

# When Fox News' Most Loyal Fans Turn on Fox News

I recently received a question about Fox News viewers which was sent to my [Friday Q&A sessions](#) on this website. It was from "Andy D." who wanted to know why so many of those viewers had turned on Chris Wallace.

"Maybe I'm wrong about this, but I don't think I am," Andy wrote. "Judging by online conversations and conservative blogs, it used to be that Fox News viewers respected and were generally proud to have Chris Wallace as part of the network. ... But ever since Trump won, Wallace seems to be one of the more despised Fox News personalities (among the network's viewers) – often framed as a biased anti-Trump pro-Democrat hack who needs to be fired. ... In reality, he hasn't changed at all. He's the same guy they used to admire – fair, blunt, and still holding both sides' feet to the fire."

Then came the \$64,000 question: "Do these Fox News viewers no longer care about the network's credibility? Do they no longer care about having reputable, professional journalists that they can hold up as examples to the network's critics?"

The answer I gave Andy is that the Fox News Channel's most passionate viewers never really cared about the network's credibility. They never really cared, either, about having professional journalists with reputations for fairness that they could hold up as examples of honest journalism to Fox's many liberal critics. All they cared about was Fox giving them the kinds of opinions they already agreed with.

"The kind of Fox viewers you describe," I told Andy, "don't care one bit about anything but pumping up the president. If he does something that puts him in a bad light, and Chris Wallace says so, they turn on Wallace."

Or, you will recall, they turn on Megyn Kelly. On August 6, 2015, at the first GOP presidential debate, she had this exchange with Donald Trump:

“You’ve called women you don’t like fat pigs, dogs, slobs and disgusting animals,” Kelly began.

“Only Rosie O’Donnell,” Trump said to applause and cheering.

“For the record, it was well beyond Rosie O’Donnell,” Kelly said. “Your Twitter account has several disparaging comments about women’s looks. You once told a contestant on ‘Celebrity Apprentice’ it would be a pretty picture to see her on her knees. Does that sound to you like the temperament of a man we should elect as president?”

It was a perfectly reasonable, fair, question. Except those passionate Fox viewers didn’t think so. (For the record, I’m making a distinction between Fox viewers in general and MAGA hard-right Fox viewers.)

Choosing to side with a Fox anchor or with Donald Trump was a no brainer: They chose Mr. Trump who went on a tweeting rampage, calling Kelly, among other things, a bimbo.

For those who haven’t figured it out yet, MAGA hard-right Fox viewers are loyal to Fox only when Megyn Kelly or Chris Wallace or anyone else on FNC tells them what they want to hear. When they don’t, they get hammered on social media and elsewhere. Just ask Bret Baier.

He recently pushed back on a point conservative panelist Mollie Hemingway, a reliable defender of President Trump, was making about an interview Jared Kushner gave to Politico. Kushner was asked about the meeting he had at Trump Tower in June, 2016 with a Russian who claimed to have dirt on Hillary Clinton. At one point, the Politico reporter asked Kushner, if it happened *again*, would he *this time* call the FBI.

Mollie Hemingway thought it was an old, tired question – and then blasted the media in general for not asking what, in her view, were more relevant questions about FBI misconduct and what she said was Democratic collusion with the Russians.

Baier asked her, politely but directly, if she really thought it was irrelevant to ask if Kushner would call the FBI *if the Russians tried to set up a similar meeting in the future*. Hemingway gave her answer and they moved on. But Fox's passionate viewers didn't.

Here's just a small sample of reaction to Baier:

[@BretBaier](#) Liberal side is in full effect. He was totally disrespectful and rude to Molly Hemingway but kid gloves with that AWFUL NPR Lady! Way to Go Bret I thought you were better than that! So disappointed your turning out to be as fair and balanced as Nut Bag [@ShepNewsTeam](#)

– Rhonda Sexton (@RhondaSexton17) [June 3, 2019](#)

[@MZHemingway](#) [@BretBaier](#) was out of line. Its obvious he is a liberal. He wants to hold to his base & gain liberals. We resent his interruption & questioning of your observations. [@realDonaldTrump](#) [@charliekirk11](#) [@DFBHarvard](#) [@RyanAFournier](#)

– Darrell Collins (@DarrellCollin19) [June 4, 2019](#)

I don't know how you can take [@BretBaier](#) any more. He ignores all the facts and facilitates the Trump collusion charade. I used to think he was a good news man, but he's shown himself to be just another swamp rat with TDS.

