ABC’s Anti-Bush Anchor

Dear Member,

Almost every conservative in America has come to expect Peter Jennings to report on President Bush’s Iraq policy in a biased manner. But even those expectations are being exceeded.

The ABC anchor, more than any other network star, has incorporated a blatant and militant anti-Bush bias into his coverage. His relentless and unfair questioning of administration policies has highlighted this anchor’s reflexive anti-Bush attitude.

Here’s one example. When Deputy Secretary of Defense Paul Wolfowitz claimed in a January 23 speech that Iraq threatened to kill scientists that cooperated with the United Nations, Jennings was beside himself on World News Tonight. “There is no way to know how the administration verifies that Iraqi scientists were threatened with their lives if they talked to U.N. inspectors,” Jennings condescendingly opined. “It is a very inflammatory charge at a very tense time.”

That’s news reporting?

Fast forward to February 10 and a report from ABC’s Brian Ross. Ross noted that U.N. inspectors had received what they consider “important, new and credible information” about intimidation of Iraqi scientists. Ross also interviewed an Iraqi defector who told him scientists live in fear and even noted the recent “suspicious” death of one Iraqi scientist whose loyalty was in doubt. Such a suspicious death, according to Ross, might be “the message of the kind the regime there has used many times before.”

So what did Jennings have to say when his own reporters were disproving his opinions? The scientists, Jennings claimed in his introduction to the piece, “may simply not wish to talk to people they regard as enemies of their country. Others may be downright afraid.”

Funny thing. That’s exactly the line that Saddam Hussein has been pushing! Not only did the ABC anchor find it improbable that the Iraqi government – despite Hussein’s well-documented record of gassing, shooting and slaughtering his own citizens – would try to scare scientists, he also pooh-poohed Secretary of State Colin Powell’s claims before the United Nations. In Jennings’ view, the United States must present courtroom-style documentation of Iraqi violations and satisfy the objections of every U.N. member before military intervention is acceptable. Intelligence intercepts, satellite photos, defector reports and the words of a respected President and Secretary of State just aren’t enough for him. Nor is support from the President’s political opponents.

When former Clintonite George Stephanopoulos noted on the February 5 World News Tonight that many Democrats were impressed
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with Powell’s speech, Jennings interjected doubt. “Let me add a note of skepticism,” the Canadian said. “Does this mean they were impressed with the substance or the performance?”

Later in the same show, when ABC’s defense correspondent John McWethy warned of the threat Iraq’s chemical and biological weapons posed to U.S. troops, Jennings took umbrage at the notion that Hussein might still have such weapons. “John, very quickly. It’s an ‘if’ still at the Pentagon, is it? ‘If’ he has all these provisions,” Jennings stressed.

Jennings’ knee-jerk rejection of American claims has been so consistent that other reporters, who are hardly pro-Bush or pro-military intervention, are snickering at ABC. When ABC’s White House reporter Terry Moran asked Press Secretary Ari Fleischer about Iraq’s “arsenal of germs and chemicals” making its way into terrorists’ hands at a February 12 press conference, Fleischer was stunned.

“Does this mean ABC News is acknowledging that Saddam Hussein has weapons of mass destruction?” Fleischer asked as the room burst into laughter.

Jennings is also convinced the anti-war movement in the U.S. is getting short shrift. “The debate whether war is the right solution goes on. Though somewhat more timidly in this country, people argue, than in other places,” he said near the end of the February 7 World News Tonight. The solution? A road show to see what the “people” really think about Iraq and war.

The following Monday Jennings was in Portland, Oregon reporting that an ABC News poll found two-thirds of the country supported military action to oust Hussein. And what did that mean? Jennings’ political spin was extraordinary.

“There is no consensus about war,” the anchor said with a straight face at the top of the show. Later in the broadcast he included clips of a town meeting at the Portland ABC affiliate that showed – surprise, surprise – different opinions on military action.

The next day the Osama bin Laden tape urging solidarity between Iraq and al Qaeda was played to the world. The U.S. quickly claimed this was more evidence of a link between the two forces. Jennings, who had moved on to Phoenix, Arizona, again took the anti-U.S. position. In fact, the anchor expressed doubt that the duly elected President’s administration spoke for the U.S.

“The United States, or the Bush administration at least, is portraying this statement as evidence of a link between al Qaeda and Saddam Hussein,” Jennings smugly stated.

