

“Obama’s Racist Pointman” and “The Last Time I Saw Paris”

I know that even six years into his presidency there are people who still see Obama in the exact same way he was presented to us in 2008 – as the great uniter of blacks and whites. But, then, there are those who also approve of his foreign policy in the Middle East. Sometimes you merely have to accept innate stupidity as a part of the human condition and move on.

Among the legion of disasters one can lay at Obama’s feet, the racial antagonisms he has fostered might well stand out as his greatest failing. That’s because it’s the one he could have most easily avoided.

On other issues, one could, to a greater or lesser degree, blame his partisan politics. But because he was black, when it came to the racial divide, he was in the unique position of being able to bridge it in ways that no other president could. But instead of using the bridge, he blew it to smithereens by appointing one unrepentant racist, Eric Holder, to head up the Justice Department and he made another, Al Sharpton, his consigliere on racial matters.

Sharpton gained his initial fame back in the 1980s using the lies of a black teenage girl, Tawana Brawley, to denounce the NYPD. For those too young to remember, Ms. Brawley was afraid that her mother would ground her if she found out that Tawana had spent the weekend making whoopee with her boyfriend. So, instead, she concocted a sordid tale about being tossed in a trash dumpster after being raped by six New York City cops.

The lies worked to his advantage then and Sharpton has seen no reason to change his ways. He has merely revised the narrative. Back then, his stooge was a sexually precocious

teenager; today, he uses a couple of black thugs as the innocent victims of police brutality in his tale of woe. But the motive now, as it was then, is simply to promote Al Sharpton as the conscience and spokesperson for black America.

For reasons I can't fathom, race hustlers like Sharpton and Jesse Jackson are catnip for the media. Although they both speak as if their mouths, along with their brains, were full of mush, they have been the go-to guys on matters of race for the past several decades. In spite of his deficiencies as a public speaker, Sharpton even gets to host his own show on MSNBC. The fact that nobody watches MSNBC is no excuse, and his bosses at NBC shouldn't be allowed to use that as an alibi for providing the putz with a megaphone.

When in December, Sharpton hosted an anti-police demonstration in Washington, D.C., he actually flew arsonist Joshua Williams, whom most of us had last seen on TV burning down the Quik Trip market in Berkeley, Missouri, so that he could address his fellow thugs.

Although Sharpton owes his current prominence to the likes of Obama and NY Mayor Bill De Blasio, he owes far more to Jesse Jackson. It was Jackson, after all, who taught him all he knows about corporate extortion.

At present, Sharpton is being paid by Colgate-Palmolive, Anheuser-Busch, Macy's, Pfizer, Pepsi, GM, Walmart, Chase, Verizon, McDonald's and MGM, among a great many other companies, for what the mob used to call "protection." When Al Capone got paid off, it was to prevent a bomb being tossed through a tavern window. When Jackson receives a corporate donation to his Rainbow Coalition or Sharpton gets a donation to his National Action Network, it's to prevent having a bunch of black stiffys parading for the TV cameras in front of their headquarters, claiming the companies engage in racist policies.

And because Sharpton gets to sit next to Barack Obama more often than Michelle does might also explain why he is still walking around a free man even though he's in arrears to the IRS to the tune of \$4.5 million.

For me, the biggest surprise is that Sharpton, who was a roly-poly guy back in the 1980s and is now so tiny he looks as if his neck is too skinny to hold up his head, never thought to market the Sharpton Diet. The change has been so dramatic, the weight loss so astounding, I thought at times he might actually disappear altogether. But, alas, that was only wishful thinking.

But that's not my only wish when it comes to one of America's three most odious race hustlers. My other wish, far-fetched as it might be, would be for all those companies who are currently being bled by Sharpton to receive thousands of angry letters and phone calls from customers threatening to take their business elsewhere if they continue to pay a shakedown artist who knows everything there is to know about extortion, except, that is, how to spell the word or pronounce it.

