



AIM in the News

page 2



The Real Drama
is in the Demo-
cratic Primary

page 3



Fox News'
Debate Questions
to Trump Were
Tough, Not Inap-
propriate

page 6

AIM REPORT

For Fairness, Balance
and Accuracy in News
Reporting

2015 | XLIV-12

Krugman and the Times Still Spinning Obama's Legacy

By Roger Aronoff

In the view of The New York Times and other beacons of the liberal media, President Barack Obama's policies are a resounding success and he rarely makes a misstep. The harmful effects of his policies, as well as his many scandals, must be ignored or covered up with misleading statistics and deceitful reporting that preserve his radical, left-wing legacy, and even make it sound mainstream.

Members of the media often follow the lead of the Times in choosing the angles for their own reporting. And, as we noted last year, Paul Krugman's columns for that paper, while opinion pieces, reflect the Times' underlying perspective and political agenda.

Just as last summer Krugman triumphantly announced that 2014 would go down in history as "as one of those years when America took a major turn in the right direction," his August 10 column seeks to demonstrate how Republican presidential candidates are unable to confront Obama's "failure to fail," despite all the dire conservative warnings. In other words, Krugman has once again penned a defense of President Obama's agenda, particularly Obamacare and America's economic growth.

"Talk to right-wingers, and they will inevitably assert that it [Obamacare] has been a disaster," he claims. "But ask exactly what form this disaster has taken, and at best you get unverified anecdotes about rate hikes and declining quality."

Those "unverified anecdotes" were considered so credible that Krugman's own paper dedicated a front-page article last October to the crisis facing Americans who could no longer pay for their rising deductibles and their medical expenses under Obamacare: "About 7.3 million Americans are enrolled in private coverage through the Affordable Care Act marketplaces," wrote the Times, "and more than 80 percent qualified for federal subsidies to help with the cost of their monthly premiums. But many are still on the hook for deductibles that can top \$5,000 for individuals and \$10,000 for families—the trade-off, insurers say, for keeping premiums for the marketplace plans relatively low."

But the Times' reporting on this issue was a short-term divergence from its, and other papers,' long-term campaign to demonstrate that Obamacare has been successful regardless of the evidence demonstrating that it has damaged Americans' ability to



pay for their health care. Any objective analysis—one not secretly swayed by hidden political and familial connections—would conclude that Obamacare has been an abject failure marked by rising costs and declining care.

"Obamacare was supposed to be a job-killer..." writes Krugman, criticizing Republican presidential candidate Marco Rubio (R-FL). Krugman writes that "in the year and a half since Obamacare went fully into effect, the U.S. economy has added an average of 237,000 private-sector jobs per month" and labels this a better performance than any "since the 1990s," better even when compared with President Ronald Reagan's term in office.

"Many employers cut workers' hours to avoid the Affordable Care Act's mandate to provide health insurance to anyone working 30 hours a week or more," wrote Mortimer Zuckerman for The Wall Street Journal last year. "The unintended consequence of President Obama's 'signature legislation'? Fewer full-time workers. In many cases two people are working the same number of hours that one had previously worked."

Zuckerman broke down the employment figures from the previous month, another one of those months with an increase of about a quarter million people in private-sector jobs: "Full-time jobs last month plunged by 523,000, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics. What has increased are part-time jobs. They soared by about 800,000 to more than 28 million. Just think

continued on page 3

AIM

in the News

In the last **AIM Report**, in this section, we cited **Jerome Corsi**, a correspondent for **WorldNetDaily**, whose recent article for **WND** was based on information he received from **Accuracy in Media's Citizens' Commission on Benghazi (CCB)**. Here is more from that article:

"The **CCB**, in its interim report issued on April 22, 2014, added another twist to the story.

"The report said an American citizen source 'trusted by the **CCB** who has long experience in the Middle East described the flow of weapons from Qatar to the Libyan rebels and the diversion of some of those arms.'

"The report explained that after **Qaddafi's** regime had been ousted, a delegation from the United Arab Emirates traveled to Libya to collect payment for the weapons the UAE had financed and Qatar had delivered to the **Transitional National Council** during the war.

"The UAE delegation was seeking \$1 billion it claimed was owed,' the report said. 'During their visit to Tripoli, the UAE officials discovered that half of the \$1 billion worth of weapons it had financed for the rebels had, in fact, been diverted by **Mustafa Abdul Jalil**, the **Muslim Brotherhood** head of the **Libyan TNC**, and sold to **Qaddafi**.'"

