

WASHINGTON POST NEEDS A REALITY CHECK

Jeff Bezos, the owner of the *Washington Post*, lives in the real world, but many of his readers and writers do not. He knows the media have lost their credibility but the others do not. They need a reality check.

Bezos put the squash on an editorial to endorse Kamala Harris. Now the sky is falling in Washington.

He took to the editorial page to defend his decision. Here's what he said about newspapers. "We must be accurate, and we must be believed to be accurate. It's a bitter pill to swallow, but we are failing on the second requirement. Most people believe the media is [sic] biased. Anyone who doesn't see this is paying scant attention to reality, and those who fight reality lose."

He's right. The data prove it. In the 1970s, when Gallup first started asking about the media's credibility, trust ranged from 68 percent to 72 percent. Today it is at 31 percent. That's a record low. And it may be worse than that. Another national survey, released in September by Populace, found that 24 percent *publicly* agree the media tell the truth, but only 7 percent *privately* believe they do.

Just recently, a Rasmussen survey found that 50 percent of likely voters believe the media are biased in favor of the Democrats. In fact, 49 percent agree that the media are "truly the enemy of the people." The *Washington Post* has contributed mightily to this perception.

Here's an example about the Post that shows its blatant bias against the Catholic Church (many more could be provided).

In a November 13, 2022 editorial, it was claimed that "high-

level sexual misconduct and cover-up in France shattered illusions of progress by the church toward establishing a culture of transparency and accountability in its hierarchy.”

The evidence? A retired cardinal and archbishop in France admitted to sexual misconduct with a teenage girl 35 years earlier.

At the time Bill Donohue wrote, “There are over 5,000 bishops in the world and the *Washington Post* found two of them who were involved in sexual misconduct decades ago. The paper argues that this shatters ‘illusions of progress.’” Donohue couldn’t help but say, “What is really shattered is the credibility of its editorial board.”

Those who write for the newspaper do not see themselves as biased. They see themselves as being right. Those who think otherwise are simply wrong. That is the liberal mentality, whether found in the media, education, or anywhere else.

The paper’s readers feel the same way. In retaliation against Bezos’ decision not to endorse Harris, more than 200,000 of them have canceled their digital subscription. Editorial board members and reporters are also quitting.

Journalist David Hoffman has had it, saying, “I stand against silence in the face of dictatorship.” He didn’t call him Hitler, at least not in public, but he did say, “I believe we face a very real threat of autocracy in the candidacy of Donald Trump.” His colleague, Mary Roberts, said she is quitting “because the imperative to endorse Kamala Harris over Donald Trump is as morally clear as it gets.”

As Jonathan Turley and others have documented, the Biden-Harris years represent the most anti-free speech administration in the history of the United States, yet according to the *Washington Post* they do not pose a threat to democracy—Trump does. Is there any air in their bubble?

Even richer is former Washington Post executive director Marty Baron. “To declare a moment of high principle, only 11 days before the election that is just highly suspect that is just not to be believed that this was a matter of principle at this point.”

It takes gall for Baron to accuse Bezos of not being principled.

In 2018, *60 Minutes* fired its executive producer, Jeff Fager, because he was a sexual predator. He would have been fired earlier had Baron not killed a story about his behavior. [See Donohue’s book, *The Truth about Clergy Sexual Abuse*, for more information on this story.]

Amy Brittain, the *Washington Post*’s investigative reporter, and Irin Carmon spent four months doing a story on Fager; it was a follow-up to an earlier piece on Charlie Rose, who was fired from CBS after sexual harassment claims were made. They spoke to several women who said Fager had sexually abused them. Baron, they said, kept delaying the story and refused to speak with them. When the story finally ran, all the allegations against Fager were deleted; only additional allegations against Rose made it into the print.

Why did Baron kill the story on Fager? According to Carmon, “The close relationship between the paper and 60 Minutes” had something to do with it.

Bezos needs to clean house, and he is not alone. As the Gallup poll showed, the media are “the least trusted group among 10 U.S. civic and political institutions involved in the democratic process.” Small wonder why.

