



AIM in the News

page 2



Is Huma Abedin the Next Van Jones?

page 3



Former TV Network Producer, Upset with Andrea Mitchell, Says "I'm Done" denying Liberal Media Bias

page 6.

AIMREPORT

For Fairness, Balance and Accuracy in News Reporting

July-A 2012 | XXXXI- 13

Muslim Brotherhood Issues Raise Perplexing Questions

By Roger Aronoff

Many in the media are condemning Rep. Michele Bachmann (R-MN) and four other congressmen who sent a letter to the State Department Deputy Inspector General, and the IGs of four other agencies, calling for investigations into the possible infiltration by the Muslim Brotherhood (MB) of the State Department and other agencies. What's gotten the most attention is the fact that the letter to the State Department singled out Huma Abedin, the State Department's Deputy Chief of Staff, who has been a close aide to Secretary of State Hillary Clinton going all the way back to her time as First Lady, during the Clinton administration. Abedin is also the wife of the disgraced former congressman from New York, Anthony Weiner.

This has caused quite a ruckus, with charges of McCarthyism hurled at Rep. Bachmann, and a split among Republicans, including Senators John McCain and Lindsey Graham, plus Speaker of the House John Boehner, who have sharply criticized Bachmann and the letters she and the others have sent. The Left is having a field day, the conservatives and Republicans are scrambling to contain the issue.

But there is a bigger picture here. Should we care if indeed the Muslim Brotherhood has gained a foothold throughout the Middle East, and if they wield significant influence within the Obama administration? Or does that make us Islamophobic? What shouldn't get lost in all this are the policies of the Obama administration that have helped facilitate the ascendancy of the Muslim Brotherhood, particularly in Egypt. Investor's Business Daily has made it abundantly clear that that is exactly what has taken place. In the editorial, titled "How Obama Engineered Mideast Radicalization," they lay out the following timeline:

2009: The Brotherhood's spiritual leader—Sheikh Yusuf Qaradawi—writes an open letter to Obama arguing terrorism is a direct response to U.S. foreign policy.

2009: Obama travels to Cairo to deliver apologetic speech to Muslims, and infuriates the Mubarak regime by inviting banned Brotherhood leaders to attend. Obama deliberately snubs Mubarak, who was neither present nor men-



tioned. He also snubs Israel during the Mideast trip.

2009: Obama appoints a Brotherhood-tied Islamist—Rashad Hussain—as U.S. envoy to the Organization of the Islamic Conference, which supports the Brotherhood.

2010: State Department lifts visa ban on Tariq Ramadan, suspected terrorist and Egyptian-born grandson of Brotherhood founder Hassan al-Banna.

2010: Hussain meets with Ramadan at American-sponsored conference attended by U.S. and Brotherhood officials.

2010: Hussain meets with the Brotherhood's grand mufti in Egypt.

2010: Obama meets one-on-one with Egypt's foreign minister, Ahmed Aboul Gheit, who later remarks on Nile TV: "The American president told me in confidence that he is a Muslim."

2010: The Brotherhood's supreme guide calls for jihad against the U.S.

2011: Qaradawi calls for "days of rage" against Mubarak and other pro-Western regimes throughout Mideast.

2011: Riots erupt in Cairo's Tahrir Square. Crowds organized by the Brotherhood demand Mubarak's ouster, storm buildings.

2011: The White House fails to back longtime ally Mubarak, who flees Cairo.

2011: White House sends intelligence czar James Clapper to Capitol Hill to whitewash the Brotherhood's extremism. Clapper testifies the group is moderate, "largely secular."

2011: Qaradawi, exiled from Egypt for 30 years, is given a

continued on page 3

AIM

in the News

Accuracy in Media is planning a major conference on September 21st for the 40th anniversary of the **AIM Report**. The theme will be how the media have been so protective of President Obama on various issues throughout his four years in office.

