

Jesus Christ & El Morya

on the Media Serpent

Chapter 7 of *Collusion*.

The Gaffe Patrol

Only Republican misstatements are a media target.

One of the most obvious tricks of the media is how they declare themselves to be entirely objective when deciding which statements

by politicians and their campaign aides qualify as “gaffes” and which do not. Gaffes, as everyone knows, can be dangerous, sometimes extremely so, when they can easily be used to cause a candidate to lose an election. *Gaffes* strengthen media caricatures in the public mind, creating character sketches in twenty-five words or less, whether it’s Dan Quayle’s misspelling of *potato* or Sarah Palin’s alleged remark that she could see Russia from her house (something uttered not by Palin, but by her *Saturday Night Live* impersonator).

The best gaffes are those that entertain, which makes them easy to spread. They are also a handy pretext for the howls of liberal outrage (and laughter) that resound throughout the media echo chamber. The manufacture and promotion of alleged gaffes by conservative candidates is therefore one of the main tricks liberal journalists use to shape and influence public opinion, and ultimately, tilt elections.

Example of Gaffe. Biden

As everyone knows, Joe Biden was the Senate's leading gaffe machine, with a long history of embarrassing statements to his credit. In 2006, he asserted: "You can't go to a 7-Eleven or a Dunkin' Donuts

unless you have a slight Indian accent."

NOSTREDAME: Mitt Romney is the Red China choice in the White House in the handover of the United States to be Hong Kong.

JESUS CHRIST: Here this gaffe by Romney the media ignores.

Chapter 10 of *Collusion*.

Magazine *Mother Jones* posted a secret tape of Mitt Romney talking to donors at the private residence. The headline emphasized: "When he doesn't know a camera's rolling, the GOP candidate shows his disdain for half of America."

Romney said: "I would never convince 47 percent of the electorate to vote for me, since they were dependent on government."

David Axelrod's case, they couldn't trust Mitt Romney. After the election, he said at the University of Chicago that he wanted voters to think Romney "was out of touch with their economic experience, and that his fundamental view of the economy was one which didn't incorporate them. And frankly, when that 47 percent tape came out, it was a pretty strong ratification of our view."

Axelrod was more emphatic with *Politico*: "I think that the greatest gift we got may have been that 47 percent tape, which was him [Romney]."

EL MORYA: It is a comment that does require an interpretation. The meaning of it is that he considers the electorate working for the government, is a government that would be easily manipulated by money to his favor. It rings of Caiaphas' betrayal of Christ.

HOLY AIMEE: The gaffe is however how you at one time understood the power monger as Pontius Pilate and Caiaphas, and now you do not recognize neither the gaffe nor the “souless robot”.

EL MORYA: The High Priest *is* Caiaphus. The “commander in chief” *is* Caiaphus. The President in the United States is held up in idolatry and idol worship as the High Priest.

Face the Nation host Bob Schieffer eviscerated Romney on CBS *This Morning*. Apparently the incompetent Romney was “looking for every way he can try to lose and drive down his percentage of victory. . . . I guess the only thing worse you could say, in a time like this, when people are out of work is that Herbert Hoover is my hero or something like that. It just boggles the mind.”

EL MORYA: What you read here is an objective reporter who senses that this is one who does say what is *politically correct* and even that— it has little meaning that he says it boggles his mind.

HOLY AIMEE: The “boggles the mind” means that neither common sense nor the soul can recognize where this person stands on important issues, where is his humanity. The topics discussed are diatribe, they are slogans thought through of by speech writers and cue cards, and there is not much soul substance in the words that come forth as politically correct diatribe statements.

JESUS CHRIST: The uncorrupted soul knows right and wrong.

CHAPTER 5

Richie Rich Romney

Don't vote for a "predatory capitalist" stereotype.

