



WASHINGTON WATCH
WITH ROLAND MARTIN

TRANSCRIPT

SHOW AIRING NOVEMBER 22, 2009

Host: Roland Martin

Guests: Senator Sherrod Brown (D-OH)

Rep. William Lacy Clay, Jr. (D-MO)

Dr. Melissa Clarke, Medical Director of Active Health Management and
Former Assistant Dean for Medical Education at Howard University
College of Medicine

René Syler, Former Co-Host of CBS' "The Early Show" and Co-Chair of
Komen For The Cure's "Circle of Promise"

Michel Martin, Host of NPR's *Tell Me More*

Amanda Carpenter, "Hot Button" columnist for *The Washington Times*

Joe Madison, Talk Show Host on Sirius/XM Satellite radio

Nia-Malika Henderson, White House Reporter, Politico



TV One - Washington Watch
Producer: Jay Feldman
"Washington Watch," Show 11.20

K. Wills Transcripts

**(SEGMENT 1,
PART 1)**

MR. ROLAND MARTIN: I'm Roland Martin, and this is TV One's "Washington Watch."

At the top of our agenda this week, President Barack Obama's popularity overseas not yet translating into wins for the United States. New cancer screening guidelines for women cause massive confusion and anger among patients, doctors and politicians. Harsh attacks on Attorney General Eric Holder's decision to try 9-11 plotters in New York City, and the Senate's healthcare reform bill is finally up for action.

MR. ROLAND MARTIN: Our "Washington Watch" newsmakers this week: Ohio Democratic senator Sherrod Brown. With our "Washington Watch" panel Michel Martin, host of "Tell Me More" on National Public Radio; Joe Madison, talk show host on Sirius XM satellite radio; and Amanda Carpenter, the "Hot Button" columnist for *The Washington Times*. Plus, Congressman William Lacy Clay, Jr., of Missouri, shares why the 2010 Census is important to us.

And our special guests, Dr. Melissa Clarke, former assistant dean of medical education at Howard University; and René Syler, former co-host of CBS's "The Early Show." They sort out those confusing

breast cancer guidelines. And in our "Obama Watch," Nia-Malika Henderson, of Politico.com, examines the reality of change compared to the expectation of change.

All that and more today on "Washington Watch."

[END OF SEGMENT.]

**(SEGMENT 1,
PART 2)**

MR. MARTIN: All right, folks. Our guest right now, a major player in the United States Senate, big-time news maker. We welcome to "Washington Watch" Ohio senator Sherrod Brown.

How's it goin'?

SEN. SHERROD BROWN: It's goin' well, thanks. Glad to -

MR. MARTIN: All right.

SEN. BROWN: -- be here.

MR. MARTIN: Busy week, of course. Health care, the whole issue of Attorney General Eric Holder and the terror trials. I want to start off first, though, with the President's trip to Asia. A lot of people are highly critical of the trip, saying nothing was really accomplished. It was simply eight days of just great pictures.

But here's what the President, though, said during his speech in Tokyo.

[VIDEO CLIP OF PRESIDENT OBAMA.]

PRES. BARACK OBAMA: So, I want everyone to know, and I want

everybody in *America* to know, that we have a stake in the future of this region, because what happens here has a direct effect on our lives at home. This is where we engage in much of our commerce and buy many of our goods, and this is where we can export more of our own products and create jobs back home in the process.

[END VIDEO CLIP.]

MR. MARTIN: Asia, biggest trading partner in terms of especially China, holder of our debt. Was this a successful trip? And, how do you actually measure it when people are saying, "He did nothing"?

SEN. BROWN: Well, there are - there's a group of people - 30 percent of the country and some percent of the media - that criticize him for crossing the street, so -

MR. MARTIN: [Chuckles.]

SEN. BROWN: -- you - you take that off the table.

I think it was an important first step. I don't know how you judge a success of a trip, and I think it's probably not -

MR. MARTIN: So, is it more -

SEN. BROWN: -- more of a -

MR. MARTIN: -- long-term than -

SEN. BROWN: -- yeah, it's a- --

MR. MARTIN: -- short-term?

SEN. BROWN: -- it's always long-term. And the question is,

"What does the President now do about China currency?" What does the President do about the loss of manufacturing jobs during the Bush years? And we've - we lost - we lost more than 3 million manufacturing jobs in our country, about 10 percent of those in my state of Ohio, and a lot of that in the Bush years was because of trade policy and tax policy. And the President's got to set us off in a new direction.

I think China laid the groundwork to do that, so that we don't keep outsourcing jobs. We're - we're going to - we're going to create all these new manufacturing jobs. This new industry in alternative energy - those jobs - those manufacturing jobs - solar, wind turbines - they have to be in Toledo and Cleveland, not in Shanghai and Beijing.

MR. MARTIN: So, are folks missing that point, that this trip was more about jobs? It seems the White House, when they - when - when they came back, said, "Look. This" - "This is what it was about. It wasn't necessarily about diplomacy; it was about j-o-b-s."

SEN. BROWN: Yeah, it's - it *is* about jobs, and I think everything the President's doing now - including the healthcare debate and the healthcare bill - is about jobs, how to - there - there are - I mean every day, I meet people. They're just some people that I just saw in the studio whose children are in their twe- -- they're not children anymore, I guess. They still are - [chuckles] - to me, but -

MR. MARTIN: They're still children.

SEN. BROWN: -- in their twenties, who just - one just lost a job. The other one's not so sure what happens to his company. So, we're seeing that in so many people with college educations -- and without college educations - and everything the President's doing is about jobs. And more power to him. That's exactly what he needs to do.

MR. MARTIN: But you have this huge fight that - that is going on, especially - you mentioned healthcare. And it seems to really be this - this battle among Democrats, and what I find to be interesting - and I say it purely from a Machiavellian point of view - it was a perfect situation to, in essence, have Democrats fighting one another on its two most important issues: women and the right to choose and the issue of universal healthcare.

SEN. BROWN: Yeah.

MR. MARTIN: And so how do you bridge the gap, to get Democrats to make a decision on this, when you have women who are saying, "We are not going to accept" - "to tolerate these cutbacks," then all of a sudden, people are saying, "Yeah, but we need this healthcare bill"?

SEN. BROWN: Well, the answer to your first question, Roland, is we're not going to compromise on - on women's right to choose. The - this - this is a Democratic administration, Democratic House and -

MR. MARTIN: But it -

SEN. BROWN: -- and Senate.

MR. MARTIN: -- was in - it was in the House, though.

SEN. BROWN: I understand it was in the House, but it's coming out in the Senate. It's not in the Senate version. It's not going to be in the conference report.

MR. MARTIN: So, you -

SEN. BROWN: The President -

MR. MARTIN: -- don't think the President's going to sign a law that has those res- --

SEN. BROWN: The President -

MR. MARTIN: -- Stupak restrictions.

SEN. BROWN: -- the President says, and we won't pass a bill - the Senate will never pass a bill that has those restrictions. In the House, we'll pass a bill without them, I'm convinced.