All this from a man who continues to deny that he is in any way biased.

As you expect, we’ve taken Jennings to task at every possible opportunity. MRC Vice President of Research and Publications Brent Baker has tracked Jennings’ comments on a daily basis since late January and has literally stuffed our daily CyberAlert publication with the man’s missteps and prejudices. We’ve also issued a national Media Reality Check pointing out Jennings’ overwhelming preference for “anti-war” voices. And it’s paying dividends. The country now recognizes how left wing Jennings truly is.

As always, none of this would be possible without your support. Your support enables us to fight for fair and honest coverage of the President and, let us not forget, of our military forces who may soon be in combat in Iraq. I can assure you that it has never been put to a better use than it is now.

Until next time,

L. Brent Bozell III, President

Bush Honors the Confederacy... Uhh, Never Mind

Time was so eager to link President Bush with the Old Confederacy that its staff refused to let facts get in the way.

When former Clinton aides came to Time with rumors of a new Confederate memorial ceremony that had been instituted by the Bush administration, the magazine devoted a half-page story to the claim in their January 27 issue. Time reporters Michael Weisskopf and Karen Tumulty, two of the magazines senior correspondents in Washington, charged that Bush had revived a practice of sending floral wreaths to the Confederate Memorial in Arlington National Cemetery on Memorial Day. It was a practice, according to Time, the first President Bush had ended.

The truth about the wreath was quite different. “The story is wrong,” Time admitted on February 3. The elder Bush did not end the practice of sending a wreath to the Confederate Memorial; he changed it from Davis’s birthday to Memorial Day. Time also noted that the Confederate wreath was a tradition that continued under Bill Clinton as well.

Once again, “elite” journalists found what they thought was harmful information that jibed with their pre-conceived notions about conservatives, ran it without verification and wound up with egg on their faces. When will editors at outlets like Time show some backbone and take action against this sort of sloppy reporting? As long as the sloppy reporting hurts conservatives, it won’t happen.
The MRC has demolished the suddenly popular liberal myth that the media are conservative; provided expert opinion on combat coverage to the nation’s largest newspaper; and provided the ammunition that Rush Limbaugh and nationally syndicated columnist Kathleen Parker used to rip the pompous – and hypocritical – Hollywood movement against sport utility vehicles. Not bad for a couple of weeks’ work.

Limbaugh read Parker’s Orlando Sentinel column that ridiculed the anti-SUV movement to millions of Americans on his February 3rd broadcast. Parker used an MRC CyberAlert item about Today co-host Matt Lauer’s SUV “guilt” as the centerpiece of her column and credited the “ever-alert Media Research Center” for the information.

MRC President L. Brent Bozell debated Eric Alterman, a long-time Nation correspondent and MSNBC columnist who has written a book actually claiming the media has a conservative bias, for three days on National Review Online. The MRC President also appeared on CNN’s Crossfire on February 5 to debate Alterman. We think Brent won the debate going away, but don’t take our word for it. Former George W. Bush speechwriter David Frum used part of his National Review Online column to critique the debate. “I am sure I am not the only reader who thought that Brent Bozell wiped the floor with Eric Alterman in last week’s three-round NRO debate over media bias” Frum wrote. “In fact, Alterman’s argument was so amazingly feeble that it leads one to question why he bothered with it at all.”

Judging by his arguments Alterman doesn’t even know the meaning of the word bias. He appeared on MSNBC the following Sunday to debate MRC Director of Media Analysis Tim Graham, where the debate was as one-sided as ever. The MRC has years of studies and quotes to back up its claims. Liberals claims a conservative bias have none of it because no such evidence exists, as Graham skillfully pointed out.

MRC Vice President of Research and Publications Brent Baker was cited in the January 24 USA Today, the nation’s largest circulation newspaper, as part of USA Today Founder Al Neuharth’s column. The column discussed the wisdom of embedding journalists with troops in the event of war with Iraq and included Baker’s “feedback” opinion. “The Bush administration should be very wary about granting journalists access to the front lines,” Baker said. “While most reporters can be trusted, all too many will put getting a scoop or highlighting an embarrassing military miscue ahead of the success of the U.S. military effort and the safety of the troops.”