HARRIS AND “Dr.” JILL COMPETE FOR HONORS

The literary credentials of Kamala Harris and Jill Biden are quite a spectacle. Not sure who is more impressive.

Harris claims to be the author of a 2010 book, *Smart On Crime*. Jill Biden claims to have a doctoral degree. But there's more there than meets the eye.

It's a sure bet Harris didn't write *Smart On Crime*. On the book's cover it identifies Kamala Harris “with” Joan O.C. Hamilton. Real authors know what that means—“with” wrote the book. This is acceptable if the “author” is a celebrity or an athlete, but when politicians, or TV personalities for that matter, sell themselves as real authors—when “with” wrote the book—it is simply dishonest.

But this doesn't excuse Harris from the charge of plagiarism. It has now been revealed that several passages in the book were lifted, word for word, from the Associated Press and Wikileaks. Harris put her name on it so she has to be held accountable. Bill Donohue begged off from buying it because it is selling on Amazon for \$395.

Her oral skills are no better. Known as the “Word Salad Queen,” Harris has a penchant for scrambling her thoughts. Much of what she says is so incoherent, or just plain dumb, as to make heads spin. For example, when she says, “I grew up understanding the children of the community are the children of the community,” it suggests that others grew up understanding the children of the community are *not* the children of the community. Would love to meet them.

Harris' understanding of what culture means is equally profound.

“Culture is—it is a reflection of our moment and our time. Right? And present culture is the way we express how we’re feeling about the moment and we should always find times to express how we feel about the moment. That is a reflection of joy. Because, you know...it comes in the morning.” For some reason, we thought it was after lunch.

An Ed.D. is not like a Ph.D. The former is a degree in administration; the latter is a research degree. Most Ph.D.s, Donohue included, don’t identify themselves as Dr., though they have every right to do so. To be awarded the degree, they have to write a dissertation, or what is regarded as an original contribution to research. This is not a requirement for an Ed.D. Therefore, when someone with an Ed.D. identifies as Dr., it makes those with a Ph.D. wince.

Jill Biden, armed with her Ed.D., insists on being called Dr. Jill, and the media dutifully comply (some people actually think she’s a physician). After perusing what the University of Delaware calls her “dissertation/executive position paper” (never heard of an “executive position paper”—must be unique to Ed.D. candidates), it is clear that her “Dr.” status is an embarrassment.

News reports say that her paper, which was on student retention in community colleges, is 137-pages long. Actually, the text is only 79 pages (the rest are introductory notes and the bibliography). It reads more like an encyclopedia than serious scholarship.

Readers can’t get by the first two pages without wondering how any educator would sign off on it. Yet seven did, including the Provost. Then again, the Bidens are god in Delaware.

“Dr.” Jill got off to a bad start. She writes, “The needs of the student population are often *undeserved*, resulting in a student drop-out rate of almost one third (our italics).” She obviously meant “underserved.” This was the second sentence on p. 1.

On p. 2, she proves her mathematical illiteracy. Commenting on the demographic characteristics of the students at Delaware Tech, she writes, "Three quarters of the class will be Caucasian; one quarter of the class will be African American." She should have stopped there. But evidently she can't count. She added, "one seat will hold a Latino; and the remaining seats will be filled with students of Asian descent or non-resident aliens."

Sometimes she simply makes no sense. "Although students make friends through their classes and their technologies..." What's that? Students make friends through "their technologies"?

Even better are her childlike constructions. She makes such pedestrian points that it makes the typical pub conversation sound Shakespearian.

"A faculty mentoring program can go hand-in-hand with the advisement process." Isn't that what mentoring programs are all about? Then we learn that "The best mentors are the faculty or staff with whom a student seems to connect." Very insightful.

Furthermore, she says, "The mentor should be genuinely interested in helping the students succeed or meet their goals." Extraordinary observation. Also, "The student retention committee should formulate a plan to increase retention." Great idea.

On the conclusion page, we learn that "Because community colleges are education institutions, the most important focus must center on the academic success of the students." Go to the head of the class, Dr. Jill.

Kamala and Dr. Jill are proof positive that anyone can make it in the USA.