On healthcare overall, there're only three or four Democrats who are standing in the way, and the President's going to have to weigh in. I mean the President's going to have to make calls and sit down with those four Democrats, and we - we're all working them one-on-one, talking to them, and -

MR. MARTIN: I mean you guys -

SEN. BROWN: -- this is too -

MR. MARTIN: -- [crosstalk]- --

SEN. BROWN: -- important. This is the mo- --

MR. MARTIN: -- you guys -

SEN. BROWN: -- yeah[?], this is the most important thing any of us have done in our professional lives.

MR. MARTIN: -- but you['ve] got Sen. Ben Nelson saying, "I have no problem being a lone Democrat standing in the" -

SEN. BROWN: Yeah, well -

MR. MARTIN: -- "way of this."

SEN. BROWN: -- we'll - we'll s- -- we'll see about that - won't we?

I think that - I mean I - I think, in the end, the President of the United States is going to call on him. I don't think any Democrat, no matter how conservative, wants to stand in the way of history, wants to be on the wrong side of history, wants to look back and say, "You know, on a procedural vote, I killed the most important thing of my career."

In m- -- in my career - I've been in politics for a long time. My vote against the Iraq war and my vote for healthcare are the two most important things I've ever done. Once I vote for it, it comes to the floor. And I think most of us look at it that way, and you don't - you don't want to be on the wrong side of history, no matter what your state. If you have a "D" after your name, you know this is the most important thing you can do for - for people of all incomes, of all races, of all - in all states in this country.

MR. MARTIN: So, you're saying that Stupak amendment passed by the House, when it crosses the President's desk, that is going -

SEN. BROWN: It's not there.

MR. MARTIN: -- to be history.

SEN. BROWN: It's not there.

MR. MARTIN: Okay.

Speaking of history, let's deal with 9-11. Attorney General Eric Holder made the decision they're going to try Khalid Sheikh Mohammed in New York City. Rudy Giuliani, he's out here, complaining, saying, "Oh, this makes no sense," but the first World Trade Center trials were held in New York City, in federal court.

What's the difference? What's the - what's the big deal with having this trial in a U.S. court?

SEN. BROWN: Well, the difference is Rudy Giuliani's talking about Barack Obama instead of George Bush. That's the only difference. I mean - and these guys, they're - they - they're going to attack Obama for *anything*. And somebody like Giuliani's - he's announcing - he apparently is going to announce in the next few days - or, at least he's saying he is, quietly - that he's going to run for the Senate, and he - he wants to keep 9-11 alive. And it's always good to attack a terrorist, and, you know, I th- -- I - this - this trial is the right thing to do. Holder's handling it well. Obama's handling it well. U.S. courts are the - I'm not a lawyer, but U.S. courts are the place to do this, and I - I - more power to 'em.

MR. MARTIN: So, you don't have any concerns that somehow this is

going to open up these individuals to our laws, that - because what I also hear people saying [is], "Look. We are a nation of laws," that this *is* the American way. The crime took place in New York City. The World Trade Centers [sic] were attacked. This person [is] responsible for the crime. That's where it should took [sic] place, versus military tribunals."

SEN. BROWN: And there's p- -- plus, there's precedent to do it, as you pointed out, earlier in the decade. So, yes, of course. And I mean our system of l- -- I - I understand our - our legal system's not been fair to - to large numbers of people in this country over the decades. And I didn't see Rudy Giuliani and his crowd speaking out against that kind of rape - that kind of injustice, if you will.

No. I think this is the right way to do it. I think he'll get a fair trial. I - I'm not going to say - well, I'm pretty clear what will probably happen, probably what *should* happen, but I don't think we prejudge. The President's not prejudging. Let him go in front of the American legal system, and - and justice will be done.

MR. MARTIN: One thing with the issue of jobs from a different perspective. We saw action in the House this week where members of the Congressional Black Caucus held up a bill on financial reform, because they want to see a more specific plan from the President that deals with Black unemployment, that deals with Black teens, Black men. They don't feel as if this White House

is being more aggressive on that.

All right. Should this administration - first of all, it caught them by surprise. Should this administration attack this issue from a - from a targeted spe- -- area in terms of different groups, as opposed to saying, "No. It's sort of" - "sort of a whole deal"? Are different places different in terms of how you attack the issue of jobs?

SEN. BROWN: Sure. I think it's - but it's - it's - it's not - it's not race as much as it is income, as much as it is history of - for instance, the President needs a manu- --

MR. MARTIN: So, more c- - more class -

SEN. BROWN: -- -facturing -

MR. MARTIN: -- as opposed to -

SEN. BROWN: -- yeah, I think it's more class, but I also think it's regional, too. I mean the - in - in my part of the country, Ohio, we have a - a very proud manufacturing history. We're the third-largest manufacturing state in the country. And the - the - the best ticket to the middle class for African-Americans for five - five - five decades has been g- -- good, strong manufacturing jobs. It's -- there used to be, in inner cities and all over my -

MR. MARTIN: Textile -

SEN. BROWN: -- state -

MR. MARTIN: -- plants, manu- -- [crosstalk] -

SEN. BROWN: -- yeah[?] -

MR. MARTIN: -- in terms of car companies -

SEN. BROWN: -- steel, auto - especially in my parts.

MR. MARTIN: -- right.

SEN. BROWN: Steel, auto, chemicals, paper companies - all that, often in the -

MR. MARTIN: They're all gone.

SEN. BROWN: -- often in the inner city. They were the ticket to the middle class for so many. So many - I went to school - I went to school with so many African Americans whose parents were manufacturing - blue-collar, union workers in those - and - and blue w- -- both White and Black, and those kids got to go to college and got to buy a house and got to do all that.

And so the President really needs to specifically do a manufacturing policy, and particularly he needs to do rural development in Appalachia -

MR. MARTIN: Gotcha.

SEN. BROWN: -- both White and Bla- -- Appalachia, Ohio, and - and more rural, Black areas in the South. I mean those - that kinda targeting is what makes sense.

So, what the - what the CBC did - the Black Caucus did - more power to 'em.

MR. MARTIN: All right. Senator, we certainly appreciate it.

SEN. BROWN: Thanks -

MR. MARTIN: Look forward -

SEN. BROWN: -- [crosstalk] - to see you.

MR. MARTIN: -- to having you back.

[THE TWO SHAKE HANDS.]

SEN. BROWN: I'll do it.

MR. MARTIN: Thanks a bunch.

SEN. BROWN: Thanks.

MR. MARTIN: Folks, a cancer screening recommendation for women sets off confusion and fear - *major* firestorm. Still to come on "Washington Watch," a doctor and a breast cancer advocate share their advice on how you should proceed in light of this new information.

[END OF SEGMENT.]

**(SEG-
MENT 2)**

MR. MARTIN: Folks, joining me now, Dr. Melissa Clarke, a medical director of Active Health Management, a company based here in D.C. with offices all around the country, but she's here in D.C. Also joining us is René Syler, breast cancer advocate and a long-time journalist.

Certainly want to welcome both of you to "Washington Watch."

DR. MELISSA CLARKE: Thank you.

MR. MARTIN: Doctor, I want to s- --

MS. RÉNÉ SYLER: Thank you.