Accuracy in Media's Roger Aronoff interviewed **Senator Tom Coburn (R-OK)** about his book *The Debt Bomb*, on **AIM's BlogTalkRadio** show, **Take AIM**. **Coburn** has been a leading voice in Congress on the insanity of out of control debt, duplicative waste and bureaucracy, and the need to get health care costs under control. You can listen to **AIM's** talk radio show, **Take AIM at blogtalkradio.com/accuracy-in-media**.

So far this year, **Accuracy in Academia's** executive director **Mal Kline** has participated in two debates for the **Close-Up Foundation** and given a presentation to the **American Association of University Professors**. Also, **AIA** has presented two author's nights at the **Heritage Foundation** to capacity audiences.

AIM plans to promote the **September conference**, and needs your support. Please visit aim.org/donate/make-a-donation/

AIMREPORT

A twice-monthly newsletter published by Accuracy in Media, Inc.

Editor: Roger Aronoff

4455 Connecticut Ave, NW #330
Washington, DC 20008
202-364-4401 | www.aim.org

Editor's Message



Dear Fellow Media Watchdogs:

When President Obama said on July 13 in Roanoke, Virginia, "If you've got a business—you didn't build that. Somebody else made that happen," it set off a firestorm of criticism and became a defining issue in this year's campaign. His pals in the media argued that the line was taken out of context, that he was just making an obvious statement that all businesses benefit from government-built infrastructure such as roads, bridges, schools and the Internet. It soon became part of a Romney campaign ad, and took its place next to Obama's line that "the private sector is doing fine."

To Mona Charen, the syndicated columnist and author of several books, Obama's comments had "just defined the 2012 campaign" and "succinctly encapsulates the president's prejudices about the public versus the private sector. Though the president has frequently mouthed platitudes in praise of enterprise, his suspicion and contempt for business has always percolated just beneath the surface."

In fact, the rest of that passage, or even the whole speech, didn't change the context or the values revealed in Obama's statement.

Economist Thomas Sowell of the Hoover Institute pointed to the basic fallacy in Obama's thinking: "At a time when a small fraction of high-income taxpayers pay the vast majority of all the taxes collected, it is sheer chutzpah to depict high-income earners as somehow being subsidized by 'the rest of us,' whether in paying for the building of roads or the educating of the young."

Why, he asked, since the roads and schools are used by everyone, "should high achievers be expected to feel like free loaders who owe still more to the government, because schools and roads are among the things that facilitate their work?"

Obama was also wrong about the Internet. Not only was it not Al Gore, who said he "took the initiative in creating the Internet," but a Wall Street Journal article by Gordon Crovitz made clear that it also wasn't the government that was responsible for creating the Web as we know it. In fact, it was a detriment: "As for the government's role, the Internet was fully privatized in 1995, when a remaining piece of the network run by the National Science Foundation was closed—just as the commercial Web began to boom. Economist Tyler Cowen wrote in 2005: 'The Internet, in fact, reaffirms the basic free market critique of large government. Here for 30 years the government had an immensely useful protocol for transferring information, TCP/IP, but it languished...In less than a decade, private concerns have taken that protocol and created one of the most important technological revolutions of the millennia.'"

As usual, the media are doing their best to help Obama spin his way out of his latest gaffe, meaning that he inadvertently revealed his true feelings. •

For Accuracy in Media

Roger Aronoff

Your Letters

Dear Editor:

What else can be expected from the "mainstream" media? The "mainstream" media are, most of them, cesspools of hardcore-Left ideologues and operatives and, consequently friends of America's enemies, for, the enemy of my enemy is my friend; that's the explanation of their love with Obama and with Islmofascism.

Maria M.

Please send Letters to the Editor to:

Accuracy in Media
Attn: Letters to the Editor
4455 Connecticut Ave, NW #330
Washington, DC 20008
or email to info@aim.org

Please keep your submissions to 50 words or less. Letters may be edited for length.

hero's welcome in Tahrir Square, where he raises the banner of jihad.

