Dear Friend,

“Loose lips sink ships” was a phrase used during World War I to remind people who worked in sensitive or war-related positions to keep their mouths shut about their work, lest some information slip that could be used by the enemy.

It was good advice, and America won World War I and World War II, in part, because Americans and government officials, by and large, kept their mouths shut when necessary. Unfortunately, that’s not the case today.

On June 23, the New York Times published a story that disclosed a secret anti-terrorist program that tracks global money transfers. The program was legal and working – several terrorists had been caught and some of the financial networks of terrorist groups had been dismantled. The New York Times had been repeatedly warned by the Department of Justice, the leaders of the bi-partisan 9-11 Commission, and leaders of both political parties not to run the story because it would jeopardize the war against terrorism. The NYT, headed by its arrogant executive editor, Bill Keller, and stuck-in-the-1960s publisher Arthur Sulzberger, decided it knew better and ran the story.

As a result, at least three ongoing investigations of terrorists were affected, the ACLU has filed a lawsuit against the U.S. government, several European countries are demanding oversight of the program and, overall, a powerful weapon in the war against terrorism has been taken away from America. The program is now in turmoil and American lives are at greater risk. This is exactly what the New York Times was warned would happen.

If this had happened during World War II, the New York Times likely would have been shut down. And its publisher, editors, and the reporters responsible would have been interred until war’s end and then investigated and prosecuted for treason, for providing aid and comfort to the enemy. No less should happen with the New York Times and its executives today.

Here at the Media Research Center and in our TimesWatch division we monitor the liberal bias of the NYT every day. The liberal media do not police themselves nor hold any of their own, especially the “Gray Lady” NYT, accountable. But we do. We are America’s media watchdog. Your generous financial support makes this possible. And in this case, Continued on page 2
the actions by the NYT are so egregious, so reckless, we are pushing as hard as we can to expose this newspaper’s destructive and America-loathing actions for all of America to see.

After the NYT story ran, the MRC distributed a CyberAlert to more than 10,000 conservative leaders across America and posted the alert on our www.MRC.org website. Our analysis was also posted on our blog, NewsBusters.org, which is read by more than 50,000 people daily. Then, we issued a press release warning that the NYT would stop at nothing to propel its liberal agenda, not even jeopardizing America’s national security. Further, our TimesWatch division distributed its analysis, “Times Cripples Another Terrorist Surveillance Program,” which has been supplemented by several follow-up reports. Also, our grassroots program, MRC Action, sent e-mails to hundreds of thousands of Americans alerting them to the NYT’s treachery.

Thousands of Americans responded to our efforts and sent e-mails and letters and made phone calls to the NYT and to public leaders. MRC experts were interviewed on dozens of talk radio shows and Fox & Friends invited me on to discuss the explosive issue. By now we were reaching millions of Americans. At the same time, several congressmen called for an investigation of the NYT and, if the evidence warranted, a prosecution of the newspaper.

To be sure, numerous conservative leaders (and some media folks) stepped up to the plate and demanded a full accounting of the New York Times. But the MRC’s leadership and unparalleled research and analysis complemented the work of those conservatives and continues to hold the NYT’s feet to the fire.

For instance, confronted by outrage nationwide, the NYT’s Bill Keller tried to defend his decision to run the financial-tracking story as “a matter of public interest.” But as the MRC and other conservatives noted and publicized, the secret program was not illegal, did not infringe on civil rights, and had been reviewed by Congress. It was not a matter of “public interest.” But it was of interest to terrorists.

Ask yourself this question: What if, during World War II, the New York Times had revealed a secret program to track the financial transactions of Nazis and, as a result, compromised America’s war effort? Would that have been in the “public interest”? No. It would have helped the Nazis. Today, the actions of the NYT are helping terrorists.

Of course, when Keller’s spin didn’t wash well, he tried to blame conservatives. As he told CBS’s Bob Schieffer on Face the Nation, which naturally gave him a warm welcome, “It’s an election year, beating up on the New York Times is red meat for the conservative base. … And making this kind of clamor, I suspect, they hope will silence people who do talk to the press and maybe intimidate reporters.”

No, the point is to silence left-wing radicals who expose national security secrets during wartime, who put American lives at risk and then rap themselves in the First Amendment claiming they’re the real patriots.

