



AIM in the News

page 2



Why Was Putin
a No-show in
Paris?

page 3



White House
Press Secretary
Josh Earnest
Says It's Not
"Accurate" to Call
Paris Terrorism
"Radical Islam"

page 6

AIM REPORT

For Fairness, Balance
and Accuracy in News
Reporting

2015 | XLIV-2

It's the President's Policies—Not His Team's Vision

By Roger Aronoff

It's been a gradual process, but we welcome former *New York Times* columnist Leslie Gelb to the realization that President Barack Obama's leadership has been disastrous for this country. In October Gelb wrote, "while Obama inherited rather than caused many of the world's current crises, his habitual complacency and passivity prevent him from mitigating or resolving them."

By November, Gelb had scathing criticism for Obama, writing for *The Daily Beast* that "The leak suggests that Mr. Obama remains blind to the principal cause of his foreign policy woes... he is the person most responsible for the absence of a U.S. foreign policy strategy, for policy zigs and zags, and for the loss of credibility and power. The essential fault lies not with the stars around him, however dim, but with himself."

The failure to send a high-ranking member of Obama's administration to Paris for the so-called unity rally was the last straw for Mr. Gelb, whose impeccable establishment credentials include board senior fellow and president emeritus at the Council on Foreign Relations. He even acknowledges it in *The Daily Beast* title: "This Is Obama's Last Foreign Policy Chance."

Gelb said that failing to go to Paris or send the vice president was more than a "horrible gaffe," adding that it "demonstrated beyond argument that the Obama team lacks the basic instincts and judgment necessary to conduct U.S. national security policy in the next two years. It's simply too dangerous to let Mr. Obama continue as is—with his current team and his way of making decisions. America, its allies, and friends could be heading into one of the most dangerous periods since the height of the Cold War."

But unfortunately, this wasn't Obama's last foreign policy chance. Gelb recommends that Susan Rice, Ben Rhodes, Denis McDonough, and Valerie Jarrett go. There is no doubt that these four have helped make an utter mess of American foreign policy, but largely at the direction of their boss.

Gelb suggests that President Obama add establishment Republican Thomas Pickering, who is soft on Iran and also complicit



in the Benghazi cover-up, as the Chair of the discredited Accountability Review Board (ARB), the State Department creation that didn't even interview then-Secretary of State Clinton, and informed Mrs. Clinton through her aide, Cheryl Mills, when the vice chair of the ARB became concerned about the testimony of one of the witnesses.

"Pickering has personally explored opening relations with Hamas; pushed peace talks with the Taliban; argued for getting rid of, or removing to the U.S., all tactical nuclear weapons in Europe (and moving Russia's to east of the Urals); and promoted bilateral talks with Iran without preconditions," wrote Andy McCarthy. These are the credentials to pull our country out of its foreign policy disasters?

In the end, we may not even agree with Gelb's advocacy that the President should replace his current team, or whether that even matters. And that is because of another point he makes: "In the end, making the national security system work comes down to one factor, one man—Barack Obama. He's the key problem, and he's the only one who can bring about a solution."

What Gelb's column fails to recognize is that this isn't a prob-

continued on page 3

AIM

in the News

In the last **AIM Report**, we cited the work of **Jerome Corsi**, writing for **WorldNetDaily**. **Corsi** wrote a series of articles on AIM's **Citizens' Commission on Benghazi**. **Corsi** quoted extensively from **AIM Editor Roger Aronoff**:

"Aronoff said that if the Benghazi scandal had taken place under a Republican administration, establishment media would have been tireless in demanding a full and complete congressional investigation."

"With a Republican in the White House, we'd be hearing demands from the mainstream media for the president to come clean," Aronoff said. **"But here the mainstream media are largely ignoring the Gowdy investigation. [They] want to go along with the Obama administration narrative that there is no scandal here and the American people should move on."**

"Aronoff said establishment media wanted to end the Benghazi investigation with the report...issued in November by...the Republican-led **House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence**. The report 'found no evidence' to support allegations the **Obama** administration blocked attempts to send rescue operations to Benghazi during the assault or sought to mislead the public afterwards."

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

Editor's Message



Dear Fellow Media Watchdogs:

The story of NBC News anchor Brian Williams' admitted lie has the potential of being a teachable moment, to use a well-worn phrase. He only made the admission after being publicly challenged by former military people who had been on the same helicopter with him back in 2003, which he had claimed was hit by RPG (rocket-propelled grenade) fire while he was aboard. He didn't call it a lie. He said, rather, that he "conflated" his chopper with another one that actually was hit. Most of the media, particularly at his own network, called it a "mistake."