THE LAST TIME I SAW PARIS

In 1940, when Jerome Kern and Oscar Hammerstein II wrote their Oscar-winning ode to Paris, she had recently been invaded by the Nazis. Had the song been written 75 years later, the lyric would have to mention that her streets ran red with blood, and Hammerstein would have to find a rhyme for Islamic butchery.

It wasn't that long ago that the media expressed its universal contempt for Sony Pictures when the company initially decided not to release "The Interview." The charge was that Sony was letting Kim Jong-un get the idea he could unilaterally abolish the First Amendment. Even Obama, in spite of his fondness for Hollywood liberals, belatedly piled on, insisting that Sony had made a mistake.

But now it's the media itself that has decided that punking out is the better part of discretion. Even though twelve French satirists were murdered for using a cartoony depiction of Muhammad in their magazine, none of these stalwart defenders of the First Amendment is daring to publish the newsworthy cartoon.

In the same way, when Muslims killed Danish journalists over similar cartoons in 2005, these same newspapers and magazines censored themselves.

Personally, I don't condemn the NY Times, CNN, Fox, the AP, Time magazine, the L.A. Times or any of these other media giants for their cowardice, which is at least rational behavior in a world rife with jihadists, but for their hypocrisy, which I find contemptible. Where do they get off shaming Sony for caving to threats?

Worse yet, these media cowards have the gall to pretend they're motivated by a profound respect for religion. In my opinion, if Islam is a religion, and not a barbaric cult, then so was Nazism; and Charles Manson, Jim Jones and David Koresh, should all be regarded as religious leaders.

Barack Hussein Obama – and what belief system would we normally connect with someone named Barack Hussein Obama? – famously said, “The future doesn't belong to those who slander the Prophet of Islam.” But that goes without saying. After all, what could any reasonable person find slander-worthy in a Prophet who was known to be a pedophile and who promoted his faith by butchering those who dared question his holiness?

For years, conmen have made fortunes convincing the greedy and gullible that they had come up with a legitimate way to avoid paying income taxes. Well, this is to announce that I have come up with a sure-fire system of my own, but being the kind of guy I am, I'm offering it for free. All you have to do is be black and a prominent left-winger. For instance, when Rep.

Charles Rangel, among his other sins, was found to have been a long-standing tax cheat, his House colleagues voted to censure him. After which, they all adjourned to the House dining room to serenade Charley with a few rousing choruses of "For He's a Jolly Good Fellow."

You might say that congressmen get away with all sorts of monkey business, and you'd be right. But consider another black left-winger who doesn't hold a public office, Al Sharpton. In spite of an unpaid \$4.5 million tax bill, he is welcomed with open arms wherever black bigots congregate – be it in the streets of Ferguson, Missouri, or the West Wing of the White House.

And for those who insist that military service should be a prerequisite to a career in politics, it should be noted that Rep. Rangel apparently served honorably in the U.S. Army from 1948-1952. It is also true that he once admitted, "I only cared about dead soldiers when they looked like me." I don't believe it's a coincidence that the remark sounds very much like something Obama has been heard to say whenever some black thug gets shot.

Because I recently warned everyone off the 16 movies the studios sent me in December looking to garner my vote in the Writers Guild competition, I feel compelled to report that they finally got around to sending me one worth my time, and therefore yours. It's an English movie, "The Imitation Game," about Alan Turing, who led the English team of linguists and mathematicians who miraculously cracked Germany's enigma code during World War II.

Only once in my life did I come up with a great money-making idea. The miracle took place about 35 years ago when I wrote an article suggesting that for those people who wanted a pet, but thought dogs and cats were too much trouble, but were willing, for reasons I couldn't imagine, to settle for the likes of birds, fish and reptiles, they might consider sharing

their home with a rock. I mentioned that they were low upkeep: no messes to clean up, no newspapers that needed changing and absolutely zero food costs.

When I say it was a great money-making idea, I don't mean that it made me any money. No way. It took some other guy to see the commercial potential of the goofy notion and to make millions marketing Pet Rocks.