CNSNews.com Executive Editor Scott Hogenson appeared on Fox News Channel’s The O’Reilly Factor on January 24 to discuss a report by CNSNews.com that quoted a Daimler-Chrysler executive calling conservatives “myopic.” The resulting publicity forced the executive to apologize for the remark.

A CNSNews.com story by Senior Staff Writer Marc Morano on a film shown at the Lincoln Memorial suggesting the 16th President would support gay rights, abortion rights and feminism received nationwide coverage as well. Rush Limbaugh, Washington Times and Fox News Channel picked up this CNSNews.com scoop in early February. For more on this story and its impact read Hogenson’s column on page six.
Brokaw appeared on CBS’s "Public Opinion" as part of a news story. NBC correspondent included Iraqi for quoted more "average" Iraqis in her story Letterman being presented. The morning after his you, but not to journalists. That's obvious, you say? Maybe to you, but not to journalists.

Unfortunately, Brokaw’s admission has had no effect on how the news is being presented. The morning after his Letterman appearance, NBC’s Ann Curry quoted more “average” Iraqis in her story for Today, the third time in eight days the NBC correspondent included Iraqi “public opinion” as part of a news story.

In a spasm of liberal guilt on the January 28 Today, co-host Matt Lauer admitted he owned an SUV and worried he was “using more than my fair share of the fuel, the precious fuel, that’s available.”

Lauer’s confession came during NBC’s third segment in six weeks describing SUVs and how terrible they are. The segment started as a discussion on fuel economy but quickly degenerated into more free publicity for the Detroit Group, a gathering of anti-SUV Hollywood celebrities led by Arianna Huffington. The group claims SUV drivers support terrorism and received yet another free commercial plug when Lauer played one of their insulting ads. He then asked his two guests if it was fair to link SUVs and terrorism.

How about linking the Detroit Group and hypocrisy, Matt? The New York Post noted on January 17 that the four primary founders are quick to use “gas guzzling private jets.” According to the short article, they all prefer private jets to commercial flights, although Huffington claims only to ride in private planes when her friends have empty seats. How thoughtful.

It’s safe to assume that the four also live in houses that are much larger than those of the average SUV owner. If driving gas-guzzlers contributes to terrorism doesn’t living in opulent Hollywood mansions with exorbitant energy bills do so even more? What about Manhattan penthouses?

Now that’s a question we would like to hear Lauer ask the next time NBC highlights these ridiculous attacks on SUVs. But that might be hitting a little too close to home.

Jennings Neglects Leftist Ideology

Leftist British politician Tony Benn went to Iraq in early February and conducted a television interview of Saddam Hussein with the avowed purpose of “stopping the war.” Benn neglected Hussein’s butchery over the years and conducted a thoroughly craven interview with the dictator.

The Benn-Hussein videotape – it was the first interview the tyrant had given a Western “journalist” in 12 years – was played on the three network evening programs on February 4 like a basketball highlight. The play-by-play, however, differed drastically from network to network.

Both NBC and CBS explained to viewers that Benn was motivated by a political agenda. NBC News said the former Member of Parliament was an “anti-war British politician” and CBS News called him a “lifelong leftwing activist.” The following night on 60 Minutes II, correspondent Bob Simon actually called Benn a “lefty,” one of the few times CBS has ever used the word to describe a politician.

ABC’s Peter Jennings, of course, deliberately left out ideology and agenda, referring to Benn only as “a former member of the British Parliament” who was “one of Britain’s most famous and outspoken politicians.” Deep in the subsequent story from Dan Harris, ABC did note that Benn was conducting the interview in an effort to stop the war.

One can’t help but recall the lengths Jennings went to in January 1999 to label Senate Republicans at the Clinton impeachment trial as “conservative” or...
Helen Thomas says “[George W. Bush] is the worst President in all American history” ☛ Newsweek’s Bush-bashing Eleanor Clift wants Tricky Dick back... “I’d like to have Richard Nixon back, actually. I think he would be a huge improvement” ☛ CNN’s Bruce Morton claims “[Bush] is a Reagan Republican.” How does he define Reagan Republican? “Big tax cuts tilted toward the rich – and if that means deficit spending, so what? He’s pro-business, wants oil drilling in Alaska and offshore, would let coal plants pollute the air more” ☛ Eleanor Clift adds that the Bush tax-cut plan “is a big bribery of the right wing” ☛ CNN Capital Gang’s Al Hunt says “It’ll be a bonanza for the rich...You’ve got to go back to Teapot Dome to find such a fleecing” ☛ Charles Pierce of the Boston Globe offers a nauseating endorsement of Ted Kennedy: “If she had lived, Mary Jo Kopechne would be 62 years old. Through his tireless work as a legislator, Edward Kennedy would have brought comfort to her in her old age” ☛ The President strikes back as he greets ABC’s George Stephanopoulos for a reporters’ dinner: “Welcome back to the White House, George. We’ll have to make sure we count the silverware.”

