

John Carpenter Shoos Away Bigoted Fans



I don't follow many entertainers on Twitter, but there are a few that I like to keep tabs on. One of them is iconic SciFi/Horror film director, John Carpenter, of whom I am a fan.

As I mentioned in a [column back in August](#), I host an annual Halloween party where I screen scary movies for a room-full of attendees. Carpenter's *The Thing* and *In the Mouth of Madness* have both been featured.

Incidentally, if you ever get a chance to watch the DVD version of *The Thing* that features dual-commentary from Carpenter and Kurt Russell (the film's star), do so. It's a riot.

Carpenter doesn't spend a lot of time on social media, and though I've gathered over the years that he's a liberal thinker (like most in the entertainment profession), he doesn't say much about politics. On Tuesday, however, he broke from the norm with this eyebrow-raising tweet:

"THEY LIVE is about yuppies and unrestrained capitalism. It has nothing to do with Jewish control of the world, which is slander and a lie."

He was referring to his 1988 film, *They Live*, starring the late professional wrestler, Rowdy Roddy Piper. I saw this movie as a 16 year-old, when it was originally in theaters, and found it thoroughly entertaining.

Remembered mainly for a tremendous quote about *bubblegum* and *kicking ass*, and one of the most epic fight scenes in cinematic history, *They Live* is indeed (as Carpenter described) built on the notion of economic inequality. In fact, the theme is glaringly obvious. The film's premise, after all, is that the world's ruling class are actually aliens from another planet who are subliminally oppressing the human population through consumerism and mass media.

So what do Jewish people have to do with this? As it turns out, Carpenter's film is a [longtime favorite](#) of online white supremacists and neo-Nazis, who revere it as a metaphorical swipe against Jewish supremacy.

No, I'm not joking.

Carpenter isn't amused by the ridiculous interpretation of his film. He has apparently been tormented for some time by the small but vocal community of bigots who've used *They Live* imagery to spread nefarious online memes. And who can blame him?

It's no secret that the Internet can be an ugly place, especially in the realm of politics and ideology. Anonymity has a weird way of emboldening (and for some people, legitimizing) some pretty perverse thinking. As a moderator on a political-commentary website, I can tell you that I've seen my share of truly disturbing comments.

At the same time, it should be noted (as is the case with

Carpenter) that you can't always blame the dignitary for the kooks he or she somehow manages to inspire.



Order personalized copies of John Daly's Sean Coleman Thriller series.

Whose Coup? & BONUS: Liberal Bigotry

A lot of folks are up in arms over the U.S. supporting the Egyptian military, claiming it is illegal for us to send foreign aid to a nation whose democratically-elected government has been overturned by a coup. I'm not one of those people.

Even if I entertained the slightest doubt about what we should do, the fact that the loudest voice demanding that we cease sending money to Egypt is John McCain's would be the clincher. He may have been right about something or other during the past few decades, but nothing comes to mind.

Voting is overrated. The Egyptians elected Mohamed Morsi because they were convinced he was a moderate. Heck, that's

the same reason that many people voted for Obama in 2008. Unfortunately, by the time a lot of Americans woke up, he had managed to get millions of them hooked on food stamps and what they'd been told would be cheap health insurance. And, alas, we didn't have a military prepared to do the right thing by protecting us from ourselves.

Those of us who live in free societies tend to forget that voting isn't a miraculous antidote for those who are too lazy, greedy and ignorant, to understand that the best government of all is one that leaves most decisions in the hands of the individual.

In this country, we have millions of people who watched those little Obama commercials featuring a fictional Julia who depended entirely on the federal government for her very survival, and nodded along with the narration. They thought they were watching a Disney movie in which Obama was the fairy godmother, while the rest of us were convinced we were watching a horror film in which Obama was wearing a hockey mask and carting around a chainsaw.