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:

I've been observing politics closely for a long time. The first election I took an interest in was Nixon-Kennedy in 1960. I've attended six national conventions as a journalist, starting with the Democratic convention in Chicago in 1968, and both Democratic and Republican conventions in Miami Beach in 1972. In all, that's three Democratic, and three Republican conventions. And I must say, one year before the two nominees will be chosen, I find it extremely difficult to envision how

either party is likely to go in 2016. The early favorites, Jeb Bush and Hillary Clinton, both appear to be in big trouble.

On the Republican side, it looks to me like Donald Trump will probably hang on to his significant lead in the polls going in to the actual primaries and caucuses. We start with the Iowa caucus on February 1st, followed in February by New Hampshire, South Carolina and Nevada. Then on March 1st, which is Super Tuesday, 12 states will choose their delegates on a single day. After that, the parties should be down to just a very few viable candidates left standing.

Is anyone thinking about dropping out now? Rick Perry can't even pay his bills, or his staff, but there are millions of dollars in Super Pac money to launch him into the upper tier of candidates. Among the leading candidates based on the latest polls are Trump, Carly Fiorina, and Ben Carson, two business people and a pediatric brain surgeon. Elected politicians are struggling. Jeb Bush, thought to be the front runner, and having the largest bankroll, doesn't seem to be gathering any steam.

The media have largely focused on Trump, predicting his demise on several occasions already. He regularly shows contempt for most of them, calling their questions stupid and finding other ways to insult them, but they seem to love it. It's like an abusive relationship. The others are fighting for oxygen, and a chance to move up a few notches on the 17-person ladder. We have more than five months until the first vote is cast. Until then, we have nothing to go on but polls, where often five or six candidates are within the margin of error of each other.

The Democrats are another story. With the Hillary ship taking on water faster than she can bucket it out, and a possible criminal prosecution for mishandling classified information hanging over her head, the powers that be in the Democratic Party, the media and Team Obama are faced with a serious dilemma: Dump Hillary, by ratcheting up the pressure, and possibly even indicting her, and take their chances with socialist Bernie Sanders or one of the old guard Dems like Vice President Joe Biden, Secretary of State John Kerry, or former VP Al Gore—all names that are being mentioned. If they go that route, don't expect the Clintons to sit still for it. It could mean all out civil war in their party. The stakes couldn't be higher, but the picture couldn't be more confusing as to how this is all going to play out. It will be a fascinating ride. •

For Accuracy in Media

Roger Aronoff

Your Letters

To the Editor:

Yes, the media are very important, but much more important is the ideology that moves most of the media and, much more importantly, the ideological nucleus of Democrat Party: An eclectically "pragmatic" ideological salad with the basic "lettuce" in it being socialism and, to a considerable extent, communism.

Maria

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.

of all those Americans working part time, no doubt glad to have the work but also contending with lower pay, diminished benefits and little job security.” That is the America that Obamacare and the Obama economy are creating.

The Hill’s Vicki Needham reported on August 7 that “wage growth remains stagnant even as the labor market makes gains.” Despite this, Needham describes the current “improving” economy as a “boon for President Obama.”

This is an economic shell game, pure and simple. As a Princeton economics professor, and former Enron consultant, Krugman must know better. He does acknowledge that there are “many reasons to qualify” the low unemployment rate, “notably the fact that measured unemployment is low in part because of a decline in the percentage of Americans in the labor force.” But that huge understatement was it as far as balance goes.

The labor participation rate is actually stuck at around 62.6 percent, comparable to the 1970s. That’s more than three percent less labor participation by Americans than there was in January 2009 when President Obama took office, according to the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. That translates to approximately 90 million people, depending on how you count them, who either aren’t working or aren’t looking for work.

When such inconvenient facts don’t provide support for Obamacare, amnesty, or additional climate change regulations in the service of Obama’s progressive agenda, journalists try to divert the public’s attention by manufacturing supportive headlines.

CNN reported on August 7 that African Americans now have an unemployment rate below 10 percent, at 9.1 percent as of this July, with the headline, “Black unemployment rate falls to lowest in 7 years.” This is “especially encouraging” because “unemployment for African-Americans was 11.4% last July,” it reports.