“A Washington Post television critic claimed banning partial birth abortions is a “far right” issue.

While Shales admitted Bush did well, he couldn’t help but launch in one of those anti-conservative jabs that liberal journalists love to throw and editors never catch. The speech was fine, he said, except for the “sop he [Bush] threw to the far right” by calling for an end to partial birth abortions.

A “sop” to the far right? Where has Shales been living? According to a CNN/USA Today/Gallup Poll conducted in January, 70 percent of the public favored banning partial-birth abortions. That number clearly indicates that it is not an issue of the “far right” and that Americans of all political stripes have serious problems with the procedure. But those numbers don’t matter to liberal journalists like Shales. In their opinion, it’s a “conservative” issue and they are going to continue to portray it as one, regardless of what the public thinks.

Don’t Worry Folks, We’re Still Going to Burn Up

How do the global warming theorists and their media cheerleaders explain the brutally cold winter the eastern half of the U.S. has experienced this year?

Don’t worry, its just part of nature’s cycle.

NBC’s Robert Hager stood outside in the Washington, D.C. cold on January 23 and relayed that line during a segment on The Nightly News. “How could such cold square with claims of global warming?” Hager asked. “It’s because, scientists say, weather will always come in sporadic bursts of hot and cold.”

“Sporadic bursts” of hot and cold? That’s the same thing skeptical scientists say about global warming. But their message never seems to get through, even when the weather is clear and crisp.

Weather comes in “sporadic” bursts of hot and cold. No kidding!

Lots on Protest March, Little on March for Life

An MRC study of ABC, CBS and NBC proved the January “peace” protests received far more coverage than the March for Life.

The three broadcast networks did 26 segments on the “peace” march of January 18 and fourteen of those were publicity stories before the actual event. The same networks did only nine stories on the abortion issue on January 22. If we’re being technical – and we are – the actual number of stories on the March for Life was zero, since every story included both sides of the abortion debate. NBC’s Today even managed to merge coverage of the pro-life rally of tens of thousands with pro-abortion rallies of about 100.

Pro-life forces aren’t surprised by this information. But they deserve better coverage than this – and we’ll continue to help them demand it.
I’ve written in the space before about how news professionals relish the scoop. Scoops provide bragging rights and ego strokes and audience bumps, so I’m a big fan.

But more important than mere scoops is news that results in positive change, which is what I like to believe was the driving force behind the notion of an active news media being the watchdog of the government.

It’s a point of pride here at CNSNews.com that we have done precisely that on innumerable occasions over the years, most recently regarding one of our nation’s most venerable monuments; the Lincoln Memorial on the Mall in Washington, D.C.

On February 4, CNSNews.com published an exclusive report by Senior Staff Writer Marc Morano about a supposedly educational video presentation at the Lincoln Memorial juxtaposing the words of Abraham Lincoln with a collage of left-wing imagery, suggesting our 16th president would have approved of abortion, anti-war protestors, homosexual rights and the like.

Absent from this video are any images to balance the liberal causes associated with the words of Lincoln; nothing from the March for Life, nothing from the Promise Keepers event on the Mall, nothing from any of the major demonstrations featuring conservative issues or positions.

The video is part of a larger display at the memorial, which won an award during the Clinton administration for “education and interpretation.” But the controversy over the video was so intense, no one seems prepared to take credit for it.

The exhibit in which the video appears was organized by a group calling itself the Up Close Foundation, but their spokesman, Chuck Tampio, said the group had nothing to do with the video.

Even the Park Service was unclear on the matter, first attributing the video’s production to the Discovery Channel, but later saying it was made by a Park Service filmmaker who has so far not returned repeated calls for comment.

Two days after this initial report, CNSNews.com published a follow-up piece about House Appropriations Committee member Rep. Todd Tiahrt (R-Kan.) and his efforts to bring the liberal bias of the video presentation to the attention of the administration and fellow Members of Congress.

