

In response to a letter in the Inky complaining that the press was besotted with Obama and that all three network anchors went to Germany to bask in his glory, I wrote the following:

Heh! News anchors didn't go with presidential candidate Barack Obama because they were acting like groupies ("The rock star" letter, July 28), they were eagerly anticipating Obama's failure and humiliation! It was a wholly unanticipated stroke of good fortune for the Obama campaign that Iraqi Prime Minister Nuri al-Maliki would agree with Obama and not candidate John McCain about timelines for American troop withdrawals. The Bush Administration was also caught flat-footed and has been furiously maneuvering as quietly as possible to try and reverse the Iraqi Prime Minister's clearly-expressed preference. Obama has clearly learned from the behavior of the press corps back during the Clinton years and has refused to fall into many snares the press has been setting for him. Their treatment of him is the result both of his luck and his skill. Will his good fortune continue? Obama knows full well they're anticipating a downfall.

To which he responded:

Baloney. The vast majority of the media desperately want a Democrat - any Democrat - in the White House, and will use every weapon in their power to do so. Remember Dan Rather repeating lies about Bush's service record that he knew was false, and his producer passing it to the DNC so that they could run parallel press releases, all timed just before the 2004 election? That was just one example. Virtually all the TV networks - ABC, CBS, NBC, CNN, etc. - have reported Obama's speeches with puppy-dog adoration, and Brian Williams, Katie Kuric and Charlie Gibson went with him to continue the process.

The Newspapers (just look at the Inquirer for the past two weeks) have shown Obama on the front page "above the fold," as they say in the press, day after day. They favor him in more subtle ways; for example, look at the Inquirer's accounts every day (today, for instance) of the two candidates. Obama is always shown first, above McCain. When they are mentioned in an article, the heading is always "Obama and McCain" when convention is to list opposing candidates alphabetically to avoid preferential treatment.

Look how the press/media never mention Obama's many loony gaffes, like saying we need more "Arabic translators" in Afghanistan (where they don't speak Arabic), that he had been in 57 states and was heading for the 58th, not being sure whether he was speaking to a crowd in Sioux City or Sioux Falls - if one of these had been uttered by McCain the media would immediately have hinted that is signified senility. Neither did the media note that Obama said one day that "Iran is a tiny country that poses no threat to the United States," and a few days later "Iran poses a grave threat to this country." Or his continued lies about the surge ("I was always in favor of it.")

And when did you see TV showing the many times when Obama lost his train of thought, or his

teleprompter went wrong, and stood there either just going "ah - ur - um" for a couple of minutes, or rambling incoherently? He speaks well, like Reagan, from a prepared and rehearsed script, but when forced to speak extemporaneously the Great Orator disappears - which is why he chickened out of debating McCain, after saying "I will debate him any time, any place." Just one example:

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Zc6wQMVHhic&NR=1>

Nick O'Dell Flt. Lt. RAF (Retd.)

You mean you weren't aware that Katie Couric edited McCain's interview to cover up his gaffes? He made some doozies too!

Sorry, but I think when someone speaks to a crowd of foreigners that ISN'T burning the President in effigy while the other guy speaks to an audience of two, one is a BIT more deserving of coverage than the other.

Rich

BTW, The Bush AWOL story was broken by the Boston Globe in 2000, LONG before Dan Rather got involved in it.

When Reagan issued his historic "Mr. Gorbachev; Tear Down This Wall," he didn't feel it necessary, or presidential, to precede it with a reggae band and free beer and bratwurst in order to draw a crowd. Neither did John Kennedy with his "Ich bin ein Berliner."

And Dan Rather was the one, dumbbell, who received the fake letter in **2004**, typed with a font not available when it was supposed to have been written, originally intending to show it on his TV show a week before the election, when it would be impossible to counter it with facts, but was forced to blow his story prematurely when other media got wind of it. And even when it was revealed as an obvious fake, he stuck to his line. Here was clear evidence of the media attempting - and damn near succeeding - in affecting an election for the president of the United States.

One other bit of Freudian slip was Peter Jennings, on election night 2000, reporting "We've taken uh, the Democrats have taken new York State."

And notice how the media, with the exception of FOX, is providing all sorts of excuses for Obama going to the gym instead of visiting wounded troops. McCain did so on most of his eight (count them) visits to Iraq, quietly and without ceremony. Once Obama found that he couldn't make a photo-op of it, screw 'em; I'll go shoot a few hoops. After all, I voted against funding them, and still say the surge didnt work. Don't believe the bullshit coming from his camp; the Pentagon has solidly denied them

Anyone who denies that the vast majority of the media is solidly in Obama's pocket is imbibing the KoolAid.

