



Jeff Bezos, Founder of Amazon, Owner of Washington Post, Is Seen As Key Player in 'Deep State'

This is a short course for those who are not sure what the "deep state" is. This commentator shows how unelected power brokers in intelligence agencies and media outlets control the government and engineer public opinion. As one example, Jeff Bezos, the founder of Amazon, who is worth \$89 billion, bought the *Washington Post* (WaPo) even though it was losing money, because it is influential in politics and creates public perception of the news. Amazon signed a data processing and storage contract with the CIA in 2015, and Bezos is close to that agency – perhaps **very** close. WaPo attacks President Trump daily with stories that come from the CIA. Bezos hired several Democrat Party insiders, including John Podesta Hillary's former campaign manager. Put all that together, and you are looking at an example of the deep state. –GEG



Venezuela: Communist Government Orders Bakeries to Sell Bread Only to Its Supporters. Other Citizens Starve

Venezuelans are starving due to collectivist economic policies, and they correctly blame the government. The government does exactly what collectivist government always do in such cases. It punishes its critics and rewards its supporters. Bakeries are ordered to sell bread only to government supporters and let the critics starve. –GEG

Joys of Socialism: Venezuelan Regime Forces Bakeries to Sell Bread ONLY to Supporters

The Socialist Venezuelan government is now ordering bakeries to ONLY sell bread to regime supporters.

This is the Democrat dream for America.

The people are starving under this Marxist regime.

From the Candelaria Assembly–

Carlos Julio Rojas, coordinator of Defense Front of North Caracas, said the order comes from the Government of the Capital District

[Read full article here...](#)



Harvard Study of Coverage of Trump's First 100 Days Shows Extreme Media Bias

A Harvard study on the press coverage of President Trump's first 100 days in office by the *New York Times*, *Wall Street Journal*, *Washington Post*, and the newscasts of CBS, and Fox show that their reports were 80% negative. CNN and NBC were 93% negative. –GEG

How negative was press coverage of President Trump's first 100 days in office? Far more than that of Barack Obama, George W. Bush, or Bill Clinton, according to a [new report](#) from the Harvard Kennedy School's Shorenstein Center on Media, Politics and Public Policy.

The Harvard scholars analyzed the *New York Times*, *Wall Street Journal*, *Washington Post* and the main newscasts (not talk shows) of CBS, CNN, Fox and NBC during Trump's initial time in office. They found, to no one's surprise, that Trump absolutely dominated news coverage in the first 100 days. And then they found that news coverage was solidly negative – 80 percent negative among those outlets studied, versus 20 percent positive.

The numbers for previous presidents: Barack Obama, 41 percent negative, 59 percent positive; George W. Bush, 57 percent

negative, 43 percent positive; and Bill Clinton, 60 percent negative, 40 percent positive.

Accusations of bias aside, it's simply a fact that a number of negative things happened in Trump's opening 100 days. The Russia investigation, for example, was a source of endless criticism from Democrats and other Trump opponents. The travel ban executive order led to intense argument and losses for the administration in the courts. The healthcare debacle created more negative coverage because it was a major screwup and a setback for both Trump and House Republicans.

That said, the coverage of some news organizations was so negative, according to the Harvard study, that it seems hard to argue that the coverage was anywhere near a neutral presentation of facts. Assessing the tone of news coverage, the Harvard researchers found that CNN's Trump coverage was 93 percent negative, and seven percent positive. The researchers found the same numbers for NBC.

Others were slightly less negative. The Harvard team found that CBS coverage was 91 percent negative and 9 percent positive. New York Times coverage was 87 percent negative and 13 percent positive. Washington Post coverage was 83 percent negative and 17 percent positive. Wall Street Journal coverage was 70 percent negative and 30 percent positive. And Fox News coverage also leaned to the negative, but only slightly: 52 percent negative to 48 percent positive.

Ninety-three percent negative – that's a lot by anybody's standards. "CNN and NBC's coverage was the most unrelenting – negative stories about Trump outpaced positive ones by 13-to-1 on the two networks," the study noted. "Trump's coverage during his first 100 days set a new standard for negativity."

[Read full article here...](#)



The Pentagon Buys Fuel Cheap, Resells to Its Own Forces, Uses Profit for Operations It Wants to Hide

The *Washington Post* reports that the Pentagon is recycling a scam from WWII whereby it buys fuel and then resells it to its own armed services at a higher price and uses the profits as a slush fund for questionable purposes. Since 2010, the Pentagon has built up a \$6-billion surplus. –GEG

The Pentagon has reportedly excessively charged its own armed forces for fuel and used the surplus generated to fund Syrian rebels, among other ventures.

A new [investigation by The Washington Post](#) has discovered that the Pentagon is using an old setup dating back to World War II, in which the Pentagon buys fuel centrally and resells it to the armed services, to charge super high prices and use extra revenue for questionable purposes.

The revenue generated is not insubstantial, as the Pentagon is the largest consumer of fuel in the world, purchasing 100 million barrels annually.

Since 2010, the Pentagon has managed to build up a \$6 billion surplus and since 2015 – with permission from Congress – has

pulled funds out of the account to spend \$80 million on training Syrian rebels and \$1.4 billion for random expenses from the war in Afghanistan.

[Sponsored Links by](#)

In particular, the \$80 million for Syrian rebels constituted an effort to save the scandalous Syria Train and Equip Program, which was supposed to produce thousands of trained rebels. Instead, the program [produced a maximum of 150 rebels](#). The extra money didn't work and the program ended.

In the case of Afghanistan, \$1.4 billion was allocated to drones and contractors, in addition to other expenses, because of the Taliban's resurgence

In an interview with The Washington Post, former Secretary of the Navy Ray Mabus said that he and other senior leaders have been complaining about high fuel prices, but noted the backlash from such complaints has been severe.

"We've been complaining about this," [Mabus said](#). "But if we do it too loudly, oh man, they come back on us really hard."

"Another word for it is 'slush fund,'" Mabus added.

[Read full article here...](#)



Geoengineering and 'Chemtrails' Are Described in Mainstream Media As Highly Dangerous But Necessary To Combat Global Warming

Mainstream media is presenting geoengineering and 'chemtrails' as potentially disastrous to the Earth, but that the risk is warranted in order to combat global warming. The *New York Times* said in April that "we are living through a test already," but the full article makes it clear that the 'test' to which it refers is, not that the sky is already being sprayed with chemicals. It refers to the theory that global warming is plunging the world into an future fraught with danger and that doing nothing about it is a 'test' of equal risk to spraying the sky. The intended message of that statement is that, it makes no difference if the sky is sprayed or not. In either case, we already are in a test – so relax and be grateful for chemtrails. That's the party line. The second part of this presentation reviews the dark history of the US government using citizens for chemical testing without their knowledge or consent. [For the record, we believe that geoengineering/ chemtrails have been used in NATO countries for several decades and that the purpose of the current media blitz is to condition the public to accept that without complaint when the authorities get around to admitting what they have been doing all along. For the story **behind** this story, see [Global Warming: An Inconvenient Lie.](#)] –GEG

[Read article here...](#)