– Dave Baker (@FlyoverVet) [June 4, 2019](#)

For those of you who don't know, TDS stands for "Trump

Derangement Syndrome.”

*Now, [@BretBaier](#) is becoming a [#NeverTrump](#) idiot. I only wish he would attack the other [#NeverTrump](#) idiots ([@MaraLiasson](#)) as much as he did [@MZHemingway](#) tonight. [@foxnews](#) is going left fast.*

*– Chris ☐☐ ([@Chris\\_1791](#)) [June 3, 2019](#)*

Again, Baier was not “rude.” He did not “attack” Mollie Hemingway. He simply asked her a question. So why so much anger?

“Trumpism is a religion. And when someone like Baier challenges a member of the Trump faithful, it’s considered blasphemy,” my friend and fellow columnist John Daly told me after the flare up on social media.

Ever since Fox went on the air in 1996, its commentators have played to the faithful in the congregation, giving them what they want to hear. So when a real journalist asks a real question that doesn’t conform to what they’re used to, they’re understandably shaken.

Opinions they don’t want to hear aren’t what they signed up for.

That’s not how it’s supposed to be, they must be thinking. For many years, *we got the kind of opinions we want*, they figure. So when Chris Wallace or Megyn Kelly or Bret Baier does what a journalist is supposed to do – ask tough questions without taking sides – the Fox viewers feel betrayed. *You’re supposed to be on our side*, they say.

MAGA hard-right Fox viewers have abandoned their principles, at least when it comes to defending Donald Trump.

Here’s a hypothetical: Let’s say it was President *Obama* who

said he had fallen in love with North Korea's brutal dictator Kim Jung-un. And let's say Mr. *Obama* said it was because Kim had sent him "beautiful letters." How do you think Hannity and Ingraham and Carlson would handle that piece of news?

We know exactly how they'd handle it. And we also know how Fox's most passionate viewers would handle it. Yet when their messiah, Donald Trump, made that ridiculous observation about his affection for a dictator who kills or imprisons his enemies, real or imagined, Mr. Trump's loyal supporters who are glued to the Fox channel day and night, just yawned.

For some time now, politics has been a form of warfare. Cable TV news has provided the ammunition to fight the war. Cable news, I recently wrote, is a weapon – one used to either support the president or to bring him down.

Roger Ailes, the visionary who created Fox News, created something else: a loyal audience that was tired of liberal bias just about everywhere else on the TV news dial and found a home at Fox.

Ailes gave them a safe place where they could go to get their biases validated. And these days, Fox is the place they can go to hear opinion talking heads tell them how wonderful the president is and how evil his enemies are.

They don't go to Fox News to hear tough questions asked by real journalists about a controversial president. That, they can get in a bunch of other places.

At Fox, and at CNN and MSNBC, considering the other side's point of view is looked upon as a waste of time. The idea that Fox viewers can learn something from Trump critics is heresy. And the same goes for CNN and MSNBC viewers learning something from supporters of the president.

Andy, who sent in the question, wondered if Fox viewers no longer care about the network's credibility. Andy, my

friend: They never did. It's just much more obvious these days, in the Age of Trump.

---

## **“The Late Barack Obama” and “Proud To Be A Flat Earther”**

**Burt's Webcast is every Wednesday at 1 PM Pacific Time.**

**Tune in at [K4HD.com](http://K4HD.com) His Call-in Number is: (818) 570-5443**

I apologize if some of you read the title of this piece and leapt to the conclusion that Joe Biden had ascended to the Oval Office, not that that would be cause for dancing in the street. Biden, after all, is a great champion of the Affordable Care Act and has been wrong when it comes to foreign affairs for nearly as long as Obama has been alive.

