

# Times Free Press

## Cooper's Eye on the left: The false MAGA files

Clint Cooper

February 18, 2019

Sundae missing its cherry

What's the only "fact" you remember about the alleged attack on "Empire" actor Jussie Smollett last month? The "fact" that his attackers wore red "Make America Great Again" (MAGA) caps. That was all over the news about the attack on the actor.

Last week, on "Good Morning America," he said he'd never made the MAGA reference.

"I never said that," Smollett said. "I didn't need to add anything like that. They called me a [expletive]. They called me a [different expletive]. ... I don't need some MAGA hats as the cherry on top of some racist sundae."

Who created the racist sundae then? The police? The media? And what was the intent of creating such a sundae? Hurting the president?

Smollett has claimed two men beat him up, tied a rope around his neck, said racial and homophobic slurs and threw a chemical substance on him. In a follow-up interview with the Chicago Police Department, he reported the men said, "This is MAGA country."

Apparently, MAGA was someone's racist cherry.

Hat trick

Speaking of the national media, when an independent investigation released its findings last week that high school students of Covington Catholic didn't harass anyone last month while waiting for their buses at the Lincoln Memorial in Washington, D.C., ABC, CBS and NBC didn't give the report any airtime.

The three broadcast networks had been front and center in running with the harassment scenario, though.

CNN did offer the information, though show host Brooke Baldwin coughed — intentionally or not — as she noted that "investigators concluded that the students did not chant 'build the wall' and never — excuse me — never responded to the Black Hebrew Israelites with racist or ironic statements."

What was the common denominator with the previous story? Some of the Covington students wore MAGA hats.

The recent Big Lie

You'll hear this lie a lot over the next 18 months — that the December 2017 tax cut primarily benefited the rich and did little for the middle class. Sen. Kamala Harris, D-California, one of the declared 2020 candidates, went so far recently as to call it a "middle-class tax hike."

Even the far-left Washington Post, in its "Fact Checker" segment, couldn't stomach that, giving her four out of a possible four Pinocchios for lying.

The lie came from her tweet that "the average tax refund is down about \$170 compared to last year. Let's call the President's tax cut what it is: a middle-class tax hike to line the pockets of the already wealthy corporations and the 1 [percent]."

In assessing her statement, Glenn Kessler, the "Fact Checker," cited a congressional committee, a left-leaning tax think tank and the libertarian Cato Institute. They concluded 80.4 percent of those who paid tax would have a cut and that 91 percent of those in the middle class would have a cut.

A Harris spokesman, of course, retorted that Harris was referring to the "long-term effect" of the tax cut, but that was certainly not said in her tweet, which was made "without nuance or qualification," according to Kessler. He also noted truthfully that the size of the refund reflects nothing about the size of a tax cut or increase.

Sadly, the candidate's website uses the slogan "Speaking Truth, Demanding Justice."

Wait, what?

The political far left's Green New Deal sounds great to many in America — until they find out what's really in it. College students, riddled with indoctrination by left-wing professors, are particularly susceptible.

More than 75 percent of millennials, for instance, support the government "guaranteeing a job with a family-sustaining wage, adequate family and disability leave, paid vacations, and retirement security to all members of society." In general, more than 50 percent of millennials (ages 18-37) support the plan in general.

When they found what was in it, though, it was a different story. Cabot Phillips of Campus Reform interviewed some University of Miami students who first drooled over the prospects, then were, to say the least, a little shocked at its truths.

"I don't agree with that," a man said when told coal, natural gas and some other fuels would be outlawed in 10 years. "I do not think it is feasible in 10 years," a woman said.

Told the government would supply funds for those unwilling to work, one man said, "No, absolutely not." "If you're not willing to contribute to society," another man said, "I don't think the people who are contributing should pay for you." "I think it sends a poor message," a woman said, "of 'you can just get away with just not doing anything'."

Only time will tell if their opened eyes remain so or if they'll close them again and open their mouths for another spoonful of left-wing pablum.