Glassdoor Chief Economist Andrew Chamberlain tells CNN Money that “The unemployment rate can fall for good reasons—people find jobs—or bad reasons like people who couldn’t find jobs leave the labor force.”

This is an economic shell game, pure and simple. As a Princeton economics professor, and former Enron consultant, Krugman must know better.

“Unfortunately, I think [this month] it’s more being driven by people leaving the labor market,” he continued.

Yet, despite Chamberlain’s comments, the article maintains that “experts say the trend over the past year is positive.”

But according to the left-leaning Economic Policy Institute, 51 percent of black high school graduates between the age of 17 and 20 are underemployed, meaning unemployed or working part time, but wanting to work full time.

However, the real dereliction of duty by the mainstream media has been with the ongoing underreported or misreported stories that they don’t dare to touch. From the FAA hiring scandal, to the IRS scandal, to *Fast & Furious* and the Benghazi scandal, the media run faster and harder every day to dream up new stories about trivial events to fill their papers with anything—any diversion that doesn’t implicate the Obama administration for its widespread and growing malfeasance. A current diversion is Donald Trump vs. Fox News’ Megyn Kelly, following their Fox News Channel debate confrontation, plus the subsequent comments Trump made on CNN.

Reporters won’t admit that Hillary Clinton’s ongoing email scandal involving the misuse of classified information, lies, and stonewalling, is, in fact, a State Department scandal. After all, the State Department knew about then-Secretary of State Clinton’s use of private email, and

allowed her to do all of her business on a private email server, leaving it vulnerable to sophisticated hackers such as those operating in China, Russia, and North Korea. NBC News reported on Monday that “China’s cyber spies have accessed the private emails of ‘many’ top Obama administration officials, according to a senior U.S. intelligence official and a top secret document obtained by NBC News, and have been doing so since at least April 2010.”

President Obama has admitted that he exchanged emails with Secretary Clinton at her private address, but still maintains that he didn’t know “the details” about her private server, or that she did all of her government business on it. He had originally said he learned about Hillary’s “private email address use through recent news reports, [at] ‘the same time everybody else learned it.’”

That was the same lie he initially told about how he learned about the IRS targeting of conservative groups.

David Axelrod, the former senior advisor to President Obama, said back in February, during his book tour, “And I’m proud of the fact that, basically, you’ve had an administration that’s been in place for six years in which there hasn’t been a major scandal.”

The only reason these scandals aren’t labeled as such can be blamed on a Krugman-like syndrome: an absolute refusal by these reporters to connect the dots from debacles such as *Fast & Furious* and the Benghazi scandals back to their real source, the Obama White House. Responsibility for these scandals flows from the top down. Since the Justice Department refuses to seriously investigate these scandals, it is left up to Congress and the media, neither of which have the authority to indict anyone, nor, apparently, the appetite or guts to pursue them. •

Roger Aronoff is the Editor of Accuracy in Media, and a member of the Citizens’ Commission on Benghazi. He can be contacted

The Real Drama is in the Democratic Primary

By Roger Aronoff

While the attention of the world was on the first Republican presidential debates in Cleveland on August 6th, the drama in the Democratic Party may soon overshadow anything the GOP has to offer. Look at

what’s happening on the way to Hillary Clinton’s coronation in 2016. All of a sudden, Sen. Bernie Sanders (I-VT), a self-identified “democratic socialist,” is within striking distance in some of the key early primary states. But the real action is with Vice President Joe Biden. Will he or

won’t he challenge Mrs. Clinton? That is the question.

If we take our cues from The New York Times, Hillary should be worried. First came the story about two inspectors general seeking a criminal referral involving Mrs. Clinton’s use of her email server while

continued on page 4



she was secretary of state, and the potential mishandling of classified material. Then, after pushback from the Clinton camp, the Times pulled back, to some extent. No, it wasn't a criminal referral, they determined on second thought. Yet now the FBI has opened an investigation, and they only get involved when crimes are alleged, or there is the possibility that national secrets may have been compromised.

Are we witnessing a situation like 1968, when Eugene McCarthy entered the Democratic primary race against then-President Lyndon Johnson, and when McCarthy did well in New Hampshire, then-New York Senator Bobby Kennedy decided to jump into the race? Will Biden be Bobby Kennedy to Sanders' Gene McCarthy, in terms of challenging the presumed Democratic Party standard bearer, once it has become clear that the standard bearer is vulnerable?

