

Hillary's Top Donor Just Bought The Onion — Started Publishing Propaganda Immediately

February 19, 2016 | 833 upvotes | by [redpillbanana](#)

Summary: Hillary supporter's media conglomerate buys The Onion and publishes fake humor articles to support her. The mainstream media is untrustworthy. [RIP The Onion](#).

Article here:

<http://thefreethoughtproject.com/hillarys-top-donor-buys-onion-starts-publishing-propaganda-immediately/>

Most of you are familiar with The Onion. I've always loved how The Onion wrapped hard truths in humor, especially RP truths. Here are many examples:

- [European Men Are So Much More Romantic Than American Men vs. American Women Studying In Europe Are Unbelievably Easy](#)
- [But If We Started Dating It Would Ruin Our Friendship Where I Ask You To Do Things And You Do Them](#)
- [Few More Items Knocked Off List Of Desirable Traits In Partner As Woman Turns Year Older](#)
- [Report: Rising Number Of Weak, Emasculated Men Working As Stay-At-Home Dads](#)
- [Area Woman's Type Tall, Athletic Men Who Have Already Hurt Her](#)
- [Girlfriend Changes Man Into Someone She's Not Interested In](#)

They've also taken many searing jabs at Hillary in the past:

- [Hillary Clinton To Nation: 'Do Not Fuck This Up For Me'](#)
- [I Am Fun](#)
- [Poll Finds Hillary Clinton Candidate Most Americans Want To Have 8-Ounce Glass Of Tap Water With](#)
- [Benghazi Committee Instructs Hillary Clinton To Limit Answers To 'I Failed The American People'](#)
- [Aides Gently Remind Hillary Clinton Not To Refer To Opponents As 'Obstacles To Greatness'](#)
- [Hillary Clinton Tries To Woo Voters By Rescinding Candidacy](#)
- [I'm Weighing Whether Or Not I Want To Go Through The Hell Of Appealing To You Idiotic, Uninformed Oafs](#)

Unfortunately, the following has happened:

When it was revealed in January that satirical news outlet, The Onion, had been purchased by Univision Communications (which is co-owned by one of Hillary Clinton's biggest fans, top campaign donor, and pro-Israel fanatic, Haim Saban), it was if the world suddenly held its breath to see if the move would be the outlet's downfall.

Now, it appears we have our answer. On Tuesday, an apparent attempt at satirical understatement in actuality proved to be nothing less than a blatant propagandistic fluff piece touting Clinton's ostensibly stellar career.

It didn't work.

[“Female Presidential Candidate Who Was United States Senator, Secretary Of State Told To Be More Inspiring.”](#) read The Onion’s not-at-all-opaque headline. And the nauseating attempt at tongue-in-cheek praise didn’t stop there.

According to the short ‘article,’ Hillary’s media advisor, Jim Margolis, urged “the woman — who overcame entrenched societal biases to build a successful legal career, became the first female senator elected in the state of New York, oversaw the Department of State during a period of widespread international tumult, and, if elected, would be the first female president in American history — to be more uplifting to voters.”

We've already seen [extreme media bias towards Clinton](#). Now it seems that even satire sites are not immune from political bias.

How is this related to TRP? [I've submitted a warning in the past about how all men should be concerned about a Hillary Clinton presidency](#) and there have been plenty of other good submissions since ([example 1](#), [example 2](#)). With the media behind her, there's a good chance that she'll clinch the presidency (unless she [self-implodes like last time](#)). If she's elected, get ready for some serious anti-male policies and more entitlements for women.

Lessons learned:

- The MSM is becoming increasingly centralized, biased, and untrustworthy.
- Even satire/humor sites are not immune from political bias.
- The once-great The Onion, which used to be full of hard truths wrapped in humor, has become a propaganda vehicle for Hillary 2016.
- For American men, it is time to start thinking about what it might be like to live in an increasingly feminist environment.

Archived from theredarchive.com

Comments

Red_August • 129 points • 19 February, 2016 12:07 PM

It's not just a leftist thing, each american media outlet always picks a pony in the race. Same with right-wing cuck-outlets. The owners go to the races then to see which pony wins. The problem is that every pony ultimately runs in the same direction, in the same 'race' and for the same stakes or paradigm. *They run for the owners* but with different populist flavours.

There will albeit be favouritism for their direct owner-supporters but the corollary is that even if one pony owner loses, the winning pony owner's interests do not generally fall very far away from the other pony owner's interests. They do however usually fall significantly away from the people's. Let the little people argue endlessly about ultimately not very consequential emotional debates such as abortion whilst the pony owners remove all vestiges of nation-state and shape the corporate republic to come.

CopperFox3c • 28 points • 19 February, 2016 04:24 PM

The truth is always interpreted. I actually wrote a post about this issue earlier this week.

The truth is never directly observable ... it is always interpreted. As such, the true danger lies not in the "other side" of the debate, but in extremism in any form. Extreme interpretations of the truth serve as vehicles to limit the freedom of individuals.

Paid_Internet_Troll • 16 points • 19 February, 2016 05:54 PM

The truth is never directly observable ... it is always interpreted.

Yes. This is something that great thinkers/philosophers have been talking about for thousands of years. Everyone from Plato to Confucius to Buddha.

As such, the true danger lies not in the "other side" of the debate, but in extremism in any form. Extreme interpretations of the truth serve as vehicles to limit the freedom of individuals.

"Extreme" by whose interpretation? If you're submitting your inner thoughts to some sort of "majority rules/don't get to far from what the majority thinks" test, then you're fucked.

In 1850, the notion that black people were 100% capable of interacting on an equal level with whites was an "extremist" notion. Even the Abolitionists at the time believed in racial segregation, and that blacks were some sort of "inferior species."

Don't let the crowd define what is "extreme" and what is "acceptable," because a majority of idiots aren't going to stumble across the truth just because they had a vote on it.

CopperFox3c • 11 points • 19 February, 2016 06:13 PM*

It's not about majority opinion. "Extreme" can be defined as any interpretation (which fits the evidence) that doesn't pass the Occam's Razor test. There are exceptions, but that is the general rule.

For instance, the fact that women tend to be more attracted to strong, powerful, high-status men, and thus men tend to be more focused on accumulating status and money, and thus men tend to be richer and more powerful, could be the result of a centuries-long patriarchal oppression by a secret worldwide cabal of men ... or it could simply be *biology*.

In that case, biology is the most parsimonious explanation, the other explanation being "extreme".

Paid_Internet_Troll • 3 points • 19 February, 2016 10:13 PM

Ah, I see what you're saying now.

FreeRadical5 • 3 points • 20 February, 2016 06:54 PM

While I agree with everything you're saying, it would make more sense if you replace the word "extreme" with "illogical".

Average RedPiller's view of gender would be considered extreme by the vast majority of the population. What makes them extreme is the extreme deviation from the norm. That is the commonly accepted meaning of the word.

waynebradysworld • 1 point • 19 February, 2016 07:47 PM

170 years later and they still can't function as a whole. No country under black leadership is worth a damn. They plague every country they inhabit with crime.

Maybe those ideas in the 1850s weren't as far out as you'd like to believe.

Paid_Internet_Troll • 5 points • 19 February, 2016 10:20 PM

170 years later and they still can't function as a whole. No country under black leadership is worth a damn. They plague every country they inhabit with crime.

There are a whole raft of reasons for that, but I've never, ever, seen any sort of credible evidence that "black skin = crime." It just doesn't make sense.

For example, there are people in Southern India who are "blackier" than a lot of people from Africa, and there are people from New Guinea whose bloodlines have been separated from Africa for two or three times longer than Caucasians have even existed... and yet, there's supposed to be some sort of magical secret gene connected to the darkness of skin... despite completely different genetic bloodlines leading to that dark skin... that makes people automatically bad?

I don't buy it. It doesn't make any sense.

