



AIM in the News

page 2



Anti-NSA Campaign Could Lead to Another 9/11

page 3



Former MSNBC Producer Rips Network—Says it has become the “Official Network of the Obama White House”

page 6

For Fairness, Balance and Accuracy in News Reporting

AIM REPORT

2013 | XLII-12

Obama Leak Investigation Targets Retired General

By Roger Aronoff

The Obama Administration is at it again, pursuing yet another leaker. The target named in this investigation is Retired Marine General James “Hoss” Cartwright, former vice chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Cartwright is being investigated for possibly having leaked information to The New York Times’ David Sanger about Stuxnet, the joint cyber-attack program with Israel that disabled as many as 1,000 Iranian centrifuges, a key part of Iran’s nuclear enrichment program. The program is believed to have set Iran’s nuclear program back about two years.

As we had previously suggested, the Administration had not gone after the leakers of the Stuxnet story, nor the leakers of the “kill list” story, because those were “sanctioned leaks.” After all, “Administrations have always done exactly what Obama’s has: condemn leaks in public while leaking for its own benefit,” wrote Trevor Timm in the June 2012 issue of Foreign Policy magazine. (The Times’ Stuxnet story was published on June 1, 2012.)

Perhaps this never was, or is no longer, a sanctioned leak, and the Administration is going after the man it deems responsible. Will the Administration therefore go after the leakers of the “kill list” story, if given the chance, as well?

“The revelation [that Cartwright is a ‘target’ of the investigation] which was first reported by NBC News, means that an administration that has already launched more leaks prosecutions than all of its predecessors combined is now focused on one of its own,” reported The Washington Post. “Since Obama took office, the Justice Department has prosecuted or charged eight people for alleged violations of the Espionage Act.”

The facts don’t quite add up in the case of Cartwright, whom NBC News described as a four-star general with a “close working relationship” with Obama. Cartwright is also described by NBC as formerly “a key member of President Obama’s inner circle of national security advisors.” Bob Woodward of The Washington Post described him as “Obama’s favorite general.” Are we really expected to believe that the Stuxnet leak, which made the Administration look good and was leaked by a close advisor to the



President, was done without the President’s blessing?

“The legal sources say the FBI originally focused on whether the Stuxnet leak came from the White House,” reported NBC News. “But late last year agents started zeroing in on Cartwright, who had retired from the Pentagon in 2011.” The question now is, who leaked the information about Cartwright being a target of this investigation. And why now?

“Congressional leaders demanded a criminal investigation into who leaked the information, and Obama said he had zero tolerance for such leaks,” reported The Guardian. “Republicans said senior administration officials had leaked the details to bolster the president’s national security credentials during the 2012 campaign.”

“The larger reality is that these leaks, designed to highlight the President’s credentials as a tough leader, are trying to mask the fact that Obama has virtually nothing to show on key national security issues,” wrote Steven Bucci for the Heritage Foundation at the time. “When progress is absent, a desperate Administration may use leaks, even if it harms national security.”

“It’s obvious on its face that this information came from

continued on page 3

PLEASE NOTE AIM’S NEW ADDRESS

4350 EAST WEST HIGHWAY | SUITE 555 | BETHESDA, MD 20814

AIM

in the News

MENA FN and Agence France Presse did a story about the launch of **Al Jazeera America**, and cited **Accuracy in Media**. "The conservative activist group **Accuracy in Media** accused **Al-Jazeera** of being a 'mouthpiece of the Muslim Brotherhood and its various terrorist affiliates,'" said the online article.

"**Al-Jazeera** has already been shown to play a role in radicalizing Muslims abroad to make Americans into terrorist targets," **AIM's Cliff Kincaid** said.

"Is there any reason to believe its impact in America itself would be any different?"

The news site added that "The reasons remain unclear for **Al-Jazeera's** US launch, likely to be a huge financial drain and unlikely to turn a profit anytime soon."

AIM is launching a major new project, described in the letter from the **AIM** editor on this same page. With an event to start it off at the **National Press Club**, **AIM** is once again stepping out in a high-profile way on an issue of great national importance.

Can an administration get away with such scandalous behavior as they have demonstrated in the case of Benghazi?

Please help out **AIM** on this outstanding project.