MR. MARTIN: -- I want to start with you first. This week, lots of controversy -

DR. CLARKE: Absolutely.

MR. MARTIN: -- with the U.S. Preventative Services Taskforce, this taskforce, a group of government - appointed by the government, a group of experts - doctors, if you will. Now, for so long, we've heard women should get mammograms beginning at the age of 40. All of a sudden, they change it and say, "No. It should be the age of 50." Explain what in the world happened. Why did they make this decision - this recommendation?

DR. CLARKE: Absolutely. Well, what they did was they took evidence that's from seven, large studies, and they examined that evidence to see - to try to answer this question, which is actually really been controversial for a while, "When should mammography screening start."

And their recommendation was that it should now start at age 50, and it should be every other year. But one thing that's really important to know is that there's a level of recommendation, like a strength behind the recommendation, level A, B, C, D and I. "I" means "insufficient evidence." "A" means, and "B" means, "We really strongly recommend this. Do it," you know, "unreservedly." Level C means, "Do it, but not necessarily routinely," and that's exactly what this recommendation -

MR. MARTIN: Well, but -

DR. CLARKE: -- was.

MR. MARTIN: -- le- -- le- -- let's just be honest, though. The average person out there, they're not sitting here thinking about an A, B, or C. We're ver- -- folks are very clear. That is, do

you get a mammogram beginning at the age of 40, or do you not get it?

DR. CLARKE: Right. You're exactly right, and that's why a number of large professional organizations - American Cancer Society, the National Medical Association, the American College of Radiology - have come out and said unequivocally, "Let's keep doing what we're doing" -- mammograms - age 40, one to two years apart.

MR. MARTIN: René, of course you were one of the anchors of "The Early Show," long-time journalist, but you're also a major breast cancer advocate. It has affected - frankly, this whole issue affected you and your family. Your reaction when you heard this, and how have you responded? How has the breast cancer community responded to this recommendation?

MS. MICHEL MARTIN: Well, you know, I'm probably more passionate, because, as - as you said, I'm an advocate. I'm not looking at the hard science as much as I'm looking at how this is gonna confuse women. I think, Roland, you hit the nail on the head just a moment ago when you said, "Do you, or do you not, get a mammogram?" because that's what the American public needs to know. They need to know, "What does this recommendation mean for me?" For years and years and years, we told women, "Okay, mammograms, though not perfect, are the best tool we have to fight breast cancer. And so ha-" - "having said that, you should start your screening at 40."

But now we've come out with these new recommendations. Now, keep in mind these new recommendations - the issues that I have with them are this: for women of average risk - that means no family history; you don't have the breast cancer gene - they are saying between 40 and 49, that you should forgo your screening, and that - that should start at 50, and then every other year. All right. That's women of average risk.

But for women with a family history, or who have the BRACA gene, the genetic link, they're saying that, you know, "You're" - "You're not part of this group." But the issue is the majority of breast cancer - the majority of breast cancer cases come from women who do not have a family history, that come right outta the blue. My mother, who had breast cancer, there was no history of breast cancer in our family before her. My *father* had breast cancer. There was no history of breast cancer in his family.

So, you see, the issue I have with this is there are women who will fall between the cracks, that women will die from this screen [sic] - that women are confused about these new screening guidelines. And, to me, that is unforgivable.

MR. MARTIN: Dr. Clarke, one of the - one of the issues raised by this taskforce had to do with false positives, and they sort of factored that into their decision. Explain that and why that - as best you can - made a difference in their determination to say go from 40 to 50.

DR. CLARKE: Yeah. When you're looking at the age group of women

age 40 to 49, breast cancer screening is thought to be a little bit less effective because of this issue of false positives, meaning that it says - the test says, "There's a high chance of breast cancer here," but further testing turns out, "No. Actually, there's no breast cancer here."

And so, therefore, it's thought that in - as you get older, that false positive rate goes down -

MR. MARTIN: And they -

DR. CLARKE: -- so -

MR. MARTIN: -- were saying, then, what? Something like 1 in 1800 or 1900 actually get breast cancer because of these false positives?

DR. CLARKE: No. Actually, what that statistic is is how many women have to be screened -

MR. MARTIN: Gotcha.

DR. CLARKE: -- in order to find one woman who has breast cancer.

MR. MARTIN: Gotcha.

DR. CLARKE: So, at -

MR. MARTIN: Okay.

DR. CLARKE: -- age 40 to 49, it's 1900. Age 50 to 59, it's 1300, roughly.

MR. MARTIN: René, this is a - a huge issue for Black women, because Black women are less likely than White women to get breast - cancer, but will - but - but when detected, far more die.

MS. SYLER: Right. It's the - the mortality is higher in - in - in communities of color. And that's, I guess, the issue that - again, that I have with this - is that, you know, we don't need to convolute this issue any more. We don't need to give people a reason not to be advocates for their own healthcare. We don't need - or, to abdicate the responsibility.

You know, the other thing on these recommendations which I thought was *completely* just mind-boggling was when they said, "Don't" - "Doctor, don't teach your" - "your patients breast self-exam anymore." In other words, for years we were telling women, "In" -

MR. MARTIN: Right. I -

MS. SYLER: -- "the" -

MR. MARTIN: -- mean tha- -- I mean tha- --

MS. SYLER: -- "shower" -

MR. MARTIN: -- that's confusing. [Chuckles.]

A: -- "In the shower, feel your breasts. Know what your breasts feel like. Know what they're supposed to look like."

Why would you, as a clinician, say, "Don't know your body?" Honestly, that - I don't - I don't get that at all. So, I have - I'm - I'm troubled by that.

And back to Dr. Clarke's analysis -

MR. MARTIN: Right.

MS. SYLER: -- of the numbers, which makes *complete* sense when you look at hard and fast numbers.

MR. MARTIN: 'Bout 15

MS. SYLER: Nineteen hun- --

MR. MARTIN: -- seconds.

MS. SYLER: -- -dred - but - but when you are the one person who has a breast cancer that was caught early -

MR. MARTIN: Right.

MS. SYLER: -- that - that's pretty doggone important.

MR. MARTIN: Doc, again, thi- -- this is throwing confusion in, but S- -- but the secretary of Health and Human Services, Kathleen Sebelius, she said, "Look. Stick with the 40. This is only a recommendation. We're saying, 'Move forward with the 40.'" "

DR. CLARKE: Absolutely. And I think the take-home point here is women need to stay empowered. Sit down, talk with your doctor. Know the risk factors. Know those risk factors that you can lessen, like overweight -

MR. MARTIN: Right.

DR. CLARKE: -- obesity, lack of exercise.

MS. SYLER: Absolutely.

DR. CLARKE: Know those things. Make informed decisions with your doctor.

MR. MARTIN: Now, one thing. We're gonna be watching out for to make sure these health insurance companies continue to pay for these mammograms, and they don't use this particular taskforce as a reason not to pay for them.

Dr. Clarke, René Syler, we certainly appreciate it. Thanks a bunch.

MS. SYLER: Thank you, Roland.

DR. CLARKE: Thank you, Roland.

MR. MARTIN: All right, folks. This discussion is far from over.