It's just racism wrapped up in pseudo-scientific language.

winter-sleep7 points 19 February, 2016 10:53 PM [recovered]

"black skin = crime" is just a caricature. Genetic differences go much deeper than pigmentation.

waynebradysworld • -7 points • 20 February, 2016 12:37 AM

All the way to their rotten, black souls

waynebradysworld • -3 points • 19 February, 2016 10:24 PM

You are operating in theory, I am simply observing what is. I don't claim to know WHY (though I can speculate, like you)

bootsiejenkins-9 points 19 February, 2016 07:56 PM [recovered]

What's your plan about it big bad stormfront man? Or do you just plan on crying about it on the Internet.

waynebradysworld • 3 points • 19 February, 2016 08:14 PM*

Does the truth offend you bro? You just embodied like 4 fallacies with one comment... Am I

in two chromosomes or trp?

What will I do about it...? Refuse to feel guilty when BLM etc attempt to spread guilt. Call spades spades.. Not put myself in bad positions. Probably ruffle some feathers along the way.

P.s. enjoy faggot

<http://www.theblaze.com/stories/2016/02/18/police-release-disturbing-surveillance-video-of-alleged-black-lives-matter-ambush-on-decorated-u-s-marine/>

I can post a new one just about every day. Go jerk off to Beyonce or something

[deleted] 19 February, 2016 09:25 PM*

[permanently deleted]

waynebradysworld • -5 points • 19 February, 2016 10:20 PM

The story of my life is that I have 25 tallies, a hot d1 cheerleader smash piece and I conceal carry my custom .45 1911 on a regular basis. I pray every day that a stupid mother fucker comes at me. Fiend to hit a lick bruh

[deleted] • 3 points • 20 February, 2016 06:27 AM

The story of my life is that I have 25 tallies, a hot d1 cheerleader smash piece and I conceal carry my custom .45 1911 on a regular basis

HAHAHAHA get the fuck out of here.

waynebradysworld • 1 point • 20 February, 2016 04:26 PM

Are you so envious of my life that you assume it can't be true?

I must be doing something right

Red_August • 2 points • 19 February, 2016 11:59 PM

Happy to discover your blog. Happy reading ahead - cheers.

MentORPHEUS • 18 points • 19 February, 2016 07:15 PM

It's not just a leftist thing, each american media outlet always picks a pony in the race. Same with right-wing cuck-outlets. ... The problem is that every pony ultimately runs in the same direction, in the same 'race' and for the same stakes or paradigm. They run for the owners but with different populist flavours.

An important point, and why I hate seeing posts about Left/Right politics on this sub. Just because extreme far-left positions like Feminism and SJWs are the natural enemies of the Red Pill Man, does NOT mean that the right is our friend either. Wear it on your sleeve that you are 100% against marriage, sleep with multiple women half your age, don't go to their church, then come back here and tell us that the American Right Wing in its present incarnation is the natural home of Red Pill Men.

faded_jester • 24 points • 19 February, 2016 09:45 PM

A point many of our brethren seem to either ignore or deny.

A simpler explanation may be: Hating cold weather doesn't mean you love hot weather....it means you hate cold weather.

I'm what many would consider here a dirty "liberal".

That doesn't mean I love welfare, will vote for Hillary, and think my white privilege is problematic.

Point of fact is I love guns, can't stand feminists, and think religion is silly.

I'm simply here because this is one of the last few places where men can talk like men without fear or consequence. We can be brutally honest here, discuss ideas, and never have to placate women because "feelings".

I'm a man first, everything else second. The Red Pill (to me at least) is about being the best man you can be, everything else can be debated on a different sub or in a private message.

wanderer779 • 9 points • 20 February, 2016 01:51 AM

Hear, hear. Honestly probably 70% of what I read here isn't worth shit. The fact that I'm still here probably speaks more to how anti-male everything else is than anything else.

[deleted] • 1 point • 22 February, 2016 03:31 AM

This. I come to TRP looking for an informed discussion about male sexual strategy. Politics does not have to be a part of that. Some people's political opinions in here downright scare me.

Golden_Dawn • -5 points • 20 February, 2016 01:04 AM

Just because extreme far-left positions like Feminism and SJWs are the natural enemies of the Red Pill Man, does NOT mean that the right is our friend either.

If the right isn't your friend, perhaps it's time to take a good hard look at yourself?

MentORPHEUS • 8 points • 20 February, 2016 01:20 AM*

Maybe you should reread what myself and RedAugust posted. Our (my) assertion is that left/right thinking is plugged-in behavior, which serves interests that include neither of us. It is part of a divide and conquer game. When you unplug from it, you may find that we have more in common than not, and are better off united by our common goals *against* those who would have us battling over left/right identity while they quietly win the game.

Golden_Dawn • 1 point • 20 February, 2016 03:06 PM

our common goals

Curious to know what you believe those to be.

McLarenX • 7 points • 19 February, 2016 09:56 PM*

Glad someone finally went into this on here. Being redpilled on matters such as these international globalists is just as important as being redpilled on the nature of women. National identities are being taken, and Western nations are being slowly bled dry.

There is a strong group of people that controls international finance, who are also incredibly involved in every facet of political life. Most "national" banks are under private ownership, including the Federal Reserve of the United States. These people have weaseled their way into controlling the currency of every country, under the guise of "preventing panic" and "stabilising the market". When, in fact, an astute observer will note their manipulation of currency interest rates and world commodities actually triggers these "financial crisis" and "recession".

Not sure how redpilled the mods themselves are here, (and I don't want us gaining undeserved labels by those enchanted by the agenda), but there is a manifesto that has been repeatedly purged and prevented

publication by a respected and revered man that can be had online for free. He predicted a hundred years ago the dire situation the populous is waking up to.

PM me, only if you are truly open minded about learning who our true money masters are.

Mandatory reading as well, a media magnate / international banking effective states their agenda and why "native populists must not win "

[deleted] • 3 points • 20 February, 2016 03:08 AM

He's referring to 'The International Jew' by Henry Ford.

curious97 • 1 point • 21 February, 2016 05:19 AM

what is fascinating to me is that this paragraph could be referring to The Communist Manifesto or the actual thing you're talking about just as well

McLarenX • 1 point • 21 February, 2016 09:40 AM

Yeah, I didn't go into the their agenda of forced racial dissemination and destruction of traditional religious morals because that turns people off to finding the truth.

[deleted] 19 February, 2016 02:23 PM

[permanently deleted]

redpillschool[M] • 24 points • 19 February, 2016 03:24 PM

I want you to know, your comment was removed, not because of the Jew comment, but because of concern trolling.

[deleted] • 7 points • 19 February, 2016 03:42 PM

would love to see the Jew comment though. I love em. because you know, they rule the world.

tits_out_forTheBoys6 points 19 February, 2016 11:22 PM [recovered]

Jews are the most ethnocentric, parasitic, and predatory race known to man. This is why they denounce Gentile ethnocentrism as "racism" (a term invented by a Jew). The Jew is a master at putting us in a moral sandbox in which his criticism is not allowed by using loaded and corrupt vocabulary.

Also the red pill cannot be abridged, as we swallow the Red Pill we slowly learn the Jew is damn near the Architect.

[deleted] • -5 points • 20 February, 2016 01:44 AM

Many things invented by a Jew. Probably most of what you are using right now

tits_out_forTheBoys • 4 points • 20 February, 2016 02:11 AM*

There's a YouTube video called Thanks Jews! which points out the "great" things Jews do for us.

If the Jews had never created The Frankfurt School, then TRP wouldn't exist because feminism would have never existed. Thanks Jews!

[deleted] • -5 points • 20 February, 2016 02:19 AM

Don't have Polio? Thank a Jew

tits_out_forTheBoys • 3 points • 20 February, 2016 02:57 AM*

The exception doesn't make the rule and you can't claim to be "redpilled" and see the generalities of the behavior of women and then ignore it for other clearly defined groups.