No, I was referring to Obama's lack of punctuality. He is not only late when it comes to delivering his annual budgets, laughable as they are, but he's even late when it comes to delivering his speeches, and we all know how much he loves the sound of his own voice. I can't count the times that someone at Fox News – usually Bret Baier – would announce that Obama was about to deliver a speech, and 10 minutes later, he still hadn't shown up. The camera would show the microphone, but there'd be nobody there. Finally, he'd stroll in –no explanation, no apology – and there would still be nobody, just an empty suit at the microphone.

What it tells you when someone is habitually late is that he regards himself as not only more important than anyone else, but more important than everyone else.

Next, I'm afraid I have to be more careful about my jokes. For

instance, a while ago I pointed out that the administration was boasting about the decrease in the rate of unemployment, while ignoring the fact that the decline was entirely attributable to the millions of Americans who had simply stopped seeking jobs. I predicted that if things continued that way, eventually both the employment and unemployment rates would be zero.

Almost before I got the words typed, we heard that ObamaCare would cost us 2.3 million jobs, while an increased minimum wage would cost between 500,000 and a million jobs. What's worse, the Democrats are actually trying to stick a smiley face on it. Cripes, isn't there anyone in this regime who can take a joke?

Nancy Pelosi insisted that the loss of all those jobs would be wonderful because people would be free to pursue their dreams, unless, of course, their dreams involved actually working fulltime and earning a decent living.

If you sit down and read the Constitution, you will find that our forefathers, employing remarkable prescience, protected us from just about every imaginable contingency. The one thing they couldn't protect us from was ourselves – and the electoral power of the lazy, the ignorant, the greedy and the envious.

Kathleen Willey, one of the many women Bill Clinton sexually assaulted, has recently pointed out that his wife aided and abetted him every inch of the way, starting way back when he was still the governor of Arkansas. Whereas the Democrats never stop accusing Republicans of waging war on women, Ms. Willey is right on the money when she says that Hillary Clinton is the war on women.

She's exactly right. Not content with trashing the women that her husband attacked, Hillary Clinton dismissed all the women who accused ex-Sen. Bob Packwood of similar actions as

“whiners.” How he treated his female staffers was of absolutely no concern either to Mrs. Clinton or to her vile cohorts in NOW. What mattered was that Mrs. Clinton felt she needed his vote in the Senate in order to help pass HillaryCare. And let us not forget that it was HillaryCare, not RomneyCare, which was really the precursor to the nightmare we know as ObamaCare.

Honesty compels me to admit that I can't stand anything about Mrs. Clinton, including her voice, her eyes and that awful grimace that passes for a smile. In fact, I have always felt that when it came to the Clintons, as with the Obamas, it was the wives who possessed the Y chromosome.

Speaking of males and females, a textbook used at South Carolina University insists that Ronald Reagan, who not only appointed a woman to be Ambassador to the U.N., but, unfortunately, saw to it that Sandra Day O'Connor would be the first female justice on the Supreme Court, was a misogynist. The partisan textbook aside, I doubt that any woman would stay married to a misogynist for 52 years, putting up with a ton of embarrassing crap, unless, of course, she felt she had to in order to run for president herself.

I do not understand why the House Republicans are so reluctant to use the one power they possess, that of the purse, to rein in Obama. After all, if your kid acts like a spoiled brat, you cut off his allowance, and there's never been a bigger brat than the one acting up in the Oval Office.

Finally, I am not one to sniff at free market capitalism, but I nearly keeled over when I heard that an Oregon company is selling action figures of Edward Snowden, Julian Assange and Eric Holder. I don't know about the others, but if you want your very own Snowden, it will cost you \$99 or just \$60, if you merely want the little head, perhaps to stick on a little pike.



After wondering why anyone would want any of these figures, assuming they're not into voodoo, the next question that comes to mind is what actions would be the most appropriate. The best I could come up with is that you might wind up the Snowden doll and watch it run off to Russia; wind up Assange and watch it sneak into your private papers; or wind up Holder and watch it sell weapons to Mexican gangster dolls.