Williams tried wrapping himself in the idea that he was actually paying tribute to military people when he made the "mistake," and claims that his concern for the troops is real. But he acted as though that was the first time he had told that story, even though he had told the same lie (my characterization) again and again, on David Letterman's TV show and in an interview with Alec Baldwin on his then-radio show.

Some in the media called for him to step down or be fired, such as David Zurawik of the Baltimore Sun. As this goes to press, the network announced that Williams will be taking a six-month leave of absence, without pay. The likelihood is that Williams won't be back. There will probably be some sort of payout to him, so that he leaves without a lawsuit or further damage to the network. There have been many who have survived lying and plagiarism in the recent past. Politicians are another matter. Those, such as Hillary Clinton, John Kerry, Barack Obama and Sen. Richard Blumenthal don't have actual bosses who can sideline them, other than the voters, or Congress through impeachment, but for a network news anchor, it is a tough sell to keep him on once his credibility is gone. For politicians, especially President Obama, it's par for the course.

We have pointed out many times how network news anchors and reporters lie by distortion and omission, by double standards and through their own political bias. They often refuse to cover genuine scandals when they are from a left-wing administration in bed with the networks, that share their ideology, a relationship which usually trumps objective reporting. And no network has done that more frequently than NBC and its cable network partner MSNBC.

When it comes to stories like the IRS scandal, or the VA scandal, or Benghazi, or conflicts of interest, and blatant lying, the Obama administration could almost always count on Brian Williams, NBC and MSNBC to spin stories to their liking. And that is the related story. How many times has the Obama administration flat-out lied, and the media just ignored it? The Washington Post deserves some credit, because through their Fact Checker column by Glenn Kessler, they have exposed some of President Obama's most egregious lies, such as his claims about Obamacare, and about negotiations with Iran. I'll have much more to say about this in the near future. •

For Accuracy in Media

Roger Aronoff

Your Letters

To the Editor:

When the Benghazi investigation finally breaks through, a lot of people are going down. That is why the left is fighting so hard to end it.

Steve D.

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.

lem of President Obama receiving bad advice. It is that he is ideologically driven, and his agenda is clearly antithetical to America's national security needs and interests. This has been apparent since before the President took office, but it was laid bare in his first year in office. It is just that virtually everyone at The New York Times and other foreign policy establishment institutions either didn't recognize it, or thought his presidency would be a great antidote to the "cowboy" foreign policy, as they saw it, of the George W. Bush era.

Consider these following presidential actions:

- President Obama's Cairo speech in his first months, where he invited the Muslim Brotherhood, and didn't invite the then-president of Egypt to attend;

- his hands off the green revolution in Iran that possibly could have overthrown that dangerous, terrorist sponsoring, corrupt regime;

- the unilateral removal of our missile defense system from Poland and the Czech Republic;

- President Obama's ongoing pledge to shut down Guantanamo Bay;

- his immediate demands on Israel that proved both wrong and counterproductive for what he was hoping to achieve;

- the unnecessary war in Libya, and the resulting Benghazi Islamic terrorist attack on our Special Mission Compound, and the obvious lies and dereliction of duty

that went along with it;

- the current phony war against ISIS, with a plan to defeat them that would be so absurd if it wasn't so tragic;

- and Obama's lies and distortions about the nature of the threat in today's world, which include the West's failure to confront the Islamist, jihadist terrorism and growing caliphate.

The problem is not a lack of policy, or rearranging the circle of advisers—it's Obama's actual policies themselves that have us in this mess that Leslie Gelb has come to recognize.

The Wall Street Journal carried an article about how the Iraqis are growing impatient with how the U.S. and its coalition are carrying out the war against the Islamic State (IS), with whom we're supposedly in a years-long process of degrading and destroying. "The swelling disapproval reflects Iraqi impatience at the U.S.-led mission's multiyear strategy against Islamic State, also known as ISIS. Many Iraqis see the insurgents as an immediate threat pulling their country apart amid immense suffering," reports the Journal. "Some Iraqis even believe the coalition is aiding the extremists by airdropping weapons into the third of the country they control."

It has put us in the position of coordinating with Iran, and the Iranian-backed militias are doing much of the fighting on

the ground, while at the same time we are supposedly attempting to defeat ISIS in Syria, in which we are doing some of the dirty work for Bashar al Assad, another Iranian proxy.