Well, apparently, every 35 years, I come up with these moneymakers. The other morning, I went out to my car, turned the key and was greeted with silence. My battery was kaput. When I had driven the car the previous night, everything was hunky-dory and it wasn't as if I had left the lights on.

Its time had come, as it must to all of us, and it had simply moved on to battery heaven. Anyway, what I'd like to know is why, if the battery in my smoke alarm can beep a polite warning when it's on the verge of passing away, my car battery can't do the same.

Believe me, if I knew how to invent things, I would get right on it. But I can't. So I am offering this to the world free of charge, which, come to think of it, was the problem with my damn battery.

They Have to Decide if They Want to be Liberal – or Unhinged

✘ For a while now I have been worrying about liberals. Not all of them, of course, just most of them; especially the

supposedly smart elite ones.

Some of the things they've been saying are more than a little screwy. So I thought maybe they were going mad. Now I have second thoughts. Unfortunately they're the same as my first thoughts. Now I'm convinced they've lost their minds.

Before we start ... a warning: You may think I made up some of the following examples. You may think I'm just having some fun at the expense of libs. Nope. Everything is real. You know the old saying (that I just made up): Out of the mouths of liberals comes some pretty wacky stuff.

First, there's Old Reliable, Chris Matthews, the man who never lets you down when it comes to giving liberals a bad name. During the GOP National Convention he suggested that when Republicans link Barack Obama to Chicago politics – (wait for it!) – they're being racist.

"They keep saying Chicago by the way, have you noticed?" Matthews said on MSNBC, also known as Obama Re-election headquarters. "They keep saying Chicago. That's another thing that sends that message – this guy's helping the poor people in the bad neighborhoods, screwing us in the 'burbs."

That's when another liberal, journalist and author John Hielemann, chimed in with, "There's a lot of black people in Chicago."

Get it? Every time Romney tries to tie Barack Obama to crummy, corrupt Chicago politics, what he's really doing is appealing to white racist Republicans, the only kind of Republicans there are, in the worldview of many elite liberals.

But if that was a 9.5 on the nutty scale, Matthews MSNBC colleague Lawrence O'Donnell hit the jackpot with a perfect 10.

O'Donnell was on the convention floor, and informed by MSNBC host Martin Bashir that later that evening Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell would tell the delegates, "For four years, Barack Obama has been running from the nation's problems. He hasn't been working to earn reelection. He's been working to earn a spot on the PGA tour."

Here we have another ugly example of Republican racism, at least as far as Lawrence O'Donnell is concerned. "We know exactly what he's trying to do there," he said. "He's trying to allied (sic) Tiger Woods, and surely the lifestyle of Tiger Woods, with Barack Obama. ... These people reach for every single possible racial double entendre they can find in every one of these speeches."

So if you say Barack Obama spends too much time on the golf course and not enough time trying to fix the nation's problems, that's the Republican not-so-subtle way of reminding everyone that a) Barack Obama is black – like Tiger Woods – and b) that he has the same "lifestyle" which almost certainly means that the president – like Tiger Woods – fools around with women who aren't his wife.

Thank you, Lawrence, for that brilliant analysis. I would have never thought of it. And neither would anyone else *on the entire planet* – except for people suffering from CDS – Conservative Derangement Syndrome, a terrible disorder that strikes liberals young and old whenever they come into contact – even through the TV screen – with anyone to the right of Debbie Wasserman Schultz.

As Washington Post journalist Jennifer Rubin said on CNN: "MSNBC has to decide if it wants to be liberal or unhinged." I think we can agree that MSNBC has already made that decision.

And then there's the hilarious "joke" from Yahoo! News Washington Bureau Chief David Chalian, who was caught on an

open mic during ABCNews.com's Webcast during the GOP convention. With a major storm heading for the Louisiana coast while Republicans were having a good time in Tampa, Chalian said Mitt Romney and his wife Ann were "Not concerned at all. They're happy to have a party with black people drowning."

