

The Worst Journalism of Our Time

Now that we know that Donald Trump wasn't a stooge of the Kremlin, now that it's been determined he wasn't a Russian "asset" or a Manchurian candidate, let's say out loud what everyone knows.

Donald Trump's real crime as far as left-wing journalists and politicians are concerned is that he's guilty of defeating Hillary Clinton. It's really that simple. And for this affront to their progressive sensibilities, he must be brought down.

Just as there were journalists too young to cover the great civil rights story of the 1960s and tried to capture those glory days by lionizing groups like Black Lives Matter and reporting on racism in America whether it really existed or not, so too are there journalists who wish they had been around during Watergate but were busy finger painting in kindergarten or weren't even born when Woodward and Bernstein brought down a president.

Now, those who were too young to bring down Nixon want their fame and glory too – and Donald Trump is their target.

So for two years they went on a rampage. They launched what a headline over an op-ed in the Wall Street Journal accurately calls, "A Catastrophic Media Failure."

For the record, some journalism about the president these past two years has been solid. But too much of it hasn't been.

You'd think that if honest mistakes were made they'd go in both directions. But they didn't. They all went in the anti-Trump direction. Journalists, often citing anonymous sources (who, like the journalists themselves, also despised the president) couldn't wait to link him to the Russians.

If CNN were a doctor it would be sued for malpractice. At “The most trusted name in news” as they like to call themselves, they don’t even try to hide their loathing of this president. If you turned to CNN at almost any time during the past two years you would have been exposed to one conspiracy theory after another about the president and the Russians.

One of many examples: CNN said Donald Trump Jr. was secretly given email access to stolen documents before WikiLeaks publicly exposed them. This would be a bombshell – because if true it could prove that the President Trump’s own son was colluding with Russian hackers to help his father take down Hillary Clinton.

One tiny problem: CNN somehow got the date wrong; the email was sent to him *after* WikiLeaks published the stolen documents.

CNN also reported – based on a single anonymous source – that Trump advisor Anthony Scaramucci was under investigation for a meeting he took with a Russian banker prior to Trump’s inauguration. Scaramucci denied the story and CNN eventually acknowledged it got it wrong. Three journalists responsible for the fake “scoop” resigned as a result.

And Brian Stelter, CNN’s alleged media reporter, asked this question on his show in December 2018: “Does the public understand just how much trouble the President is in? If not, that is a failing of the press.”

Does Brian Stelter understand just how dense he is? If not, that’s a failing of CNN for putting this shill for the mainstream media on television.

In August 2017, Dan Rather went on MSNBC to declare that there’s “a political hurricane out there at sea” by the name of “Hurricane Vladimir” – a hurricane, we were led to believe, that could sweep Donald Trump right out of office.

ABC News ran a collusion story alleging that former national security adviser Michael Flynn was prepared to testify that then-candidate Donald Trump ordered him to make contact with the Russians. Turns out it happened after Donald Trump was elected and was transitioning into office – a standard practice for an incoming president.

Then there's Jonathan Chait, a progressive currently working at New York magazine, who before the president met with Putin in Finland last summer wrote that "it would be dangerous not to consider the possibility that the summit is less a negotiation between two heads of state than a meeting between a Russian-intelligence asset and his handler." Chait, a left-wing ideologue who masquerades as a thoughtful journalist, was only speculating, of course – just asking a simple question, don't you know: What if the President of the United States is a spy working for the Russians.

Here's another question: What if Jonathan Chait wasn't so left-wing? Would his journalism be less dependent on wild speculation and more responsible?

Or how about Paul Krugman, one of the many Trump haters at the New York Times, who tweeted that "the failure to connect the dots on Trump-Russia" was one of the "big failures of 2018 campaign coverage."

Often it was their allies in the Democratic Party that were driving the Crazy Train – the journalists acting as their stenographers, rarely grilling them on their unfounded and unsubstantiated accusations.

There was Beto O'Rourke who stopped eating dirt long enough to say that, "You have a president who, beyond a shadow of a doubt sought to, however ham-handedly, collude with the Russian government, a foreign power, to undermine and influence our elections."