Check out what others in the medical community are saying about the new recommendations on NewsOne.com.

A lackluster presidential visit to Asia, plus the politics of 9-11 seem never to go away. We'll get into it with our "Washington Watch" panel: Michel Martin, the host of "Tell Me More" on National Public Radio; Joe Madison, talk show host on Sirius XM satellite radio; and Amanda Carpenter, the "Hot Button" columnist for *The Washington Times*.

[END OF SEGMENT.]

**(SEG-
MENT 3)**

MR. MARTIN: All right, folks. All newbies this week joining on the "Washington Watch" panel. Welcome Michel Martin, the host of "Tell Me More" on National Public Radio. Or, should we say - [softens and modulates his voice] - "Michel Martin, National Public Radio" - [chuckles] - Joe Madison, radio talk show host on Sirius XM satellite radio; and Amanda Carpenter, the "Hot Button" columnist for *The Washington Times*.

All right, folks. Welcome.

MR. JOE MADISON: Thank you.

MS. AMANDA CARPENTER: Thank you.

MR. MARTIN: All right. Glad -

MS. MICHEL MARTIN: Thank you.

MR. MARTIN: -- to see you. Let's get right to it. Khalid Sheikh Mohammad - all this drama over having a terror trial in New York City. Is th- -- is it that big of [sic] a deal that somehow they're going to attack us even more because of this trial? What - what do you make of all the drama over the decision by Attorney General Eric Holder?

MS. MARTIN: Well - Joe -

MR. MADISON: Go first.

MS. MARTIN: -- well, I mean -

MR. MADISON: Ladies -

MS. MARTIN: -- one of things -

MR. MADISON: -- first.

MS. MARTIN: -- [crosstalk] - well, thank you -

MR. MADISON: You're -

MS. MARTIN: -- Joe.

MR. MADISON: -- welcome.

MS. MARTIN: -- one of the things that - that puzzles me about this is we're al- -- we are already incarcerating people from the drug cartels who have done some amazing and grotesque -

MR. MARTIN: They're also -

MS. MARTIN: -- things -

MR. MARTIN: -- terrorists.

MS. MARTIN: -- and some - they - well, okay, you can call them whatever. It, uh, sort of - once you start killing kids, I don't really care what you are; but, you know, you're just - you are whatever you are. But we're already trying these people. We're incarcerating these people, and we don't seem to have a problem with it - who speak, you know, a - a language widely spoken in the United States, far more than these folks do, and have social networks in this country.

So, I guess part of it is because it puzzles me why we're so convinced that we cannot adequately sort of detain and house these people.

But the other thing about this that puzzles me is that it seems to me that President Obama and Attorney General Holder have already convicted these people publicly. So, that - I mean they've already said, "We're going to convict these people," "We're going to impose the death penalty." So, if that be the case, why are we having a trial?

MR. MARTIN: Now, Amanda, we saw at the first World Trade Center attack they were tried *in New York City*.

MS. CARPENTER: Um-hum.

MR. MARTIN: They were convicted, sent to a super max prison. So, what is the difference between those terrorists and Khalid Sheikh Mohammad? What's the difference?

MS. CARPENTER: Well, the worry is is [sic] that those terror trials, when they went through - this is - I mean a lot of the

problems people have with this is it seems somewhat like a legal experiment. And that's because when they go through a federal court, the defense is able to obtain intelligence from the prosecution, because they have a right to know what's being used against them. And in that case, classified information came out, and people who have ties to terrorists did obtain it.

And that's the worry again in this scenario.

MR. MARTIN: But was that the same concern with the first World Trade Center attack? Again, those -

MS. CARPENTER: Well, I don't -

MR. MARTIN: -- were -

MS. CARPENTER: -- think people knew what was going to happen.

This is a lesson that we learned from that trial, and so I think that's contributing to - I mean this isn't a thing "Can we detain them safely, or not?" It's, "Is this the right way to handle enemy combatants who are being tried for terrorist crimes?"

MR. MARTIN: But, Joe, we're seeing so much drama over this. We saw 9-11 parents say- - families saying, "Hey, this is going to reopen the wounds." But this was the scene of the crime. This is where it took place. If this is the person being held accountable, why not try him?

MR. MADISON: *Absolutely.* First of all, let me - let me point out a- -- a- -- at least the government is the prosecutor in this. There's not a prosecutor that I've ever interviewed, or talked to, or seen on TV who *hasn't* said, if they *do* speak

publicly, "We're gonna get a conviction." "We're gonna get a conviction, and we're gonna fry 'em." That's what prosecutors -

MR. MARTIN: I hear -

MR. MADISON: - do.

MR. MARTIN: -- it all the time in Texas, where I'm from, so, you know -

MR. MADISON: *Particularly* in your -

MR. MARTIN: [Laughs.

MR. MADISON: -- state.

MS. MARTIN: But in the civilian system, there *is* supposed to be a presumption of innocence until proven -

MR. MADISON: There -

MS. MARTIN: -- guilty by -

MR. MADISON: -- there *is* -

MS. MARTIN: -- a court of law -

MR. MADISON: -- unless -

MS. MARTIN: -- so -

MR. MADISON: -- you're a prosecutor.

MS. MARTIN: -- the President is not a prosecutor.

MR. MARTIN: The President represents the *government*. The *government* is prosecuting these people. So, he is a representative of the government.

Number two, New York City has always, will always be on terrorists' lists. It - no if[s] ands -

MR. MARTIN: To- --

MR. MARTIN: -- buts about it.

MR. MARTIN: -- number one -

MR. MADISON: And if -

MR. MARTIN: -- top of the list.

MR. MADISON: -- there's any state, any city that can handle it, it is certainly this city.

I think what it really gets down to is just mere politics, because what I'm hearing people on the right say is, "I don't trust Eric Holder." And that's what's really going down here.

MR. MARTIN: I'm trying to -

MR. MADISON: It's just sheer -

MR. MARTIN: -- I'm - I'm -

MR. MADISON: -- politics -

MS. MARTIN: Yeah -

MR. MARTIN: -- well, I'm to figure out -

MR. MADISON: -- as it relates to -

MR. MARTIN: -- Rudy Giuliani. I'm tryin' to figure him out, because he says, quote, "I" - "I think this is a very dangerous decision and an irresponsible one, and one that's absolutely unnecessary."

MR. MADISON: It wasn't irresponsible when he was a -

MR. MARTIN: And this was -

MR. MADISON: -- prosecutor.

MR. MARTIN: -- quote he said about the *first* World Trade Center attack. "This demonstrates that New Yorkers won't meet violence

with violence, but with a far greater weapon, the law... It should show that our legal system is the most mature legal system in the history of the world, that it works well..."

MR. MARTIN: It's the same situation.

MS. CARPENTER: Well, Rudy -

MR. MARTIN: I - I don't get -

MS. CARPENTER: -- Giuliani -

MR. MARTIN: -- the -

MS. CARPENTER: -- has been on both sides of this issue, as you've just laid out, but -

MR. MARTIN: So, he's flip-flopping and dancing all around.

