain why Romney, at best, is running neck-and-neck with the president.

And according to a new CBS News/New York Times poll, voters give President Obama a lead over Mitt Romney when asked which candidate would do a better job handling foreign policy, Medicare, health care, taxes – and this is a significant switch – even the economy and unemployment, where the president holds a one point lead over Romney. One point isn't much, that's for sure. But the economy was Romney's strength – an issue Romney won in the polls until now.

Only when asked who would do a better job with the federal budget deficit does Romney come out ahead of the president, 51 to 43 percent.

Most of the panelists, which included media pundits from the right and conservative activists, thought Romney would win, and win big. I think those people are either geniuses or certifiably nuts.

Yogi Berra was right when he said making predictions is hard, especially when they're about the future. But I still think Obama is the odds on favorite.

But if Mitt Romney manages to win, I'm guessing it will be because the Democrats couldn't get out the vote the way they did four years ago.

Young people enthusiastically supported the president last time around. They still favor him, but in smaller numbers. Four years ago a lot of them were in college. Today, a lot of them still can't find a job.

Hispanics probably won't come out in the same big numbers as for years ago, and neither will Jewish voters, which might matter in Florida. You can only make a first impression once. Obama made his in 2008. For a lot of his one-time supporters, the thrill is gone.

Barack Obama talks a lot about the economic mess he inherited four years ago. Wait till he sees the mess he inherits this time if he wins.

---

## Bad News for Barack Obama?

☒ Another day another poll. This one from The Hill, the Washington paper for political junkies. It was taken on September 2, just after the GOP convention in Tampa, of 1,000 likely voters.

And the results don't look good for Barack Obama.

Fifty-two percent of likely voters say the nation is in "worse

condition" now than it was in September 2008.

Only 31 percent of voters say the nation is in "better condition" today, while 15 percent say it is "about the same."

So, should the president be re-elected? A majority say no.

Fifty-four percent say President Obama doesn't deserve to be re-elected, based solely on his job performance. Only 40 percent say he does deserve a second term.

And what about the so-called centrists, independents, the voters who, especially in a close race, each candidate needs to win in November?

Fifty-six percent are unsatisfied with Mr. Obama's handling of the economy. Fifty-three percent say the country is worse off.

Fifty-two percent of voters who consider themselves centrists said President Obama does not deserve re-election based on his job performance.

It's no surprise that men (57 percent) are more likely than women (51 percent) to believe the president does not deserve re-election.

According to The Hill, "The results highlight the depth of voter dissatisfaction confronting Obama as he makes his case for a second term at this week's Democratic National Convention in Charlotte, N.C."

Despite all this, almost every poll shows the race too close to call.

So, the million dollar question: How can this be?

One possibility is that the American people still like Barack Obama, and likeability goes a long way in politics. But another possibility is that the voters may simply be lying to the pollsters.

A friend of mine, I'll call him Sigmund, wrote this to me the other day, outline three possible reasons the polls are wrong:

"1. Those polled don't want to be labeled racists [so they tell the pollsters they're going to vote for President Obama or that they're undecided].

2. Those polled are suspicious and distrustful of any perceived, institutional or political questions of any kind.

3. Those polled who are conservative either hang up or decline because they believe their vote is their vote, and none of our business, particularly in today's toxic environment and particularly among older voters who actually will vote."

Sigmund is an analytical guy and in this case may have the wisdom of Dr. Freud. And if he does, if he's on to something, that could be good news for Mitt Romney.