Before you could say "Mitt Romney used to be the Grand Wizard of the Michigan Ku Klux Klan" Chalian was fired. But is that fair? After all, he only said what so many other liberals in and out of the media say about Republicans – when chit-chatting among themselves. Chalian's crime was saying it out loud into an open microphone. (He later apologized.)

And you remember Clint Eastwood's routine with the empty chair. Bet you didn't know the lousy bigot was just one more old, white Republican male spewing racism on national television.

Someone called Mike Elk, who is described as a labor journalist, tweeted, "Eastwood chair rant was RACIST, white man putting dirty words into mouth of black man like a puppet."

And a blog on the left-wing Think Progress Web site weighed in with this: "You can't escape the racial subtext of what happened last night. Eastwood scolded an (imaginary) black man for his perceived slights to the American way in front of an audience of millions, and a sea of mostly white faces laughed and egged him on."

There's another old saying (that I did not make up but wish I did): "The only people who see everything through a prism of race are skinheads and liberals."

What Would Martin Luther King Think of Chris Matthews?

✘ Like many people in our country, I was born after the African-American Civil Rights Movement. I wasn't around to witness the shameful legalities of racial discrimination, and the bold acts of civil disobedience led by brave heroes to end that discrimination. No, I learned of the historical plight where many of us did: From school, film footage, and the words of the great Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.

King's *dream* of a colorblind society has made him one of the most important figures in all of American history. He died for that dream, but thanks to his bravery, leadership, and moral messages of freedom and equality, his dream now flourishes in this country.

On the few occasions when I'm asked which people inspire me the most, Martin Luther King, Jr. is always right at the top of that list. In my view, King's most powerful message was that he wanted his children to grow up in a country where they "will not be judged by the color of their skin, but by the content of their character." It's such an amazingly profound statement to me, and he phrased it so simply and earnestly that its meaning was unmistakable.

That's why I find it absolutely astonishing that, after nearly fifty years of amazing racial strides in this country, many proclaimed admirers of King seem to have absolutely no clue what the man gave his life for. They not only fail to understand it, but manage to unwittingly marginalize and even pervert King's dream under the premise of defending it.

From a media standpoint, the most vocal offender has to be MSNBC's Chris Matthews. While there's no shortage of knee-jerk race-baiters in the left-wing media, Matthews is in a class

all by himself. He has actually managed to pollute the sincere meaningfulness of the *actual* civil rights movement, by conducting a hair-on-fire, satirical civil rights movement of his own.

The *Chris Matthews Civil Rights Movement* isn't about freedom, racial equality, or advancing society. It's about taking viewpoints that he disagrees with, reflexively crumpling them up into something unrecognizable, then unraveling them through a nonsensical methodology to expose the inevitable conclusion of *racism*.

He's been skipping down this tasteless and obnoxious path for some time now, but while broadcasting from the Republican National Convention this week, he demonstrated just how truly demented he has become.

Monday night, he interviewed former presidential candidate, Newt Gingrich. Matthews took the opportunity to accuse both Gingrich and Mitt Romney of using "racial code words" (a favorite phrase of his over the past year) by bringing attention to the large number of Americans that are on welfare and food stamps. According to Matthews, if you point out that an unhealthy, unsustainable number of people are reliant on these programs, you're a racist. Why? Well, Matthews' rationale is that when the public thinks about welfare and food stamps, they also think of black people. So if those programs are mentioned aloud, the public (presumably white people) will be inclined to believe that black people are a drag on our society. Matthews has been insisting that Republicans realize this, and that's why they keep bringing up the topic.

Newt Gingrich found the obvious irony in Matthews' logic: It's Chris Matthews (not the Republicans) who is making the connection between welfare, food stamps, and the black community. The Republicans have merely stated the numbers without any mention of ethnicity. Of course, that observation

was adamantly rejected by the *Chris Matthews Civil Rights Movement*.