Have you ever noticed the media's dirty trick about multimillionaires in politics? If you're a Democrat named Kennedy or Rockefeller, who inherited millions, or have a habit of marrying women with millions (think John Kerry), or made your millions chasing ambulances (Edwards), it couldn't possibly put a wrinkle in your populist image. As long as you favor every redistribution scheme that the Ivy League economists can muster, your riches aren't disqualifying. They can even add glamour to your aura.

But if you're a Republican with a gleam in your eye toward tax cuts and deregulation, then it doesn't matter whether you're Old Money or New Money or even No Money. You will be deemed an "economic royalist," as Franklin Roosevelt put it.

When ABC anchor Diane Sawyer interviewed Mitt Romney on April 17, 2012, she casually announced "the Obama campaign is working overtime to paint the portrait of a man whose riches have put him out of touch." She then offered Romney the Obama spin:

“The speaking fees, the Cadillacs, the story out now that there’s an elevator for your cars in the new house you’re *planning* in La Jolla. Are you too rich to relate?”¹

There’s an obvious answer that Romney did not give. “Diane, you make \$12 million a year. The ritzy Manhattan penthouse, the wealthy movie director husband, the estate on Martha’s Vineyard. Does that make you too rich and elitist to relate to your audience?”

Romney’s actual answer wasn’t bad. “We don’t divide America based upon success and wealth and other dimensions of that nature. We’re one nation under God. We come together. This is a time when people of different backgrounds and experiences need to come together.”

The Obamas, like most liberals, loved to talk a good game about national unity, but in the political wars, talk is cheap. They have always preferred, and benefited from, the divide-and-conquer basics of class warfare. In his post-election interview at the University of Chicago, Obama strategist David Axelrod expressed amazement that Romney and his campaign team never sold his life story aggressively. “I don’t think they fleshed him out enough,” he said. “People need to know who you are, they need to be comfortable with who you are. . . . Whatever message you build has to be built around your biography, and it has to be compelling.”

Obama had a biography that journalists never failed to recount and find compelling, even if, as we’ve discussed, so much of it was the president’s own mangled memoir myths and stump-speech whoppers, augmented by apple-polishers like Chris Matthews who found him perfect in every way.

Axelrod and Team Obama obviously preferred to have Obama evaluated as a compelling historical figure, and not so much as a policy architect. They wanted him painted as above the grubby fray of everyday politics. Obama’s policies were always secondary, and necessarily so, given their abject failure. Even policy statements

could be better understood as empathetic personal poses for the lower- and middle-class voters that said “I understand you, I’m like you . . . unlike that out-of-touch Richie Rich over there with his car elevator.”

Axelrod professed amazement that Romney spent at least 90 percent of his primary money on negative ads against his Republican opponents instead of defining himself. After he won the primary, “we thought the first thing they would do would be to do that, and just create a stronger sense among the American people of just who he was.” Axelrod was happy that Romney skipped it: “That of course left an opening for him to be defined around some of his business practices that have become well-known now.”²

~~Team Obama knew what it was doing. Team Bain Capital didn’t have a clue. The Obama campaign and its “unaffiliated” Super PACs were merciless in attacking Romney as the worst kind of financial assassin and tax cheat. Reporters covering the campaign didn’t protest. They did not like Romney. He lacked personal warmth. His way of speaking was too crisp and efficient, his hair too tidy. He was a soulless robot.~~ Romney felt compelled to add the word “human” to his campaign speeches, but it did no good. He was a rich Republican capitalist. Strike One, Strike Two, and Strike Three.

For example, on July 17, the very same day that Chris Matthews described Obama on *Hardball* in utopian terms as “the perfect father, the perfect husband, the perfect American,” on the very same channel *New York Times* columnist Charles Blow offered MSNBC’s dystopian take on former Massachusetts governor Mitt Romney on *The Last Word*. Romney would abandon every liberal position he ever took in Boston to win the White House—as if Obama had never flip-flopped on anything in 2008, or once he was inaugurated—so he had no soul.

“This is the kind of man that Mitt Romney is. This man does not have a soul. If you opened up, you know, his chest, there’s probably a gold ticking watch in there and not even a heart. This is not a person.”