Editor's Message



Dear Fellow Media Watchdogs:

Accuracy in Media has had a long history of supporting America's military and national security needs. Reed Irvine founded AIM in 1969 because of media coverage of the Vietnam War, and the related Cold War. Later, in the 1980s, when PBS produced their 13 part series called "Vietnam: A Television History," AIM answered back with a two-part documentary called "Television's Vietnam," which exposed the many inaccuracies and deceptions in the PBS series.

Irvine, who had himself been a Marine Intelligence officer in World War II, was passionate about his patriotism, and aware of the very real threat that communism and the far-left represented to this country. AIM was in the forefront of the highly contentious issue of Prisoners of War, Missing in Action (POW/MIA). There were those in Congress and the media who didn't want to accuse the Soviet Union, or the North Vietnamese, of lying about how many of our POWs they were holding, and how many had died in their captivity. To Irvine, there was no room for compromise on that issue. We didn't need to normalize relations with countries that completely violated human decency, and the rules of war, to the extent that they exist.

Proper treatment of our military by the enemies we faced, by Hollywood, and by the liberal media, were values that AIM has often fought for in the public arena. And today, we continue to honor Reed Irvine's memory, and the organization he founded, by standing up for our military, and the values they represent, even if those values have not been realized during the Obama Administration. That is why AIM has established the Citizens' Committee on Benghazi. We held a press conference on July 30th at the National Press Club to announce the formation of the group, and its intentions to investigate in a public forum, the scandal of the Obama Administration known as Benghazi, or BenghaziGate. And it's not, by any means, a "phony scandal."

In our corner are men like Gen. Tom McInerney, Gen. Paul Vallely, Gen. Charles Jones, and Admiral James "Ace" Lyons, all retired. In addition, we have Col. Allen West, Captain Larry Bailey, and Col. Wayne Morris, and Col. Dick Blauer, again, all retired, all highly distinguished. The group also includes two former CIA agents, Clare Lopez and Wayne Simmons, with more to come.

The initial plan is to hold a conference September 16th to attempt to ascertain what happened and who was responsible for the failure to provide sufficient security or to withdraw our ambassador from Libya, one of four people killed on September 11, 2012. We will discuss the failure to bring military assets to bear in a way that might have saved some of those lives, as well as the cover-up, and the role of the media. You can learn more by visiting the new website, www.aim.org/benghazi. More to follow. •

For Accuracy in Media

Roger Aronoff

Your Letters

To the Editor:

This news conference [on Benghazi] is so welcomed...I feel such a strong sense of injustice for those men who died and I am weary of being so angry for so long. This at least gives me hope that we might stop the lies, cover-ups and corruption. I think America is getting very tired of everything falling apart in this country, I know I am.

Charlie

Please send Letters to the Editor to:

Accuracy in Media
Attn: Letters to the Editor
4350 East West Highway #555
Bethesda, MD 20814
or email to info@aim.org

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

AIMREPORT

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

Editor: Roger Aronoff

4350 East West Highway #555
Bethesda, MD 20814
202-364-4401 | www.aim.org

individuals who are in the Administration,” said Senator John McCain (R-AZ) on CNN’s “State of the Union” last year. “The President may not have done it himself, but the President certainly is responsible as commander in chief.”

It is clear now that the information did come from high up in the Administration.

“The [New York] Times said Cartwright was one of the crucial players who had to break the news to Obama and vice-president Joe Biden that Stuxnet had escaped onto the internet,” reported the Guardian.

It turns out that in recent years President Obama has had growing reasons to dislike Cartwright’s political efforts. “After retiring, Cartwright took a position at the Center for Strategic and International Studies and has spoken frequently on national security issues,” reported The Washington Post. “[Cartwright] has emerged as a growing critic of the Obama administration’s expanded use of drones to counter the al-Qaeda threat.” Cartwright also opposed a surge in Afghanistan, according to the Post. Perhaps Cartwright’s criticisms may have heated up the President’s desire to go after this particular leaker?

While Gen. Cartwright has refused to comment to the press about these developments, his attorney, Gregory Craig said, “General Cartwright is an American hero who served his country with distinction for four decades. Any suggestion that he could have betrayed the country he loves is preposterous.” Those sound like fight-

ing words. It remains to be seen if Cartwright leaked the information at all, and if he did, was it on the President’s behalf? Does the President have something on Cartwright that might prevent him from talking, or does Cartwright’s loyalty really extend that far?