It's bad enough that Obama tells one whopper after another when the topic is the massacre in Benghazi, a Department of Justice that spies on journalists or an IRS that sees its primary mission to get Obama re-elected, but, just recently, he told a bunch of kids that broccoli is his favorite food. It's one thing for Michelle to say something that goofy, but we all know that Barack's taste runs to cheeseburgers, pizza and ice cream. I'm not suggesting he should be compelled to come clean about his diet, but why lie to the kids? Why not just keep his trap shut? Does the schmuck lie just to stay in practice?

It took some years for people to finally acknowledge that Woodrow Wilson was the most racist president in U.S. history. I hope it won't take that long for people to wake up to the fact that Wilson, who openly regarded blacks as an inferior

race, couldn't hold a candle to Obama, who, along with Eric Holder, goes out of his way to display his contempt for Caucasians.

You only have to keep in mind that he attended Jeremiah Wright's church for 20 years, where Sunday after Sunday he got to hear his religious mentor voice his hatred of America and its white population. Then, if you recall, his first order of business upon moving into the Oval Office was to have the bust of Winston Churchill removed.

Then he appointed Eric Holder to be his attorney general, and the first thing we heard out of Holder's mouth was an announcement that whites were cowards who refused to have an honest dialogue about race. Translated, that's code for whites being unwilling to kowtow to blacks intent on browbeating them.

The next thing we knew, Holder was refusing to indict black thugs for intimidating white voters, and Obama was excoriating the Cambridge Police Department for having the audacity to arrest a black friend of his for disturbing the peace.

Because neither Obama nor Holder are the sort to rest on their racist laurels, Obama stuck his shnoz into the Martin-Zimmerman case by saying that Trayvon Martin looked like the son he never had, and Holder authorized a unit of the Justice Department known as Community Relations Service to organize racially-charged demonstrations against George Zimmerman. Fortunately, it's not every day that the federal government subsidizes a lynch mob.

Finally, it has often occurred to me that conservatives like dogs, while liberals tend to favor cats. I happen to know several exceptions to this rule; both people and cats. I suspect that those cats are the ones who share the finer attributes of dogs. I also acknowledge that many people simply want a pet, but can't keep a dog because they work such long

hours or travel a great deal.

As I see it, dogs are friendly, loyal and courageous. Those are all qualities that resound with conservatives. Cats, on the other hand, tend to be aloof and snobbish. They pretend to be independent, but the pretense only lasts until dinnertime rolls around.

Dogs have been known to pull family members out of burning buildings and even leap into raging rivers to rescue perfect strangers.

I'm convinced a cat would only go into a burning building to save its favorite catnip-laced toy mouse and would only consider diving into a body of water if they saw a can-opener going under for the third time.

It just occurred to me that I am more than a little finicky, would never jump into a raging river and, on occasion, have been known to be rather snooty. Good heavens, I'm a cat!

LIBERAL BIGOTRY

It would be a lie to say that bigotry doesn't exist in this country. The lie is in the media's insistence on attributing it to white conservatives. If you believed these people who lie for a living, everyone who isn't black, Muslim, homosexual, a Democrat, an illegal alien, a single woman or a member of the left-wing media, can safely be assumed to be a bigot.

If you only believed what you read in your local newspaper or hear from anchors and reporters for the major TV networks, you would think that white conservatives spend 24/7 pondering how best to oppress everyone who isn't one of them. As a white conservative, I also stand accused of waging endless war on women.

The fact of the matter is that white conservatives are

probably the only group of Americans that others can safely insult and ridicule without being blasted as a bigot, racist, misogynist and/or homophobe.

As proof of this, let me remind you that although everyone at Fort Hood was aware of the fact that Major Nidal Hasan had essentially taken to smooching his photo of Osama bin Laden, he continued to hold his job for no other reason than that his superior officers were terrified of being drummed out of the service for offending a Muslim.