[deleted] • -4 points • 20 February, 2016 04:05 AM

Let's generalize Jews ... Smart , good with money , founded two of the most common religions in the world , one of which is likely yours, been around as a group for over five thousand years -- before whatever group you choose to say you were a part of existed , and will likely exist long after " your" people are a distant memory ... Survived extermination sand prospered.

Yea I'll take those generalities

[deleted] • 3 points • 19 February, 2016 08:10 PM

-Moshe, why do you read the right wing newspaper instead of the Jewish one?

-Well, because when I read our newspaper, we're victims of abuse and bombings and terrorism, and when I read the right wing newspaper, we're the rulers of the world!

[deleted] • -1 points • 19 February, 2016 08:19 PM

I read both LOL and thanks

and I guess since I am jewish, I just believe what I experience

NaClAgNO3 • 1 point • 20 February, 2016 02:26 PM

The Jews that you are referring to are the fake Jews. This video here shows the real and true Jews that are enlightening the fake Jew about the truth!

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hB1bLgl5WDs>

[deleted] 19 February, 2016 03:41 PM*

[permanently deleted]

redpillschool[M] • 19 points • 19 February, 2016 04:14 PM*

That's fine, just proves my point.

No, this doesn't prove your point.

You thought making a comment about Jews was going to get you downvoted or removed, but you couldn't do it without concern trolling, of course you're getting removed for breaking the rules.

I left this as a record so that you can't cry censorship when the big bad mods removed your useless bullshit.

If you break the rules, you get removed.

I'm starting to think the mods of this sub are fat jewish women that just want "equality".
Pretty crazy.

You are one strike from a ban. And when you go crying because you think it's about Jews, I'll point people to this thread where you were simply trolling.

tits_out_forTheBoys • 9 points • 20 February, 2016 12:24 AM

I can confirm everything redpillschool just said.

As one of the stronger critics of Jews, I've been given a more than reasonable level of treatment by the mods about what I can say on here. They might not necessarily agree with it, but that certainly doesn't mean that they're influenced by Jews in any way whatsoever. If they were, then I would damn well sure have been stripped of my EC flair by now.

These guys are legit, and TRP is no doubt one of the few safe havens remaining for free speech. Anyone who can't see that is blind.

[deleted] • 2 points • 20 February, 2016 12:37 AM

Admit it, jappy girls never put out for you and you have a big chip on your shoulder. You can't get that delicious knish

tits_out_forTheBoys • 8 points • 20 February, 2016 12:58 AM*

Yes, this is why I'm an anti-Semite who persecutes Jews with mean words and hateful facts.

Because Jewess pussy is "chosen" pussy. Like why couldn't I have been born into the persecuted race, so that I could be "promised" ample Jewess knish, and infinite shekels for the Sholocaust?

[deleted] • 3 points • 20 February, 2016 02:38 AM

It's that weird thing on your schlong. Get cut and watch em line up to let you blow loads on their Michael Kors sweaters

[deleted] • -1 points • 20 February, 2016 04:08 AM

Versace dude. Versache. At least

Seducibledotcom • -1 points • 20 February, 2016 06:51 AM

What the fuck is concern trolling???

[deleted] 19 February, 2016 02:37 PM*

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] • 3 points • 19 February, 2016 03:22 PM

John F. Kennedy

If only you knew how bad things are going to get.

thiasus • 53 points • 19 February, 2016 12:48 PM

American Women Studying In Europe Are Unbelievably Easy

As a European man, this article is hilariously spot-on. Every single thing the fictional guy lists is 100% true, and given the precise and correct details he sprinkled in about locations and food I doubt this isn't based on actual personal experience.

Themooseconnection • 140 points • 19 February, 2016 09:37 AM*

"Journalism" and "the news" have been dead for a long time. People are too stupid to realise "the news" isn't the facts, it's actually someone else's opinion on the facts.

[deleted] • 40 points • 19 February, 2016 03:41 PM

people now are stupid enough that they don't care. they want to be told what to think, the toughest decision they have all day is who to vote for in american idol

[deleted] • 12 points • 19 February, 2016 04:53 PM*

Oh god, I just had a horrid realization... *there are people who are too lazy to even vote in American Idol.*

tits_out_forTheBoys • 15 points • 19 February, 2016 11:04 PM

Agreed, but the rabbit hole goes deeper than that.

"The News" promotes an endless stream of conflicting opinions on the most vital matters of life. It's a big divide and conquer tactic: Destroy the natural rallying points of human thought, and divert our thoughts and interests over to luxury.

No one gives a fuck about anyone but themselves these days. That's the extent of the mainstream media's power over people.

machimus • 5 points • 19 February, 2016 08:47 PM

I like South Park anyway, but this season they did an unusually good indictment of ads taking over where the news used to be.

thechariot83 • 2 points • 20 February, 2016 02:03 AM

I don't hold a lot of hope for people 40 years of age and over. News Corporations have already drilled their heads with garbage. The newer generations though, through the power of the internet, are waking up to the bullshit. I think that's why Bernie Sanders has so much support from the youth demographic. Young people are tired of bullshit politicians and Bernie stands out to them.

Themooseconnection • 6 points • 20 February, 2016 02:26 AM

You think your vote actually matters..... HAHHAHAHA bread and circuses friend. You're brainwashed just like the boomers that get told what think by the media everyday.

thechariot83 • -1 points • 20 February, 2016 02:32 AM

Very, very ignorant comment my dude.

Themooseconnection • 5 points • 20 February, 2016 03:06 AM

I'm gona vote for Bernie guys he promised me free shit herp derp

thechariot83 • 8 points • 20 February, 2016 08:12 PM

I didn't even mention my political affiliation. Smarten the fuck up.

Mildly_Sociopathic • 1 point • 19 February, 2016 04:37 PM

Actually, I think about 50% (not certain on exact numbers) of Americans no longer trust the 'news'.

Paid_Internet_Troll • 12 points • 19 February, 2016 05:56 PM

That would be the top 50%. There's still the *other* 50%.

Vietnom • 44 points • 19 February, 2016 04:55 PM*

Great post. It's happening everywhere.

I'm a writer who was working freelance for LA Weekly. My articles were consistently some of their most trafficked and most shared articles, largely because they took an angle that was counter to the mainstream perspective (which is what alt weeklies used to be best at). Then a new SJW editor came in, and these were four of the first front page articles under her regime: <http://imgur.com/6PAjEk0>

And then this one this week: <http://imgur.com/XhFWAH3>.

Needless to say, I don't write for them anymore.

waynebradysworld • 18 points • 19 February, 2016 07:55 PM

WOW thats a piss publication

yiab127 • 14 points • 19 February, 2016 10:18 PM*

Even The Economist has taken a huge turn for the worse. When I first started reading it over ten years ago, it was a dense and somewhat dry weekly commentary on business, political, and economic trends. Over the past few years, and this year in particular, it has become filled with all sorts of cultural lecturing and social justice crap. Not to mention that the core material has declined in both in depth and quality. As far as I know it's one of the few news sources that has seen revenue *increase* in recent years so that's not even an excuse. If this keeps up it'll end up as a pop-culture zombie like TIME or National Geographic.

wanderer779 • 7 points • 20 February, 2016 02:00 AM

For some reason your comment reminded me of something. These fuckers, whoever they are, also got ahold of popular mechanics. My dad and I both noticed it, we were on the phone and he was like, "did you get the new popular mechanics?", and I was like, "well it says PM but it's not it" an he was just like, "yep." I don't know if anyone here subscribes to it but if you do you know what I'm talking about.

insideman83 • 1 point • 20 February, 2016 06:08 AM

How does Popular Mechanics turn SJW?