“Cartwright, a four-star general, was cleared in February 2011 of misconduct involving a young aide,” reported the Associated Press. “The report did find that Cartwright mishandled an incident in

It turns out that in recent years President Obama has had growing reasons to dislike Cartwright’s political efforts.

which the aide, drunk and visibly upset, visited his Tbilisi, Georgia, hotel room alone and either passed out or fell asleep on a bench at the foot of his bed.”

“Cartwright denied any impropriety and was later cleared of all wrongdoing.” He resigned from the military in August 2011. Perhaps Cartwright is waiting for the right time and place to offer his side of the story.

CNN’s Barbara Starr seemed to come to Cartwright’s defense, saying that “This is not a guy who goes rogue. So you might wonder if maybe somebody in the White House originally encouraged him to discuss this program.” And NPR’s Tom Gjelten also seemed surprised that

Cartwright might have done this, saying, “Most of us who have covered national security issues have known General Cartwright. I have to say, my impression has always been that he’s a real straight arrow. He certainly never leaked anything to me...He was always very careful in our conversations not to get into anything classified. So this is hard to understand.”

Just days after the Sanger story broke in June of 2012, citing Obama’s alleged role in the success of Stuxnet, The Atlantic pointed out that “Israel’s officials have a message for anyone praising the CIA for its sophisticated cyber attack on Iran: It was our baby. The Stuxnet computer worm, described by David Sanger in The New York Times last week as an invention by the Bush administration, was actually developed by Mossad, according to Israeli officials speaking with Haaretz journalist Yossi Melman on condition of anonymity.”

In fact, media reports in early 2011, including in The New York Times and the British Telegraph appeared to back up the likelihood that Israel was the primary author of Stuxnet, while acknowledging the U.S.’s role in its creation and implementation. But the timing of the Sanger story in June 2012—just months before the presidential election—made the source of this leak, its proximity to the White House, and its accuracy, all suspect. •

Roger Aronoff is the Editor of Accuracy in Media.

Anti-NSA Campaign Could Lead to Another 9/11

By Cliff Kincaid

The first Assistant Secretary for Policy at the United States Department of Homeland Security warned Congress in July that “hyped and distorted press reports” about the NSA’s terrorist surveillance programs “may cause us—or other nations—to construct new restraints on our intelligence gathering, restraints that will leave us vulnerable to another security disaster.”

Stewart A. Baker, in testimony before the House Judiciary Committee, said that when the story about the terrorist surveillance program known as PRISM broke, “reporters at The Guardian and The Washington Post made it look as if the NSA had direct, unfettered access to private

service providers’ networks and that they were downloading materials at will.” But he said this was “hyped” in order to “spur a public debate about NSA surveillance.”

Baker added, “Actually, they didn’t just want to spur debate; they tried to control it—by withholding information from the public.” He said the press failed to emphasize the “minimization and targeting guidelines” adopted by the government and approved by the FISA court for this program.

Baker explained: “Snowden and his allies in the press had copies of the minimization and targeting guidelines; they surely knew that the guidelines made the programs look far more responsible. So they suppressed them, waiting a full two weeks—while the controversy grew and

took the shape they preferred—before releasing the documents. Since no self-respecting reporter withholds relevant information from the public, it’s only fair to conclude that this was an act of advocacy, not journalism. Perhaps the reporters lost their bearings; perhaps the timing was controlled by advocates. Either way, the public was manipulated, not informed.”

He was referring to Glenn Greenwald of The Guardian and Barton Gellman of The Washington Post.

Yet, on the basis of these inflammatory and misleading reports, members of Congress such as Senator Rand Paul (R-KY) are trying to restrict the ability of the NSA to collect data and apprehend terrorists.

A story about the Judiciary Committee hearing, “Bipartisan House panel slams

continued on page 4

administration on surveillance,” by Josh Gerstein in Politico, completely ignored Baker’s testimony and criticism of media coverage of the NSA. Gerstein told AIM he only had time to cover the first panel, which featured administration and government witnesses, and not the second panel, which included Baker and others. He thought Politico’s “media team” might be interested in Baker’s criticism of the press.

We wait for that story to appear.

Meanwhile, The Washington Post story, “Lawmakers of both parties voice doubts about NSA surveillance programs,” and The New York Times story, “Bipartisan Backlash Grows Against Domestic Surveillance,” covered part of the hearing but ignored Baker’s incisive criticism of the press.

Hence, the media are perpetuating the manipulation of the public through misinformation about the nature of the NSA terrorist surveillance programs. The entire hearing can be viewed on C-SPAN.

