By: JANE M. ORIENT, M.D.
Special to the Penny Press

Stock photos of “healthcare workers” who attend patients—physicians are no longer distinguishable—usually feature a stethoscope draped around the neck.

But some, such as cardiologist Eric Topol, consider the stethoscope obsolete, nothing more than a pair of “rubber tubes.”

The most important part of the stethoscope is the part between the ears. But some think that will be replaced by artificial intelligence, and the rubber tubes by sophisticated electronic gizmos costing at least ten times as much as the humble stethoscope.

High tech is wonderful and increasingly capable, but if the stethoscope is dying, so is the art of clinical medicine.

The proper use of the stethoscope requires the doctor to touch, listen to the patient, and spend some time with a living person, not a computer. Patient and physician must cooperate: “Stop breathing,” “Take a big deep breath,” “Lean forward,” and so on.

It may be true, as Dr. James Thomas said, that graduates in internal medicine and emergency medicine miss as many as half of murmurs using a stethoscope. There are several reasons for this. One is not taking enough time to listen in a quiet room, and failing to perform the special maneuvers required to bring out an otherwise inaudible murmur (lean forward and exhale fully, turn onto your left side, squat then stand up, etc.).

The other is inadequate training. There are excellent recordings of heart sounds and murmurs, which of course would take time away from the time-devouring electronic medical record or “systems-based” medicine. And a recording is not the same thing as a live patient. Much of today’s teaching in physical diagnosis may be by “patient instructors”—paid actors pretending to be patients, who are evaluating the students as the students examine them. Rounds may be in a conference room, focused on the electronic record, instead of at the bedside.

In the old days, all the members of the team got to examine a real patient who had an interesting finding, with the patient’s permission and under the supervision of an attending physician. It seemed to me that patients usually enjoyed being the center of attention and the star of the show, and hearing the professor discuss their case. We learned how to help patients to sit up, and about hairy chests, layers of extra insulation, noisy lung sounds, shortness of breath, and other impediments to an easy examination.

The stethoscope is not just for heart murmurs. It’s for finding subtleties in careful, slow measurement of the blood pressure. It’s for extra or abnormal heart sounds. One can sometimes hear evidence of vascular problems inside the skull, or in the arteries.
supplying the brain, kidneys, or limbs. Or signs of intestinal obstruction. One can check to make sure a breathing tube is in the right place.

I don’t know of any bedside technologic wonders for examining the lungs. The stethoscope can detect sensitive signs of heart failure, pneumonia, fluid in the chest, collapsed lung, or airway obstruction. One can listen frequently to monitor changes in the patient’s status—much more efficiently than bringing the portable x-ray machine around.

The stethoscope works even when the power is off, the batteries are dead, the computer is down, or some circuit in the ultrasound device is malfunctioning. It works in facilities too poor to have the latest technology, or with patients who can’t afford to pay for a more expensive examination.

The stethoscope has tremendous capabilities in trained hands. Patients might want to evaluate whether they have a clinician who knows how to use it or is just carrying around a prop or status symbol. If you have symptoms suggestive of a heart or lung problem, does the doctor listen to all the lung fields—upper, mid, and lower, front and back? To at least four places for heart sounds? Are you asked to cough, say “e,” whisper something, take deep breaths or slow quiet ones, or do other maneuvers if something in the history or examination suggests a possible problem? Is the tv off, and are visitors asked to be quiet?

Everybody including doctors loves fancy technology. But before we toss out the old reliable tools, backed by two centuries of experience, how about some serious comparative studies like those the proponents of evidence-based medicine constantly demand?

Jane M. Orient, M.D. obtained her undergraduate degrees in chemistry and mathematics from the University of Arizona in Tucson, and her M.D. from Columbia University College of Physicians and Surgeons in 1974.
Income Inequality in America: Facts and Issues

Income inequality among Americans has been a major subject of debate for a decade, and ever more so with leftwing extremists now dominating the ranks of Democratic presidential aspirants. So, let’s get the basic facts and issues straight.