Mr. Gelb, we've just outlined how President Obama's foreign policy team has been mishandling the hard questions—since day one—and Paris was, unfortunately, just a flash in the pan that momentarily illuminated the President's perverse ideological strategic vision. He wasn't there, nor did he send Vice President Biden, because he doesn't stand in solidarity with the views of the French Prime Minister, Manuel Valls, who said in the aftermath of last week's terrorist attacks in Paris that left a total of 17 dead, "We're at war, but not at war against a religion, not against a civilization, but at war to defend our values, which are universal." He added, "It is a war against terrorism and radical Islam, against everything aimed at breaking solidarity, liberty and fraternity."

The problem is not a lack of policy, or rearranging the circle of advisers—it's Obama's actual policies themselves that have us in this mess that Gelb has come to recognize. •

Roger Aronoff is the Editor of Accuracy in Media, and a member of the Citizens' Commission on Benghazi. He can be contacted at roger.aronoff@aim.org.

Why Was Putin a No-show in Paris?

By Cliff Kincaid

With good reason, media attention has been focused on President Barack Obama's curious absence from the Paris march against terrorism. Obama became a "Where's Waldo?" character, whose whereabouts were unknown. Observers looked for him at the march of world leaders in France, hoping to spot him somewhere. But where was Russian leader Vladimir Putin? This may have been the bigger story.

Putin's invasion of Ukraine, a source of concern in Europe, may have been a factor in his absence. But it's also true that Putin has documented pro-terrorist credentials that should have made him persona non grata at any such event. Instead, Putin sent Russian Foreign Minister Sergey Lavrov to Paris to represent his regime.

Putin was a KGB spy for many years and

ran the FSB, the successor to the KGB, which trained the notorious terrorist once based in France known as Carlos the Jackal. Carlos, a name given to him because of his roots in Latin America, has been linked to communist-run international terror networks that always had an Islamic component and a strategy in the Middle East that includes the destruction of Israel.

The name "Carlos the Jackal" is well-known globally because he was the reported godfather behind such attacks as the murders of Israeli athletes at the Munich Olympics in 1972, and the seizure of hostages at a meeting of the oil-producing countries, known as OPEC, in Vienna in 1975. But less well-known is the international terrorist support network organized by the Soviet Union and Cuba which backed him.

President Obama may want people to believe that Russia and Cuba are no longer

involved in terrorism, but hearings conducted by Congress in the 1980s, such as "The Role of Cuba in International Terrorism and Subversion," cannot be ignored. Castro was given a role in the "Liberation of Palestine" account made by the KGB, the hearings showed, as well as promoting communism in Latin America and Africa.

Before that, in 1974, the House Committee on Internal Security produced a report, "Terrorism: A Staff Study," analyzing Soviet, Chinese and Cuban support for international terrorism.

Today, the PLO (Palestine Liberation Organization) now runs the West Bank, and the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine (PFLP) continues to call Israel the "Zionist/Imperialist Project," a typical Soviet term.

Tragically, the Senate and House committees or subcommittees on security and terrorism were dismantled and there is no



1981 book, *The Terror Network: The Secret War of International Terrorism*, still stands as the authoritative analysis of the international terror networks that emerged in the late 1960s under the sponsorship of Russia and Cuba. Carlos was a key Soviet KGB operative in this effort.

Sterling identifies Carlos as someone who was under KGB control and running a terror net-

work directly out of Paris in 1974 and 1975. He killed two French agents who tried to capture him and fled France, moving around in various Arab countries and what was then East Germany, where a young KGB spy by the name of Vladimir Putin would be based. Carlos continued carrying out attacks in France and other nations through his terror network.

Carlos was born in Venezuela as Ilich Ramirez Sanchez. His first name was given by his Marxist parents as a tribute to Soviet communist leader Vladimir Ilych Lenin. Carlos “studied” at Patrice Lumumba University in Moscow, notes Jill Dougherty, once CNN’s Moscow Bureau Chief.

In fact, according to former KGB officers, the “university” was essentially run by the KGB, which used it to recruit foreign students as agents or terrorists.

The authoritative *Black Book of Communism: Crimes, Terror, Repression*, which was published in France, states categorically that Carlos worked for the KGB, carrying out terrorist activities on its behalf.

Carlos also “studied” at the Tricontinental Conference in Havana in 1966. A conference of this kind and scope, Sterling wrote, “had never been seen since the Bolshevik Revolution of 1917, and the world would never be the same.” She noted that its “General Declaration” urged close collaboration between the Soviet-style “Socialist countries” and the “national liberation movements,” in order to mount “a global revolutionary strategy” against “American imperialism.”