After 9/11, of course, the NSA and the FBI got new surveillance and investigative powers, and cooperation between them was increased.

The possible result of new restrictions on the NSA, Baker made clear, could be another catastrophic terrorist attack on America.

Baker, who also served as general counsel to the National Security Agency, essentially warned members of the committee not to panic in response to the misleading media coverage. He said that “civil liberties criticism all across the ideological spectrum,” including from such organizations as the libertarian Cato Institute, forced the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act (FISA) court in the 1980s to restrict the government’s use of information from NSA surveillance, imposing a “wall” between law enforcement and intelligence—and the result was 9/11.

But panic they did; as some Republicans joined the ranking Democrat on the committee, far-left Democratic Rep. John Conyers of Michigan, in criticizing the NSA’s programs.

As a result of the “wall” between law enforcement and intelligence, Baker explained, the FBI did not pursue two al-Qaeda operatives in the U.S. who planned the 9/11 attacks. He said, “I realize that this story is not widely told, perhaps because it’s not an especially welcome story,

not in the mainstream media and not on the Internet. But it is true; the parts of my book that describe it are well-grounded in recently declassified government reports.”

His book is *Skating on Stilts: Why We Aren’t Stopping Tomorrow’s Terrorism*.

Snowden’s disclosure about the NSA collecting telephone metadata (such as the called number but not the content



for calls into, out of, or within the United States) was made in an “out of context” manner, in order to create the impression of a “troubling” overreach by government, he said. “But context is everything here,” Baker noted. “It turns out that collecting the data isn’t the same as actually looking at it.” In order to look at the data, the government request has to be deemed “relevant” under court-ordered rules.

The notion that the government is “seizing” millions of records without a warrant or probable cause sounds like a constitutional violation, he noted, but the Supreme Court has held that such records are not protected by the Fourth Amendment, since they’ve already been given to a third party.

He went on, “The Court has recognized more than half a dozen instances where searches and seizures are reasonable even in the absence of probable cause and a warrant. They range from drug screening to border searches. There can hardly be doubt that the need to protect national security fits within this doctrine as well, particularly when waiting to conduct a traditional search won’t work. Call data doesn’t last. If the government doesn’t preserve the data now, the government may not be able to search it later, when the need arises.”

“Today, law enforcement agencies collect several hundred thousand telephone billing records a year using nothing but a subpoena,” he said. “That means you’re roughly a thousand times more likely to have your telephone calling patterns reviewed by a law enforcement agency than

by NSA.”

While warning against rash Congressional action to restrict the NSA’s terrorist surveillance powers, he noted that European nations and the European Parliament are now demanding, in response to Snowden’s disclosures, that surveillance be restricted in the name of civil liberties.

He commented that French President Hollande and the French interior minister criticized the United States for its surveillance programs in Europe, although the newspaper Le Monde “disclosed what both French officials well knew—that France has its own program for large-scale interception of international telecommunications traffic.”

“Practically every comparative study of law enforcement and security practice shows that the United States imposes more restriction on its agencies and protects its citizens’ privacy rights from government surveillance more carefully than Europe,” Baker testified.

He explained: “European regimes, by and large, offer far less protection against arbitrary collection of personal data—and expose their programs to far less public scrutiny. One recent study showed that, out of a dozen advanced democracies, only two—the United States and Japan—impose serious limits on what electronic data private companies can give to the government without legal process. In most other countries, and particularly in Europe, little or no process is required before a provider hands over information about subscribers.”

Another witness, Steven G. Bradbury, former head of the Department of Justice’s Office of Legal Counsel, said the NSA’s programs “are entirely lawful and are conducted in a manner that appropriately respects the privacy and civil liberties of Americans and the principles enshrined in the Constitution.”

Anti-NSA testimony came from Kate Martin of the Center for National Security Studies and Jameel Jaffer of the American Civil Liberties Union. These are groups that have been involved for decades in campaigns to restrict intelligence gathering by U.S. intelligence and law enforcement agencies. Not surprisingly, they found a sympathetic ear in Rep. Conyers. •

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

State Department's Credibility Remains in Tatters

By Roger Aronoff

After the news broke that the ambassador to Belgium and members of his security detail had allegedly been soliciting prostitutes, including in some cases minors, President Obama quietly announced that he would reward another major fundraiser, Denise Bauer, by naming her as the replacement for that post. Bauer had been “finance chair for Women for Obama and raised more than \$500,000 for the president’s re-election campaign”—classic qualifications, apparently, for the President who was going to change the way Washington does business.