A salient claim in this area comes from the French economist Thomas Piketty in his 2014 book, Capital in the Twenty-first Century, a 700-page tome. His starting point is that the rate of return on capital investment is generally significantly greater than the growth rate of a market economy (or, r >> g). This is generally uncontested.

So, Piketty concludes that the rich, whose incomes derive greatly from their ownership of capital, will get ever greatly richer. On the other hand, the middle and lower classes, whose incomes derive mainly from their labor, will see those incomes increase only at the growth rate of the economy. Hence, they will fall ever farther behind the upper-income people.

If that were the full story, why didn’t income inequality spiral up long ago? In part, it’s because taxes burden upper classes very disproportionately and government transfer payments (mainly welfare, food stamps and healthcare subsidies) are concentrated on the lower classes. Piketty’s comparisons are based on pre-tax income, not including transfer payments, as are almost all the data advanced by those obsessing about income inequality.

These folks also fail to adjust for declining household size in recent decades when they allege falsely that middle and lower family income levels have not increased. And Piketty’s analysis overlooks that the wealthy usually divide their estates among charities and various heirs and other folks when they pass it on, thus counteracting the fast growth of family incomes based on capital.

But the important point is that taxes and transfer payments have continued to grow relative to our economy. So, they now overwhelm every other factor, as shown by recent research by Phil Gramm, former economics professor and chairman of the Senate Banking Committee; and John F. Early, twice assistant commissioner at the federal Bureau of Labor Statistics.

When we consider family incomes after taxes and public and private transfer payments, the story is very different from that based on the pre-tax and -transfers data. That’s because 80 percent of all taxes are paid by the top two income quintiles (that is, the top 40 percent) and 70 percent of all transfer payments are received by the bottom two quintiles. Aggregate taxes paid and transfers received by the middle quintile are almost exactly equal.

The average bottom-quintile household earns $4,908 annually while the average top-quintile household earns $295,904, or 60 times as much. But when we consider the $45,993 additional income the lowest-quintile homes get from public and private transfer payments, less taxes they pay, their average incomes rise to $50,901.

For the top quintile, the net of taxes and transfers is a reduction of $100,998, leaving them with $194,906.

So, the real ratio between the top and bottom quintiles is only 3.8 times, not 60 times.

And government and the private sector shift enough net income to the lowest quintile to raise their net income to middle-class levels at $50,901.

So, is a 3.8:1 ratio fair and reasonable?

One important fact is that income mobility is higher in America than in most other countries.

Also, 50 years of increasing transfer payments and rising and progressive taxes have had another effect. When the War on Poverty transfers began in 1967, nearly 70 percent of bottom quintile prime-working-age adults were employed. Today, that figure is only 36 percent. For all the top three quintiles, however, labor-force participation has increased.

Ultimately, though, the question depends on what fairness is, as much as it does on data. Progressives, populists and class warriors erroneously claim it means equal outcomes for everyone. They forget that in market systems income flows to people roughly in proportion to the value they deliver to others – that is, proportionately to their contribution to human wellbeing and the public interest. Not so for systems that politically allocate resources.

Finally, recent research shows that three-quarters of the high incomes made by entrepreneurs flows from their own “human capital” contributions, not from the financial capital they employ. So, yes, 3.8:1 seems quite fair.

RON KNECHT

The Penny Press Sends A Bronx Cheer And A Bouquet of Weeds To:

House Intelligence Committee (yeah, they still have the nerve to call it that) Chair Adam Schiff for his handling of the so-called impeachment investigation. He, single-handedly, is running a kangaroo court with predictable results. Trump will be impeached, the impeachment will be dead on arrival at the Senate and the Democrats will soil their panties in public.
Can CNN Tank AT&T's Management?

Apparently, AT&T bought CNN thinking it was some kind of an entertainment outlet.

It is, but only to those of us who understand that Ted Turner's creation has devolved into something which no longer resembles, in any way, journalism.