Neither Bill Keller nor Arthur Sulzberger, nor the scribblers who wrote the story, Eric Lichtblau and James Risen, are honest journalists. They are political operatives who disagree with the current policy to fight terrorism and are doing everything they can to undermine that policy. And they don’t care who might get hurt, or killed, in the process.

Feeling the heat from the public, conservative leaders, members of Congress, and a few brave journalists, the New York Times turned to its friends in the liberal media for help. They obliged. Keller was given warm receptions and platforms to spin his line on CBS, CNN and PBS. Ever the liberal coward, Keller refused to be interviewed by conservative talk radio host Hugh Hewitt.

The New York Times is hoping this “controversy” will go away. The MRC is not going to let that happen. We know that loose lips do sink ships. And thanks to your financial and moral support, we are ever on the watch.

Sincerely,

L. Brent Bozell III
Founder and President
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MSNBC’s Keith Olbermann claims he’s not biased. He says he likes to “go after power,” not “after a Republican or a Democrat.” Not true. The record shows that on his *Countdown* show Olbermann repeatedly and consistently bashes conservatives and conservative policies, including the MRC and its founder, Brent Bozell. In fact, Olbermann slams conservatives on a nearly eight-to-one basis through his “Worst Person in the World!” segments.

A new study by the MRC looked at Olbermann’s “Worst” segments from the show’s debut on June 30, 2005 through June 23, 2006. While many of his targets weren’t political, about a third of the time Olbermann’s wrath was aimed at a notable liberal or a conservative, or someone flailed for an ideological stance. And then, Olbermann threw nearly all of his punches at conservatives.

For instance, of the 197 politically-salient designees, nearly nine out of ten (174, or 88%) attacked conservative targets or ideas, compared with 23 nominees (12%) in which liberals were on the receiving end of Olbermann’s ire.

Among those attacked by Olbermann:
- Bill Frist
- Donald Rumsfeld
- Antonin Scalia
- Rick Santorum
- Tom DeLay
- Pat Robertson (four times).

Never targeted:
- Hillary Clinton
- Howard Dean
- Michael Moore

Olbermann uses his podium to attack his non-liberal media competitors, especially Fox News Channel host Bill O’Reilly, whom Olbermann disparages as “the big giant head” or “Ted Baxter,” the dim anchor from *The Mary Tyler Moore Show*. O’Reilly has been a target 42 times; in contrast, Olbermann has only bad-mouthed Saddam Hussein twice.

Olbermann’s other media targets include:
- Rush Limbaugh (11 times)
- Ann Coulter (9)
- Brit Hume (4)
- L. Brent Bozell (3)
- Neal Boortz (3)
- Glenn Beck (3)
- New York Post (2)
- Michelle Malkin (2)

Olbermann rudely called columnist Michelle Malkin “crazier and dumber than we all thought” and a “nitwit.” Shortly after the MRC study was released, Olbermann lashed out at the Center, describing it as a “rabid right-wing spin group.” On that June 28 show, Olbermann also tagged MRC President Brent Bozell the “Worst Person in the World!” because the Center issued e-mails to hundreds of thousands of Americans about weapons of mass destruction in Iraq.

Sneering at conservatives may make Olbermann popular among left-wing bloggers, but his bias makes him the obvious choice for “Worst Anchorman in the World!”

Rich Noyes is director of research at the Media Research Center. Brad Wilmouth is an MRC research analyst. To view the complete report, visit www.MRC.org, *Media Reality Check*, June 27, 2006.
John Dean, Again

The liberal media are once again praising John Dean and helping promote his new conservative-bashing book, *Conservatives Without Conscience*. The treatment by MSNBC’s Keith Olbermann on July 10 was typical. On *Countdown*, Olbermann nodded endlessly as Dean ranted that modern conservatives are moving the Republican Party toward “authoritarianism” and that people such as George W. Bush and Dick Cheney have an “authoritarian personality.”

Dean also labeled 23 percent of the population as “right-wing authoritarian followers” who are willing to “march over the cliff.” The left-wing Olbermann did not challenge Dean’s bizarre claims. He instead made references to Nazi Germany and, quoting a passage from Dean’s book, brought up the possibility that conservatives might intentionally “provoke potential terrorists” in an effort to “maintain influence and control of the presidency.”

