Media's Misplaced Attention Regarding Overseas Attacks

09.20.12

From Breitbart..

"The New York Times' headline, 'Anger Over a Film Fuels Anti-American Attacks in Libya and Egypt'-- buried on page A4!--does not even inform readers that U.S. diplomatic missions were attacked, or the fact that one official in Libya was actually killed.

The article goes on to criticize [the allegations made] that 'the Obama administration's first response was not to condemn attacks on our diplomatic missions, but to sympathize with those who waged the attacks.'

[These allegations led] *Roll Call* to claim that a 'rift' had developed among Republicans... *Roll Call* tried its best to make this rift seem wide, but even those Republicans the paper quoted all agreed that the criticisms of Obama was essentially correct...

What the *Times* is really outraged about...is that the events have placed the Obama administration's foreign policy of appeasement in a deservedly bad light."

Media Ignores A Significant Reason Behind Chicago Teachers Strike

From Newsbusters...

"The massive teachers strike in Rahm Emanuel's Chicago [has] left 350,000 students in the lurch. However, only CBS *This Morning* explained that the teachers, through their public sector unions, are already well compensated, making an average salary of \$71,000 a year (plus benefits).

Reporter Dean Reynolds informed viewers, 'That a dispute involving public sector employees would erupt in Chicago was somewhat surprising, given the generous packages unions here have won in the past...' [ABC's] Good Morning America and the [NBC's] Today Show ignored these facts.

...[Also], based on picture captions from the *Associated Press*, you would think that the teachers' strike has nothing to do with money.

[The captions read] 'Chicago teachers walked out of the classroom Monday, taking a bitter contract dispute over evaluations and job security to the streets of the nation's third-largest city."

New York Times Remembers 9/11 by Blaming Bush

From the Media Research Center...

"On the 11th anniversary of 9-11, there was not a single mention of the attacks on the front page of the New York Times. In fact, there were just two local news stories related to the attacks in the entire Tuesday edition, one on delays in opening the site museum, the other on how some towns in New Jersey were scaling back annual memorial ceremonies. (The paper did put another threat to New York City on the front page: 'New York Is Lagging as Seas And Risks, Rise, Critics Warn.')

The only other 9-11 coverage was 'The Deafness Before the Storm,' an op-ed by Kurt Eichenwald, a former Times reporter with a book out on the aftermath of the attacks ('500 Days'), blaming former President George W. Bush for ignoring warnings that Osama bin Laden was readying an attack on the United States...

[Eichenwald states]: 'The administration's reaction to what Mr. Bush was told in the weeks before that infamous briefing reflected significantly more negligence than has been disclosed.'

The *Times* tried the same thing against Bush when the August 6, 2001 'President's Daily Briefing' was released, getting basic facts wrong in a rush to pin blame for the 9-11 attacks on him."