MS. CARPENTER: -- well, I think he's just been on both sides of it. Maybe --

MR. MARTIN: Which is -

MS. CARPENTER: -- when he -

MR. MARTIN: -- a flip- --

MS. CARPENTER: -- came -

MR. MARTIN: -- -flop.

MS. CARPENTER: -- out - yeah, sure.

MR. MARTIN: Okay.

[CHUCKLING.]

MR. MARTIN: Just wanna make sure it means the same thing!

[Chuckles.]

MR. MADISON: [Chuckles.]

MS. CARPENTER: But, you know, I - I don't - I really don't think

that position to this is because people don't like Eric Holder. It is a legal question about whether we should award constitutional rights to people who commit acts of terror on our country.

MS. MARTIN: I also think it is an emotional and psychological question, which is that 9-11 changed a lot of people. If you talk to a lot of people in the Bush administration, they will say they had a very different worldview before 9-11. More was known about the extent of the al-Qaeda network after than before. You could argue whether we should've known, or whether it was - it was there to be known, but I think 9-11 had a profound effect on people's thoughts about these terror networks, how they operate.

There're - still, the other side will argue - Roland, those who are saying we're still fighting the last war, because the leadership - it is not a top-down organization anymore.

MR. MARTIN: Right.

MS. MARTIN: It has dispersed. The - the so-called "terror network" is not what we think it is, that that's old news, and we should be sort of preparing ourselves for the next news, which is that these are decentralized entities which are operating under their own command, and that Khalid Sheikh Mohammed is not the relevant player anymore. There is no one, central player. So, there is that argument as well.

But I do think that we can't discount the traumatizing effect that 9-11 had had, both on our decision makers and on the

public, and I do think that the 9-11 surviving families - you know, their feelings ought to be considered -

MR. MARTIN: But -

MS. MARTIN: -- it can't be - it can't be dispositive.

MR. MARTIN: -- but here's what's interesting and part of that.

There are different feelings, and there're so many different families. Some say, "Try 'em," some say, "Don't," so, there's no real one - one train of thought -

MR. MADISON: Look, I think -

MR. MARTIN: -- on this issue.

MS. MARTIN: I think - [crosstalk] -

MR. MADISON: -- the fear -

MR. MARTIN: Final comments and -

MR. MADISON: -- well, the -

MR. MARTIN: -- we move on -

MR. MADISON: -- fear -

MR. MARTIN: -- to the next topic.

MR. MADISON: -- is - I think the fear is, on some people's part, is that they think there's going to be an O.J. moment here. And what I mean by that is that he might get off in a civilian trial.

Well, again, Eric Holder has said, "Even if he *is* found innocent" - which they don't think he will be - "we'll arrest him immediately, because we've" -

MR. MARTIN: [Crosstalk]- --

MR. MADISON: -- "got other cases against him."

I cannot imagine that in New York City -

MR. MARTIN: -- right.

MR. MADISON: -- there will be a jury or a judge that will, one,
d- -- allow state secrets -

MR. MARTIN: Right.

MR. MADISON: -- to be exposed; and, two -

MS. MARTIN: That's -

MR. MADISON: -- a jury that will let this guy walk outta there.

MR. MARTIN: I wanna deal with the issue of the President going
to Asia. Here was the headline in *USA Today*: "OBAMA GOES TO
CHINA, BRINGS BACK A T-SHIRT." The -

MS. MARTIN: [Chuckles.]

MR. MARTIN: -- President is -

MR. MADISON: Made in China.

MR. MARTIN: -- getting ri- -- I mean -

MR. MADISON: Right?

MR. MARTIN: -- [chuckles] -

MR. MADISON: [Chuckles.]

MS. CARPENTER: [Chuckles.]

MR. MARTIN: -- the President's getting ripped left and right.
Folks are saying this trip accomplished nothing.

Your assessment of the trip to Asia - Amanda?

MS. CARPENTER: Well, I think the number - the top two issues
right now are jobs and the e- -- jobs and healthcare, and he was
gone for a few days. And I think people are disappointed in that

-

MR. MARTIN: So, but -

MS. CARPENTER: -- and the -

MR. MARTIN: -- [crosstalk] -

MS. CARPENTER: -- biggest news -

MR. MARTIN: -- the cam- --

MS. CARPENTER: -- story -

MR. MARTIN: -- -paign.

MS. CARPENTER: --- was also -

MR. MARTIN: A president can do more than one thing at one time.

MS. CARPENTER: Oh, sure. I agree, but the biggest news story was he got a t-shirt, and he bowed too deeply. And I don't think any of those -

MR. MARTIN: Which -

MS. CARPENTER: -- helped him.

MR. MARTIN: -- and - the bow -

MS. CARPENTER: I know. I -

MR. MARTIN: -- thing was stupid.

MS. CARPENTER: -- I agree it's -

MR. MARTIN: That was just -

MS. CARPENTER: -- a non- --

MR. MARTIN: -- stupid. That was -

MS. CARPENTER: -- -story.

MR. MARTIN: -- just -

MS. CARPENTER: But -

MR. MARTIN: -- stupid.

MS. CARPENTER: -- that's what dominated the media on the trip.

MR. MARTIN: Now, Joe, he did not get China.

MR. MADISON: I bowed when I came in here, to *these* two women -

MR. MARTIN: [Laughs.]

MR. MADISON: -- deep as I *could* -

MS. CARPENTER: Very respectful, too.

MR. MADISON: -- possibly.

MS. CARPENTER: Thank you.

MR. MADISON: Oh, okay. And I -

MR. MARTIN: [Giggles.]

MR. MADISON: -- think that's what the President -

MS. MARTIN: And we *deserve* it.

MR. MADISON: -- was doing -

MS. MARTIN: We *deserve* it.

MR. MADISON: -- was bowing in respect. I mean this bowing too deeply - *give me a break!* And then when he was at the other meeting of the Big Eight, or what they're called, he shook hands. He gave a brotha shake. He did the bump with Michelle. *Cut it loose, you guys,* and find some public policy issues to discuss!

You *weren't* going to accomplish anything with a country that owns damned near every Treasury bond -

MR. MARTIN: [Chuckles.]

MR. MADISON: -- that you've *issued!*

MR. MARTIN: Now, one of the -

MS. MARTIN: [Crosstalk] -

MR. MARTIN: -- issues that the - [crosstalk]- --

MS. MARTIN: -- China owns 22 percent -

MR. MARTIN: I mea- -- I s- -- I think I'm *talking* China.

MS. MARTIN: -- 22 perc- -- China owns 22 percent of all foreign-held U.S. Treasury securities -

MR. MADISON: Yeah?

MS. MARTIN: -- and - but most -

MR. MADISON: And the rest -

MS. MARTIN: -- of those -

MR. MADISON: -- is spread out -

MS. MARTIN: -- are old.

MR. MADISON: -- among everybody else.

MS. MARTIN: Us. *We* own them.

MR. MADISON: [Crosstalk].

MS. MARTIN: Most of it's held domestically, so let's not get -

MR. MARTIN: -- but - but -

MS. MARTIN: -- conf- --

MR. MARTIN: -- but here's what's the issue in terms - in terms of with China. One of the biggest issues [is] he did not get China to agree to was tougher sanctions against Iran.