Reminds me of a book, The Conquest of Cool, about how advertisers in the '60s started to suck up to the emerging hippies in order to rejuvenate these lumbering corporations that had lost credibility with baby boomers:

<http://www.amazon.com/The-Conquest-Cool-Counterculture-Consumerism/dp/0226260127>

wanderer779 • 1 point • 20 February, 2016 05:11 PM

It wasn't so much SJWey. They started putting hot girls in tank tops every few pages and the topics for their articles changed from interesting stuff about how technology worked to things I'm not interested in. I can't even remember what they were about to give an example. If I still had a copy here I'd refer back to it but I threw them all out.

spaceythrowaway • 3 points • 21 February, 2016 08:59 PM

I'm Indian. When my dad was young, it was next to impossible to get international magazines without paying a shit load of money

We would have to suffice with old magazines sold on the streetside for \$1 a pop

I remember in 1993, my dad went on a business trip to Mumbai. The economy was just opening up then. He came back with half a dozen National Geographic magazines from the 1970s

I read them cover to cover, even though as a 11 year old I couldn't really understand them. But I knew it was powerful writing and even more powerful photography

The NatGeo of today is a sham

Limekill • 1 point • 21 February, 2016 04:13 AM

TIME is a POS. It's not even a magazine anymore. I mean read the number of pages of content.

Economist more technical articles are good, but they are let down by "more popular" BS new stories. Like how they are pro-immigration and then suddenly back tracked when the realised 1,000,000 people showing up is actually bad.

BigDaddyLightskin • 1 point • 22 February, 2016 04:32 PM

What do you read now? I've noticed this trend myself.

Copenhagen23 • 9 points • 20 February, 2016 09:26 AM

Whites, camera, action? Wow. That's some shit. How about Jews, camera, more Jews?

MyLittleAtomBomb • 23 points • 19 February, 2016 04:28 PM

It joins cracked and collegehumor in the great webserver in the sky.

cariboo_j • 19 points • 19 February, 2016 07:02 PM

Cracked used to be awesome! Now it's just preachy SJW bullshit trying to make me feel guilty about everything.

darkrood • 2 points • 20 February, 2016 12:36 AM

REALLY?!!! Damn, I haven't kept up with it except David Wong's stuff.

Is there any evidence? Seriously, I barely notice.

gprime312 • 6 points • 20 February, 2016 02:15 AM

wat? Wong is the fucking leader in self-hating, white-bashing "journalism" You know he's white and changed his name to be more "ethnic" right?

TheRedPilsner • 10 points • 20 February, 2016 04:01 PM

The AMA with David Wong a few months back was hilarious. As soon as it started, people started asking him why he changed Cracked from a clever satire site to SJW clickbait. Wong threw a fit and asked his followers on Twitter and Facebook to downvote the people asking those questions, and got his own account banned because he violated Reddit's brigading rules.

darkrood • 1 point • 20 February, 2016 02:31 AM

I thought everyone knows that he's white.

I like his piece on "6 harsh truths that make you a better person"

Based on that, It's pretty obvious this guy knows the reality of dating world, and someone did post that as a good red pill reading piece.

[deleted] • 21 points • 19 February, 2016 01:26 PM

"But If We Started Dating..." is violently beautiful. Truth from sea to shining sea!

Klokinator • 14 points • 19 February, 2016 03:35 PM

Hillary's agenda is the MSM and Banker agenda: Globalism and the extermination of all decent people. It's baffling too, why they would want to eliminate the greatest and most productive society of all time. I just don't get it.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=yeJ-iv3MOTo&feature=youtu.be>

redzorp • 16 points • 19 February, 2016 05:26 PM

The Republican agenda is the same (with the possible exception of Trump).

Yes, the Elite want to destroy the west. Took me a long time to understand this but if you dig deep it makes sense in a very perverted way.

They want to turn the entire planet into one giant serf plantation, with the Anglo and Zionist elite sitting at the very tippy-top of the one-eyed pyramid. It will literally be a scientific dictatorship, worse than anything Orwell described. Alex Jones and his merry band of conspiracy demagogues over at InfoWars are pretty much bang on for the most part.

And the cruel irony is that the bulk of humanity will just quietly accept everything, like they did with feminism, the Patriot Act, NSA spying and on and on...

dr_warlock • 3 points • 19 February, 2016 11:29 PM

Cut off a titty and place it on the table. The nipple is the elite, everyone else is a boob. That is the goal for globalism.

poop_lord_420 • 1 point • 19 February, 2016 10:58 PM

I wouldn't really call Donald Trump or Ben Carson republicans. They are just running for the republican nomination.

wanderer779 • 1 point • 20 February, 2016 02:02 AM

What are they going to do about china though?

redzorp • 2 points • 20 February, 2016 06:16 AM

China and Russia are the endgame for the Elite. Both of those countries are slated for destruction and/or dismemberment.

The Elite have been trying economic warfare and proxy wars against both countries but so far neither has cracked.

The final option is World War III to finish the job. I am hoping that the Elite are not quite inbred and insane enough to actually go there. But given their behavior over the last 20 years, I would not put anything past them at this point.

IamGale • 13 points • 19 February, 2016 10:40 AM

This is a good and well-researched post dude. I had no idea of this, thanks!

theozoph • 19 points • 19 February, 2016 03:23 PM

Haim Saban. Probably a Baptist.

redzorp • 6 points • 19 February, 2016 05:21 PM

Haha. Yeah.

Nothing to see here. Move along. Move along.

vaelamin • 16 points • 19 February, 2016 04:12 PM

even the satire sites get bought buy israel. America the cuck of israel.

_orion[] • 9 points • 19 February, 2016 04:45 PM

Rip onion, may your lil Wayne solving mexicos drug problem video stream forever on

blacwidonsfw • 9 points • 19 February, 2016 05:53 PM

My favorite onion article was "girl visits remote African poor village, inspires her to change her Facebook picture forever". So funny. RIP

StratCat86 • 1 point • 24 February, 2016 05:25 PM

I always liked, "SCOTUS overturns car."

KissTheBridesmaid • 13 points • 19 February, 2016 01:32 PM

Great post, again exposing how every communication that comes to us has a specific hidden purpose. Often not even very well hidden.

As for the presidency, a man will have to bend to the female imperative just as much as a woman, perhaps even more so, in an all-out white knighting effort to avoid being perceived as a misogynist.

In order to get the entire female population on your side, simply provide some female privilege. This will get them ALL on your side, even if there are other issues that could benefit / damage them more.

The male population is not so easily won over. They are more likely to consider issues impacting their personal life goals, social class etc, the sheep mentality does not work here.

This is why women will continue to get random illogical privileges, and all of their 'issues' will be catered to and used to gain political support. Who happens to be in power is irrelevant. You have to please women to get there in the first place.

[deleted] • 9 points • 19 February, 2016 06:02 PM

simply provide some female privilege.

Tell them there is a wage gap and you will fix it, and they wil come. Tell blacks they are oppressed and you'll fix it, and they will come.

Create a good, tell them they need it, hold it above their heads, and only give it to them when they vote for you.

Get them addicted to the drug of welfare - paid for by the value creators. They will come back for more, which keeps power in the party's hands.

When does it all fall down?

darkrood • 1 point • 20 February, 2016 12:38 AM

paid for by the value creators.

When value creators says fuck it, and vote with their feet.

AmlanceJockey • 4 points • 19 February, 2016 05:22 PM

Only Nixon could go to China and only Hillary could tell the feminists to fuck off.

Limekill • 1 point • 21 February, 2016 04:16 AM

Perhaps true. From what I've seen women (non college age) sometimes are more aligned to the political party than even men. Men will reason and disagree and possibly change their vote. Women will just hang on to what they know even harder.

[deleted] • 6 points • 19 February, 2016 04:48 PM

The Onion has been sinking for some time now. Their clickbait "Clickhole" is horrendous.

faqr • 6 points • 20 February, 2016 02:20 AM

The onion just got too big for its breeches. You can't have a counter-culture website going mainstream without losing its niche.