Have the media and their allies in the Democratic Party decided that Hillary is too badly damaged, and ethically challenged to win the election?

The news media are star-struck by The New York Times, which, allegedly, provides "all the news that's fit to print." As Accuracy in Media has repeatedly demonstrated, the news that the Times editors actually see fit to print is often full of bias, inaccuracies, and complete spin. And, sometimes, the Times transparently involves itself in promoting or destroying candidates.

Maureen Dowd's recent Times column, "Joe Biden in 2016: What Would Beau Do?," begins by comparing scandal-plagued Hillary Clinton with Tom Brady, and then proceeds to promote Vice President Biden's chances by recounting the emotional words that sons Beau and Hunter apparently used to encourage their father to run for president while Beau laid on his death bed, dying from brain cancer.

"When Beau realized he was not going

to make it, he asked his father if he had a minute to sit down and talk," writes

Have the media and their allies in the Democratic Party decided that Hillary is too badly damaged, and ethically challenged to win the election?

Dowd. "Of course, honey," said his father, she recounts.

Dowd continues,

"At the table, Beau told his dad he was worried about him.

My kid's dying, an anguished Joe Biden thought to himself, and he's making sure I'm O.K.

'Dad, I know you don't give a damn about money,' Beau told him, dismissing the idea that his father would take some sort of cushy job after the vice presidency to cash in.



Beau was losing his nouns and the right side of his face was partially paralyzed. But he had a mission: He tried to make his father promise to run, arguing that the White House should not revert to the Clintons and that the country would be better off with Biden values.

Hunter also pushed his father, telling him, 'Dad, it's who you are.'"

Where, exactly, could Dowd have received that heart-wrenching anecdote? Only from the friends, family, or supporters of the very person who some speculate

may jump into the 2016 presidential race.

"And so I completely have faith in that Beau Biden anecdote," exclaimed Helene Cooper on Meet the Press the next day. "I think it's really telling." Cooper believes Dowd's story because, "Before she was a columnist, she was a fantastic political reporter. She has really good sources."

"But, you know, when I think about what the Bidens have been through, and I think about that if Maureen's sources are correct, then that son's request is very powerful, I would think," Kathleen Parker sympathetically added on Meet the Press.

No mention was made that The Wall Street Journal reported that both sons were "urging" the vice president to run for president—back in June. "Before his death last month, elder son Beau Biden encouraged his father to get into the race, people familiar with the matter said," reported the Journal on June 28. "And Hunter Biden told a friend in recent weeks he, too, would like to see the vice president wage one more campaign for the White House."

"It's no secret that he's thinking about this...I'm glad he's thinking about this. But he hasn't made up his mind," said Beau Biden, the Times reported this April.

Beau's consistent support for his father to become president is clearly nothing new. What's new was the Times' coming to the same conclusion as The Wall Street Journal. When the Times reports the story, even through a columnist as opposed to a reporter, it becomes a legitimate story for the rest of the media. We pointed out the likelihood of Biden's entry into the race a month ago, based on the Journal and other stories out at the time.

Knowing the bitter history between the Clintons and Obama, one has to wonder about the timing of recent events. Did the FBI start their investigation, which isn't being called a criminal investigation at this time, at the urging of President Obama, who would obviously prefer that Biden carry on his legacy, rather than Hillary? Obama could never trust Hillary to be loyal to his disastrous policies and controversial legacy. But Biden? Yes, he most likely would stay loyal to Obama. This has the potential to make the Republican race seem dull. •

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.

continued on page 5

U.S. Acquiescence to Bad Iran Deal Was No Mistake

By Retired Adm. James A. Lyons

There is no shortage of critics of the recently concluded nuclear agreement that President Obama has reached with the evil Iranian theocracy. All the “known concessions” by the Obama administration should come as no surprise. Make no mistake—these concessions were not due to incompetence nor the inability to negotiate. They are part of the president’s planned agenda to fundamentally transform America by diminishing our stature and credibility. It is another example of his misguided view that America must be humbled for the many “problems” we have caused throughout the world.

Mr. Obama’s game plan on how to negotiate with the Ayatollah Ali Khamenei had its genesis in the summer of 2008. According to scholar and author Michael Ledeen, around the time when candidate Barack Obama received the Democratic Party’s nomination, he opened a secret communication channel with the Iranian theocracy. The go-between was Ambassador William G. Miller, the former U.S. ambassador to Ukraine, who spoke fluent Farsi from his previous tours of duty in Tehran.