As Accuracy in Media has noted, the State Department, under Hillary Clinton, may have actually covered up eight different investigations—if not more, including the one involving the Belgian ambassador. These investigations include allegations of prostitution, pedophilia, sexual assault, and drug purchases. They risk embroiling this presidential hopeful—Mrs. Clinton—in a series of scandals come the 2016 election, if the media were to give a damn. “A true champion of women and children should not have this stain on her record,” wrote Salena Zito for Real Clear Politics, adding that “like a splattering of blood-red berries on a white-linen tablecloth, it will serve as a constant reminder that she did not speak for those who had no voice.”

“But one other thing should disturb any observer: Here was Clinton, the self-proclaimed champion of women and children, apparently standing by as women and children were abused by people who worked for her—and the only proactive step of her trusted staff was to cover it all up,” wrote Zito.

There is another disturbing aspect to this story. The whistleblower who revealed the cover-up of these investigations, Aurelia Fedenisn, has borne the brunt of State Department bullying as a result of her efforts to bring the cover-ups to light. Fedenisn was formerly an investigator at the State Department’s Office of the Inspector General. “[The Department] had law enforcement officers camp out in front of her house, harass her children and attempt to incriminate herself,” Fedenisn’s attorney, Cary Schulman, told Foreign Policy Magazine’s *The Cable*.

Now the Administration threatens to become embroiled in a Watergate-style

scandal; the law offices of Schulman and Mathias were broken into multiple times over a single weekend in early July. That’s the same offices as those representing Fedenisn. We are reminded once again of the Nixon Administration, whose “Plumbers” broke into the office of the psychiatrist of Daniel Ellsberg.

Only their offices in the high rise full of other offices were targeted. An unlocked office down the hall was passed by, untouched. Three computers were stolen and a file cabinet was rifled through while silver bars were passed over. Clearly, the burglars were after information, not valuables.

“My most high-profile case right now is the Aurelia Fedenisn case, and I can’t think of any other case where someone would go to these great lengths to get our information,” Schulman told John Hudson of *The Cable*.

Schulman told Fox KDFW News that he had contacted the FBI to look into the burglary because it may be political. But, he told *The Cable*, he doesn’t think it was perpetrated by the State Department itself. “It wasn’t professional enough,” Schulman told Hudson. “It is possible that an Obama or Hillary supporter feels that I am unfairly going after them. And the timing of this is right after several weeks of very public media attention so it seems to me most likely that the information sought is related to that case. I don’t know for sure and I want the police to do their work.”

Perhaps it wasn’t perpetrated by the State Department, but it might have been sanctioned by a rogue Department official bent on revenge, or someone who has been politically hurt by the revelations.

The State Department, regardless, has been quick to deny allegations of wrongdoing. “Any allegation that the Department of State authorized someone to break into Mr. Schulman’s law firm is false and baseless,” State Department spokeswoman Jen Psaki said.

This wouldn’t be the first time that Psaki has been caught in a fib. As a matter of



fact, just days earlier, as reported by Mediaite, Psaki called all reports that John Kerry was boating during the military coup in Egypt “completely inaccurate.” She stuck by that story, even as evidence to the contrary began to surface. The story that Kerry had been on his yacht was first reported by a CBS *This Morning* producer. Finally, when photos popped up online, Psaki acknowledged that Kerry was on his boat, if only briefly: “While he was briefly on his boat on Wednesday, Secretary Kerry worked around the clock all day including participating in the president’s meeting with his national security council.”

Some in the media, such as Erik Wemple of *The Washington Post*, pushed a narrative that some journalists are hypocrites, and won’t give Kerry a break, while they do their work from the beach or other vacations spots. The real issue, however, is that the State Department’s first instinct was to lie, just as it was under Hillary Clinton during the Benghazi scandal. Once the photos were posted online, that position became untenable.

As for the investigations into the allegations of wrongdoing at the State Department, Psaki said at the time that “The notion that we would not vigorously pursue criminal misconduct is not only preposterous, it’s inaccurate.” Yet, the revelations brought about by Fedenisn have clearly gotten under someone’s skin. •

Roger Aronoff is the Editor of Accuracy in Media, and can be contacted at ronoff@aim.org.