How bad is CNN's coverage of the President?

Well, depending on who you choose to believe, studies from Harvard to the Media Research Center place the ratio of positive to negative coverage between 91% negative to 93%. Every media analyst agrees. CNN's coverage is so biased that it can hardly be called coverage.

And it seems to be cheerfully brought to you by the American Telephone and Telegraph Company. At 208 S. Akard Street in Dallas, Texas. CEO Randall Stephenson (rs2982@att.com) and Chief operating Officer John Stankey (JS9991@att.com).

When these guys bought Directv, I was a fan. When they brought out Directv Now (Now ATT TV Now) as a streaming service I was and still am a fan. When they bought Warner Media, I was OK with that.

I figured that CNN was already so screwed up, it had only one way to go—up. I was wrong.

I was against the Justice Department’s antitrust action. Still am.

That said, who knew that the two executives I listed above (along with their emails) were closet liberals?

My suspicion still is that they’re not. What they, are, I think, is scared to death—like the dog which caught the car. They have no idea what to do. Owning HBO is one thing. You can always disavow Bill Maher.

But a news outlet? That involves editorial judgment and CNN already had less than none. It needs grown-ups to instill some discipline. Stephenson and Stankey are supposed to be those adults. Only nobody told them. They were too busy getting Hollywood elite sweet nothings blown up their skirts.

On one hand, they don’t want to make the left mad. After all, the left controls show biz—right? On the other hand, they really don’t want to have to choose up sides against a President who could easily be re-elected. Much of their communications business is heavily regulated. And, just to make things interesting, an activist management company, Elliott Management, took a $3.2-billion position in AT&T and wants change as well as seats on the Board.

So, wouldn’t the smart money be to make those clowns in Atlanta actually run a news outlet as opposed to taking virtually every opportunity to tilt to the radical left?

Apparently, Mr. Stephenson's testicles were there when he bought into the entertainment business, but seem to have softened when it comes to making tough decisions regarding the content of his acquisitions which could ultimately send his share price plummeting.

Here’s a hint as to how another executive has handled it.

Apple’s Tim Cook—hardly a Trump fan—has kept an open channel to the President even though he supported Trump’s 2016 opponent.

That makes sense, considering their common interests, especially where it comes to China, trade and intellectual property.

Do you really think Trump would refuse Stephenson’s call?

As long as his company is channeling Nancy Pelosi, it is probably a difficult call to have.

But if Stephenson and Stankey could say, with straight faces, that they are aiming to make CNN a “just the facts” news outlet, you can bet Trump would take that call.

It’s high time the folks on Akard Street in Dallas started worrying about their shareholder value. They could fix CNN in two weeks. Nobody is asking that they try and duplicate Fox. Just be fair. If they don’t, and 63,000,000 Trump voters take offense, well, they don’t make fallout shelters deep enough to protect them from the economic consequences.

FRED WEINBERG
Biden Out, Bloomberg In

Now that Sleepy Joe is out of the race, Democrats are reaching new heights of panic. What’s that you say? You didn’t know Biden was out? True, the media hasn’t officially reported his demise, but, c’mon man … get real. It’s over for Sleepy Joe.

The truth be known, Biden never was the so-called front runner. From the day he announced his candidacy, it was just a question of when he would implode. If the no-chance jackals go after him with pitchforks in tonight’s debate, particularly on his China and Ukrainian crimes, his wife had better be ready with a glass of warm milk and plenty of Valium. Very sad ending for a life well lived in the swamp.

Biden’s departure leaves only two (sort-of) legitimate candidates — Lyin’ Lizahontas and Grungy Bernie. Of course, neither of these cretins would have the slightest chance against Trump. Establishment Democrats are well aware of this, which is why they are actively looking for a savior. And right now, I can’t think of any Democrat who could fill that bill.