The message was, “Don’t sign an agreement with the Bush administration. Wait until I am president — you will get a much better deal! You will like my policies. I am your friend.” Here is a country that has cost thousands of American lives. Furthermore, all Americans should never forget that it was Iran that provided the key material and training support to the September 11 hijackers. Without that support the attack could not have been carried out, and some 3,000 innocent Americans who were doing nothing more than going to work would be alive today. Yet our president told this regime that he was their friend.

This borders on treason and most certainly violated the Logan Act, which forbids private citizens from interfering in government diplomacy.

The endless Kabuki dance that went on in Geneva and Vienna was not only an embarrassment for all Americans, but more importantly, it “conceded America’s honor,” an honor that has stood on bedrock principles which hundreds of thousands of Americans have paid the ultimate price to protect. Our nation was humiliated.

This treaty must be rejected.

While being challenged throughout the world, the Obama administration continues with its senseless unilateral disarmament of our military forces, thereby jeopardizing our national security. As if disarmament were not enough, our military is being forced to train the military forces of our potential enemies. Specifically, Chinese infantry troops are being trained in the United States. Moreover, the Chinese navy was invited to participate in the 2014 Rim of the Pacific fleet exercise and has been invited again to participate in the 2016 fleet exercise to be held off the coast of Hawaii, alongside all of our major Pacific allies. We clearly are compromising our tactics, techniques and operations.

Compounding the problem is the use of our military as a social engineering laboratory to advance Mr. Obama’s political and social agenda. With regard to the promotion of the gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgender lifestyle, my late friend M. Stanton Evans in his monumental 1994 book, *The Theme is Freedom*, had it right when he called it a return to the “pagan ethic.”

Clearly, the Obama administration is attacking the American way of life from all aspects. Our open border policy makes absolutely no sense. We have anywhere from 11 million to possibly as many as 30 million illegal immigrants within our borders. Sanctuary cities are also in clear violation of immigration laws. The welcome mat has been put out by the administration so that the more recent illegal immigrants are able to draw upon a wide range of taxpayer benefits, including food stamps, health care and earned income tax credit for three years, all at the American taxpayers’ expense. However, the overwhelming majority of immigrants come here as the result of our visa policies. The U.S. issues the treasured “green card” to approximately one million immigrants per year, most of whom are unskilled. They are immediately entitled to numerous benefits at taxpayers’ expense. Congress must act



to limit the number of green cards issued.

Releasing illegal immigrants from jail with criminal records is a deliberate affront to all Americans. Seeding throughout the country Muslim immigrants who have no intent to assimilate is another affront and tears at the fabric of our society.

Compounding the immigration crisis is the Obama administration’s inclination to divide Americans by race and class. This is unconscionable. You are either an American entitled to all the benefits that being an American conveys, or you are not. Those are the only two classes. The first one is sacred.

The corruption of our government agencies, fostered by the Obama administration, should not be overlooked. The selective enforcement of our laws and traditions has lowered Americans’ respect and trust of those agencies. However, taken in the aggregate, the fundamental transformation of America is taking place with no objections from Congress and the Supreme Court, which are supposed to prevent illegal and unconstitutional acts by an out-of-control president. Congress and the high court, and for that matter, our military leadership, are complicit in these illegal actions by not faithfully executing their oaths of office. This cannot stand. As Thomas Paine stated, “These are the times that try men’s souls.” With our corrupt leadership, it is now time to take back America.

This column was originally published in *The Washington Times*.•

Retired Admiral James “Ace” Lyons is a former four star admiral, Commander-in-Chief of the U.S. Pacific Fleet, and the Father of the Navy Seal Red Cell Program. As the Deputy Chief of Naval Operations from 1983-1985, he was principal advisor on all Joint Chiefs of Staff matters. He is a member of the Citizens’ Commission on Benghazi.

Fox News' Debate Questions to Trump Were Tough, Not Inappropriate

By Don Irvine



The first debate in the GOP presidential primary season may have been five days ago, but the controversy still remains thanks to Donald Trump's endless criticism of the debate questions and co-moderator Megyn Kelly. Trump accused her of asking him an inappropriate question and said that she had "blood in her eyes."

Trump also said that the questions were "not nice."

