

The Media Endorses Barack Obama

Writing in the this space two months ago, I laid out the media advantage that President Obama has in his quest for reelection. According to a study done by the Pew Research Center, 32% of journalists say they are liberal, 53% moderate and just 8% conservative. Ask John McCain how the press treated him in 2008 if you want specifics on the tilt toward Barack Obama.

A great illustration of media bias is the recent dustup over Sandra Fluke. She is the liberal activist trotted out by the Democratic Party to deflect the contraception issue away from the “church-state” controversy which the White House was losing, into the more emotional “women’s health” arena. Nancy Pelosi herself organized a press dog and pony show for Ms. Fluke, who portrays herself as a law school student having a rough time paying for birth control pills. She wants the feds to pick up the tab through mandated insurance benefits even though the pills cost about \$9 a month at places like Wal-Mart, and are distributed free at health clinics under Title Ten legislation.

But you won’t find those facts being discussed much in the national media. No, for them Ms. Fluke is a victim of a cruel system that wants to unduly burden American women.

Sure.

Of course, Ms. Fluke was handed an enormous gift by Rush Limbaugh when he made demeaning comments about her. Immediately, the committed left wing media machine, led by the amazingly dishonest Media Matters internet site, cranked up two themes: that Limbaugh should be deported to Tonga, and that he is the real power behind the Republican Party.

MSNBC, which is now partnered up with Media Matters in the quest to disseminate left wing propaganda, went wild and so, to a lesser extent, did other national media outlets. The story line is that because the Republican candidates did not call for Limbaugh to be sent to Guantanamo Bay, they endorsed his attitude toward Ms. Fluke. The analysis was so hysterical that it could have been a Jon Stewart bit, and in fact it was.

The bigger picture is this: voters who do not pay close attention to public policy and political controversies are at the mercy of so called "prevailing wisdom." That is what they hear around town, from their friends, etc. As long as most of the media, including the entertainment industry, promotes one particular candidate for President, that person will have a major advantage in November.

But informed voters know the fix is in although there's little they can do about it. Another Pew survey taken in January finds that 67% of Americans believe there is bias in news coverage. They are right and it is to the left.

Few in the press are reporting the truth about Sandra Fluke. That is an indicator of what the American media has become, as well as what is likely to come as the election campaign unfolds.

Yes We Can't

Here's how President Bush and the republican establishment see it: African-Americans make up 13% of the population, and Hispanic-Americans are at 14%.

Doing the math, that is a big number to cede to the democrats every four years. Forget about converting most blacks—the GOP

has no clue. But there are millions of conservative Hispanics, and this amnesty's for you.

Mr. Bush's new proposal to allow about ten million illegal aliens to work and live in the USA is a calculated political move. He is betting that his supporters, many of whom will not like the quasi-amnesty, will vote for him anyway, especially if Howard Dean is his opponent.

And by showing compassion to millions of Hispanic illegals, the President hopes to win some hearts and minds and, most importantly, votes.

The question is: Will the new program help America? The answer is no. That's because Mr. Bush has proposed a situation that is all carrot cake and no stick. Once the poor of the world realize that anyone who sneaks into America illegally can get the benefits of living in this country, the flood gates, which are already open, will crack completely.

Remember, the immigration mess we have now started after Ronald Reagan granted amnesty to illegals in 1986. Since that time, tens of millions of undocumented people have found a way to the USA, hoping for exactly what Mr. Bush has now given them. Why wouldn't millions more follow that lead?

I actually support the President's program, if he would get serious about supervising the borders and prosecuting companies who continue to hire illegals after the amnesty kicks in. The Border Patrol flat out admits it cannot stop the flood of people and narcotics coming from Mexico.

So why not have the National Guard assist the Border Patrol? The President could make that happen, but will not. He also has no plan to crack down on employers who continue to break the rules. Mr. Bush has a "yes, we can't" attitude when it comes to imposing discipline on the illegal problem.

Finally, it is a pipe dream to think that allowing millions of poorly educated people to assimilate into the USA will not be without unintended consequences. Under the program, millions of illegals will be bringing family members here, and their period of adjustment will not be easy.

Right now, 34% of all LEGAL Mexican immigrants are on welfare, and 25% of illegals are getting government assistance. That number will not decline, as some illegals will make it and some will not.