Rather in Denial

Former CBS icon Dan Rather still believes that his *60 Minutes* story on George W. Bush’s National Guard service, although based on forged memos, “absolutely” is “the truth.” The story has been endlessly discredited by innumerable experts and news outlets — and Rather even apologizes for it on CBS — yet Rather, who was disgraced by it and forced out of CBS because of it, now wants to re-write history. He told *Larry King Live* on July 12 that “we had a lot, a lot of corroboration, of what we broadcast about President Bush’s military record. It wasn’t just the documents.”
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Mention that you read about the offer in *FLASH*.

Instead of owning up to the truth, Rather blamed his critics for his ouster. “It’s a very old technique that when those who don’t like what you’re reporting believe it can be hurtful, then they look for the weakest spot and attack it, which is fair enough. It’s a diversionary technique.” When asked about CBS’s liberalism, Rather replied, “They call you names when you insist on being independent.”

Rooney Slams Rather

The agnostic and liberal Andy Rooney revealed what every conservative has long known about Dan Rather: He is a liberal and his liberalism was projected through his reporting. On the June 22 *Imus in the Morning*, Rooney revealed, “My problem with Dan was always that you knew where he stood politically. And the fact that he stood on my side didn’t have anything to do with it. I thought he was a bad representative of the liberal side because he was so obvious with his opinions. There were just little words he used when he was on the air that made it apparent to everyone that he was a liberal Democrat.”

Rooney then incredulously insisted that while Walter Cronkite “had just the same liberal Democratic opinions as Dan,” it was something “you would never know” because he kept it off the air.

Press Corps Nabobs

Fox reporters Fred Barnes and Morton Kondracke blasted the White House press corps for its unwavering left-wing questions of the President during a June 14 press conference. “These questions tell you what reporters are interested in and not what is really important or what the American people would like to hear about,” snapped Barnes on Fox’s *Special Report with Brit Hume*. “The President just went on a trip to Iraq to demonstrate that he’s not pulling out the troops right away. If you couldn’t realize that that’s what that trip was partially about, you’re an idiot.
And yet the first question was about a troop pullout. The second question was about getting out of Guantanamo. I mean, it just went on and on.

“Two questions about Karl Rove. Karl Rove has just been vindicated … Come on. These are obsessions of reporters that don’t match the feelings of the American people.” Kondracke added, “What’s interesting, though, is that there was hardly any question, critical question from the right ….”

**Bush, Dictator!**

*Newsweek’s* loony Eleanor Clift revealed her true colors, yet again, by describing Russian President Vladimir Putin as “an effective dictator” and President Bush “a dictator who’s ineffective.” The leftist Clift made her comment on the July 15 edition of The McLaughlin Group. When challenged by Financial Times editor Chrystia Freeland, who has written a book on Putin, that the word “dictator” should not be used “so loosely,” Clift backtracked, saying, “Well we have an authoritarian President who is ineffective.”

To her credit, Ms. Freeland did not give in, stating the obvious to the loose-lipping Clift: “No, he’s not authoritarian. … You guys, you guys can elect your Presidents and there can be a free choice. That’s not the case in Russia.”

**Coulter Bad, Franken Good**

NBC’s Matt Lauer laughs when liberals criticize conservatives but he is outraged — outraged! — when conservatives criticize liberals. This was obvious on the June 6 Today show, when Lauer nearly apoplectic in reaction to comments by conservative author Ann Coulter about several 9/11 widows who have used their situations to promote liberal politicians and liberal policies. Lauer repeatedly challenged Coulter along the lines of “if you lose a husband you no longer have the right to have a political point of view?” And so on.

Yet when Lauer interviewed liberal author Al Franken back in October, he laughed along with all the barbs and nasty remarks and never challenged Franken. When Franken snidely commented that Karl Rove and Scooter Libby would be executed for treason, Lauer smiled and laughed and kept the apparent “joke” rolling along.
The New Gay Times

BY L. BRENT BOZELL III

There was the expected wailing and gnashing of teeth from the left when New York’s state Court of Appeals ruled against installing so-called “gay marriage” by judicial fiat, as they had in the People’s Republic of Massachusetts. The New York Times, as expected, was stunned that the judges could find a “rational basis” for traditional marriage, and that judges would defer to elected legislators.