So, Michel, from your standpoint, what did this trip accomplish? The White House is -

MS. MARTIN: Well -

MR. MARTIN: -- saying, "Well, long term - it's going to benefit

us long term," but it seems that every time there's a foreign trip, the -the answer is, "Well, this is going to help us in the long run." Is there *anything* -

MS. MARTIN: -- but, you know -

MR. MARTIN: -- that helped in the short term?

MS. MARTIN: -- I'm *puzzled* by this, because, on the one hand, people decry that sort of long-term change -

MR. MARTIN: Um-hum.

MS. MARTIN: -- the tone, "investment in future relationships" approach; and, yet, when the man won the Nobel Peace Prize, people said, "Well, he hasn't done anything!" "He hasn't done anything yet!" And then they say, "Well, you've won the Nobel Peace Prize for changing the tone of relations with" -

MR. MARTIN: Um-hum.

MS. MARTIN: -- "our international partners."

China is terribly important to U.S. initiatives right now. The c- -- the, uh - the United States cannot affect North Korea on its own. That's been made clear. The Bush administration tried a different approach. They tried the "axis of evil" approach for eight years and found at the end of the administration it was not productive in seeking w- -- you know, our foreign policy objectives. So -

MR. MARTIN: And -

MS. MARTIN: -- they changed the tone.

MR. MARTIN: -- and D- -- and David -

MS. MARTIN: They didn't--

MR. MARTIN: -- had[?] --

MS. MARTIN: -- have time to sort of carry it out.

MR. MARTIN: -- and David Axelrod -

MS. MARTIN: China is a -

MR. MARTIN: -- even said that[?].

MS. MARTIN: -- major player - China is a major player in Africa.

China's a major player in Tibet. China is a major -- so - so -

so, in part, trying to forge a new relationship with China, so

that China can be a more effective partner on the international

stage in accordance with U.S. objectives and values - I - I - you

know, I guess I - I guess what I'm saying is I think that there's

such a thing as soft power, and there's such a thing as hard

power. And part of it is we have an ideological divide over

whether soft power has any value, and I think that's partly what

this - this trip was about.

MR. MARTIN: So, the comment -

MS. MARTIN: Amanda's right, though. There're a lot of people

who thought he shouldn't have gone, to begin with. I don't see

how you can do that -

MR. MARTIN: -- s- --

MS. MARTIN: -- in the current environment.

MR. MARTIN: -- so, the comment from David Axelrod, you think, is

on the money when he said, "We didn't come halfway across the

world for ticker tape parades. We came here to lay a foundation

for progress. We've done that, so we believe it was a successful trip" That it - that this administration should be saying, "Hey, as we're building relationships" - or, "rebuilding them, that benefits us, maybe not now, but a year, two, three years down" -

MS. MARTIN: See, that's -

MR. MARTIN: -- "the road"?

MS. MARTIN: -- why I'm glad they invented clichés in journalism. "Only time will tell, Roland."

MR. MARTIN: [Laughs.]

MS. MARTIN: "Only time will tell." But that's wha- -- that's what long-term investments are. You cannot de- -- necessarily determine the value of it in - it is true that it is customary to come home with some sort of -

MR. MARTIN: Right.

MS. MARTIN: -- pre-negotiated, precooked outcome, so that both parties can claim victory. They don't seem to have done that in this case. I'm curious as to why not -

MR. MARTIN: I got less than -

MS. MARTIN: -- but -

MR. MARTIN: -- a minute. What do you think of the Congressional Black Caucus this week telling the White House where to stick this financial reform deal? They said, "Look."

MS. MARTIN: [Chuckles.]

MR. MARTIN: "You haven't done enough when it comes to Black unemployment. We want to see a specific plan."

[The] White House is not happy that they scuttled this - this bill for the short term.

MR. MADISON: We- -- [the] Congressional Black Caucus, I think, is - is saying to the Obama administration what a lot of us have been saying, and that is all boats don't rise equally. And this - this administration is so dead set on suggesting that we're in this post civil right era, this "post-racial" era.

MR. MARTIN: Right.

MR. MADISON: *We are not!* And when you look at Black unemployment and unemployment, in general -

MR. MARTIN: Right.

MR. MADISON: -- you're going to have a wh- -- the - the issue is going to be jobs.

MS. MARTIN: But why was that the target? I have a hard time understanding why legislation to protect consumers in the marketplace and to make a more level playing field for investors was the right target for the caucus.

MR. MADISON: Oh, I just think -

MS. MARTIN: Help me -

MR. MADISON: -- it was -

MS. MARTIN: -- with -

MR. MADISON: -- I d- --

MS. MARTIN: -- that.

MR. MADISON: -- no, I don't know if it was -

MR. MARTIN: I - I -

MR. MADISON: -- [crosstalk]- --

MR. MARTIN: -- I think it was a shot across the bow.

MR. MADISON: -- it - that's -

MR. MARTIN: I think - [crosstalk] -

MR. MADISON: -- right. That's what -

MR. MARTIN: -- [crosstalk] -

MR. MADISON: -- I'm saying.

MR. MARTIN: "This is a deal that you want."

MR. MADISON: Right.

MR. MARTIN: Okay? And I think -

MS. MARTIN: But, presumably -

MR. MARTIN: -- I th- --

MS. MARTIN: -- that's a bill that their constituents would -

MR. MARTIN: -- oh, no, no, no.

MS. MARTIN: -- want.

MR. MARTIN: No, no. But I think, Amanda - I think the CBC did what the blue dogs did when it came to the healthcare bill.

MR. MADISON: That's right.

MR. MARTIN: They said, "We have 42 votes."

MS. MARTIN: Um-hum?

MR. MARTIN: On that committee, they had ten votes.

MR. MADISON: That's right.

MR. MARTIN: And they said, "Our ten votes can shut this thing down." And it did. It was a word to the White House, saying, "If you" - "You need to deal with us a lot more than the way

you've been dealing. Let's get your attention.

And I think it *did* get their attention.

MS. CARPENTER: Sure. Yeah, they have every right to scream. I might disagree with the approach, but there has to be a focus on jobs, and I think they were a - a force in getting the White House to sort of acknowledge that. And, you know, there was other press conferences with the Democratic leadership, saying, "We're about jobs now."

I mean I don't care how they do it.

MR. MADISON: That's right.

MS. CARPENTER: You've got to get people

MR. MADISON: Because the -

MS. CARPENTER: -- jobs.

MR. MADISON: -- campaign for 2010 has started now.

MS. CARPENTER: Yes.

MR. MARTIN: Great point.

Folks, we're out of time. We certainly appreciate it, though. Michel, Joe, Amanda, thanks a bunch. We'll have you back.

MR. MADISON: Thank you.

MR. MARTIN: All right! Folks, you want to join our discussion?

Log on to TVOneOnline.com and leave your comments, and don't forget to tell us your name and where you live - or, at least where you *fake* like you're livin', or somethin' like that.

[CHUCKLING.]

MR. MARTIN: Still to come on "Washington Watch," President Obama learns leading the country isn't the same as leading a campaign.