2011: Through his State Department office, William Taylor—Clinton's special coordinator for Middle East transitions and a longtime associate of Brotherhood apologists—gives Brotherhood and other Egyptian Islamists special training to prepare for the post-Mubarak elections.

2011: The Brotherhood wins control of Egyptian parliament, vows to tear up Egypt's 30-year peace treaty with Israel and reestablishes ties with Hamas, Hezbollah.

2011: Obama gives Mideast speech demanding Israel relinquish land to Palestinians, while still refusing to visit Israel.

2011: Justice Department pulls plug on further prosecution of U.S.-based Brotherhood front groups identified as collaborators in conspiracy to funnel millions to Hamas.

2011: In a shocking first, the State Department formalizes ties with Egypt's Brotherhood, letting diplomats deal directly with Brotherhood party officials in Cairo.

April 2012: The administration quietly releases \$1.5 billion in foreign aid to the new Egyptian regime.

June 2012: Morsi wins presidency amid widespread reports of electoral fraud and voter intimidation by gun-toting Brotherhood thugs—including blockades of entire streets to prevent Christians from going to the polls. The Obama administration turns a blind eye, recognizes Morsi as victor.

June 2012: In a victory speech, Morsi vows to instate Shariah law, turning Egypt into an Islamic theocracy, and also

promises to free jailed terrorists. He also demands Obama free World Trade Center terrorist and Brotherhood leader Omar Abdel-Rahman, a.k.a. the Blind Sheik, from U.S. prison.

June 2012: State grants visa to banned Egyptian terrorist who joins a delegation of Brotherhood officials from Egypt. They're all invited to the White House to meet with Obama's deputy national security adviser, who listens to their demands for the release of the Blind Sheik.

July 2012: Obama invites Morsi to visit

The Muslim Brotherhood's sudden ascendancy...was helped along by a U.S. president sympathetic to its interests over those of Israel and his own country.

the White House this September.

The Muslim Brotherhood's sudden ascendancy in the Mideast didn't happen organically. It was helped along by a U.S. president sympathetic to its interests over those of Israel and his own country.

This is what should be being debated, and investigated. Sure, some people will take issue with certain of the characterizations in the IBD timeline. But it is hard to deny the overall truth of it.

In March of 2011, in an AIM Report titled "Media Playing Crucial Role in Middle East Uprisings," I wrote that "Maybe in the next presidential election, we will be debating 'who lost Egypt.' But preferably, we'll be debating instead whether a thriving and peaceful democracy in Egypt

should be credited to George Bush's democracy agenda or to Barack Obama, for wisely guiding the transition."

At the time, the MB claimed they were not going to run a candidate for president if Mubarak went away, but that turned out not to be true. While many in the media tried to convince us back then what a moderate force the Brotherhood was, it should be recalled that it is the oldest Islamist group, "founded in Egypt in 1928 by Hassan al-Banna, who became a great admirer of Adolf Hitler and his Nazi regime. Following an attempted assassination of Gamal Abdel Nasser in 1954, the group was outlawed in Egypt."

The man who was elected last year to head the MB in Egypt was Mohammed Badie. Here is what he said in a sermon in 2010: "Arab and Muslim regimes are betraying their people by failing to confront the Muslim's real enemies—not only Israel, but the United States. Waging jihad against both of these infidels is a commandment of Allah that cannot be disregarded. Governments have no right to stop their people from fighting the U.S."

The point is, the media are eager to use this story as another way to attack the GOP. That's what they do. But let's see if they'll show some intellectual honesty and look also at the underlying issue: Should we care if the U.S. government maintains close ties with the MB, both internally and externally, and has supported their ascendancy in the Middle East?•

Roger Aronoff is the editor of Accuracy in Media

Is Huma Abedin the Next Van Jones?

By Cliff Kincaid

Senator John McCain has become a left-wing media darling for defending Hillary Clinton aide Huma Abedin against truthful charges that she has family connections to the pro-terrorist Muslim Brotherhood. Andrew McCarthy notes there used to be a time when McCain was alarmed by the advance of the Muslim Brotherhood.