Over the years, when blacks misbehave and get into trouble with the law, other blacks, usually at the instigation of creeps such as Jesse Jackson, who turned corporate extortion into a career, and Al Sharpton, who rode to fame and fortune by accusing NY cops of raping a black teenager named Tawana Brawley, can be counted on to riot on cue.

The truth was that young Miss Brawley had concocted the vile tale because she'd been shackled up with her boyfriend and was afraid she'd get into trouble with her mother. But even after the truth was known, Sharpton led demonstrations that led to blacks murdering whites. And today, instead of having to ring a little bell and chant "Unclean, unclean" when he appears in public, he hosts his own TV show on MSNBC, gets to dine with the likes of Bill O'Reilly in fancy New York restaurants and be treated like the second coming of Martin Luther King by the craven media.

In 2006, half a dozen black guys beat up a white guy in Jena, Louisiana, for no other reason than that they felt like it. No sooner were they put on trial than the demonstrations by blacks began on behalf of the Jena 6, as they came to be known.

That same year, a black hooker accused members of the Duke Lacrosse team of raping her at a frat party, where she'd been hired to strip. The students were lynched in the media until

the truth came out that she had concocted the story, no doubt in hope of being paid hush money. In the aftermath, there were no apologies from the media or from those moral cretins who will joyfully demonstrate on behalf of hookers, bullies, Rodney King or O.J. Simpson, just so long as they're black. Reverend King urged people to judge others by their character, not their skin color, but apparently only white folks were paying attention.

Today, in spite of the fact that George Zimmerman is a decent man who mentored black youngsters, blacks would have you believe that Trayvon Martin, a drug-dealing thief, was a model citizen whom nobody but a Klan member would ever suspect of being up to no good on a rainy night in a neighborhood where he didn't live, but where burglaries had become commonplace.

The media is so corrupt that when bash mobs – black teens who congregate through social networking in order to steal and vandalize in large groups – recently ran wild in Los Angeles and Long Beach, the local newspapers and TV stations referred to them merely as “people” or “teens,” refusing to even mention their race.

Until the media reports black on white crimes or even black on black crimes as eagerly as they do the far less frequent white on black crimes, they should be regarded as accessories to murders, rapes and robberies.

No white person in his right mind ever goes out of his way to excuse or defend meth-dealing motorcycle gangs or the thugs who make up the Aryan Nation, arguing that they turned out to be law-breaking creeps because they were raised in poverty in homes without responsible, loving fathers. No one sanctions their violence, lack of education or their siring babies out of wedlock, or thinks about blaming society at large for their obvious shortcomings.

You don't see members of the media contorting themselves into

moral pretzels insisting that these white schmucks shouldn't be held responsible for the crimes they commit. It's only blacks who are infantilized.

What many people fail to grasp is that when the media parrots the race hustlers who claim that high-achievers such as Clarence Thomas, Thomas Sowell, Condoleezza Rice, Walter Williams, Allen West and Dr. Ben Carson, are inauthentic, while holding so-called authentic blacks to a lower moral standard, it's the vilest form of bigotry because it implies that nothing better can ever be expected of them.

©2013 [Burt Prelutsky](#). Comments? Write BurtPrelutsky@aol.com.

Why Did Ron Paul Get a Pass on His “Hates Muslims” Comment?

✘ When I saw the *Tonight Show* video clip of Republican presidential candidate Ron Paul saying that fellow candidates Michele Bachmann and Rick Santorum “hate Muslims”, I was sure it had been taken out of a context. I figured that maybe Jay Leno had jokingly asked Paul to describe how critics would try and frame each of the candidates if they won the nomination, or something of that nature. Boy was I wrong. After watching the entire segment, it was clear that he was absolutely defining the two as bigots. I imagine even the most loyal Ron Paul supporters found themselves cringing at that moment.