Former MSNBC Producer Rips Network—Says it has become the “Official Network of the Obama White House”

By Don Irvine



A former producer for MSNBC has grown tired of the network’s hosts unquestioning loyalty to President Obama over the government’s surveillance program and the treatment of Edward Snowden, labeling his former employer the “official network of the Obama White House.”

Jeff Cohen, who was a producer for Donahue, showed little sympathy for MSNBC, which he feels should have defended Snowden’s actions, instead of siding with the Obama administration:

“When it comes to issues of U.S. militarism and spying, the allegedly ‘progressive’ MSNBC often seems closer to the ‘official network of the Obama White House’ than anything resembling an independent channel. With a few exceptions (especially Chris Hayes), MSNBC has usually reacted to expanded militarism and surveillance by downplaying the abuses or defending them.

“Had McCain or Romney defeated Obama and implemented the exact same policies, treating whistleblowers like Manning and Snowden as foreign espionage agents, one would expect MSNBC hosts to be loudly denouncing the Republican abuses of authority.

“But with Obama in power, a number of MSNBC talking heads have reacted to the Snowden disclosures like Fox News hosts did when they were in hysterical damage control mode for Bush—complete with ridiculously fact-free claims and national chauvinism that we’ve long come to expect from the ‘fair & balanced’ channel.”

Cohen also railed against Ed Schultz, who he said sounded like (heaven forbid) Sean Hannity when he criticized Snowden,

and said another host functioned like an “auxiliary prosecutor in the Obama Justice Department” in going after Snowden.

Cohen is right about MSNBC’s unflinching pro-Obama bias, he’s just a few years late in realizing it. •

ABC’s Rick Klein Calls Obamacare Rollout a “Slow-Motion Train Wreck”

By Don Irvine



On a recent edition of This Week on ABC, the network’s political director, Rick Klein, criticized the Obama administration’s handling of the rollout of Obamacare. He called it a “slow-motion train wreck,” following the announcement that the employer-mandate provision would be delayed until January 1, 2015:

“You have seen Democrats saying that implementing Obamacare has the potential to be a train wreck. Well, now you have the prospect of a slow-motion train wreck. Here’s the thing about this particular provision, this affects thousands of workers, not the millions of workers who are going to be impacted over the long haul on this. So if you couldn’t even get this piece of it right after a three-year ramp up period, and you’re saying that you need another year and a half just to put in this tiny piece of Obamacare.”

While Klein deserves credit for calling out the administration on their handling of Obamacare, he has downplayed the effect it will have on workers. According to Forbes, two leading health economists are estimating that nearly 300,000 workers will be adversely affected by the employer mandate, which is much higher than Klein’s claims.

In addition to the employer mandate, the administration also announced last week that they will scale back oversight of income claims by applicants, and delay electronic notices to beneficiaries and applicants until 2015.

The Democrats would be well advised to derail this monster before it becomes a full-blown train wreck. •

CBS: Obamacare Delay a “Major Setback” for White House—Gives Impression It’s “Barely Operational”

By Don Irvine

Reporters and anchors on CBS This Morning were in general agreement that the decision by the White House to delay the implementation of the employer mandate until 2015 was a “major setback” for the Administration and could inflict some political damage as well.

The mandate was one of the most controversial provisions in the health care law, and there have been complaints from businesses that were concerned about the cost of implementation. Some had threatened layoffs to offset the added costs of compliance, which more than likely influenced the White House’s decision.

CBS chief legal correspondent Jan Crawford said that it was a “major concession of what is considered the President’s signature achievement,” and that it contradicts Obama’s claims that the law is “working the way it’s supposed to.”

That sentiment was echoed by CBS Political Director John Dickerson who said the delay was “not good” and that “It sort of contributes to the feeling that the Affordable Care Act is a jalopy they’re trying to roll out of the driveway here at barely operational for the president.”

The Administration wants the public to believe that they heard the complaints of businesses and that’s why they decided to delay the mandate implementation. But in fact businesses have been complaining since before the law was passed and were ignored by the Obama administration. •

What You Can Do

Please send the enclosed postcards to:

- Mr. Chris Matthews of MSNBC, for calling GOP senators “terrorists,” just more of his hateful nonsense;
- Ms. Margaret Sullivan of The NY Times about a recent Obama interview;
- Please make a donation to help support the work of AIM’s newly formed Citizens’ Commission on Benghazi.