Nia-Malika Henderson explains in the "Obama Watch." But up next, we'll have the real reasons why you need to be counted in the 2010 Census.

**(SEG-
MENT 4)**

MR. MARTIN: All right, folks. I'm joined now by Congressman William Lacy Clay, Jr., a Democrat from Missouri.

Congressman Clay, welcome to "Washington Watch."

REP. WILLIAM CLAY: Thank you for having me on the show.

MR. MARTIN: All right. We were talking about [the] Census, but I want to deal with another issue that's been hot this week. You're a member of the House Financial Services Committee. Now, the Congressional Black Caucus had some issues this week with the financial reform bill and, frankly, held that bill up. Explain what happened and what ticked the CBC off. And, trust me, the White House also is not happy with what you guys did this week.

REP. CLAY: Well - and we know that this is one of the administration's priorities, the reform of - of Wall Street and the - and the financial regulatory system.

MR. MARTIN: Right.

REP. CLAY: And so we - we don't have any problem with the bill.

What the issue is is that we have some systemic risks that impact the African-American community in a way like - like no

other community is - is impacted: unemployment at 15+ percent.
Middle-class and lower-income constituents -

MR. MARTIN: So - so -

REP. CLAY: -- are really --

MR. MARTIN: -- what are you -

REP. CLAY: -- suffering.

MR. MARTIN: -- so, what are you demanding of the White House?
Are you demanding that a more robust action plan be put in place
to deal with unemployment for African-Ameri- --

REP. CLAY: That there -

MR. MARTIN: -- -cans? What are you asking for?

REP. CLAY: -- that there be a targeted effort from this
administration to address the economic woes of our community.

MR. MARTIN: So, there're ten CBC members on the committee, and
so you guys do- -- don't believe that that plan actually exists.

REP. CLAY: Well, we - we have given them the opportunity to
address it. We think that - that - that they will over the next
week to ten days come up with some solid solutions to - to change
our economic situation in our community.

MR. MARTIN: [The] CBC has been strong supporters of this
president since he came into office in January, yet with this
particular issue we also saw Congressman John Conyers this week
have some tough comments for the President as well. This is what
he told - I believe it was Politico.com. He felt that the
President was bowing down to the right when it came to the issue

of healthcare, and that congressional progressives always -
quoting - quote, "Have to save his can."

What do you make of his comments in terms of being that
critical of the President when it comes to healthcare and his
dealing with the Republicans and the right on some of these
issues?

REP. CLAY: Well, John Conyers has been here for 45+ years, and
he has never bitten his tongue to anyone, or about any issue.

But getting back to the economic woe[s], we want our - our
issues addressed also. And - and - and we -

MR. MARTIN: In a spe- --

REP. CLAY: -- have heard --

MR. MARTIN: -- -cific in a specific, targeted way.

REP. CLAY: -- we have heard from our constituents how they are
suffering, how - how 50 percent of African American teens have
stopped looking, or are unemployed at this - at this time.

MR. MARTIN: Right.

REP. CLAY: And we need to have a concerted effort to rebuild our
- our inner city and to put people to work.

MR. MARTIN: Another big issue that the CBC and you are
intimately involved with [is] the U.S. Census.

REP. CLAY: Yeah.

MR. MARTIN: I recall when the President was looking at Senator
Judd Gregg to be the head of the Commerce Department,
Congresswoman Barbara Lee sent a very tough letter, saying, "I'm

sorry. This person is not fully supportive of our efforts with the Census."

This whole issue of the undercount - what is being done to ensure that minorities are being adequately counted in the U.S. Census, and how are you pushing to make sure it happens?

REP. CLAY: Well, this year, as the chairman of the Census Subcommittee, that has oversight over this \$14 billion undertaking that is required constitutionally since 1790, I - I want to ensure that - that we do the best job possible of counting every American. In 2000, we missed 3 million Americans, and most of them were either Hispanic or African-American.

MR. MARTIN: And some folks would say, "Okay, fine. Three million" - uh, "Three hundred-plus million - no big deal." But the reality is, from your standpoint, that the Census is directly tied to resources, tied to dollars. And so when we talk about unemployment and other kind[s] of social services, the Census correlates directly with that.

REP. CLAY: That is true. The - the Census is tied to - to \$400 billion annually that the federal government allocates to communities.

MR. MARTIN: Plus, political representation in -

REP. CLAY: It's about -

MR. MARTIN: -- sitting[?] districts, as well.

REP. CLAY: -- it's about money, power and information. That's what the Census is about. The money is \$400 billion. The power

is the political reapportionment, how we - we um, uh -

MR. MARTIN: Some states might -

REP. CLAY: -- come up -

MR. MARTIN: -- gain congressional -

REP. CLAY: -- with - with -

MR. MARTIN: -- seats. Some -

REP. CLAY: -- congressional -

MR. MARTIN: -- might lose.

REP. CLAY: -- districts to - from state legislative districts to school board districts. And -and that's what the Census is about - as well as how businesses -

MR. MARTIN: Um-hum.

REP. CLAY: -- determine where to locate a business based on a - on a census. And if - if - if we don't respond to the Census, if we don't mail back our questionnaire, then for each individual that doesn't answer that form, that costs his community - his or her community \$1200 annually. Over ten years, that's \$12,000. We need a fair return on our taxes, too.

MR. MARTIN: Well, I say this here for the people out there: this is nothing to be scared about. So, if you get it, it's not like somebody's trying to track you, trying to look for you. It's a matter of getting your fair share of dollars for your particular community, your neighborhood, your block, your street, your home.

REP. CLAY: You're absolutely correct. It is a return on our

investment in our government.

MR. MARTIN: So, you get it, send the doggone thing in!

REP. CLAY: [Chuckles.]

MR. MARTIN: It's no big deal.

REP. CLAY: And if you *don't* send it in, an enumerator will be knocking on your door that looks like you and me.

MR. MARTIN: All right. Well, we certainly appreciate it, Congressman. Thank you so very much. Look forward -

REP. CLAY: Thank you -

MR. MARTIN: -- to having you back.

REP. CLAY: -- for having me.

[THE TWO SHAKE HANDS.]

MR. MARTIN: All right. Thank you very much.

REP. CLAY: Appreciate it.

MR. MARTIN: Folks, up next: is the country's optimism about President Obama fading? Politico.com's Nia-Malika Henderson examines the challenges of running a country versus running a political campaign.

**(SEG-
MENT 5)**

MS. NIA-MALIKA HENDERSON: Thank you, Roland.

[INFORMAL COMMENTS.]

MR. MARTIN: All right, folks. It's time for our "Obama Watch," and Nia-Malika Henderson of Politico.com is here.

All right, Nia. Reality is setting in for the President in

terms of talking about change, making change a reality. We saw this week the Congressional Black Caucus go after the President when it comes to wanting a specific plan on Black unemployment. You saw Senator Jo- -- 'scuse me - Congressman John Conyers say he's tired of having to save the President's butt, if you will.

What do you make of people saying, "We're not getting what we thought we were s'posed to be getting"?