For the past three years, conservatives have loudly and rightfully objected to the absurd narrative from Obama

supporters that people who oppose the president's policies are racists. Practically every prominent conservative and conservative group with a national platform has publicly lambasted and mocked the vile claim. Yet, now that a presidential candidate from their own side of the aisle has used essentially the same tactic (in front of a national audience, no less) to proclaim that fellow candidates are guilty of religious bigotry, the assertion has largely escaped meaningful scrutiny.

Paul's apparent reasoning is that someone who supports tough action against a country that happens to be predominantly Muslim is a bigot. Of course, the irony there is that the same logic could be used to categorize someone who supports inaction in response to a nuclear attack on Israel (as Paul does) as an anti-Semite. Something tells me that the congressman would take fierce exception to that accusation.

Now, I wouldn't expect anything less than passive analysis from the mainstream media. After all, the only thing they like more than scathing *liberal* criticism of conservatives is scathing *conservative* criticism of conservatives. They love Republican infighting, and many of them are so loathing of social conservatives like Bachmann and Santorum that they'll condone *any* sort of attack on them. My guess is that they probably don't even think Paul's comments were all that controversial.

Of course, it would be an entirely different story if Paul had laid those claims on President Obama, Joe Biden, or Hillary Clinton. After all, the administration has presided over multiple wars and sanctions in the Middle East. CIA director Leon Panetta, in fact, reiterated just this week that the administration would take "all steps necessary" to prevent Iran from getting the bomb. This seems to meet Paul's criteria for bigotry. But if he had directed those comments toward the administration, there would have been an absolute media firestorm. Swarms of reporters would have relentlessly

followed Paul around to campaign stops, repeatedly questioning him and demanding that he clarify his allegation. It would have been a topic on all the Sunday morning talk shows. Jon Stewart would have had a week's worth of comedic material. And of course, the ladies on *The View* would have been in complete hysterics.

But what I really find interesting is the lack of condemnation and scrutiny coming from the right.

Just a few weeks ago, FOX News ran segment after segment on Jimmy Fallon's band leader blasting out a song titled "Lyin' Ass Bitch" when Michele Bachmann was introduced on his late night show. Just about every conservative analyst on television and radio had something to say about it, and it remained in the national news cycle for days. Apologies were demanded and apologies were given.

But I ask you: Which is worse? The immature insinuation that someone is a *liar* and a *bitch*, or an outright accusation that someone is a bigot who wants to "go after" a religion? To me, the answer is simple.

Yet, over a week has gone by and the story has never exceeded that of a passing news tidbit. Most of those who *have* commented on it have dismissed it as a tacky "cheap-shot" in a competitive race. To me, a *cheap-shot* is mocking Rick Perry's failure to remember his own talking point. Throwing out gratuitous accusations of bigotry is not a cheap-shot. It's deplorable, and Paul's use of the typically left-wing tactic may have been the most personal and hostile attack from any candidate on a fellow candidate in this campaign. Ron Paul has not offered an apology, and there has been no pressure on him to give one.

Why aren't influential conservative voices coming out against Ron Paul the same way they've come out against Newt Gingrich over his controversial comments? After all, those same people

can't be any happier with him as a candidate than they are with Gingrich.

The default excuse used to be that Ron Paul's candidacy was so inconsequential to the presidential race that he wasn't worth extensive probing. But that has changed. Polls are now showing that he has a very real chance of winning the Iowa caucus. While few believe he can win many (if any) states beyond that, his candidacy certainly impacts the race.

Maybe many of those voices from the right *checked out* for the holiday season. Maybe *Romney Acceptance* has settled in, and they're content with letting the remaining *unelectables* beat each other to a pulp and split the conservative vote to ensure Mitt's victory. Maybe Ron Paul has gone to the well so many times with his provocative rhetoric that critics have grown tired of addressing it.

Whatever the explanation, I think there's something very wrong in how inconsistent we continue to be when judging what is acceptable in our political discourse. I fear there's no limit to how low the bar can be selectively lowered.