Later that same day, we published another follow-up, this one explaining how the Interior Department and the National Park Service, which runs the memorial, had initiated a formal review of the controversial video.

David Barna, the public affairs chief for the Park Service, told us a preliminary review of the video by Park Service staff resulted in some saying the use of Lincoln’s words “as a text to highlight these modern-day protests is inappropriate.”

By February 7, Fox News had picked-up on the story and a petition drive to have the video removed from the Lincoln Memorial was launched.

Over the next few days, CNSNews.com published a number of related articles about the video, including one taking a closer look at the roots of the video and another featuring a Lincoln historian’s “outrage” with what he perceived as the video’s deliberate misrepresentation of Lincoln’s presidency.

Then came the public protests. In spite of heightened security and freezing weather uncharacteristically cold for Washington in mid-February, a demonstration against the video was staged on the steps of the Lincoln Memorial on February 13.

All because of one story that no one else in the media bothered to cover.

This story wasn’t over as of this writing, but with congressional and Bush administration reviews already underway, petition drives and public protests surrounding this video at the monument to one of America’s greatest presidents, you can bet we’ll be keeping an eye on the situation and reporting on developments as they happen.

In the meantime, please accept this as the freshest example of how the staff of CNSNews.com keeps its promise to you every day; to report the news the establishment media ignore or under-report.

And if our reporting results in positive change for the nation, so much the better.

Subscribe to the MRC’s biweekly newsletter, Notable Quotables, and receive a FREE video of the Decades Most Outrageous Liberal Media Bias! It’s the hilarious video that started it all. Watch as the MRC roasts the most liberal members of the national “news” media. Join the audience in booing Bryant Gumbel as he blamed Rush Limbaugh and other conserva-tives for the bombing in Oklahoma City, and as columnist Julianne Malveaux says she wished Clarence Thomas would die of heart disease. Get NQ de-livered to your door at the mem-ber rate of just $30 per year and receive the video for FREE! Call Donna Gould at (800) 672-1423 ext. 122.
Harsher Memories of Clinton
by L. Brent Bozell III

The Clinton era seems long gone now, but when the memories come back, they’re not generally pleasant. For conservatives, the bad memories surface when CNN has the gall to bring Clinton on Larry King Live on Ronald Reagan’s birthday. There he was, to publicize his stage appearance with the Rolling Stones to raise funds to fight that global warming monster. In his typically petty way, this most unpresidential former president slammed George W. Bush for not spending enough on homeland security while giving tax cuts to the rich.

Liberals still regret having to drop all the fairy tales about the admirable Clinton marriage and the president’s supposedly reformed sexual behavior. A few weeks ago, ABC’s Good Morning America revisited the five-year anniversary of the Monica Lewinsky story, and reporter Claire Shipman couldn’t help shuddering at the “acid flashbacks” to that awful moment for Democrats when a Clinton scandal moved the Nielsen ratings meters.

But for a few journalists, the memories of the Clinton impeachment are becoming sharper than they used to be. Longtime CBS Capitol Hill correspondent and Face the Nation host Bob Schieffer has a new memoir out called This Just In: What I Couldn’t Tell You on TV. It seems that what he couldn’t tell you on TV was what everyone already knew: Clinton was a sleazeball.

Schieffer confesses that early on he had a “prejudice” in favor of Clinton, since he corrected the notion that not all wisdom somehow originates in the northeast United States. He adds “I come from a long line of conservative Texas Democrats, but I claim no political party.” He says Clinton established some “remarkable feats,” from NAFTA to welfare reform to balancing the budget — feats which seem less remarkable when you acknowledge they were GOP initiatives, not his.

But Schieffer grows agitated remembering September 11, 1998 — the day he spent part of his afternoon reading snippets of the Starr Report in live coverage. He remembers “as the father of two grown daughters, I found the whole thing depressing.”

On that day, he had the ability to express that personal feeling, but he never did. Reporters express their personal feelings about everything else, but not this.

Schieffer suggests “Clinton disgraced the highest office in the land, and as the tawdry details of his affairs became a part of the national conversation, he coarsened the culture of the people he had been elected to lead. That was his crime.”

Schieffer never talked about a coarsened culture on TV, either. What conservatives had so forcefully maintained, and which Schieffer now concedes was true, was roundly ignored when it was news.