### **Proud To Be A Flat Earther**

As you have probably heard, John Kerry, who is nearly as screwy as Al Gore, has announced that climate change "is the most dangerous, most fearsome, weapon of mass destruction."

Inasmuch as Obama and his underlings have once again dragged out this bugaboo in hopes of currying favor with their base and redirecting attention away from the stench of the Affordable Care Act, it would be better described as a weapon of mass distraction.

Even if global warming, or whatever they're calling it this week, wasn't political chicanery posing as science, Obama, Kerry and the jack-booted thugs at the EPA, would be whistling in the wind. That's because China, India and Indonesia, have no plans to shut down their coal-burning plants and withdraw quietly to the pre-industrial 19th century just so the bribe-noshing, cabernet-swilling, swells can feel good about themselves. China, alone, for crying out loud, opens a new coal-burning plant every single week of the year.

Scuttling the coal industry in America will not only drive an economic stake through the heart of such states as Kentucky, Pennsylvania, Ohio and West Virginia, but send the energy costs of every American soaring through the stratosphere, just as Obama swore to do in 2008.

The fact is that even if not a single lump of coal were burned in the United States, it would have no more effect on the atmosphere than I would have on the world's water supply if I

only showered every other day.

Possibly the biggest victim of the weather hoax is science itself. When those seeking grants and tenure forsake any pretense of being truth seekers, and go along with the notion of science being based on consensus and actually use the toxic United Nations to seal the deal, you know you're dealing with liars and fakers.

Furthermore, these are some of the same folks that couldn't create a workable website in spite of blowing several hundred million dollars and wasting three years in the attempt. They are obviously in no position to label those who question their technological expertise as paid-up members of the Flat Earth Society, as Obama and Kerry do with annoying regularity.

It just strikes me that if you can't even produce a viable website, you're on very shaky ground when it comes to trying to screw around with the world's weather.

In 2008, when Obama boasted that his energy policy would send energy costs skyrocketing – and still got elected – I assumed most people thought he was joshing. And when, as president, he unleashed the dogs of the EPA on the coal industry, I assumed most people sloughed it off as strictly between him and the folks in those coal mining states. But when he was re-elected last year, even carrying some of those very states, it merely convinced me that a lot of people can't chew gum and vote at the same time.

Coal is responsible for 40% of our energy. If a foreign power had somehow deprived us of our coal supply, we would have gone to war with them. Well, not Obama, of course, but all our other commanders-in-chief would have. Hell, Obama wouldn't have gone to war over Pearl Harbor

In case you're not able to keep up with all the shenanigans Obama pulls off on behalf of those whose votes the Democrats require if they're not going to follow the Whigs and Bull

Moosers into the dustbin of history, he is opening gas stations offering free gas in 70 inner-city locations around the country.

Apparently, a little known provision of ObamaCare authorizes "improved transportation routes to hospitals." As the regime's argument goes, what good is this splendiferous new health care system if poor people can't get themselves to the few remaining doctors? The first such station just opened, naturally, in Detroit. And, no, the customers, if you can even call them that, will not have to prove they'll be using the gas to get to Henry Ford Hospital or Sinai-Grace.

The price tag attached to this giveaway is two billion dollars, and only a very backward child would believe it has any other purpose aside from persuading grateful recipients to use some of that gas to drive themselves to the voting booth on Election Day.

Finally, in case you missed the news, "Cover Oregon," that state's ObamaCare exchange, has spent \$160 million and has yet to sign up a single person. In some quarters of the state, that has been the cause of high dudgeon, but I say, back off! After all, Obama blew nearly a trillion dollars on his stimulus bill and it led to no jobs, shovel ready or otherwise, and he's still running victory laps over it.

The shmuck also wasted several hundred million of our tax dollars on Solyndra and other con games involving green energy, all for the benefit of his major campaign contributors.

It just seems to me that Oregonians who have twice voted overwhelmingly for Obama have no business getting all hissy over a paltry \$160 million. One could say it's merely a case of Oregon's chickens answering that age old question by crossing the road in order to come home to roost.

©2014 [Burt Prelutsky](#). Comments? Write [BurtPrelutsky@aol.com](mailto:BurtPrelutsky@aol.com).