We commented on this new phase of McCain's career when he showed up at a Washington event to praise and honor the Arab-funded Al-Jazeera, the voice of the Muslim Brotherhood. Ikhwanweb.com,

the website of the Muslim Brotherhood, has labeled Al-Jazeera "the greatest Arab media organization."

Almost as curious as McCain's flip-flop on this critical national security issue is Republican House Speaker John Boehner saying, "I don't know Huma. But from everything that I do know of her, she has a sterling character, and I think accusations like this being thrown around are pretty dangerous."

The "accusations" are questions about the kind of investigation that was made of her background. Boehner admits not knowing her but has already come to the conclusion that the "accusations," which

are questions, are somehow "dangerous."

The issue here is the U.S. relationship with an organization that has spawned almost every major terrorist group in the Middle East and is taking control of Egypt and other nations.

Equally bizarre has been the rhetoric of Fox News contributor Edward Rollins, who used to work for Rep. Michele Bachmann, one of five members of Congress raising questions of the State Department Inspector General about Abedin. "I can assure Mrs. Bachmann, that Ms. Abedin has been thru every top clearance available and would never have been given her position with any questions of her loyalty,

continued on page 4

to this country,” Rollins insists.

But Rollins cited no factual basis on which to make such a sweeping allegation. How does he, a former Republican official, know anything at all about the background investigations, if any, of top Democratic or Obama administration officials?

A question for Rollins, who has assumed the mantle of national security expert: Did Abedin get the same background investigation enjoyed by Van Jones before he lost his job at the White House? At the time that Jones was forced to resign, in response to damaging disclosures about his communist background, Rollins said Jones “did the right thing” by resigning because he had become an embarrassment to the White House. Abedin is quickly becoming another such embarrassment.

But while Jones was only in his job for six months, Abedin has been by Hillary’s side for many years, the last three as Deputy Chief of Staff to the Secretary of State.

The Jones case is instructive. There is no indication that the White House asked the FBI to investigate him or, if they did, that the background report uncovered anything having to do with his communist background. This would mean that the FBI did a lousy job of investigating Jones. On the other hand, there is the possibility that the FBI did uncover something sinister about Jones but the White House decided to ignore it, until the concern about him reached a fever pitch.

The Congress to this day has never investigated how Van Jones got his job, although Obama aide Valerie Jarrett admitted at a national left-wing bloggers convention that “we”—presumably referring to herself and Obama—decided to pick him. What the Congress should be doing, in the wake of damaging disclosures about Abedin, is investigate how she got her job and what influence she is exercising at the State Department. That is exactly what Bachmann and others want to know.

Members of Congress take an oath to defend our country against all enemies, foreign and domestic. The notion of “enemy” loses its significance if Obama officials can redefine the term and escape accountability for making deals with those who want to destroy us.

In general, the Congress needs to know who in the administration is getting a pass on what the FBI used to call its CARL test—examining a federal applicant’s char-



acter, associates, reputation and loyalty. Such a probe necessarily involves inquiring into one’s family members.

Obama himself escaped such scrutiny, by virtue of the fact that he won his office through an election. That is why his “vetting” by the media, at this late date, four years after he was elected, is still absolutely necessary. But escaping a federal background investigation should not be extended to other top administration personnel.

Rollins’ claim that he can somehow “assure” Bachmann of the results of an investigation into Abedin is an obvious falsehood. As a former campaign manager and now pundit, he has no such authority or expertise.

Making charges that are truly irresponsible and beyond the pale, Rollins went on to allege that Abedin is the victim of McCarthyism. This is a falsehood that shows how little Rollins knows about the Venona transcripts, which documented, in the words of historians John Earl Haynes and Harvey Klehr, that the Soviets “had recruited spies in virtually every major American government agency of military or diplomatic importance,” and that 349 citizens, immigrants, and permanent residents of the United States “had had a covert relationship with Soviet intelligence agencies.” Senator Joe McCarthy, still one of the liberals’ favorite villains, only scratched the surface of the problem.