Which, in turn, brings me to Michael Bloomberg. As I’ve been saying for months, Granny is likely to throw his hat in the ring, especially now that he realizes Biden is doomed. Warren and Sanders supporters would fight Bloomberg tooth and nail, labeling him a carpetbagger who is trying to buy the nomination with his billions, but, in the end, money talks and Bloomberg would likely find a way to get the nomination.

I hope I’m wrong about this, because, as I have said many times in the past, Bloomberg would have a legitimate shot at beating Trump, for three reasons:

1. He has instant name and face recognition.
2. He can be just as nasty as Trump.
3. His $58 billion net worth dwarfs Trump’s net worth.

That said, let’s all pray that Horrible Hillary stops talking about running and actually jumps in the race. Now that would make for an entertaining year ahead, starting with her battling Bloomberg for the Dirty Dem nomination.

In the meantime, enjoy another world-class clown show tonight, because most of these characters won’t be around much longer.

ROBERT RINGER
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Fracking Bans Will Cost Democrats the White House

It often seems as if Democrats want to reelect Donald Trump. Why else would their top presidential candidates advocate a ban on fracking, the drilling technique that supports millions of jobs and accounts for half of all U.S. oil production?

Such a disastrous proposal will alienate the swing voters Democrats need next November. If candidates want a real shot at the White House, they would be wise to adopt President Obama’s pro-fracking approach.

Over the past decade, advances in fracking have made the United States the world’s largest producer of oil and natural gas. A fracking ban would undo this progress overnight. Such a policy would reduce U.S. crude oil production by 6 million barrels each day. Removing that energy from the market would likely cause a global depression.

America’s economy would suffer the most. A fracking ban would eliminate nearly 3 million jobs and cost our economy more than $430 billion a year. It’s no wonder the head of the International Energy Agency recently said that cutting off oil and gas production is not advisable for “the U.S. government or another government in the world.”

But a fracking ban isn’t just economically disastrous. It’s political suicide.

Any Democrat who wants to win the presidency in 2020 will have to carry Pennsylvania — a state that broke Republican in 2016 for the first time in nearly three decades.

Pennsylvanians have benefited quite a bit from the fracking revolution. The oil and gas industry contributes more than $44 billion to the state’s economy each year, and supports over 322,000 jobs. Crippling this vital industry is no way to win votes in the Keystone State.

Still, many Democratic candidates have made opposition to fracking a major part of their campaign. Sen. Elizabeth Warren has promised to “ban fracking — everywhere” on her first day as president. Sens. Kamala Harris and Bernie Sanders have also pledged to ban the practice, as has former Vice President Joe Biden.

Even for Democrats, this position is extreme. After all, it was a Democratic president who oversaw the early years of the fracking boom.

Throughout his time in the White House, President Obama supported the domestic energy renaissance. As he boasted during his 2013 State of the Union address, “After years of talking about it, we are finally poised to control our own energy future...We produce more natural gas than ever before — and nearly everyone’s energy bill is lower because of it.”

Obama-era officials have even criticized proposed alternatives to fossil fuels. For instance, Sen. Sanders wants the United States to shift to 100 percent renewable energy sources by 2030. But former Secretary of Energy Ernest Moniz has said it’s “not realistic” to expect such a shift, even by 2050.

That’s because the types of innovations needed to wean the world off fossil fuels don’t even exist yet. And until they do, low-income Americans rely on oil and gas for affordable energy. Already almost a third of middle- and low-class Americans struggle to afford their home heating costs.

Any Democrat who wants to win the White House will need to follow President Obama’s lead and take a more moderate approach to fracking. If they don’t, they might as well congratulate President Trump on his reelection now.

ZAK RADZAK
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Suppose it was President Trump at Gettysburg...
Reducing Uncertainty in Trade with Mexico and Canada

American businesses face enormous challenges right now. The ebb and flow of the trade war with China is roiling supply chains. A simmering tariff war with the European Union could soon boil over.