That same day, an unhinged Matthews scolded RNC chairman, Reince Priebus, for the Republican party's criticism of the president's recent changes to welfare eligibility requirements. "You are playing that little ethnic card there!" Matthews chided, forcing even his liberal colleagues seated at the same table to squirm uncomfortably in their chairs. "It's a race card!"

When Priebus stated that Obama is using a European approach in managing our economy, Matthews screamed, "You're doing it again!... You're saying he's influenced by *foreign* influences! You're playing that card again!" Matthews' assertion was that if you believe the president is taking our economy in the direction of European economies, you're a racist. I would love to be able to explain his thinking on that one, but I started to form a headache when I tried... so I stopped. Sadly, that statement wasn't even the most outrageous one that Matthews made during the discussion...

He complained that Mitt Romney had a cushy life growing up, in comparison to the president. Matthews screamed that President Obama has "an African name, and he's had to live with that!" Aside from the obvious racial condescension of that statement (again, not recognized by the *Chris Matthews Civil Rights Movement*), I found it humorous that Matthews was trying to evoke sympathy for the president's name from a guy named "Reince Priebus".

On Wednesday night, Matthews decried the Republicans for repeatedly mentioning that Barack Obama comes from Chicago. The nerve! How could they do such a thing?! As we all know, the president IS from Chicago. It's the city where he has lived much of his adult life (and still has a house there), it's the city he served public offices in, and it's the city where his presidential campaign is based. According to

Matthews, because there's a significant black population in Chicago, mentioning Chicago in accordance with Obama is another "racial code word." Yes, in the *Chris Matthews Civil Rights Movement*, saying the name of President Obama's hometown is considered *hate speech*.

Later Wednesday, after Vice Presidential nominee Paul Ryan delivered his well-received speech to the RNC crowd, Matthews came forward with some unique, on-the-spot analysis. After hearing Ryan's line about our rights coming from "nature and God", he pondered what type of audience that comment was tailored for. His determination was that it was designed to resonate with people who received their rights prior to 1965. In other words, *white people*. The *Chris Matthews Civil Rights Movement* has apparently decided that either "nature", "God", or a combination of the two are also *racial code words*.

Now, maybe I should cut Matthews a little slack on that last one. It was pretty late at night when he made those comments. He may have just been a bit tired after a long day of identifying other, various forms of racism (I've heard that can be exhausting). Maybe a night's sleep did him some good. When Chuck Todd interviewed him Thursday morning, it was a perfect opportunity to find out if that was the case. To his credit, Matthews' didn't repeat his 1965 reference. Nope, he instead took us back further in time and suggested that the Republican party wanted to take the country back to the days of slavery. Yes, slavery. Thanks for clearing that up, Chris! You're a class act!

At least when Al Sharpton does stuff like this, the motivation is clear. He's just trying to market his career.

But with Matthews, I think it's more complicated than that. Sure, he's a committed liberal with a crippling case of *white guilt*, who is astonishingly desperate to earn acceptance from the hardest-left elements of the Democratic party. But there's something else, and I think it goes to his professional

career. I think he has felt so tormented and bitter over the thumping he's taken from conservative critics over his embarrassing fawning of Barack Obama, that he somewhere along the line blew a gasket.

Four years ago, Chris Matthews sacrificed any journalistic integrity he may have still had to serve as a shameless media-cheerleader from Barack Obama. No one has let him forget it. To this day, he's still often antagonized by hecklers and guests on his show for confessing that he felt a "thrill" up his leg when listening to Obama speak. With his audience dwindling, his media colleagues regularly laughing at him, and his very relevance steadily slipping from his grasp, he's made a life-decision to re-establish himself as a man of great importance – a crusader, if you will. And for a dedicated, bleeding-heart liberal like Matthews, there is no more noble crusade than that of exposing racism.