_fappycamper • 26 points • 19 February, 2016 01:27 PM

Hillary will feel the "bern" on March 1

[deleted] • 17 points • 19 February, 2016 06:07 PM

Exactly, and if not him, Trump is next in line for me. I'm a liberal, not an idiot, I refuse to vote this train wreck.

nuesuh • 9 points • 19 February, 2016 06:27 PM

I'm also split between Trump and Sanders. I like Trumps views on women and Muslims... Other than that, Sanders hits the nail on many subjects.

darkrood • 7 points • 20 February, 2016 12:40 AM

What about when the BLM girls take over his event?

That whole thing was pretty cringe worthy.

Heck, even his supporter on the stage signal crowd to be silent for the girls (facepalm).

It shows that he's surrounded by useless people, or he can't say no to SJW.

Either is bad as a presidential trait.

nuesuh • 5 points • 20 February, 2016 09:26 AM

I agree. Not a supporter of either candidate, just saying Trump has decent views on women and Muslims, and Sanders does hit the nail on a lot of topics, imo.

There are no good presidential candidates. Can't remember ever seeing a good candidate for the US presidency.

darkrood • 0 points • 20 February, 2016 06:20 PM

My voting strategy:

Just don't vote for a sleazeball or a wimp.

StarDestinyGuy • 2 points • 20 February, 2016 12:09 AM

Sanders believes the wage gap myth too, unfortunately

Darkone06 • 7 points • 20 February, 2016 02:24 AM

Honestly while he talks about it, he is for worker rights period, to alienate feminist esp when that is Hillarys only winning group would be suicide.

dx fifa • 2 points • 20 February, 2016 02:20 AM

The dilemma of the classic liberal

nuesuh • 1 point • 20 February, 2016 09:24 AM

I guess... 3 years ago i was, very very left wing.

Now... I guess I'm a fucking liberal. I guess that is the result of rationality.

dx fifa • 6 points • 20 February, 2016 11:20 AM

Lots of people on TRP see black and white with left and right. You're either a good, manly, smart conservative or a bad, weak idiotic liberal. A lot of them would actually be traditional liberals.

[deleted] • 4 points • 19 February, 2016 08:21 PM

Hillary has proven to be one hell of a Machiavellian (like the vast majority of politicians), but she doesn't seem to get away with it as often as others do.

TheRedPilsner • 5 points • 20 February, 2016 04:04 PM

She's like Cersei Lannister; not nearly as clever or skilled at playing "the game" as she thinks she is.

[deleted] 19 February, 2016 05:22 PM*

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] • 2 points • 24 February, 2016 05:45 PM

My dad is a stout republican and is voting for Bernie in the primaries solely because of this, found it pretty amusing

KimJongUntzUntz • 2 points • 19 February, 2016 06:05 PM

The only problem with Bernie is that he will take our second amendment right away...He seems like the only canidate that isnt status quo though...Im torn between having my country ruined, or my second amendment rights ruined...

americanmook • 10 points • 19 February, 2016 06:26 PM*

You should probably stop posting and read more. His weak gun rights issue was heavily attacked. Plus it doesn't even fucking matter, they have to amend the Constitution to take guns away.

T0000009 • 3 points • 19 February, 2016 10:15 PM

They already confiscate guns, they made it "illegal" to make ammunition, and ...

Ah fuck it, you kids don't even understand

KimJongUntzUntz • 2 points • 19 February, 2016 06:33 PM

I think posting and talking to people is the best way to learn, especially since reading articles from news sources (like the onion), you dont really know their intent. What do you mean by "his weak gun

control stance was heavily attacked?"

Also I didnt mean he would take all of our second amendment rights away...Just look at Clinton and the Assault Weapons ban. The constitution was not ammended then, but our gun rights were severly crippled.

americanmook • 1 point • 19 February, 2016 06:40 PM

I personally don't even care about guns. A person's gonna kill me with a handgun just the same as an assault rifle if he wants to.

KimJongUntzUntz • 0 points • 19 February, 2016 07:04 PM

...or a knife, or a spoon, or a sock filled with bottle caps. The issue is not really self defense or murder rates (to me). I just really like firearms and going shooting with my buddies. Having a president try and take away all my fun toys would really suck.

darkrood • 6 points • 20 February, 2016 12:43 AM

You can always call the police when a burglar comes. (/s)

Sdom1 • 2 points • 19 February, 2016 06:35 PM

Amend. The Constitution was ratified hundreds of years ago.

Limekill • 1 point • 21 February, 2016 04:08 AM

Thank Christ its literally impossible to amend.

Tips hat a Scalia.

(Only jurisprudence people would get that joke, because Scalia actually suggested that it should be infinitely easier to amend).

[deleted] • 3 points • 19 February, 2016 10:49 PM

...they have to amend the Constitution to take guns away.

Nope. All they need is a compliant Supreme Court.

In 2008, the Supreme Court took up and considered the issue of whether the Second Amendment protected private, individual ownership of guns or whether it only protected ownership of guns by/for state militias. The Court's decision was 5-4 that the Second Amendment protected private, individual gun ownership. Now, that might sound encouraging and like the issue is settled, but keep in mind that the Supreme Court is not above reversing precedent on issues (Brown v. Board of Education being one of the higher-profile examples). And with Scalia's death, there is likely going to be another liberal justice appointed to the Supreme Court (either by Obama or Hillary if the process drags and she wins), so the 5-4 vote that upheld an individual right to bear arms will be a 5-4 vote *against* the individual right to bear arms next time a similar case comes to the Supreme Court. And if the Supreme Court rules that the Second Amendment does not protect individual ownership of guns, then there's nothing to stop the government from confiscating firearms, no amendment to the Constitution needed.

wanderer779 • 5 points • 20 February, 2016 02:14 AM

One might argue that the thing that stops confiscation of guns is the guns themselves. At that point, you have to go to war or it never meant anything anyway.

nutty_bi • 6 points • 19 February, 2016 05:13 PM

What do you know, another Jew...

[deleted] • 28 points • 19 February, 2016 11:14 AM

Jews control Hollywood and the media. Not a big shock for those of us who have been societally redpilled.

Man-with-a-pitchfork • 20 points • 19 February, 2016 03:50 PM

You realize that Hillary is not Jewish, while Bernie Sanders *is*?

SlowWing • 25 points • 19 February, 2016 05:33 PM

Yes, but Hillary is with the Bankers and Bernie isn't.

mrsmeeseeks • 3 points • 19 February, 2016 06:09 PM*

She also gets funding from the Saudi family via her foundation, the same family that secretly funnels money to Malaysia, an issue that is causing enormous turmoil in Malaysia right now. Maybe people like /u/Rebirth1337 care to explain to us why he schizophrenically believes the Jews control Hollywood, meanwhile Saudi princes are raping women (and men) in Beverly Hills? I'm really tired of the unnecessary antisemitism, the Jews are some of the most diverse groups and spread out people in the world that is simply part of the nature of humanity right now. Perhaps there is *some* tribalism, sure, but my God are you not paying attention to current events and corruption among other powerful tribes?

nutty_bi • 4 points • 20 February, 2016 01:20 AM

The Jews and Saudis are close allies. It's obvious the Jews run Hebrewood. Just look at a list of owners and CEOs of all the big movie studios. Why do you think movies are so filled with propaganda nowadays? It's all anti-white, feminist bullshit. The Jews want to destroy our culture so we're too weak to fight them.

nuesuh • 12 points • 19 February, 2016 06:25 PM

Jews doesn't care about Sanders. They care about money, which is generated through their buisnesses. Getting Shillary elected would be the best thing that could possibly happen to their companies and revenue stream. Sanders would be the worst thing that could happen.

waynebradysworld • -5 points • 19 February, 2016 07:53 PM

Sanders would be the worst thing for the entire world as we know it. Trump is America's Last Hope.

nuesuh • 3 points • 20 February, 2016 09:30 AM

You sure think highly of Trump.