What a wonderful position he is in. Point out that his lies ["I never heard any of those outrageous statements" - not in 20 years sitting in the congregation], his close association and friendship with America-hating, racist pastors and unrepentant terrorists, his reversing his stated positions on important matters - often in a couple of days, and then lying about that, too [he always maintained that the surge would work], denote a singular lack of the kind of honesty and judgment that an American president needs, and you're immediately branded with the one-size-fits-all, eliminate any debate, label of "racist."

Simply quote, *in context*, the words spoken by Obama and his wife - Americans are hicks, with their bibles and guns; America is a "downright mean" place; she had never, up to that point, been proud of her country - and you're "smearing them" with "anti-Obama bile."

Dare to say that this callow, nave man is totally unqualified for the most important, the most powerful and risky job in the world, and you're uttering falsehoods. A few years in the Illinois legislature, in which he voted "present" 140 times (i.e. was too lazy or uninformed to make a decision), then being handed a Senate seat without an opposing candidate. A couple of years in the Senate where he was essentially invisible (e.g., headed up a subcommittee that he never called into session) other than being the most liberal member, even to the left of Ted Kennedy. And, if you believe the dictum that you judge a man by the company that he keeps, what about being pally with America-hating, racist loony preachers and unrepentant terrorists?

As Geraldine Ferraro said, if he weren't black nobody would have heard of him. An orator of speeches that are nothing but loony Marxist rhetoric mixed with meaningless clichs. God help America if people don't wake up. But they won't. 16 years ago they rejected another war hero who also flew combat missions and was shot down, and had lots of experience as head of the CIA, Ambassador, VP and President, in favor of another left wing nut whose main experience, other than Governor of a jerkwater state, was treating women as disposable masturbatory dolls. Then, as now, oratory will work, confirming Phineas T. Barnum's assessment of Americans.

95% of blacks, 70% of women, and 90+% of congenital Democrats, and undoubtedly you, will with ovine obedience, troop into the voting booths and pull the lever for this dangerous man, with all the careful consideration of the man, his honesty and character and his policies, of an 85-year-old pulling the lever of a slot machine in Atlantic City.

I'll just tackle a few points here because most of what you say is perfectly legitimate partisan politics (The number of times Obama voted "Present," etc). I checked into the statement that "convention is to list opposing candidates alphabetically to avoid preferential treatment," and yes, that's a legal requirement when one is assembling a voter guide, but no, no one had ever heard of any such "convention." That sounds like one of those Republican "insta-traditions" which are whipped up to meet the requirements of the moment and will be forgotten long before the next campaign.

You listed a bunch of errors and slip-ups on Obama's part and then said "...if one of these had been uttered by McCain the media would immediately have hinted that is signified senility." But the point of my first sentence in my response was that McCain has indeed made such utterances, and not just said senile-sounding things, but things within his area of supposed expertise. I looked into how much attention the traditional media has paid to Couric editing her McCain interview to cover over McCain's absurd statement and yes, it's been covered by Howard Kurtz and the NY Times has done a misleadingly incomplete story on it, but no, there was no immediate media-wide reaction. The media mostly looked the other way.

Neither Reagan nor Kennedy was visiting Berlin as a political candidate. Both were there as sitting presidents. Is there anything that says candidates can't make speeches in foreign countries? Nonsense. This is another of those Republican "insta-traditions" that was thought up to meet the political needs of the moment and that will be discarded the moment it inconveniences a Republican. BTW, Obama didn't visit US troops in the hospital in Germany because the Pentagon has rules about political candidates making such visits. Those same rules do not apply to visiting Representatives and Senators, so there's always some interpretation involved. Obama was showing respect for military rules. The media coverage of this point has been so-so. Some have fully explained this point, some haven't.

"Anyone who denies that the vast majority of the media is solidly in Obama's pocket is imbibing the KoolAid." Actually, the LA Times looked at that very point and found it to be completely bogus

<http://www.latimes.com/news/politics/la-na-onthedia27-2008jul27,0,712999.story>

People will "pull the lever for this dangerous man" because Obama is not G. W. Bush! That's precisely why the German audience was so excited to see Obama and why no American flags were burned during that speech. Bush will be firmly in the list of the bottom five Presidents over the next century at least. His legacy, we dearly hope, will soon make its way to the trash-heap of history.

Yawn