This is the strategy that resulted in hundreds of acts of terrorism across Europe and in the United States through such groups as the Weather Underground and the Puerto Rican FALN.

Numerous reports put Carlos at the KGB-supervised Cuban terrorist training camp known as Mantanzas, where he “studied” guerrilla warfare, sabotage techniques and bomb-making.

Former KGB agents, including Litvinenko and Konstantin Preobrazhensky, confirmed published accounts that Carlos was in fact an agent of the KGB. The 1991 book, *KGB: The Inside Story*, by Christopher Andrew and former KGB officer Oleg Gordievsky, also confirms his terrorist training by the Soviets and Cubans.

Interestingly, when a TV movie was aired in 2010 about Carlos the terrorist, the Kremlin propaganda channel Russia Today (RT) ran a story saying his KGB connections were murky and had been “questioned” by the movie director. However, the director of the film did say, “He (Carlos) grew up in a Marxist family in Venezuela; his parents sent him to Lumumba University in Moscow; then he was expelled from the university for bad behavior. Then he re-emerges with a gun in his hand in Jordan at the side of the Palestinian from the PFLP, led by Wadiah Haddad, who was a KGB agent. So what exactly were the KGB connections of Carlos? It’s a very difficult subject.”

The director was quoted as saying, “it is debatable whether Carlos the Jackal, a supporter of radical Islamism, had KGB connections.”

Such a claim only makes sense from the perspective of a network that serves Putin’s propaganda interests and wants to distance Moscow from the carnage the Soviets inflicted, with the collaboration of the Cuban communists, on Europe and the United States.

The KGB connections of Carlos went far beyond the PFLP. What’s more, the late Herbert Romerstein, an expert on security and terrorism, had noted that the “expulsion” from Lumumba University was a diversion. He said that Carlos had left Moscow with a letter of introduction from a representative of the PFLP stationed in Moscow, and had joined that Soviet-backed Arab terrorist organization.

Carlos is in prison, but Mahmoud Abbas, the chairman of the PLO, has a similar background. Abbas, who is also president of the Palestinian Authority, did his Ph.D. work at the KGB’s Patrice Lumumba University, where he wrote a report claiming that there was no Holocaust, and that the Jews murdered during World War II were actually killed by Zionists working with the Nazis.

The Obama and Putin no-shows in Paris were eclipsed by the attendance of Abbas, who is now seen internationally

such body in Congress today that specifically examines international terrorist activity and its U.S. support networks.

Former KGB officers and intelligence analysts say the PLO was created by the Soviet KGB, and that the PLO’s long-time chairman, Yasser Arafat, was an agent of the Soviet intelligence service.

Indeed, Ion Mihai Pacepa, the highest-ranking defector from the former Soviet bloc, says KGB dissident Alexander Litvinenko, who was living in London, was killed by the KGB because he spilled the beans on how Soviet intelligence spawned Islamic terrorism and trained al-Qaeda leader Ayman Al-Zawahiri.

But there is another fascinating aspect to the story that brings this matter up to date. Although a Marxist terrorist for much of his life, Carlos converted to Islam and is now serving a life sentence in a prison in France. He announced in 2003 that he had pledged allegiance to Osama bin Laden.

Obama seems preoccupied with the rights of terrorists and whether they are being treated properly. However, French Special Forces kidnapped Carlos in Sudan in 1994 using a practice known as “rendition,” a practice used by the Bush administration against terrorists that has only reluctantly been embraced by the Obama administration.

In what Obama might describe as a violation of his terrorist “rights,” Carlos was reportedly injected with a tranquilizer, bound, stuffed into a sack, and transferred to France, where he was put on trial, convicted of murder, and sentenced to life in prison.

Putin, in response to the Charlie Hedbo massacre, said through a spokesman, “Moscow strongly condemns terrorism in all its manifestations,” adding, “Moscow is sure that no terrorist acts can be justified.”

Moscow’s words need to be “parsed,” as the saying goes.

The American author Claire Sterling’s

as someone opposed to the terrorism his organization has sponsored and carried out for decades. It was a clever propaganda

display that Putin must have enjoyed. •

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

Notorious Red Exploits King Legacy

By Cliff Kincaid

Janel Davis of the Atlanta Journal-Constitution reported that a “noted scholar, author and veteran civil rights activist” by the name of Angela Davis will deliver the keynote address January 18 at Kennesaw State University’s annual Martin Luther King Jr. Day observance. This is the same Angela Davis “who supported the imprisonment of Soviet political dissidents (calling them common criminals), cheered on the 1968 Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia, and was awarded the International Lenin Peace Prize (formerly the International Stalin Peace Prize) by communist East Germany,” as noted by another paper, the British Telegraph.