Trump has some good views, but it's difficult to be wrong on everything. I'm impressed with his honesty, that's about it.

waynebradysworld • 4 points • 20 February, 2016 04:28 PM

Its not that I think so highly of Trump... Its that I think so little of everyone else. Its like a buffet of turds and trump is a refreshing glass of piss

[deleted] • -1 points • 19 February, 2016 08:10 PM

Jews doesn't care about Sanders. They care about money, which is generated through their buisnesses.

By this reasoning Jew is not an ethnicity or a race or a religion, it's a state of mind

Apexk9 • -12 points • 19 February, 2016 11:28 AM

Or you fell for misdirection.

[deleted] 19 February, 2016 12:10 PM

[permanently deleted]

HobKing • 2 points • 19 February, 2016 03:10 PM

That says that Rupert Murdoch, Ariana Huffington, and Ted Turner are all gay... ?

[deleted] • 13 points • 19 February, 2016 04:05 PM

It says Goy, the Jewish word for non-Jews. The plural form is goyim.

HobKing • 1 point • 20 February, 2016 12:48 AM

Oh yes, very familiar with the term "goy," my fault!

theozoph • 10 points • 19 February, 2016 03:24 PM

Start counting, and remember Jews are only 3% of the population.

Apexk9 • 0 points • 19 February, 2016 08:16 PM

That's what misdirection would be.

Plus all those companies are owned by like 4 parent companies.

[deleted] • 8 points • 19 February, 2016 12:01 PM

They even admit it...

<http://articles.latimes.com/2008/dec/19/opinion/oe-stein19>

bokehnikon • -2 points • 19 February, 2016 02:08 PM*

<http://articles.latimes.com/2008/dec/19/opinion/oe-stein19>

Jews are well represented in Hollywood because when the movie industry was in its infancy 100 years ago, upper class WASPs considered mass entertainment careers a working-class, immigrant pursuit. By this time, many Jews were involved in vaudeville, and Hollywood was a natural segue. But what does it mean to "control Hollywood?" Is there some sort of organized conspiracy? Try to get 3 or more people to cooperate on anything. It's like saying the American automotive industry is "controlled" by pasty white guys from the Mid West. Probably.

[deleted] • 13 points • 19 February, 2016 04:06 PM

Jews don't make up half the nation, or even a quarter. They are 3%! 3% for Christ sake.

sourdieSELF • 3 points • 19 February, 2016 05:47 PM

Seriously, can we get some sort of Women in Engineering push to get non jews into that industry?

redzorp • 6 points • 19 February, 2016 05:02 PM

As someone who has worked in and around Hollywood for years in executive and sales positions - yes, it is a conspiracy. On multiple levels.

At the core it is ethnic-tribal collusion (us vs the goy) that bleeds into the political (support for Obama/Clinton) and geopolitics (support for Israel, destruction of secular, powerful Muslim states). If you observe the media with that in mind, you can see all those agendas play out.

Btw, I'm not even bashing Jews, just pointing out that any group has an agenda. And if that group controls the media, then media products will reflect that agenda. Tomorrow, if the Chinese completely bought out Hollywood, we would start to see sitcoms showing Chinese people in a favorable light (lovable, intelligent, funny, harmless) along with movies that propagandize how Taiwan and Japan are evil and cannot be trusted, yada, yada, yada...

Joseph_the_Carpenter • 5 points • 19 February, 2016 03:04 PM

Is there some sort of organized conspiracy?

Sort of. It's more of a disorganized fraternity where if you aren't Jewish you aren't getting in the big boy's club. Not that I'm complaining because I'm amazed any one group of people can control and run an industry full of neurotic assholes and narcissists. Does that sound like a similar community?

Apexk9 • 0 points • 19 February, 2016 08:17 PM

That's what misdirection is. Make you look at one hand.

sir_wankalot_here • 7 points • 19 February, 2016 10:54 AM

Well researched article except for this comment.

How is this related to TRP? I've submitted a warning in the past about how all men should be concerned about a Hillary Clinton presidency

If you believe that the President can act on his own, you are naive. Obama vs Bush there isn't much difference in policy except Obama is black.

It has pretty much been that way since the 1980s. Ronald Reagan for example legalized the most illegal immigrants. The exact number to this day is debated. Initially it was supposed to be only 100K to 200K but it possibly might be more than 2 million.

redzorp • 11 points • 19 February, 2016 05:08 PM

This is true. However the Elite faction behind Hitlery will use her presidency as an excuse to ramp up the feminist agenda ten-fold. Their end goal is to turn all western democracies into societies even more feminist controlled than Sweden.

As much as I don't trust Trump, his presidency might at least act as a temporary stop-gap against some of the Elite agenda.

sir_wankalot_here • 9 points • 20 February, 2016 12:23 AM

Marx was right on a couple of things. The big one was change won't happen unless the "elites" are forced to change by the people. This does not mean an armed revolution, all that usually happens then is you replace one set of elites with another.

Ghandhi under the British choose a method where basically he got Indians to opt out. The British would round up all of these Indians who opted out and this them in jail eventually the system started to fall apart.

So for the last elections, Ron Paul was the only President Candidate who spoke about important things, everytime he tried to talked about them he was silenced.

The important things are :

the massive debt USA has

massive amount spent on foreign wars and the US military overseas.

the amount of people (men) in jail for BS crimes

the amount spent spying in Americans

its-iceman • 9 points • 19 February, 2016 01:49 PM

Look at the number of executive orders Obama used to circumvent the pesky congressional arm of the government.

The president has an immense amount of power to impose their will.

HearTheRaven • 13 points • 19 February, 2016 02:50 PM

Look at the number of executive orders Obama used to circumvent the pesky congressional arm of the government.

On a per-year basis, Obama has used fewer executive orders than any president since Grover Cleveland.

Source

[deleted] • 10 points • 19 February, 2016 03:51 PM

This is the problem of being the first Twitter president - people know every single thing you did and assume that to mean it's a lot.

[deleted] • 3 points • 19 February, 2016 10:52 PM

The issue is the content of those executive orders, not the quantity. Yes, Obama has used significantly fewer executive orders than many other President, but a number of the ones he has used have been significant over-reaches of executive power or flat-out unconstitutional.

its-iceman • 2 points • 20 February, 2016 01:43 PM

I think I should have added more context: I'm not shitting on Obama, just using the current president for a frame of reference. Presidents have a shitload of power to do whatever they want without checks and balances.

sir_wankalot_here • 1 point • 20 February, 2016 01:16 PM

You missed my point, how much does it cost to become president ? Where does the money come from ?

waynebradysworld • 1 point • 19 February, 2016 07:57 PM

Obama isn't dumb. He doesn't use executive orders, he uses memorandum. Same exact effect, reported differently. At a higher rate than anyone ever. Stop being fucking nieve

ktchong • 2 points • 19 February, 2016 06:31 PM

October Surprise: The FBI indicts Hillary Clinton.

tekn0 • 1 point • 21 February, 2016 05:37 AM

I am waiting for this to happen. Its already in the making from what fulford says

freddymerckx • 2 points • 19 February, 2016 08:48 PM

Yeah, that's just terrible, you sound like you are up in arms. You should see the games and the propaganda brought to us by the Conservative/ Business community. Liars and thieves top to bottom

wanderer779 • 2 points • 20 February, 2016 01:41 AM*

this has actually been going on forever. Look at what happened to the daily show for example. But I'd argue that things are actually better now because the internet increased the number of competing voices by about 10 million percent.

Luckyluke23 • 2 points • 20 February, 2016 02:48 AM

i guess Hillary needs all the help she can get right?

what that saying, " if you can't join them, buy them"

insideman83 • 2 points • 20 February, 2016 05:58 AM

The Onion had been having money troubles for a while now. Its Onion News Network parody and content created under the Onion Digital Studios banner was legendary.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=84phU8of02U>

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=LtbSthgYh0U>

Once that stuff went away, it was all downhill.