This swirl of uncertainty is threatening to hold back U.S. economic growth and has lowered global forecasts. More than six in 10 CEOs say that trade disputes have hurt their businesses. Many have shelved expansion plans as they adopt a “wait-and-see” approach.

Congress doesn’t have the power to resolve trade disputes with China or the EU. But there are steps that lawmakers can take in the coming months to offer greater certainty to businesses — including by approving the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement (USMCA). The deal would give American companies a higher level of confidence that at least trade with Canada and Mexico will not be disrupted.

USMCA would replace NAFTA, the free trade agreement implemented in 1994. As former Acting and Deputy U.S. Trade Representative under President Obama, I saw firsthand how NAFTA boosted the economies of all three countries. Today, Mexico and Canada are our two largest trading partners. U.S. businesses sold more than $650 billion worth of goods and services to Canada and Mexico last year alone. This trilateral trade supports over 12 million U.S. jobs.

But NAFTA hasn’t kept pace with the digital revolution or other important issues we now seek to cover in U.S. trade agreements. When that deal was negotiated in the early 1990s, e-commerce barely existed. Most people didn’t own computers or cell phones, and Amazon was just a small bookstore operating out of Jeff Bezos’ garage.

USMCA takes NAFTA’s basic framework and modernizes it for the 21st century.

USMCA, for example, establishes a comprehensive set of intellectual property protections for technology. The deal bans trading partners from imposing customs duties on videos, e-books, games, apps, and music. It lengthens copyright terms for these digital products. And it lengthens intellectual property protections for “biologic” medicines, a class of advanced drugs that barely existed in the early 1990s and has led now to breakthrough treatments for patients.

Such provisions will help American companies — large and small — expand their business with Canada and Mexico, as well as make the standards among all three countries more uniform.

USMCA’s emphasis on intellectual property reflects the reality of today’s economy. IP-intensive industries already support over 45 million American jobs, account for 52 percent of U.S. exports, and contribute $6.6 trillion to the U.S. GDP.

House Speaker Nancy Pelosi has not yet scheduled a vote on the pact, but has signaled that the House is on “a path to yes.” Her team and the administration are working to address several issues, including ensuring strong, workable enforcement provisions in a number of areas.

USMCA is not perfect but no deal ever is. But USMCA is worth passing. Not only would it cement our extremely close trading relationships with Canada and Mexico, but it would also offer U.S. businesses more certainty in a tumultuous time.

Miriam Sapiro
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President Has Authority to Withhold Appropriated Funds Under Law

If the President is considering whether to defer or rescind military assistance to a foreign country, but has not yet made a decision to do so under the Impoundment Control Act, is he required to notify Congress? That’s what Sen. Chris Van Hollen (D-Md.) wants to know and is asking the Government Accountability Office (GAO) to report on.

The question comes after decisions by the White House to temporarily freeze and review State Department and USAID foreign aid spending in August, and $250 million of military assistance to Ukraine in July. Both reviews were completed, with the broader foreign aid being released on Aug. 7 and the military spending in Ukraine being obligated on Sept. 11. Ultimately, the President chose not to request either a deferral or rescission of the funds.

And yet Democrats want to remove Trump from office over the issue. The Office of Management and Budget for its part is saying it did nothing wrong, with OMB communications director Rachel Semmel issuing a statement saying, “As has been well documented, we fully complied with the law and decades of precedent with respect to these funds. Congress is notified if the administration intends to rescind, defer, reprogram or transfer funding, but in this case none of those things occurred and the funding was obligated as planned.”

Under 2 U.S.C. Section 684 or 2 U.S.C. Section 683, the Impoundment Control Act, the President has the power to propose deferring funds on a temporary basis or rescinding them altogether, subject to Congressional approval.

The question here appears to be what obligation the President has to spend the money whilst considering such a deferral or rescission. The answer comes under OMB’s authority under 31 U.S.C. 1512 to conduct apportionments, which the White House cited as authority for the three-day spending freeze of foreign aid in August in its letter to the Department of State and USAID.

