

# Eat The Press



[Jason Linkins](#)

[jason@huffingtonpost.com](mailto:jason@huffingtonpost.com) | HuffPost Reporting

[Become a Fan](#) [Get Email Alerts from this Reporter](#)

## TV SoundOff: Sunday Talking Heads

First Posted: 05- 9-10 08:40 AM | Updated: 05- 9-10 02:37 PM



Hello, everyone reading the internet! Good morning. My name is Jason, and this is Mother's Day. And, in honor of Mother's Day, I am going to help all of you maintain some degree of fondness for your moms by doing the one thing that might make you wish you were never born -- watch the Sunday Morning Political Word Sounding Shows. Truly, they are like a tubal ligation of the brain. In the meantime, you brew that coffee and ball those melons for the breakfast you are making for you mother, in bed. I don't mind. I'm allergic to melons, anyway. Make my throat itch.

As always, you can leave a comment, or [send an email](#), or feel free to spend some time [with me on Twitter](#), where I fret about the underwater robots that tried to place that containment dome over the oil leak. (They failed, by the way. Forgot all about gas sulfates or something? On the one hand, I'm sad that the dome thing failed -- because the oil leak is a disaster. But on the other hand, maybe it's a good thing that the robots didn't succeed? A setback to them and their plans of eventually enslaving humanity? These are the things I worry about, on the twitter.)

**FOX NEWS SUNDAY**

Oh, wow. National security with John Brennan, the government's most important John Spencer lookalike, and the two biggest spazzes in the homeland security game -- Joe Lieberman and Pete King. They will be finger painting, or something. I mean, if Pete King can sit still long enough. And the Sunday Panel is going to try to cope with the terrible economy!

So, Times Square bomb! What a terrifying time in our lives. And a sad time to be a suspicious package, laying around. Time was that a stray box or a cooler or a bundle of wires could cold chill on the sidewalk and be a part of American life, a symbol of what it meant to matter one day and be left behind the next. Now, you put down your bag from the dry store and forget to pick it up, you suddenly got a whole huge Hurt Locker thing going on. And once you see the bomb squad approaching the bag you forgot about, there's not exactly a lot of incentive to say, "Stop, sorry, that's my bottle of rye whiskey and Klonopin prescription, sorry! And then the worst part: where the hell are you going to get more whiskey and Klonopin? You had a big Tuesday of watching HGTV and crying planned!

Anyway, John Brennan. Now we're back to Shahzad being connected to the Pakistani Taliban! The New York Times ran out with that story. Subsequent reporting suggested that the Times jumped the gun. And now we're back. Am I supposed to worry about this group, though? They clearly aren't very good at training terrorists.

Did Shahzad become a citizen so he could do this? Brennan doesn't know or won't say. What happens now is we keep "pressure" on al Qaeda and a redoubled effort to "not get complacent." Does it mean that we're going to drop the bomb on this crew any harder? Brennan won't say anything specific.

But what do we want Pakistan to do, if it's not stop bombing us? Brennan says it's important that the Pakistani government not support them and instead offer us assistance in rooting them out.

Wallace asks if Brennan would characterize the operation as a Homeland Security success or was it luck, and Brennan gets his back up, praising the people who fight overseas and who guard us here at home, who demonstrate, "patriotism...dedicated and talent." "We're not lucky, we're good."

Wallace says, NO YOU SUCK. And then for some reason, the Fort Hood shooter becomes something Homeland Security was supposed to stop (a crazy person that the military knew was crazy but just passed the buck back and forth and didn't tell anyone until the day finally came he went crazy is John Brennan's fault? Is he supposed to be precognitive?) and the Christmas Crotchfire bomber becomes the successful "setting off" of a bomb? Really Chris Wallace? That's pretty stupid, even for you. Brennan says that they stopped "many, many terrorist plots" and are "on a daily basis" arresting and killing terrorists.

Anyway, it's not like there are any private sector solutions for this! Maybe everyone should get used to the idea that you can't stop every single terrorist attack.

Janet Napolitano, though, at the time where there was no evidence that the attack wasn't anything other than a "one-off" said so. And then new evidence suggested otherwise, it proved that wrong. Now Brennan's getting crap for that. What is she supposed to do? She has three choices: 1) Speak as clearly as possible about what's going on based on the reality of the evidence in front of her, 2) Say nothing, be vague, and get criticized for being vague -- hours later, when she gets specific, she can address every pundit in the universe who wants to say the administration kept the public in the dark for X hours, or 3) BE AS PANICKY AS POSSIBLE: "It's possible that Shahzad worked in coordinated WITH EVERY TERRORIST GROUP! Al Qaeda, the Baader-Meinhof Gang, Satan himself, the cast of *Viva Laughlin*...everyone should definitely lose their mind and poop their pants for the next thousand hours."

Is Mirandizing criminals in the United States an imposition to terrorist investigations? NO THEY ARE NOT, SHUT UP MEDIA, WATCH AN EPISODE OF LAW AND ORDER IT'S ONLY ON THE TEEVEE 50 TIMES A WEEK.

Now Chris Wallace is losing his mind over the KSM trial. Will it be held in New York City? No decision yet on that, and like a total asshole, I guess, Eric Holder for saying no decision has been made.

Brennan says that the big lesson here is that more vigilance is necessary. On that point, I'll suggest that everyone read Julian Sanchez's take on the surveillance state, and how it ultimately [contributed very little to the prevention of this attack](#).

All right! Bring on the bedwetters, Joe Lieberman and Peter King!

Wallace asks Leeb about the Brennan interview, and praises the law enforcement effort. "But we were lucky, we did not prevent the attack." Yes, because we don't have psychics, laying in milk baths, working with Tom Cruise! King says there's not enough evidence to convict the Obama administration of sucking, but he's looking for it! He's upset about "information" that "he'd never heard of" that helped Shahzad? No idea what he's talking about! Besides, I thought it was Pete Hoekstra that leaks sensitive information, always?

There's like, three minutes of un-livebloggable utterances that make no sense at all. "Miranda is more like a warning that it is a right," King says. It's actually just a reminder that arrestees have certain rights, the reminding of which has never ever impeded a terrorist investigation. King says it's important to find out about additional plots, which is information not impeded by Miranda.

Meanwhile, Lieberman and his ["Ha, Ha, We Can Now Arbitrarily Declare You To Be A Non-Citizen, Anytime We Want, Because While The Law Enforcement Process Was Working Just Fine, I Have To Do Something To Demonstrate How Super-Duper Angry I Am \(Sound Of Tiny Feet Stamping\) About The Terrorism Act of 2010."](#) Read [David](#)