[deleted] • 2 points • 20 February, 2016 06:23 AM

Look at Cracked.com. Going back before this, look at the Daily Show.

It's all bullshit. Nothing's pure unless you go back to your George Carlins, and even they had a certain political slant. Comedy can be one of the most ideological forms of media.

GrammerNaziParadox • 2 points • 20 February, 2016 07:33 AM

Suddenly the recent change in tone of their political articles makes sense.

howard333 • 2 points • 20 February, 2016 08:46 AM*

The corporate media in the West is highly coordinated. My first experience with that was seeing the push for gun prohibition in the 90's. This is the latest reminder that hits close to home for anyone posting here:

<http://www.returnofkings.com/79858/why-the-media-manufactured-outrage-against-our-meet-up>

pcadrian • 5 points • 19 February, 2016 11:11 AM **[recovered]**

Eh, of this happens I'm getting my PhD and getting the fuck out of this country. I have about 3 years left, and during this time I plan on creating alternate income streams that I can use later on. I hear Thailand is nice, and sterons are legal there.

[deleted] 19 February, 2016 11:39 AM

[permanently deleted]

redzorp • 8 points • 19 February, 2016 05:16 PM

America is the greatest country to *make money* in.

And once you make your money, the smart man gets the hell out. Thailand, Costa Rica, the Philippines, Eastern Europe...you can live like a king in these places if you have some good savings.

In America over the next 20 years, it wouldn't surprise me at all if you will need to qualify for a license to have heteronormative sex. And even then, it can only be with someone over the new age of consent, which will be set at 30. If you have sex with a female under 30, the male goes to jail while the female gets cash and prizes from the state to compensate for her trauma.

My plan is to get the hell outta here as soon as I can afford to.

pcadrian • 2 points • 19 February, 2016 01:11 PM [recovered]

Those people don't have options. I do.

its-iceman • 2 points • 19 February, 2016 01:49 PM

So where are you going to go?

waynebradysworld • 1 point • 19 February, 2016 08:00 PM

Noone can answer that honestly. While America has its issues, its still better than anywhere else.

princepeanutbutter • 2 points • 19 February, 2016 04:30 PM

Thailand is a military dictatorship

Paid_Internet_Troll • 10 points • 19 February, 2016 06:02 PM*

Thailand is a military dictatorship

Living in a military dictatorship where the dictator likes you personally, is much preferable to living in a democracy where the elected officials despise you personally.

Examples: Edward Snowden is enjoying his time in Russia fucking models a lot more than that fucked-up Army private (Chelsea Manning) is enjoying rotting in solitary confinement.

TheMGhandi • 3 points • 19 February, 2016 05:29 PM*

Quit acting like voting matters. America has been in control by the elite since it's creation. The federal reserve act just allowed for a private company to independently print all the money to create more debt and charge interest to the american people.

Every 20 years/generation a revolution would happen. The fact that women revolted in the 60s-70s is proof men have been emasculated for awhile.

Edit: the masculine men all died off in WWI and WWII or were incapable of being in a relationship for various reasons (eg. Torn limbs).

AlphaAccountant • 2 points • 19 February, 2016 06:44 PM

For American men, it is time to start thinking about what it might be like to live in an increasingly feminist environment.

Or to think about moving. Things are only going to get worse before they get better.

Maybe eventually we can make America great again. You can't stump the Trump.

[deleted] • 1 point • 19 February, 2016 06:03 PM

With the media behind her, there's a good chance that she'll clinch the presidency

I LOL'd so hard at this part.

Scizzler • 1 point • 19 February, 2016 08:39 PM

The world suddenly held its breath over the potential downfall? Of the onion? Lmfao, nah, not a single person did that.

smallkoopatroopa • 1 point • 7 March, 2016 03:30 PM

should be illegal for jewish people to own media

Gbcue • 1 point • 19 February, 2016 05:10 PM

The onion has been long dead due to its anti gun agenda.

PaulMurrayCbr • 1 point • 20 February, 2016 06:43 PM

“Margolis added that Clinton was too much a part of the establishment she spent decades breaking down barriers to enter.”

Would have been funnier if 'Margolis' had mentioned that she used to fuck the president. But that might be a little close to the bone, eh?

99919 • -2 points • 19 February, 2016 05:41 PM

Remember that the landmark *Citizens United* case was about *whether a group of people had the right to make videos mocking Hillary Clinton*. The Supreme Court ruled that they did, and Democrats are treating that decision like it is the undoing of our nation.

Limekill • 2 points • 21 February, 2016 03:40 AM*

No - Citizens United was NOT about a "group of individuals". It was about electioneering campaigning via Non Individuals - i.e. Corporations, Trade Unions, etc. This had been banned, but was found to be unconstitutional. It was brought not because of the videos made (protected by 1st Amendment anyway) but they were funded within the 60 day prohibition window that previously applied to corporations.

The real problem was that Citizens United green-lighted Speechnow.org case (9-0) which held that there was no restriction on contributions to Super-PACs from corporations.

Of course you might not find anything wrong corporate influence in politics, and found it disgusting that there was rules against it in the first place, in which case I guess your claim "*whether a group of people had the right to make videos mocking Hillary Clinton*" is accurate and your not completing misreading the whole case.

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Citizens_United_v._FEC

99919 • 1 point • 21 February, 2016 06:12 PM

It sounds like we disagree on first principles. I'm defining a corporation as a "group of individuals who have agreed to work together towards a common goal, and formed legal entity to do so." If you disagree with that description, we should talk about that first.

Also, you can't prevent rich people and corporations from influencing politics as long as you have carved out an exception for "media corporations." Look at Comcast-NBCUniversal, which is controlled by the billionaire Roberts family, or The New York Times, which is controlled by the billionaire Sulzberger

family, or 21st Century Fox, which is controlled by the billionaire Murdoch family, or the Washington Post, which is controlled by the billionaire Jeff Bezos, or even Viacom, which is controlled by billionaire Summer Redstone. These corporations are completely free to engage in electioneering at any point in the election cycle.

When you see Rachel Maddow, or Thomas Friedman, or Sean Hannity, or George Will, or Jon Stewart (now Trevor Noah) providing explicitly political statements, satire, and opinions in the days before an election, remember that these billionaire-controlled corporations are exercising their First Amendment rights to endorse candidates and political positions, and trying to influence elections. Why shouldn't all corporations (groups of people) have the same right?

Limekill • 1 point • 23 February, 2016 01:00 PM*

While the media does play a role and some support certain candidate, I remember watching a documentary that stated that media was not effect alone in changing votes. As an example - Rupert Murdoch (owner of Fox and newspapers in the UK and Australia) is known to be fiercely political, with his newspapers actively coming out in support of candidates/parties during election time. The documentary looked at polling trends before and after support was announced. Most of the time it found very little correlation. Part of the reason was each party has its core group of supporters and those are the people that consume that kind of media (conservatives read 'the Australian' and the 'Daily Telegraph' which support conservative politics, liberals read the 'Sydney Morning Herald' and the 'Age' which support Green/liberal parties) - They are mostly preaching to the converted already. Another reason is that it usually cancels itself out (NBC v Fox or Sky v BBC); the third reason was that most media came out in support of the most popular candidate anyway (which kind of suggests that the media is trying to get onside with the next winner anyway).

Finally most media have some kind of unbiased reporting in news, etc (think of Bush and FEMA - no amount of support from Fox was going to hide that!) and people are exposed to that. And when there is bias, people (adults) can understand the bias - people know John Stewart is liberal, and Bill O'reilly (or Sean Hannity) is Conservative - its certainly not hidden - I come from another country halfway around the world and I know who these guys are and what their bias is! Look at Trump as an example - he was called ridiculous by both media camps (lib & Cons) and yet he is #1 for the Republicans - If the media really decided on candidates he would of already been dead.