"Beyond a shadow of a doubt"? Really? Where did that come

from? How does he know that? Will reporters now treat him as a conspiratorial kook – or merely as an offbeat presidential candidate?

And there's Adam Schiff, the chairman of the House Intelligence Committee who never met a camera he didn't like – who said, "I think there's plenty of evidence of collusion and conspiracy in plain sight."

What evidence? And have reporters gone easy on him because he's constantly leaking information to them?

There was John Brennan, the former CIA director who famously said, "I called [Trump's] behavior treasonous, which is to betray one's trust and aid and abet the enemy, and I stand very much by that claim."

Yet, MSNBC treats Brennan as a serious analyst, not as someone whose hatred of the president has fundamentally tainted his analysis.

And let's not forget political scientist Rob Reiner, who doubles as a film director. Reiner said that, "The biggest scandal in U.S. history is coming into focus. On Friday Rachel Maddow made it clear. Donald Trump conspired with the enemy."

Oh, if Rachel Maddow said it on MSNBC, it must be true, right?

Every allegation fueled the media frenzy. Every conspiracy theory inspired more "news" stories which inspired more conspiracy theories which inspired still more "news" stories.

As Sean Davis put it in his Wall Street Journal op-ed, for the Trump-haters in the media, "[T]he Trump-Russian investigation was never about protecting democracy or securing elections – never mind telling the truth, which is supposed to be their job."

This was always about one thing: Bringing down the man who defeated the candidate liberal journalists wanted to win,

Hillary Clinton.

It's just a matter of time before some progressive, either in the world of politics or the world of journalism, attempts to link Robert Mueller to the Kremlin. After all, he's the villain who cleared the detested Mr. Trump of conspiracy allegations. Maybe Mueller was the Russian stooge. Maybe he was on the Kremlin's payroll.

Crazy? Maybe. But no crazier than what's been passing for honest journalism these past two years.

“I Used To Be A Democrat” and “Do Liberals Ever Listen To Themselves?”

It's true that for a long time, an inexcusably long time, I was a registered Democrat. But even then, I never called myself a liberal. Because I came of age in the 1960s, I associated liberals with the punks I knew who called cops “pigs,” called soldiers “baby killers” and used any and all means to dodge the draft, and then had the hypocrisy to announce they did so because they were avowed pacifists.

Being in my 20s myself, I knew these people and I knew it was fear of battle or being bossed around by top sergeants, typically tough guys from the South, that motivated them to head off either to Canada or to one of the many left-wing shrinks who were willing to lie about their mental disorders and or verify they were homosexuals.

Fifty years later, they're still hypocrites, but instead of

being college students, they're running colleges, TV networks, movie studios, solar panel companies and the New York Times. And, what's more, they continue to lie. Most recently, a sample of journalists lied to a pollster about their political affiliation, a mere 28% admitting to being Democrats and 50% claiming to be registered Independents.

Inasmuch as we already know that at least 90% of those in the news game always vote for liberals and that their campaign contributions are even more lopsided than that, you have to wonder why they even bother lying about something as transparent as their political bias. All you really have to do is turn on the network news or pick up a daily newspaper, Time magazine, the New Yorker, Vanity Fair or any of the slick glossies devoted to fashion and cosmetics, to realize that they should, by all rights, be paid directly by the DNC for their propaganda efforts.

Ever since I heard the head of the NBA drop the hammer on Clippers owner Donald Sterling, I found myself wondering where Commissioner Adam Silver, who is nearly as spooky-looking as James Carville, got off thinking he had the authority to take the team away from its rightful owner. I mean, who the heck does he think he is? Harry Reid?

Even I know that California is a community property state, and I certainly knew that Sterling had a wife named Shelly because I kept hearing that she was suing her husband's ex-paramour for the return of the two million dollars the old fool had lavished on her in the form of cash, cars, condo and, unfortunately for the big mouth, a cellphone.

If I know anything about Jewish wives and, regrettably, I do, Commissioner Silver would have an easier time trying to pry my dog's chew toy away from her than taking the Clippers away from Mrs. Sterling.