Thus, he appears to have made it his life mission to strike back at conservatives in the most lethal way he knows how: Exposing *them* as racists. It doesn't matter how ridiculous he sounds in the process. It doesn't matter how illogical his arguments are. It doesn't even matter that his entire supposition (that *wink-and-nod* racism is somehow a political winner in a country that has soundly rejected racism) makes absolutely no sense. He has gone *all in* with the *Chris Matthews Civil Rights Movement*. The result is an angry man with a microphone who sounds more unhinged with each passing day.

Matthews' often references Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. in his commentary. It's clear he admires King. One has to wonder, though, what King would have thought of Chris Matthews. I have little doubt that he'd be absolutely ashamed of him, because Matthews' plight pretty much goes against everything that King that stood for.

The *Chris Matthews Civil Rights Movement* isn't about advancing

an oppressed people. It's about presuming racism in order to slander people that Matthews doesn't like. The *Chris Matthews Civil Rights Movement* isn't about judging people by the content of their character. It's about condescendingly assuming that judgement of our African-American president's job performance is not about his character, but about the color of his skin. The *Chris Matthews Civil Rights Movement* isn't about striving for a colorblind society. It's about identifying and differentiating people by their race.

While King risked everything to defeat racism, Matthews uses presumed racism to advance his own sanctimony. While King's message transcends politics, Matthews' message is nothing but pure politics.

Most importantly... Every time Matthews condemns imagined racism, he marginalizes actual racism. Genuine elements of racism absolutely still exist in this country, but those elements are largely ignored because official and unofficial followers of The *Chris Matthews Civil Rights Movement* have turned racism into a satire. They've turned what should be a serious charge – one worthy of attention – into a reflexive insult that is taken with a grain of salt. He's not carrying on Martin Luther King's dream. He's trashing it.

Chris Matthews is earning himself a legacy alright, but not the one he wants. He's securing his proper spot as the national media's most abhorrent buffoon.

Romney Should Stop Running

from his Wealth

✘ Obama operatives and willing members of the media are making a big issue of the fact that Mitt Romney hasn't made public more than his most recent tax returns. This is pushing a campaign theme of theirs that Romney is super rich, with his offshore bank accounts and car elevators. They are trying to portray the President as some working class guy who understands you, and Romney is some rich guy who can't relate. This argument should be revealed as the fraud that it is.

The President has an estimated net worth of roughly \$10.5 million, while Mitt Romney's wealth is over \$200 million. The administration puts out proposals which treat anyone who earns \$250,000 is the same as Warren Buffet. The same majority of Americans who lump these two groups together would probably consider both candidates rich. This information needs to be part of the public debate. The Obama campaign would be forced to argue that our guy is just rich, their guy is super rich. This distinction without a difference, in the eyes of most voters, should be exploited by the Romney campaign.

Mr. Romney has been running for president for 6 years, and the cat is out of the bag in terms of his wealth. Having run for this long, he should also be prepared to release at least that many years of returns. He should accompany this release of information with a speech that addresses the issue. Leaking to the press what the speech is about should even get liberal media outlets to cover it. MSNBC headline... "Up next...Mitt Romney comes clean on his wealth."

During the speech he should confirm the rumor that he is rich. He should repeatedly refer to the president and himself as "members of a fortunate group of Americans, part of the 1%, two of a kind, etc." He should make it clear that Americans like himself and the President, have a special obligation to give something back to the country that has made each of them

members of the top 1%. The speech should then be capped off by a promise that he will donate his entire salary when he becomes President to charity. To go further, he should suggest that when he is convinced that taxpayer money is being spent wisely, and without waste, he will donate his salary to paying down the national debt.

This should accomplish a few things, all of them good.