The letter stated, “All previously apportioned unobligated resources in the [Treasury Appropriation Fund Symbols] shall be unavailable for obligation until three business days after the Office of Management and Budget receives an accounting from your agencies of the current outstanding unobligated resources…” The reviews were completed and the funds were released.

At the time, a question posed by critics was whether the funds could be withheld beyond the end of the fiscal year on Sept. 30 while Congress was considering a proposed rescission, effectively preventing funds from being spent and expiring prior to Congress’ consideration.

Last year, GAO asked OMB General Counsel Mark Paoletta for his views on that question, and he submitted them in Nov. 2018, stating, “the text of Impoundment Control Act clearly allows the President to propose and withhold funds at any time in a fiscal year. In addition to the unambiguous statutory language, there is bipartisan historical precedent for the President to withhold funds at any time of the fiscal year, including in instances where funds proposed for rescission have lapsed prior to the expiration of the 45-day withholding period.”

Nonetheless, in Dec. 2018, GAO came back with an opinion saying that the withholding period could not carry into the expiration of the funds: “we conclude that the ICA does not permit the withholding of funds through their date of expiration. The statutory text and legislative history of the ICA, Supreme Court case law, and the overarching constitutional framework of the legislative and executive powers provide no basis to interpret the ICA as a mechanism by which the President may unilaterally abridge the enacted period of availability of a fixed-period appropriation.”

But that opinion is non-binding and in any event, was not at issue here. Given the context of OMB conducting a wider review of foreign aid packages, it is not unreasonable to suppose that foreign military assistance to Ukraine was falling under a similar review.

Here, Congressional Democrats appear ready to vote to impeach and remove President Trump for even considering requesting a rescission of military funding to Ukraine.

Now, this all might be cause to request another opinion from the GAO, or perhaps to ham out a legal dispute in U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia over the limits of fiscal apportionment and rescission law. That’s not a high crime, misdemeanor, treason or bribery, it’s a dispute between the branches over what the letter of the law means.

In the end, however, no rescissions were even sought, and certainly none carrying through the end of the fiscal year, and all the monies were ultimately spent, rendering the question moot. This is what Democrats want to overturn the 2016 election over? C’mon.

ROBERT ROMANO

Robert Romano is the Vice President of Public Policy at Americans for Limited Government.
Convicted sex offenders could be moved into a halfway house in your neighborhood, without your knowledge. And this government program is going on across the country right now. At the same time, our right to keep and bear arms is under constant attack. The ultimate insult of gun control is that it leaves honest Americans at the mercy of those with no mercy.

The Second Amendment Foundation, urges you to become a member and support our important and innovative work. We've been fighting for your gun rights since 1974, and each year our struggle gets more difficult. Join with hundreds of thousands of other Americans who support the Foundation with their tax-deductible contributions.

Working together, we can protect our fundamental rights—the rights that keep us strong, free and safe. For more facts about gun rights issues go to www.saf.org.
Nancy burning the ships that could return to the middle.
Commentary: Chuck Muth

4 Reasons to Bet the Farm on Trump Winning Nevada & Re-Election

I love how the left-wing fake news nincompoops and the bonehead brigade of poli-sci pundits keep saying Donald Trump can’t win Nevada.

For many, they’re simply blinded by their hate for the man. For others, they’re simply ignorant of real-world politics. They know only theories they’ve read in a textbook and regurgitate tweets by similarly ignorant colleagues.

Let me explain this so even liberal blogger “Jihadi” Jon Ralston – who burbled a few weeks ago that “Trump is underwater in Nevada” - can understand it...

First, in 2016 Trump – a candidate with no previous campaign or electoral experience - narrowly lost to Crooked Hillary – who started her career in politics as an intern for Lincoln - by 27,202 votes.

Out of over a MILLION cast.

In fact, she only won Clark County with 52% of the vote and LOST the Democrat-majority 3rd congressional district.