MS. HENDERSON: Well, I mean I think if you look at a campaign, a campaign is very much like a courtship, but governing is very different. In the campaign, he was able to kind of tack toward the middle, but send some flowers to his base, and so far, he hasn't really done that. So, now you're seeing a lot of pushback from liberals, who are saying this isn't - this isn't the change they bargained on. And you see, you know, a lot of folks - whether it's the CBC, or folks like John Conyers - pushing for pub- -- the public health option, for instance, in - in healthcare.

And so I think this is going to be a kind of n- -- a problem, going forward, for Barack Obama. If you look at the last couple of months, he hasn't had a lot of victories to - to kind of count in his favor. He's had a really rough time getting this healthcare bill passed. Of course, it passed the House, but people are really displeased with some of the measures that they see coming out of this bill, including the - some of the language that's in there about abortion.

MR. MARTIN: Nia, I spent some time this week talking to some senior administration officials at the White House, and they say, "Look. In the first year and-a-half of Ronald Reagan, the right was going after him big time. There were marches in the street saying he wasn't pro-life enough." And he said, look. Look how people look on Ronald Reagan today on the right. They say you're going to have the same feeling on the left, but these things simply do not happen in a matter of months. We have to b- -- they happen in a matter of years.

What do you say?

MS. HENDERSON: It's certainly true, and liberals might not like that comparison to Ronald Reagan, but one of the things about Ronald Reagan is that he had very high personal approval ratings during his - his term, but people didn't necessarily agree with his policies.

MR. MARTIN: Similar to -

MS. HENDERSON: And those -

MR. MARTIN: -- similar to -

MS. HENDERSON: -- are similar numbers -

MR. MARTIN: -- President Obama.

MS. HENDERSON: -- exactly. Those are some of the numbers that you see coming out for President O- -- Obama. Reagan is probably the most significant political figure over the last 30 years. He very much ushered in modern conservatism. People talk about the "Age of Reagan," and, obviously, the hope from the White House is

that ten, 20 years from now, people will be talking about the "Age of Barack Obama" in the sense that he's been able to usher in, you know, kind of a - a kind of progressive to moderate liberalism.

MR. MARTIN: Well, Nia, you ha- -- you have folks, though - I mean le- -- let's look at the issue of the White House counsel Gregory Craig. Here was somebody who was backing the President early on in his campaign. He doesn't even last a year. And we had reports coming out early this summer that he was being pushed out because of the Guantanamo Bay decision. And so is that indicative of the President not necessarily sticking by the people who were with him, that he makes pragmatic decisions, say[s], "I['ve] got to cut bait, if necessary"?

MS. HENDERSON: Well, that was a real fumble on the President's part. Coming out - I think this was - what - two or three days before - two or three days after he was inaugurated and saying that he was going to close Guantanamo Bay. And we see that now he's back-pedaling from that and - and say- -- and saying essentially that he can't do that.

And I think Gregory Craig was collateral damage in this misstep by the President, and you had to kind of blame someone. And certainly, one of the things about Barack Obama is that he's a very savvy politician. People - you know during the campaign, you know, thought he was kind of a different kind of politician, but he's a very clever and savvy politician. He plays politics

very well. And I think, you know, Greg Craig was very much collateral damage in this c- -- Gitmo decision that looks like it's going to be put off for - for a - a long time at this point.

MR. MARTIN: Well, as you said, he sold himself as not being a politician in the campaign, but the reality is things certainly change, or the real issues come bubbling up once you actually begin to govern.

Nia-Malika Henderson, we certainly appreciate it. Thanks a lot.

MS. HENDERSON: Thank you, Roland.

MR. MARTIN: All right. Folks, it's time for "My Perspective."

There're some constants I can count on in life: wonderful hugs and kisses from my nieces, being driven crazy by the whiny voice of Sarah Palin, and listening to Rush Limbaugh make a total fool of himself and showcase his love affair with playing the race card. The laughable Limbaugh always wants to rip folks who call him a racist, but he sure loves to bring up race where it makes no sense *whatsoever*.

So, what did this fool say this time?

He actually alleged that the Gallup Poll is over sampling African-Americans in order to keep President Barack Obama's poll numbers high. No, *seriously!* This idiot actually *said* that! But, of course, he offered no facts to back it up; he just *made it up*.

So, Rush, since you have a fixation on Black people, how

'bout this? Why don't you come on "Washington Watch" and talk directly to Black America? You find time to talk to Fox News channel all the time and talk to your largely White listeners, and they're mostly men. So, I'm offering you an opportunity to come on this show and have a real dialogue about Black people. I want you to speak directly to Black America about your past statements on race. Let's have a frank discussion about those who find you to be a racist, Rush. And maybe you can explain to us your absolute hatred of President Barack Obama and why you want him to fail.

Rush, since you're fixated on race, come and sit next to me, and let's have a no-holds-barred discussion about race. You can look me in the eye, and I'll look you in the eye, and we can square off on the issues facing Black America.

Talking about Black people is one thing, Rush, but talking to Black people is another.

I'm Roland Martin, and that's my perspective. What's yours?

Be sure to log on to TVOneOnline.com right now and share your perspective.

We'll be right back.

**(SEG-
MENT 6)**

MR. MARTIN: All right, folks. Now to the part of the program that involves you directly. It's time for your feedback. Here's what Jilani* Anderson had to say about our discussion of why the

suspect in the Ft. Hood shooting was allowed to stay in his position, despite his reported support of radical Islamic sentiments. Jilani* wrote, "As a retired veteran, I have to share my perspective as to why I think Dr. Hasan was not summarily forced out of the military. While the issue of political correctness was a real factor in how his chain of command dealt with this, I think the bigger issue is free speech and dissent within the military ranks. Setting a precedent that a service member will be released from their obligation to serve, based on their political viewpoints, would be several steps in the wrong direction."

We received these comments on whether abortion should, or should not, be covered in the healthcare reform bill. Mdragonfly* of California left this e-mail. "I think all health issues and conditions should be covered and that a real comprehensive healthcare bill be put before the Senate. Who is writing this thing? It's a farce of a healthcare plan. We can do better. Come on, America."

Here's Diane Reed of Georgia's comment. "Abortion is not a healthcare issue. I do not believe that a government should pay for someone's moral decision to have an abortion."

And, finally, we got a lot of responses to my perspective on Black Republicans being labeled sellouts. Aletha* Ree wrote -- Aletha* Ray wrote, "I believe that Black Republicans are criticized in our community because they are pretending that

impediments do not exist in their laws" - "the application of law in their institutions and other aspects that prevent the balance of economic and political power."

Chasers left this e-mail. "I'm willing to bet that if you could come up with a valid definition, tons of Black, elite Democrats would qualify as sellouts. So, singling out Republicans as though being Black is some exclusive, monolithic group does a complete and total disservice to the disenfranchised in the Black community."

We certainly love getting your viewpoints, so keep them coming. Log on to TVOneOnline.com and leave your comments there, along with your name and location.

Folks, that's it for this edition of TV One's "Washington Watch."

I'm Roland Martin. See you next week. Goodbye and have a happy Thanksgiving.

[END OF SHOW.]