It doesn't happen too often, but every once in a while someone

forwards something to me from the Internet that I haven't seen before and that actually grabs my attention. In this case, it was a series of ways that one could easily identify a liberal. I mean aside from asking them if they happen to be journalists, judges, social workers, teachers, professors, illegal aliens, actors, musicians or convicted felons.

Here it is, with a few of my own modifications: (1) A liberal is someone who thinks Republicans are waging a war on women, but that the Muslim world isn't. (2) A liberal is someone who says to a pregnant woman: "Don't smoke, it'll hurt your baby," but tells her it's quite okay to abort that same baby. (3) A liberal is someone who thinks Fox News lies, but Obama doesn't. (4) A liberal is someone who lives in a gated community or behind a high wall, but says that a border fence won't work. (5) A liberal is someone who wails about "corporate welfare," but thinks it's great that Obama bailed out General Motors to save union contracts and blew a billion tax dollars on certain-to-fail green energy companies in exchange for campaign contributions. (6) A liberal is someone who protested the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan and proclaimed the Patriot Act fascistic, until Barack Obama took office.

Finally, Pope Francis is at it again. He has now called upon the governments of the world to redistribute their wealth to the poor in order to put an end to what he calls the "economy of exclusion," by which I assume he's referring to capitalism. What he doesn't bother explaining is that it is capitalism that allows the poor in America and the industrial West to live in, relatively speaking, the lap of luxury when compared to those who live in places where capitalism is just a rumor.

As my friend Jim Bass says, "Let him put his money where his mouth is, and start auctioning off the Vatican's treasures."

For my part, the more socialistic blather I hear bubbling out of his mouth, the more convinced I am that he should be identified as Pope Francis (D-VC).

DO LIBERALS EVER LISTEN TO THEMSELVES?

Seriously, is it possible that liberals actually believe the nonsense they go around spouting? I mean, I understand that as majority leader of the Senate, Harry Reid has to appear to be in sync with Barack Obama, but when in the wake of swapping five anti-American jihadists with unpronounceable names for one calling himself Bowe Bergdahl, Reid said, "I'm glad to get rid of them," did he not understand that most of us completed the thought with "and put them right back on the battlefield where they can resume killing our soldiers"?

For his part, Obama, after comparing himself to such wartime presidents as Washington, Lincoln and FDR, said that an exchange of POWs is typical policy at the end of a war. That must have come as surprising news to the thousands of troops still risking life and limb in Afghanistan. As for the Taliban, they're still giggling over Obama's announcement in 2012 that Al Qaeda was decimated.

The real tragedy of the swap is that we couldn't sweeten the deal by tossing in Obama.

How sappy are liberals? Well, Nobel Prize-winning economist/NY Times propagandist Paul Krugman said, "The VA is proof that socialized medicine works." Anybody care to bet that Krugman doesn't go to the VA for his medical needs?

Most of us have gotten sick and tired of hearing Obama state that he didn't know about a scandal brewing until he read about it in a newspaper, even when, as with the VA, he was yakking about that very problem six years ago. But even if that were the case, it would put him a leg up on most voters who, unless they watch Fox, read certain blogs or tune in talk radio, have to rely on smoke signals for their news. That should help explain why Democrats continue to win elections.

As for Sgt. Bergdahl, we are told by his parents and some of the schlemiels in his hometown that he spoke like a social

worker and acted like a saint, but how many social workers try to join the French Foreign Legion? And how many saints not only desert their comrades on the battlefield, but leave hoping to sign up with the Taliban? It's rather reminiscent of Edward Snowden, who betrayed America because of his alleged love of freedom and open societies, and then scooted off to China before receiving sanctuary in Vladimir Putin's Russia.

Next, why is it that when liberals argue for an ounce of prevention as opposed to a pound of cure, it's only when they're bemoaning the evils of alcohol, drugs and tobacco, but never when the subject happens to be abortions?

When Paul Ryan mentioned, with some good-natured annoyance, that he keeps getting confused with ex-congressman Anthony ("I'll show you mine if you let me show you mine") Weiner, Weiner, otherwise known as Carlos Danger to all the women he cyber-stalked, had the gall to say, "That's the final insult. How much more can I bear?" One can only assume he meant "bear" and not "bare." But see what I mean about liberals not listening to themselves?