However when Politicians go and visit the Koch Brothers to get \$\$\$ for super pacs then that is more of a cause for concern, especially considering the can actually hide the amount of money donated to each candidate. Bill O'reilly might say "come on my show and I will support you", but that is a lot different than "help me build a gas pipeline and I will give you \$12M for your Super Pac". One is general support of a party, the other is direct buying of candidates. We do not know what is said in those back rooms, we do not know what policies have been bought and sold. A media mogul might do a deal with a politician BUT they are still limited - do you really think Fox will ever support the Democrat Party? They can really only support the Republican party. And it can blow up in their face anyway - look at BSKyB.

Also you talk about "group of individuals" but they are not - the are usually set up by the candidate directly or a campaign manager, fund raiser or trusted individual. They are not 'concerned citizens' setting up a legal entity but its rather highly strategic and targeted to benefit a certain candidate (Not an issue or even a party per se).

The whole point is that influence is exposed and limited where possible. Not allowing corporations OR trade unions to advertise within a 60 day window was about limiting that influence (it was supported by both Democrat (anti Corp) and Republican (anti TU)). And the lack of accountability

and the advent of backroom deals does hurt democracy. The level of it these days is much higher. And because of no restrictions the Koch Brothers' Budget of \$889 million spending goal for 2016 (which is probably more than the either Party itself will spend!) is going to buy it a massive amount of influence.

99919 • 1 point • 23 February, 2016 01:36 PM

The media don't just have a leftward bias, although that is the case for most media outlets in the United States. The far more pervasive, and troubling bias, is the media's bias for the *interesting* and *confrontational*. That's why there is so much free coverage given to Donald Trump (and, earlier, to Barack Obama) -- these candidates are interesting. They make for good ratings. Experienced, quiet, qualified, and competent doesn't sell -- drama and story arc sells.

The media are not saying, "support this issue and we will give you free coverage on TV," they are saying, "be interesting and outrageous, or give us a good *American Idol*-style story arc, and we will give you more free coverage than all the SuperPACs combined." Some minuscule donation of a few hundred million dollars here or there from Soros or the Koch brothers or Bloomberg or whomever is peanuts compared to free time on the *Today* show, or *SNL*, interviews and features on news programs, etc.

each party has its core group of supporters... They are mostly preaching to the converted already. Another reason is that it usually cancels itself out... the third reason was that most media came out in support of the most popular candidate anyway

All of those things are also true for SuperPACs and other forms of political speech by private citizens.

Not allowing corporations OR trade unions to advertise within a 60 day window was about limiting that influence

And yet Comcast can feature a candidate at length on one of its women's programs, or on its boomer comedy programs, etc. at any point during the cycle. Let's say a 30-second commercial on a Comcast program is worth \$250,000. What do you think several minutes of free product placement on that show is worth?

So, back to the core question: *the billionaire family that runs Comcast has formed corporations that broadcast its point of view on political candidates and issues to millions of Americans, anytime it wants. Why do you think that other citizens should be blocked from doing the same?*

Limekill • 1 point • 25 February, 2016 02:37 PM*

The media want views - they want clickbait. And the easiest way to get clickbait is to report on something controversial. The media don't particularly want controversial, they just want something that gets views and can attract more money from advertising. And that is Trump calling mexicans rapists.

All of those things are also true for SuperPACs and other forms of political speech by private citizens.

Actually no. (And stop calling corporations private citizens - they are actually body corporates). Do you think SuperPACs advertise on Fox or CNN to get votes? - they only do to get the core out to vote (or support their candidate in the primaries), but they are not seeking to change their minds, because its independents who decide the elections, and they consume multiple media forms much higher than party supporters - "Various independent respondents

cited eight sources other than the two major television networks" compared to party supporters.

And why? In the 2014 midterms, 92% of Democrats voted for their own party and only 7% voted Republican. In the same election, 94% of Republicans voted Republican while only 5% voted Democratic. So the only people who will change their vote is independents and Superpacs target those voters, having to use a variety of media (billboards, internet, newspaper and TV (the less bias channels)). As you can see this is what makes Superpacs powerful - their ability to target independents.

Now 30 years ago this is what happened: Corporations might want a particular candidate to change their policies. They give that candidate money. This is Disclosed. Suddenly journalists see the records of this money and start asking the candidate questions about it, now if its with 60 days big corporates/TU's could not defend the candidate. Rather the candidate alone had to defend their policies to the electorate. The big corporations or trade unions (or super-pacs) could not jam up the media full of BS (lies) or try and divert attention away from these policies. Rather they had to sit there and endure it - they knew they would be exposed. This actually created a culture where big corporations were reluctant to give money because of how it would be seen.

These days there is no exposure, so no one gives a shit. Now it becomes about attacking the player not the policy (Run attack ads saying: "did you know Republican X voted AGAINST the 2nd Amendment" - when actually it was for high volume magazine clips), actually you can say anything - even if it BS, it won't be exposed as a lie (until after the election), even create disinformation campaigns, etc. Now I am not saying this did not happen before - it did. But it was at a much lower intensity as it was funded by a political party not a guy trying to get a pipeline approved. And there lies the difference - A Political Party trying to win a seat (for a majority) vs a donor trying to get the guy to win a seat to support his own individual issues.

And yet Comcast can feature a candidate at length on one of its women's programs, or on its boomer comedy programs, etc. at any point during the cycle. Let's say a 30-second commercial on a Comcast program is worth \$250,000. What do you think several minutes of free product placement on that show is worth?

I am not sure about the media in the US, but as part of TV licence requirements in other countries there is mandated equal time for both political parties over a certain time period (usually 30 days - which is when most independents actually decide). As for free product placement - well if your the presidential republican candidate on fox news - not much - those people are already going to vote for you. And as for money - you example is incorrect. \$250,000 is for metro, prime time markets (think NY, LA). And usually with prime time spots you get bonus spots (1 Prime time : 3-5 non prime spots), so most of the time the \$250,000 is actually worth much more than \$250,000, it might get you \$1M+ worth of exposure. And with a couple of million spent on a regional network (nobody pays \$250k a spot for regional media), you could actually dominate a market.

So, back to the core question: the billionaire family that runs Comcast has formed corporations that broadcast its point of view on political candidates and issues to millions of Americans, anytime it wants. Why do you think that other citizens should be blocked from doing the same?

Actually it is NOT the core question - the core question is - can non disclosed super pac money influence political candidates more than any traditional media? Yes. And thats why the Koch brothers have not bought TV stations - because a TV channel can really only support a party (and even then their are limits - they don't want to go to far if it alienates one of their big advertisers) - and they might get no traction on a particular issue that the owner has (see Murdoch with BSKyB). As an example in Australia we have a radio station called 2GB which is pro conservative. Now the conservative PM doesn't even bother to go on to that network - because the party already has their support - he does not need to go on. And yet if the conservative media was so powerful then he wouldn't of even been PM:

<http://www.theguardian.com/media/2015/sep/15/a-painful-morning-for-alan-jones-who-told-malcolm-turnbull-hed-never-be-pm>

so the idea is that media is less powerful because they are preaching to the converted. Superpac's power comes in from getting the support of independents - something that biased media has a lot of trouble dong. As such superpacs can be more powerful than Fox to a political candidate. Also because of the ability to hide donations Superpacs can influence candidates more on particular issues than the media can.

verify_account • -2 points • 19 February, 2016 03:24 PM

The onion is terrible humor. You shouldn't read it or associate with people who have such taste.

bobbybouchier • -11 points • 19 February, 2016 04:05 PM

I'd rather Hillary than the bern

blue_27 • 13 points • 19 February, 2016 04:21 PM

ANYONE but Hillary. ... Even Trump.