So get set for massive new human smuggling operations as the world's gangsters see gold at the end of the illegal immigration rainbow. Billions of people the world over would love to come to America. President Bush has not solved the immigration problem, and may have made it much worse. Ten years from today this country will be a much different place. Count on it.

Bad Year Rising

According to a recent Gallup poll, most Americans want Saddam Hussein tried in an International Court, but 24% say a U.S. military court should decide his fate. This, of course, would be a disaster, because America's legal system is so screwed up, Saddam might wind up a winner. Here's what could possibly happen.

The Ninth Circuit Federal Court of Appeals in San Francisco, a legal body modeled on the philosophy of Che Guevara and the most overturned federal court in U.S. history, might well rule the military court unconstitutional because as we all know, military people have strict rules of behavior and make judgments. The Ninth would never abide that.

Immediately after the Ninth ruled, Saddam would find himself in civilian criminal court and would hire Mark Geragos and Johnnie Cochran to represent him.

Geragos would book himself on the Larry King program and declare that Saddam was not responsible for the mass murderers in Iraq... devil worshipers were. Geragos would convince Larry that the devil people infiltrated Saddam's inner circle without his knowledge. Only Saddam's sons knew about the insidious activities. Too bad they're dead.

At the same time, Cochran would be asserting that U.S. forces actually planted the tens of thousands of bodies that were dug up in mass graves. Yes, that would have been difficult, Cochran would tell the E Entertainment Network, but if the Los Angeles police department could plant evidence on every single criminal case it had ever investigated, then surely the American Armed Forces could transport one hundred thousand dead bodies into Iraq.

E! would also report that Cochran had evidence Colombian drug dealers actually held Saddam hostage and ordered him to invade Kuwait.

In the preliminary hearing, Geragos would demand Saddam be let out of prison and housed at the Neverland ranch so he, Geragos, could do the needed leg work on the Michael Jackson case and Saddam's situation at the same time. Geragos would also file a motion to suppress everything Saddam has ever said in his entire life.

Meantime, Cochran would raise the race issue. He'd produce an American corporal who had uttered anti-Arab remarks while taking machine gun fire in a foxhole. Using that evidence, Cochran could then weave a brilliant line of logic: If Americans were so hateful towards Saddam's forces, why wouldn't they develop hideous weapons and violate international law? Anyone would, it was absolutely a matter of

self defense.

Cochran would then have Saddam try on all his old uniforms and they would not fit. Obviously, then, this man isn't really Saddam after all. He's Scott Petersen.

Geragos would then jump in quickly. If Scott Peterson were in Baghdad all these years, he couldn't possibly have killed his wife Lacy and their unborn child. Different devil worshipers did that. And Geragos would convince Larry King that those people worked at Fox News. Al Franken would back him up.

In the end, Saddam Hussein would be acquitted by a jury which found reasonable doubt indeed. No weapons of mass destruction. Planted bodies all over the place. Devil people running wild. No wonder things went wrong in Iraq. But you can't blame Saddam.

The delighted dictator would then move to Florida and buy a nifty home near O.J., because the Sunshine State will let you keep your assets no matter how many people you kill and torture.

A few months later, Saddam would appear on Dateline and proclaim that he would spend the rest of his days trying to track down the real culprits in Iraq. He would also file suit for millions, claiming Michael Jackson had molested him at Neverland.

American justice. There's none better.

The Secrets of Saddam

In August of 2002, thugs from Saddam Hussein's secret police shot notorious terrorist Abu Nidal dead in a Baghdad residence

where he had been staying as Saddam's "guest." The Iraqis immediately labeled Nidal's death as a suicide, causing much commotion among fans of CSI as the man apparently shot himself four times in the head.

Nidal, you may remember, was a Palestinian killer who roamed Europe and the Middle East in the 70's and 80's, creating mayhem and murdering civilians. He felt right at home in Iraq. So why was he murdered? Good question.

The importance of this execution may be enormous. The Sunday Telegraph in London is reporting that a document discovered in Iraq details a meeting between Nidal and the leader of the 9/11 attack, Mohammed Atta. The document was allegedly written by Tahir Jalil Habbush al-Tikriti, the former head of the Iraqi Intelligence Service (ISI) and a man still on the run.

Dated July 1, 2001, three months before 9/11, the text says that Atta, along with a man named Abu Ammer, met with Nidal for three days under the direct supervision of the ISI. The document mentions "targets that we agree must be destroyed."