What the American people should be demanding from the media is an investigation of Muslim Brotherhood infiltration of the U.S. Government at this time in history, as we see Egyptians demonstrating in the streets against the Obama/Hillary embrace of this dangerous organization. Egyptians also yelled “Monica, Monica,” at Hillary Clinton, something we do know a lot about.

Incredibly, The New York Times actually ridiculed the protesters for believing in a “conspiracy theory” that “originated

with American conservatives!”

But the Obama Administration’s support for the Muslim Brotherhood is not a conspiracy but a fact.

In the case of the hapless Ed Rollins, it is clear he knows less about Abedin than he knew about Van Jones, which he admitted was nothing. But he makes news by bashing the presidential candidate who gave him a job. This makes the liberal media love him.

The damaging revelations about Abedin just keep coming. Walid Shoebat and Ben Barrack have written extensively about Abedin’s Muslim Brotherhood connections. And Shoebat, a former member of the Muslim Brotherhood, is preparing the release of a major report on this matter which will make people such as McCain, Rollins, and Boehner look even more foolish than they already are for jumping to conclusions about this important case.

Shoebat has already written in detail that McCain’s defense of the Hillary aide is “demonstrably false.” It doesn’t do any good to argue, as Rollins did, that McCain is “an American hero” and that he “stood on the floor of the Senate” to defend Abedin. For some curious reason, he has switched sides in the Middle East and has embarrassed himself in the process. To make matters worse, he endangers U.S. security.

Republican presidential candidate Mitt Romney, now taking off on a foreign trip that will include Israel, has no alternative but to distance himself from McCain’s wildly irresponsible and erroneous statements.

Abedin may go the way of Van Jones. Frank Gaffney’s Center for Security Policy has just released a new report about the Islamist connections of Abedin’s mother, noting that the evidence indicates that Abedin has “deeply problematic foreign associations” that could, in violation of departmental guidelines, “create... a heightened risk of foreign exploitation, inducement, manipulation, pressure, or coercion.”

The growing controversy suggests the need for House Speaker John Boehner to do his job, rather than serve as an apologist for the Obama Administration. That means reinstating a House Internal Security Committee to get to the bottom of such matters.

If there is a legitimate controversy over how Abedin got her job and whether her

continued on page 5

family connections present a problem, the matter should be moved beyond the Inspectors General of State and other agencies, and put under the purview of a new House Committee on Internal Security. The congress hasn't had a committee or subcommittee like this for decades because congressional liberals abolished them all

on the grounds they were too "McCarthyite."

Key questions deserving answers include: who, if anyone, investigated Abedin's background, and were they made aware of the information about her Muslim Brotherhood connections?

We have a senior senator, the Speaker of

the House and a top Republican former campaign official jumping to the defense of an aide to the Secretary of State who is a central figure in a U.S. administration embracing that organization. This is the real story, and it is a bipartisan scandal. •

Cliff Kincaid is the Director of the AIM Center for Investigative Journalism.

CPUSA Says Re-electing Obama is "Absolutely Essential"

By Cliff Kincaid



Awriter for the Communist Party USA says that "...re-electing Obama is absolutely essential," and warns that "divisions among Democrats and a potential wave of bad economic news can combine to threaten President Obama's reelection."

Marxist John Case, who writes for various CPUSA publications, has written a piece, "The danger of a Romney election," for the party publication *People's World*, which warns that "Re-electing Obama is not sufficient to bring economic recovery or even relief to our people. Only a different class configuration in political power can do necessary minimum reforms to give us a chance. But re-electing Obama is absolutely essential. Now is not the time for hand washing the complexities and tactics away—or failing to triage the most critical questions from those that are less critical. We cannot win everything at once!"

In reality, the CPUSA's endorsement of Obama for a second term is not surprising. Various CPUSA officials, including Jarvis Tyner and Joelle Fishman, have openly expressed support for the U.S. President and his agenda.