- It will take the issue of “what is Romney hiding” off the table.
- Romney’s charitable donations of over \$3 million per year will be highlighted.
- It will help frame the President as also in the wealthy 1% category with Mr. Romney, neutralizing the issue.
- It will generate a belief that the President is a hypocrite.
- There may be some foolish media types who will try to explain how Mr. Obama’s \$10 million is not rich. This is a winning discussion for the Romney campaign.
- It will generate questions for Mr. Obama about why he doesn’t donate his salary.
- It will highlight the huge debt that the President has presided over.
- It brings attention to government inefficiency, which plays into Romney as a “Mr. Fix-it” such as his work at Bain Capital, rescue of the Salt Lake City Olympics, etc.

It is proper to concentrate on the economy, but sidetrack issues must be addressed as well. There are so many false and misleading statements that are put out by the Obama campaign, which are easy to turn against them. For Mr. Romney to be successful he must respond, and turn these issues to his advantage.

This Just In: War Breaks Out – Thank You, God

☒ Every now and then a war breaks out that is actually fun to watch. The kind of war where you're hoping both sides lose. Thankfully, such a war has now erupted, and right here in the United States of Entertainment. On one side is a man who gives the term "nut job" a bad name. On the other, a man who gives the term "Al Gore" a bad name.

Yes, fans of chaos, this is the war pitting Keith Olbermann against Al Gore; a war between the biggest name on Current TV (which is like calling somebody the tallest midget in the room) and the Nobel Peace Prize winner who co-founded the left-wing network. If this were a movie it would be called "Dumb and Dumber, the Sequel."

Olbermann worked for Current TV until a few weeks ago when he got fired for, among other things, not showing up to work. Hey, give the poor guy a break. He was making only \$10 million a year. Not one to tolerate injustice, he sued Current TV seeking as much as \$70 million for lost wages over the life of his contract and for an equity stake in the company that was part of the allure to get him to sign.

Just the other day, thing got interesting. Current TV fired back. It counter-sued Olbermann, claiming, as one news report put it, that, "he failed to perform his duties for the progressive television network and saying it does not owe him 'a dime' of the millions Olbermann claims he is owed."

Before we move on, let's remember that Gore (and Current TV's co-founder Joel Hyatt) hired Olbermann knowing full well that he was a time bomb with horned rimmed glasses, that he was an

escapee from a mental institution – that institution going under the name MSNBC. So Al Gore makes a chuckle-headed move like that and we're supposed to trust him when he says global warming is going to destroy the planet? Forgive me if I'm skeptical.

One of my favorite pastimes is watching progressives get ugly. I mean, they're so compassionate most of the time, right? And that's the best thing about the Olbermann-Gore War – the pure, rotten nastiness of it all.

After he got dumped, Olbermann fired a broadside against Gore and Hyatt saying in his lawsuit that there were so many technical problems at their network that it looked like “an unprofessional cable-access show.” Ouch!

Here's what the network's lawyers put in their counter-suit against Olbermann: “Current seeks a determination that it is no longer obligated to pay a dime to Mr. Olbermann who, having already been paid handsomely for showing up sporadically and utterly failing to keep his end of the bargain, now seeks to be paid tens of millions more for not working at all.”

Olbermann apparently got so sick of the Mickey Mouse operation at Current TV that he went AWOL. According to the lawsuit against him, he worked only 19 of 41 business days in January and February and refused to work on the network's primary election coverage. Question: Why should he have to work on election coverage? After all, he was only in charge of NEWS at Current TV.

But Olbermann's lawsuit says, “After being on the air for nearly eight months – long after all ‘growing pains’ should have ceased – Current still couldn't manage to, literally, keep the lights on.”

Maybe, but the counter-suit says that Olbermann was a giant pain in the ass, that he rejected seven limousine companies, that he refused to cooperate in promotional discussions and

that he took vacations with little notice. The suit also claims that Olbermann got especially annoyed one time and threw a glass mug on the set.

After reading the charges and the counter charges, I came to a conclusion: There is a God. And He likes me. He really, really likes me! Why else would he let this show go on?

One more thing: Each night, Keith Olbermann, the biggest star on Current TV, attracted 177,000 viewers.

I had more people at my Bar Mitzvah.

Please God, don't let it stop.