The differences in reporting reflect the abysmal state of our media today, as compared to a foreign newspaper that conducted some basic research. Janel Davis is obviously a young reporter who has not been trained to properly investigate a subject she is writing about. As a result, she misleads her audience and makes a fool out of herself.

A photograph of Davis shaking hands with the Stalinist East German dictator, Erich Honecker, is not that difficult to find on the Internet.

Davis, a two-time candidate for vice-president on the Communist Party ticket, was paid \$20,000 by Kennesaw State University to give a speech. Earlier in her career she beat a murder rap and was a college professor at the University of California at Santa Cruz.

In a 2012 speech, she spoke of the “planetary euphoria” she felt when Barack Obama was elected president. Davis said Obama’s presidency had resulted in “an upsurge of activism” that would not have taken place “if the Republican candidate had been elected.”

In addition to the International Lenin Peace Prize, she received an honorary degree from the Karl Marx University of Leipzig, East Germany.

The transformation of a communist apologist for the old Soviet Union and East Germany into a “scholar” and “civil rights activist” is on the same level as Davis pretending to be a working class hero



while making big bucks on the lecture circuit. Nevertheless, she still talks and acts like a communist true believer and participated in the “Occupy” movement at events in various cities.

Those who believe communism is dead might be surprised to learn that in 2012 she gave a speech calling for “combating anti-communism.” At the same time, she has adopted the cause of radical Islam, declaring “Islamophobia” to be a major threat, the communist People’s World reported.

The paper went on to say that Davis “spoke at length about [the] centrality of the Israeli oppression of the Palestinian people to the discontent in the Muslim world,” and challenged the audience to recognize “that Israeli apartheid...is just as bad” as South African apartheid.

Davis concluded her address by saying that “we need peace, justice, equality, and socialism for us all.”

A Google search finds that Davis’s Marxist speeches are being offered for fees that range from \$10,000 to \$20,000. It looks like Kennesaw, located about 20 miles outside Atlanta, got stuck with the higher rate.

Most of those offering her services as a speaker provide an extreme make-over of her career, in order to mask her decades of serving the interests of the secret police in the Soviet Union and East Germany.

For example, the American Program Bureau calls Davis a “Feminist & Writer,” whose topics include “The Role of Art in Society.”

The Keppler Speakers Bureau calls her a “living legend” who will “recount her experience as one of the country’s most prominent activists for social justice.”

The Lavin Agency calls Davis a “Legendary Human Rights Activist” who is

“internationally known for her ongoing work to combat all forms of oppression in the U.S. and abroad.”

The latter claim is most definitely a lie, since Davis was an ardent proponent of the Soviet/East German system of oppression and ignored the victims of communism—some 100 million of them.

Now Davis is claiming the mantle of Dr. Martin Luther King, a man honored by Americans for his commitment to peaceful change. Many young blacks may be duped into believing that Davis is somehow in the same league as Dr. King, as a result of papers like the Atlanta Journal-Constitution (AJC) sanitizing her career. The Davis speech was sponsored by the Kennesaw State African-American Student Alliance.

Phil Kent’s piece, “AJC Omits KSU Speaker’s Communist Background,” was the first indication that the Davis appearance at Kennesaw was not going to take place without some critical comment. He went into some detail about Davis, even noting that she once told an ACLU meeting that she “believes in the violent overthrow of America’s government.”

But that government is now showering her with student and taxpayer dollars through state universities. It is quite a racket.

Julian March of the Wilmington Star-News reported that Davis was scheduled to speak on January 20 at the University of North Carolina Wilmington (UNCW), also as part of a Martin Luther King Jr. event. The article mentions her communist past but quotes Todd McFadden, a UNCW instructor and director of the Upperman African American Cultural Center, as saying “the controversy associated with Davis’ name has faded” over the years.

He says, “Martin Luther King was controversial in his day but obviously is a much more accepted figure. Things like that change.”

One thing that has changed is that we have a media which censors the truth about people like Davis who rip off the system in order to destroy it.

In addition to pocketing tens of thousands of capitalist dollars from colleges

continued on page 6

and universities, the Angela Davis group called Critical Resistance, notes writer Tina Trent, gets funding from the super capitalist hedge-fund operator George Soros through his Open Society Foundation.