Since 1988, the CPUSA has not run its own candidates for president and vice-president, preferring instead to work through the Democratic Party. Its support for Obama in 2008 and again

this year has been open and outspoken.

The Case article offers a rationale, mostly on economic grounds, for getting Obama re-elected to a second term. He claims that the Republicans intend to do on a national level what Scott Walker has done as governor in Wisconsin—reduce government spending and the power of organized labor. Case refers to the prospect of a national "Walker-like regime." Case laments the fact that "many private sector workers," including 25 percent of Wisconsin union members, supported Walker.

In that case, as we have reported, Obama's progressive allies were soundly defeated by Walker and his conservative backers.

Obama's support in the CPUSA, a political entity once funded and directed by Moscow, has become an open secret, although the major media treat the subject as something not worthy of serious discussion. This silent treatment extends to the matter of Obama's mentor, a member of the CPUSA named Frank Marshall Davis. Members of the party have known of Obama's connection to Davis for many years, which may account for their support of the Democratic Party politician in 2008 and now in 2012. A congressional friend of Obama's from his Chicago days, Rep. Danny K. Davis, still associates with the CPUSA and even accepted an award from them.

Obama isn't the only Democrat getting various kinds of communist support. Workers World Party, an openly Marxist-Leninist party, endorsed Democrat Charles Barron for the U.S. House in the 8th Congressional District in New York City. However, in that primary election, which was held on June 26, Barron lost.

The Workers World Party newspaper referred to Barron, a city council member, as "a former Black Panther who continues to connect with many sectors

of the progressive movement. He has marched alongside oppressed activists and Occupy Wall Street in the fight against poverty, budget cuts, foreclosures, racial profiling like stop-and-frisk, police brutality, the prison-industrial complex, and all forms of injustice at home and abroad." It said Barron had won the endorsement of District Council 37, the city's largest public employee union, representing 125,000 members and 50,000 retirees, and the black-oriented *Amsterdam News*.

The Workers World Party was investigated by the House Internal Security Committee for its support of the North Korean regime and Arab terrorist groups. But the House Committee was disbanded by liberals in Congress.

The CPUSA writer John Case has not been without criticism of Obama, saying that the Democratic President made a huge mistake by firing Van Jones as White House Green Jobs czar after his communist background came to light. Case wrote last year that Jones' "Rebuild the Dream" campaign "contains all the elements that save the Obama presidency that discarded him, and the party that failed to come to his defense."

There is speculation that Jones was fired because the chain of command that hired him led to the Oval Office, including Obama adviser Valerie Jarrett and Obama himself.

Jones remains a major figure in the progressive movement backing Obama, however, and was a featured speaker at the "Take Back the American Dream" conference recently held in Washington, D.C. Participants in the conference included Communist Party activists Jarvis Tyner and Joelle Fishman. •

Cliff Kincaid is the Director of the AIM Center for Investigative Journalism, and can be contacted at cliff.kincaid@aim.org

Former TV Network Producer, Upset with Andrea Mitchell, Says “I’m Done” Denying Liberal Media Bias

By Don Irvine



For former CBS producer Greg Kandra, the selective editing of a segment that was shown on Andrea Mitchell’s show on MSNBC of Mitt Romney’s remarks after going to a Wawa convenience store for the first time was the last straw. He is now “done” defending his former colleagues and denying the existence of liberal media bias.

Kandra, who is also a Catholic Deacon, took issue with Mitchell on his Deacons Bench blog to express his outrage:

“I’m tired. Truly. I’ve grown weary of trying to defend the indefensible and explain the inexplicable. For years, people have stomped their feet and pounded their fists and snorted ‘Liberal media bias!’ and I’ve always tut-tutted and shooshed them and said, ‘No, no. Calm down. They meant well. It was just a misunderstanding. A mistake. These things happen.’ I spent over 25 years working in the oft-reviled Mainstream Media and I saw up close and personal how the sausage was made. I knew the people who wielded the knives and wore the aprons, and could vouch (most of the time, anyway) for their good intentions.