If this memorandum is legitimate, it will obviously change many things because it establishes that elusive link between Saddam and Al Qaeda. First, Howard Dean's credibility will be shattered, and he will cease to be a viable candidate for the Democrats.

Second, France, Germany, Russia, and the United Nations will be humiliated. And third, the far-left anti-war people will be marginalized for years to come in this country.

One must assume that the Bush administration knows about this captured document which is now believed to be in the hands of Iraqis working for the interim government. But it has not been mentioned in any public way in the U.S. Since disinformation is common in Iraq, and since the anti-Saddam Iraqi contingent was woefully wrong about WMD's, the Bush people may be prudent (as Bush the elder might say) in keeping quiet about this

until its validity is confirmed beyond a reasonable doubt.

Saddam, of course, knows every devious thing his government did. This is why there should be no rush to bring him to trial. The CIA should take all the time it needs to find out everything this psychopath knows. And they should use all methods short of instrumental torture to get answers.

Saddam should be deprived of sleep, loaded up with truth serum, kept isolated and underfed, confronted with noise... whatever it takes. While the United Nations and the Vatican complain about his "dignity," most Americans would like to be protected from another 9/11, thank you very much.

With CIA analyst David Kay still searching for those annoying WMD's, with Saddam in custody, with a potentially explosive ISI memo in play, just about anything could happen in the next few months vis-a-vis Iraq. There are a lot of very powerful people sweating these developments as they could be career altering.

Even though he is now a common prisoner, Saddam Hussein retains a vast amount of power simply because of what he knows. It will be fascinating to see how he uses that power.

Another Win for the Folks

Abercrombie and Fitch has raised the white T-shirt and surrendered. It is pulling its soft-core porn clothing catalog because the outcry has hurt the only thing that matters to A&F: the bottom line.

Same store sales in November were down 13% in an approving economy. Apparently showing naked people in the catalog was

stimulating—just not to clothing sales.

As you may know, Abercrombie and Fitch's target customer is between 12 and 25, so it is no wonder that a catalog promoting group sex would get some parents upset. A&F claimed the catalog was not sold to anyone under 18, but let's get real here: Kids were seeing it.

The catalog itself was perplexing as a marketing tool. It describes how great group sex is, and that dolphins do it. So what kind of clothing are dolphins wearing these days? Do they have little sweatshirts on while jumping each other under the waves?

The secular New York Times described the situation using the same tactic it did during the Reagan movie drama. The controversy was generated by "conservatives," those kill joy pessimists who want to ruin all the fun.

Here's how the Times put it: "After loud and sustained protests from socially conservative groups and feminist groups, the company announced ... it was withdrawing the (catalog)."

Sure. It's only those nasty right-wingers and feminists that stirred this up. Liberal or independent thinkers would never object to their kids seeing a half-dozen nude models doing the lambada together. In the world of The New York Times, everyday Americans would have no trouble with any of that.

Are you getting the picture here? Every time an issue of incredibly bad taste arises, like this catalog and the Reagan movie, the secular press tries to marginalize the opposition by defining it in political terms.

The truth is that most non-ideological Americans are getting sick and tired of offensive displays and outrageous behavior being rammed down their throats. Secularists do not want any judgments made about personal behavior, and if you oppose

that, they try to make you out to be some kind of junior Jerry Falwell, demanding that everyone convert to Christianity. It's simply dishonest.

Here's proof that regular Americans have had enough. A new Fox News/Opinion Dynamics poll says that 87% of Americans approve of Nativity scenes being displayed on public property during Christmas. Perhaps that's because the federal holiday of Christmas honors the birth of Jesus so there might be some context here.

But you probably did not read about that poll in the secular press. Maybe if they threw some group sex questions in that survey, it would get wider exposure.

Never before in this country has such a slender secular minority had so much power. The ACLU has succeeded in knocking nativity scenes out all over the country against the will of the people. The New York City school system even forbids any display of the birth of Jesus in its buildings. So much for the history of a national holiday.

The one-two punch of outrageous and offensive behavior and the diminishment of public spirituality is something this country is going to have to come to terms with.

Time after time commerce and the polls show that Americans want traditional values and are appalled by inappropriate material marketed to children. In the end, the will of the people will likely prevail, as the Abercrombie and Fitch situation proves. But the proponents of a secular society are fierce, and they are not going away anytime soon.