In his book Schieffer also trashes Clinton for making his secretary Betty Currie come in on her days off to clear Monica into the White House, then wait through the sexual escapades before she could go home. He attacks Clinton for sending Madeleine Albright and Donna Shalala out to lie on his behalf. He says Clinton “had shown himself to be a user of women who was not hesitant to take advantage of his friends when found it necessary for business or pleasure. Schieffer actually did say a version of this on television – on his “Face the Nation” commentary two days after reading the Starr Report on the air. But he never chided Currie, Albright, and Shalala – no babes in the woods — for knowing full well they were hiding the truth and lying to the American people.

Perhaps the most telling anecdote in his Clinton chapter comes near the end, where he tells the story of Lanny Breuer. In August 1999, six months after Clinton’s acquittal, Schieffer received an engraved card from Covington and Burling announcing that Breuer was returning to his old law firm. But the announcement struck him by boasting that Breuer represented the White House “in presidential impeachment hearings and trial, four independent counsel investigations, a Justice Department task force investigation, and numerous congressional oversight investigations.” While Schieffer thought Breuer “was a good lawyer I had dealt with and come to like and respect over that time...that engraved card carried an arresting and somewhat unsettling message: If you need a good criminal lawyer, get someone with White House experience.”

Schieffer never said that on TV, either. There’s no question but that the pro-Clinton media circled the wagons around this man in 1998. Maybe Schieffer’s memoir is far to little, far too late. But it’s better than the obedient silence from those who continue to deny the shameful performance from this shameless disgrace of a president.

For more from L. Brent Bozell III, check out his nationally syndicated column which runs every week in several top newspapers across the country – or read the articles on the MRC’s website at www.MediaResearch.org.
NBC Stereotypes Pro-Lifers as Murderous Extremists

NBC took great care to portray “peace” protesters as normal, mainstream Americans in its coverage of the Washington, D.C. “peace” rally on January 18. The network took the exact opposite approach with the January 22 March for Life, going to great lengths and great distances to portray pro-life demonstrators as dangerous extremists.

NBC demonized the movement immediately in its opening Today story. Instead of interviewing one of the tens of thousands of participants in Washington, D.C., as NBC did for its “peace” march stories, Today sent reporter Kelly O’Donnell all the way to Buffalo, N.Y., where an abortionist was murdered in 1998.

“The Buffalo women’s clinic once again finds itself at the intersection of debate over abortion,” O’Donnell told viewers. “A pro-life group called the Army of God says it will protest here today, while the clinic vows to remain open with security even greater than normal.” O’Donnell then dutifully interviewed an extremist who claimed “the stopping of murder is not wrong, even when lethal means are used.” Just to make sure no one missed NBC’s desire to make a connection between the pro-life movement and violence, the man was identified on screen as a “pro life demonstrator.”

The story is more proof of the media’s pro-abortion bias and another example of the lengths it will go to cast the pro-lifers as brutal extremists.

Melanie Hunter is Deputy Managing Editor at CNSNews.com. She edits radio and print copy, produces radio packages and writes occasional commentaries. Melanie also produces and sometimes anchors twice-a-week, five-minute radio newscasts for Radio Free Republic and produces World-in-Brief news spots to promote the CNSNews.com radio product.

Melanie is a native of Pittsburgh, Pa. and a graduate of Howard University, where she received a degree in Television Production in 1996. After college, Melanie worked as an anchor and reporter at WAMO in Pittsburgh, serving as the morning news anchor and reporter for the FM station and afternoon anchor/reporter for the AM station. She also produced daily and weekly news features, such as the Newsmaker of the Day and the Democrat/Republican Report.

Melanie left WAMO for WKYS-FM in Washington, D.C. in 1998. At WKYS, she anchored the morning news during the nationally syndicated Russ Parr Morning Show, reported on breaking news, and provided on-air comic relief with an Opera Girl character. She also did traffic reports on weekends through Shadow Broadcasting, heard on WMAL-AM.

Melanie came to CNSNews.com in November 2001. She enjoys her job, saying it helps expand her radio and editing skills, as well as increasing her knowledge of politics and foreign affairs.

Melanie lives in Forestville, Md. and has a six-year old daughter. Her future goals are to publish a novel and a screenplay she’s written.