Critical Resistance aims to empty the prisons of the United States, since criminals are considered victims of a capitalist society.

This campaign is one reason why, ac-

ording to the AJC, Davis has emerged as a “scholar” on the issue of “imprisonment.”

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

White House Press Secretary Josh Earnest Says It’s Not “Accurate” to Call Paris Terrorism “Radical Islam”

By Don Irvine



White House press secretary Josh Earnest said that while he won’t criticize anyone who uses the term “radical Islam” to describe the massacre in Paris last week at the offices of *Charlie Hebdo*, the White House won’t use that terminology because it’s not “accurate.”

Earnest was asked about this by NPR’s Mara Liasson:

Liasson: “Other allies have described the ideology that you call a warped view of Islam by calling it radical Islam. They’re not saying we’re at war with Islam. They agree with you totally and every word you’ve just said. But they are calling the ideology—the ‘warped view’ that these people adhere to—by a name. And it seems like the White House has gone to great lengths to avoid ever calling it anything other than a warped view and I’m wondering if there is a reason for that?”

Earnest: “The first is accuracy. We want to describe exactly what happened. These are individuals who carried out an act of terrorism and they later tried to justify that act of terrorism by invoking the religion of Islam and their own deviant view of it.

“The second is, this was an act that was roundly condemned by Muslim leaders. Again, I am describing to you the reasons why we have not chosen to use that label, because it does not seem to accurately describe what happened.

“We also don’t want to be in a situation where we are legitimizing what we


consider to be a completely illegitimate justification for this violence, this act of terrorism.

“Again, I’m not going to criticize anybody who uses that label. I’m talking about the way we are talking about this. And what we are trying to be as specific and accurate as possible in describing what exactly occurred.”

The only “warped view” is that of the White House, which can’t bring itself to call the terrorists what they really are, either because they’re afraid of offending Muslims, or because they don’t want to face the consequences of what being honest about it would entail.

USA Today Defends Running Radical Muslim Cleric Column—Calls it “Tempered Analysis”

By Don Irvine



Last week, *USA Today* ran a column by radical Muslim cleric Anjem Choudary, who questioned why the French government allowed the weekly satirical newspaper *Charlie Hebdo* to run cartoons that insulted Mohammed, and place its citizens at risk:

“So why in this case did the French government allow the magazine *Charlie Hebdo* to continue to provoke Muslims, thereby placing the sanctity of its citizens at risk?”

The backlash to Choudary’s column was angry and swift, as people wondered why *USA Today* would print such inflammatory remarks in the wake of the massacre at the offices of *Charlie Hebdo*, in which Muslim extremists killed 12 people.

Yet despite the outrage over Choudary’s

column, *USA Today* editorial-page editor Brian Gallagher defended the paper’s decision to publish it, calling it a “tempered analysis,” and compared it to the response they receive when publishing opinions on global warming, race and the Keystone pipeline. He concluded that refusing to publish the column would have dishonored the memory of those who were slain:

“His argument is neither an incitement to violence nor a defense of the murders. Both of those would have been unacceptable. Rather, it is a tempered analysis of the motivations behind tragedies like the *Charlie Hebdo* attack: Nothing is more central to Islam, he points out, than the sanctity of the religion’s founder, the prophet Mohammed. So Muslims, passionate in their faith, are duty-bound to reject Western standards of free speech that tolerate blasphemy to the prophet.

“Perhaps that’s attributable to the nature of the *Charlie Hebdo* story. French satirists were murdered for being bold enough to criticize Islam. We would have dishonored their memories by refusing to publish offensive commentary from the other side.”

The murder of the *Charlie Hebdo* staff—whether or not you agree with what they were publishing—is a despicable, vile act by Muslim terrorists who have no respect for human life, and who are dedicated to stamping out any dissent of their views. Choudary’s column is anything but “tempered analysis,” and only helps fan the flames of those who support his terrorist beliefs.

What You Can Do

Please send the enclosed postcards to:

- James Goldston, president of ABC News, about why the evening news failed to report on Taliban story raised by Jonathan Karl;
- Joe Scarborough of MSNBC for challenging NBC correspondent Ayman Mohyeldin’s characterization of Chris Kyle as a racist engaged in “killing sprees;”
- Please use the third postcard to help AIM with a generous donation to allow us to continue our important work of holding this administration accountable for its failures in Benghazi, and the cover-up.