

3 vs 1

Armando Simón

Just when I think that I cannot possibly hate the media hivemind more, something happens that I realize that I cannot hate the media enough.

Last night's debate between Harris and Biden was just such an occasion. Harris came prepared better than I expected, her poses and her facial expressions well-rehearsed.

But she lied, lied, lied, lied, lied, lied. And, on top of the lies, she brought up old Democratic salivating points that have proven to be more lies (the Charlottesville out-of-context remark, Trump's actions and words during January 6, his bloodbath comment). Most people have moved on from those things, but to Democrats they serve as mental masturbation.

The debate was a 3 vs 1 affair. Moderators Linsey Davis and David Muir did not correct Harris' lies, not even the most blatant ones, but repeatedly quibbled with Trump in what he said.

For example, when Trump mentioned that illegal immigrants in Ohio were eating people's cats and ducks from a pond where people feed them (including protected Canadian geese, a detail not brought up), Muir stated that the city manager had refuted it—a typical tactic of leftists of insisting everyone must ignore the evidence of their eyes and ears, since the residents are insisting the Haitian savages are doing just that, have photographed/videoed them, including a woman on her knees eating a raw cat at night, bringing to mind one of the zombie apocalypse movies. Another time, when Trump pointed out that Democrats want to “abort” a baby come to full term, Davis remarked that it was not true, that it was illegal to do so, then pivoted to Harris (later on, Trump repeated his assertion—which is true in six states). Another one was when

Trump said that crime has skyrocketed, Muir stated that FBI statistics have shown that crime has gone down. However, Trump instantly pivoted and pointed out that in those statistics, large cities had not been included.



If that was not enough, if Trump stated something Harris disagreed with, she was allowed to refute, but when the reverse occurred Trump had to insist—and persist—in being allowed to refute. And even when not allowed, he went ahead to do so above the objections of the moderators.

Harris stated that Trump has only insults to offer, then went on to repeatedly insult him.

Trump became angry a third of the way in and stayed that way

and this went to her advantage. She baited him several times and he took the bait (like size of their respective rallies). He also rambled off several times, as did she but had he stayed focused on target, he could have brought up devastating facts about his record and about hers. Instead, his ego got in the way and, as a result, several golden opportunities slipped through his fingers.

This is not to say that it was a defeat for him. At worst, it was a draw. He repeatedly hammered at her over illegal immigration. And, as for the closing statements, whereas she offered lachrymose generalities, he shot an arrow straight at her, repeating twice that if she wanted to carry out reforms, all she had to do was to go back to the White House and do it, including closing the border, which does not require legislation.



Afterwards, a collection of ABC pundits echoed back and forth how wonderful Harris' performance had been.

This morning, I checked my TikTok account and people—black and white—were absolutely livid over the unfair 3 vs 1 scenario.

Armando Simón is the author of *This That and the Other*.