“But now?”

“Forget it. I’m done. You deserve what they’re saying about you. It’s earned. You have worked long and hard to merit the suspicion, acrimony, mistrust and revulsion that the media-buying public increasingly heaps upon you. You have successfully eroded any confidence, dispelled any trust, and driven your audience into the arms of the Internet and the blogosphere, where biases are affirmed and like-minded people can tell each other what they hold

to be true, since nobody believes in objective reality any more. You have done a superlative job of diminishing what was once a great profession and undermining one of the vital underpinnings of democracy, a free press.

“Good job.

“I just have one question:

“What the hell is wrong with you guys?”

The editing of the segment was clearly designed to suggest that Romney is out of touch. But Mitchell, or her producer, decided to air a slightly longer version of the clip the following day after being contacted by the RNC and the Romney campaign, who pointed out that Romney had also talked about the federal bureaucracy and innovation in the private sector. Mitchell said on the air that she was now telling viewers that “we didn’t get a chance to play that, so here it is now.” She offered no apology for her actions or comments.

In fact, the edited clip shown by Mitchell, and ridiculed by she and MSNBC contributor Chris Cillizza, originally aired earlier in the day on “Way Too Early” with Willie Geist. And when Mitchell aired the slightly longer version the next day, it still didn’t include most of the soundbite nor the context of Romney’s point, comparing the efficiency of the private sector with the inefficiency of the federal bureaucracy. Nice try to sweep this under the rug. Does anyone believe this woman anymore?•

Politico Suspends Reporter for Suggesting Romney is Only Comfortable Around White Folks

By Don Irvine

Politico has suspended reporter Joe Williams for remarks he made recently on MSNBC and Twitter, in which he disparaged Mitt Romney.

Williams appeared on Martin Bashir’s program to talk about his perception that Romney is struggling to connect with voters, which seems to be a major preoccupation of the mainstream media:

“But it also points out a larger problem that he’s got to solve if he wants to be successful come this fall. Romney is very, very comfortable, it seems, with people who are like him. That’s one of the reasons why he seemed so stiff and awkward in some Town

Hall settings, why he can’t relate to people other than that. But when he comes on Fox and Friends, they’re like him, they’re white folks who are very much relaxed in their own company. “

After Williams’ comments went viral, Politico announced late last night, via a memo to the staff, that they were suspending Williams pending a review of his comments:

“Regrettably, an unacceptable number of Joe Williams’s public statements on cable and Twitter have called into question his commitment to this responsibility,” POLITICO’s founding editors John Harris and Jim VandeHei wrote in a memo to the staff. “His comment about Governor Romney earlier today on MSNBC fell short of our standards for fairness and judgment in an especially unfortunate way.”

“Joe has acknowledged that his appearance reflected a poor choice of words,” the memo continued. “This appearance came in the context of other remarks on Twitter that, cumulatively, require us to make clear that our standards are serious, and so are the consequences for disregarding them. This is true for all POLITICO journalists, including an experienced and well-respected voice like Joe Williams.”

“Following discussion of this matter with editors, Joe has been suspended while we review the matter,” they wrote.

According to Politico’s Dylan Byers, the memo also included this gem of a statement regarding bias:

“POLITICO journalists have a clear and inflexible responsibility to cover politics fairly and free of partisan bias.”

That may be the policy, but based on the numerous appearances by Williams and other Politico reporters on MSNBC, Politico is acting more like an arm of MSNBC (which itself serves as an arm of the DNC) than an independent news source. •

Don Irvine is the chairman of Accuracy in Media.

What you can do

Please send the enclosed postcards to:

- Dennis Ross of ABC News, about his effort to tie the perpetrator of the Batman movie massacre to the Tea Party;
- Jeff Bewkes, the CEO and chairman of Time Warner, about how they have so obviously put themselves in the service of President Obama;
- Please make a donation to AIM