There isn't a rule that debate questions have to be nice, but they should be appropriate.

Here are the questions that Trump was asked during the debate:

1. Mr. Trump, one of the things people love about you is you speak your mind and you don't use a politician's filter. However, that is not without its downsides, in particular, when it comes to women. You've called women you don't like 'fat pigs, dogs, slob, and disgusting animals.' ... Your Twitter account has several disparaging comments about women's looks. You once told a contestant on *Celebrity Apprentice* it would be a pretty picture to see her on her knees. Does that sound to you like the temperament of a man we should elect as president, and how will you answer the charge from Hillary Clinton, who is likely to be the Democratic nominee, that you are part of the war on women?

2. Mr. Trump, it has not escaped anybody's notice that you say that the Mexican government, the Mexican government is sending criminals—rapists, drug dealers, across the border. Governor Bush has called those remarks, quote, 'extraordinarily ugly.' I'd like you—you're right next

to him—tell us—talk to him directly and say how you respond to that and— and you have repeatedly said that you have evidence that the Mexican government is doing this, but you have evidence you have refused or declined to share. Why not use this first Republican presidential debate to share your proof with the American people?

2a. Mr. Trump, I'll give you 30 seconds—I'll give you 30 seconds to answer my question, which was, what evidence do you have, specific evidence that the Mexican government is sending criminals across the border? Thirty seconds.

3. Mr. Trump, ObamaCare is one of the things you call a disaster. ... Now, 15 years ago, you called yourself a liberal on health care. You were for a single-payer system, a Canadian-style system. Why were you for that then and why aren't you for it now?

4. Mr. Trump, it's not just your past support for single-payer health care. You've also supported a host of other liberal policies. You—you've also donated to several Democratic candidates, Hillary Clinton included, Nancy Pelosi. You explained away those donations saying you did that to get business-related favors. And you said recently, quote, "When you give, they do whatever the hell you want them to do." ... So what specifically did ... they do?

5. Mr. Trump, you talk a lot about how you are the person on this stage to grow the economy. I want to ask you about your business record. Trump corporations—Trump corporations, casinos and hotels, have declared bankruptcy four times over the last quarter-century. In 2011, you told *Forbes Magazine* this: "I've used the laws of the country to my advantage." But at the same time, financial experts involved in those bankruptcies say that lenders to your companies lost billions of dollars. Question sir, with that record, why should we trust you to run the nation's business?

5a. No, but the concept sir... that's your line, but your companies have gone bankrupt.

5b. Well sir, let's just talk about the latest example ... which is Trump Entertainment Resorts, which went bankrupt in 2009. In that case alone, lenders to your company lost over \$1 billion and more than 1,100 people were laid off. ... Is that the way you'd run the country?

6. Mr. Trump, in 1999, you said you were, quote, 'very pro-choice.' Even supporting partial-birth abortion. You favored an assault-weapons ban as well. In 2004, you said in most cases you identified as a Democrat. Even in this campaign, your critics say you often sound more like a Democrat than a Republican, calling several of your opponents on the stage things like clowns and puppets. When did you actually become a Republican?

7. Mr. Trump, 30 seconds to respond (to Jeb Bush's original question, which related to Trump's name-calling)

8. Mr. Trump, closing statement, sir."

There was one additional question which was asked of all candidates at the beginning of the debate about pledging not to run an independent third party campaign, which was clearly targeted at Trump, who has been rumored to be considering such a run should he fail to win the GOP nomination.

There is little doubt that Trump may have been grilled a little harder than the other candidates, but he also had more airtime than his rivals, who had to field some equally uncomfortable questions.

Maybe Trump and his opponents thought that the Fox News moderators were going to go easy on them, owing to the network's conservative bent. But by getting tough they were actually doing the field a favor by preparing them for what's sure to come from the Democrats and the liberal media as the campaign wears on. •



*Don Irvine
Chairman of
Accuracy in Media*

What You Can Do

Please send the enclosed postcards to:

- Marc Lamont Hill at CNN, for his outrageous accusation of racism in the GOP based on the Party's relationship with Ben Carson;
- Andrea Mitchell of MSNBC for her accusation that people critical of Hillary Clinton for her handling of her emails are somehow "conspiracy theorists;"
- Mike Brzezinski of Morning Joe on MSNBC for her accusations that people opposed to the Iran nuke deal are leading us into war with Iran.