The people they should be listening to are folks like Thomas Sowell, who has raised the question: "What is your fair share of what someone else has worked for?" He's also the fellow who said, "I have never understood how it is greedy to want to keep the money you have earned, but not greedy to want to take somebody else's."

Another thought liberals should heed goes this way: If you've got minimum skills, minimum education, show minimum motivation and provide a minimum contribution to the workplace, why the hell should someone be forced to pay you more than you're obviously worth?

When it comes to the stagnant economy, a problem that Obama only pays lip service to when he's trying to distract people from one of his endless scandals and his numerous end-runs

around the Constitution, Katie Pavlich, writing in Townhall magazine, points out that 47.6 million Americans are now receiving food stamps from the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program via their SNAP cards.

Because numbers alone generally make people's eyes glaze over, she reminds us that during the Depression, thousands of desperately hungry people lined up to receive free food at soup kitchens. Even if we weren't around at the time, we've all seen those grainy, heart-wrenching, black and white photos of hopeless men in overcoats, wearing hats and caps, lined up to get their slabs of bread and bowls of gruel.

Thanks to modern technology, we are spared those scenes today. But, as Ms. Pavlich, points out, if we assume that an average of 916 people can stand in a double-stacked line a quarter of a mile long, the current recipients would be standing in one that was 12,827 miles long. Only a saint wouldn't try to take cuts before the gruel congealed.

The EPA seems to have accepted the challenge by the IRS to prove itself the most contemptible, most power-hungry, agency of the federal government. With their endless regulations, it seems their sole mission is to bring to a grinding halt the age of the American entrepreneur, the American farmer and whatever still remains of American industry.

And at the rate they keep expanding the list of endangered species, soon the only one left unprotected will be the American taxpayer.

**Burt's Webcast is every Wednesday at Noon Pacific Time.
Tune in at K4HD.com His Call-in Number is: (818) 570-5443**

©2014 Burt Prelutsky. Comments? Write BurtPrelutsky@aol.com.

Alas, E Pluribus Pluribus

Not being conversant in Latin, I may have bungled the title, but I figure that if *e pluribus unum* means one out of many, what we have turned into is an America that the Founding Fathers would never recognize. When you look at the election map, we more closely resemble the Balkans than the America that used to lie between the Atlantic and the Pacific.

Even if, like me, you wonder what happened to those two million Republicans who saw fit to vote for John McCain, but decided to stay home this time alphabetizing their canned goods, there's no getting around the fact that Obama has managed to expand on FDR's base. Whereas Roosevelt managed to win four elections by appealing mainly to blacks, Jews and union members, Obama has cobbled together those three blocs along with Hispanics, homosexuals, single women, Asians, Muslims and college students.

One can hardly blame Obama for causing divisions. After all, he was desperately seeking re-election. And you can't blame Romney although a lot of right-wing Monday morning quarterbacks are doing so. He ran a fine campaign. And if the guy who oversaw the worsening of a bad economy; pushed through ObamaCare; lied about Benghazi; and promoted class, gender and race, warfare, could get himself re-elected, you can't blame his opponent.

You can, however, blame the media that stood by while Obama provided the clumsiest cover-up of a government scandal since Watergate; that helped him portray Romney as an evil plutocrat; and applauded his every utterance as if it came straight from the Mount.

You can also blame parents who have reared the greediest, most self-indulgent, self-satisfied, bunch of hedonistic morons in this nation's history. I mean, it's not as if these youngsters who think that everything from a college education to cell phones and a lifetime supply of birth control pills are entitlements, were hatched from eggs, although they clearly have close ties to those, such as chickens and snakes, who are.

The reason that the future looks so bleak is because, as I wrote prior to the election, America could probably survive four more years of Obama, but it can't survive a population that would re-elect him. It means that the takers now outnumber the makers. What's more, when you consider the demographics, it's obvious that Obama's groupies breed at a far faster rate than the rest of us. I guess that figures because they have so much more time to devote to that particular activity.