This time Trump’s running as a vastly improved, skilled and polished candidate with an awfully powerful soapbox in the White House and some $300 million tucked away in the Oval Office sofa.

Secondly, Trump’s support among Republican voters right now is in the neighborhood of 95%. The other 5% are the same “Never Trumpers” who didn’t vote for him the last time. But there are fewer of them now than there were in 2016.

Donald Trump is, after all, an acquired taste.

So ask yourself this about Trump’s base of support...

Is there any large number of voters who voted for him in 2016 who are so unhappy with the man that they’re not going to vote for him next year? Uh, no.

Thirdly, now think of the so-called “independents.”

These are among the low-information voters Rush Limbaugh talks about. They’re the folks who love to say, with high a level of moral superiority and arrogance, “I vote for the person, not the party.”

Well, guess what?

Thanks to the person currently in the White House, the economy is sizzling, unemployment is at historic lows, especially in the minority community, taxes are lower, regulations have been cut, The Wall is being built, ISIS has been obliterated and al-Baghdadi is right now being serenaded by his 72 virgins.

If you don’t think a huge number of non-ideological voters who “vote for the person not the party” are gonna switch their Hillary vote in 2016 to Trump in 2020 – including lots of blacks, Hispanics and Klingons - you’re more delusional than Beto O’Rourke and Cory Booker combined.

Fourthly, now think about the Democrats.

Their likely nominee is Joe Biden - a scandal-ridden gaffe-machine who was caught last week speaking to the curtain behind the stage instead of the audience because he didn’t know where the cameras were.

This guy’ll be able to hide is own Easter eggs next April.

Sleepy Joe doesn’t energize the Democrat base. He doesn’t make liberal hearts go pitter-patter. He doesn’t make Rachel MadCow swoon.

He doesn’t send a tingle up Chris Matthews’ leg.

Sure, lots of Democrats are going to turn out because they hate Trump. But a lot of AOC’s socialist-Democrats are gonna end up sitting this one out. Unless...

Unless the Democrats decide to commit political suicide and make a Kamikaze run for the White House next November with either Crazy Bernie or Pocahontas in the pilot’s seat.

Which means Trump will not just win and win Nevada, but will win in a landslide. Heck, he might even win ALL of Barack Obama’s 57 states!

Let me wrap up by talking a little about “voter suppression.”

Democrats continue to accuse Republicans of trying to suppress the vote by doing crazy, radical things like...you know...requiring a photo ID before casting a ballot.

I mean, that’s nuts, right?

But be aware and be warned of how Democrats, and their amen corner in the fake news media, are gonna try to suppress the Trump vote.

Between now and next November you’re gonna read a flood of headlines about the president’s supposed dire poll numbers - like this one a couple months ago from Axios...

“Poll suggests six 2020 Democrats would beat Trump in head-to-head matchup.”

And stories and commentaries such as this...

“It’s a long 17 months to Election Day, but Joe Biden is ahead by landslide proportions,” a Quinnipiac analyst says.

And you’ll hear all about Republican defections from Trump during the impeachment witch hunt. You know, “Republicans” like John Kasich, Mitt Romney and that moron Bill Kristol. (Who?)

Don’t fall for it.

Look at the super-high level of base support for Trump - and his growing support among independents and non-traditional voters who refuse to tell pollsters how they really feel.

Now look at the shaky base of support for the unholy liberal trinity of Biden/Warren/Sanders.

The ONLY hope Democrats have is for Trump supporters to stay home. So they’ll gonna use all their powers and all their skills, like the undertaker in The Godfather, to convince you that Trump can’t win.

Indeed, the fake news media’s propaganda machine is gonna be set at DEFCON 1. They’re gonna tell you Trump’s losing support. That he’s slipping. That there’s no sense in you bothering to vote because it’s hopeless.

But it ain’t gonna work. Too many voters have caught on to their game.

Trump’s gonna win Nevada.

And he’s gonna win re-election.

Bet the farm on it.

CHUCK MUTH
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