After Obama defeated Romney, Paul Krugman, who would be an embarrassment to the NY Times if the Times had the capacity to be embarrassed, advised Obama not to even consider compromising with the Republicans in the House. Instead, Krugman, who has won a Nobel Prize in the field of Economics, said Obama should call their bluff and let the economy go over the cliff. I guess there's no reason why a guy who pulls down about \$50,000 per speaking gig should concern himself with what another recession will do to the middle class. It just goes to show that the Peace Prize isn't the only inexcusable waste of Alfred Nobel's TNT royalties.

In the aftermath of the election, Chris Matthews thanked Hurricane Sandy for helping to get Obama re-elected. In a way, it's rather magnanimous of Matthews to give a thumbs-up to a malevolent Mother Nature. It can only mean that he has finally forgiven the old girl for cursing him with that embarrassing lisp.

Speaking of Sandy, I have tried in vain to find mention of any nation offering to help us deal with the debt and destruction left in its wake. I would hope, but not expect, that Congress would keep that in mind when determining to which nations we should extend foreign aid with money we first have to borrow from the shylocks in China.

There are two groups of people to whom we are expected to bend a knee simply because they are identified as civil rights leaders or former members of the military. In the first group, we find such leeches as Jesse Jackson, Al Sharpton and Joseph ("White folks are all going to Hell") Lowery, the reverend who delivered the benediction at Obama's inauguration, no doubt because Jeremiah Wright was still busy crawling out from under the bus where Obama had thrown him.

In the second group, we find the likes of Colin Powell, David Petraeus, Charley Rangel, John McCain and the late Rep. John Murtha. I'm not sure if the Peter Principle applies, the notion that people tend to rise in a bureaucracy to their level of incompetence, but it certainly seemed to kick in once these guys returned to civilian life.

In the aftermath of the election, I have tried to adopt a philosophical attitude. I tried to remind myself that this, too, will pass. But that's like saying this, too, will pass when referring to a kidney stone the size of Obama.

Frankly, I'm not sure what I find the most disgusting, but contenders are, one, that 80% of blacks, whites and Hispanics, between the ages of 18 and 29, voted for Obama; that a super candidate like Romney couldn't even do as well as John McCain; or that 50,000 Americans squandered their birthright voting for Roseanne Barr.

Finally, on November 6, 2012, it's as if the ship of state was renamed the Titanic and the majority of the passengers said, "Hey, look, there's an iceberg. Let's hit it!"

Diary of a Deranged Liberal

✘ On Sunday, New York Times writer Paul Krugman offered his 9/11 thoughts on the ten year anniversary of the terrorist attacks on America. He did so in a brief column, almost in the form of a diary entry. In it, Krugman decided to take a strong stand and call out (by name) the villains of that terrible day. Interestingly, Osama Bin Laden, Khalid Sheikh Mohammed, and Al Qaeda didn't make the list. Who did make the list? George W. Bush, Rudy Giuliani, and Bernard Kerik.

No, I'm not kidding.

His reasoning? He claims that the three became "fake heroes" by racing to "cash in" on the horrors of that day. He doesn't expand on that assertion any further, other than taking shots at his colleagues in the news media for letting the three get away with it, and at "neocons" for taking us to war.

He ended his column by announcing that he wasn't going to let online readers comment on his thoughts for "obvious reasons".

What a deranged individual.

Now when it comes to Paul Krugman, I suppose I shouldn't waste my time. The notorious left-winger is infamous for routinely making absolutely ridiculous comments that are no more grounded in reality than unicorns and vampires. However, his 9/11 thoughts do offer some constructive insight into the mind of a 21st century liberal elitist.

Even on this historic anniversary, left-wingers like Krugman can't bring themselves to condemn Islamic extremists. They're far more comfortable using the memory of thousands of American deaths to take pot-shots at high-profile political opponents

who had the gall to show actual leadership on 9/11, and in the days following the attacks.

Krugman despises these three men not because of how they handled the crisis, but because of two reasons: 1) Most Americans were inspired by their leadership that day. 2) They're Republicans.

In Krugman's mind, it was their relevance that somehow made them opportunists. With that logic, at least we don't have to worry about this "fake economist" ever becoming an opportunist. Right?