This outrage was plastered at the top of the Times with two “news” stories. One was a front-page editorial (they call it a “news analysis”) by Patrick Healy, who focused on the “gay rights advocates” and their disappointment. “Nowhere did gay marriage seem more like a natural fit than New York,” he complained, where “a history of spirited progressivism” should have made the victory of the marriage-manglers inevitable.

Inside the Times, the slant continued with two large photographs of gay activists protesting and consoling one another arm in arm about the court decision. Why not a photo of a traditional marriage supporter celebrating the ruling? Because it seems to be in every national-media rulebook that the “gay marriage” story must be accompanied by gay activists protesting, kissing, cheering, or “marrying.” Only one side matters.

This Gray Lady slant to the libertine left is no surprise. After all, then-Times ombudsman Daniel Okrent stunned insiders with a column two years ago that publicly admitted the Times was a liberal newspaper, and on the social issues, like gays, guns, and abortion, “if you think The Times plays it down the middle on any of them, you’ve been reading the paper with your eyes closed.”

But the Times isn’t just rooting for the homosexual revolution on the outside and inside of the newspaper. It has actively spread the gay gospel by funding the National Lesbian and Gay Journalists Association, and adorning its conventions with recruitment booths.

The Times also is a proud corporate sponsor of New York’s Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual & Transgender Community Center, a gay-activist hub which boasts of being the birthplace of both the radical ACT UP and the Gay and Lesbian Alliance Against Defamation.

This month, The New York Times has taken another dramatic corporate step toward taking sides in America’s culture clash. The newspaper is a “global sponsor” of the seventh “Gay Games” taking place in Chicago from July 15 to 22.

Yes, you read that correctly. The Gay Games.

Who would sponsor this stupidity? The New York Times is not alone; it is joined by other “objective” news outlets. The Chicago Sun-Times and WMAQ-TV, the local NBC-owned and operated affiliate, are also “global sponsors.” They share the Gay Games goals, to “foster and augment the self-respect of lesbians and gay men throughout the world and to engender respect and understanding from the nongay world.”

Got that, nongayers? Whatever happened to “objective” media outlets at least pretending to avoid taking sides? This is the essence of political correctness: it is better to violate openly your commitment to journalism standards than assist the “bigots” by attempting to appear fair and neutral.

And it gets zanier still. The New York Times is not only sponsoring the Gay Games, it’s having a pro-gay event there as well. As part of the “Times Talks” series, the newspaper will host a panel discussion on July 17 at the Chicago Public Library titled (so help me, I’m not making this up) “Brokeback Locker Room.” Times contributor Robert Lipsyte will discuss with a panel of six gay athletes (and no opposition) how the “climate of acceptance” has changed in professional sports, and “What can be done to reduce the level of homophobia in the locker room and the media?”

These gay-friendly “Times Talks” are nothing new. They’ve been a regular series since 1999. The Times has attracted corporate sponsors like Audi to support the chats in New York as well as San Francisco.

Just a few weeks ago, a “Times Talks” panel on the 25th anniversary of the first New York Times article on AIDS included radical activist Larry Kramer, who distributed his wild remarks in advance, claiming among other things that “the gay population of the world has been and continues to be targeted for extinction.” His written remarks also called for “Nuremberg trials” to hold not only the late Ronald Reagan, but the owners and editors of – how’s this for gratitude? – The New York Times to be tried like Nazi war criminals for the AIDS holocaust.

That’s just crazy. But by placing its famous name squarely on the side of the gay left, the New York Times is sending a message to America’s solid majority against putting thousands of years of tradition through the shredder. It says: you’re all intolerant bigots on the wrong side of history. And you will be defeated, even if we have to make utter asses of ourselves in the process.

L. Brent Bozell’s weekly column is nationally syndicated
For more columns, visit www.MRC.org.
MRC IN THE NEWS

The experts at the Media Research Center are interviewed almost every day on stories of national importance, often reaching millions of Americans daily. They provide analysis and commentary on radio, TV, the Internet, in magazines, books and in newspapers, always striving to help restore political balance to the major media. Some of the MRC’s latest media appearances include the following:

TELEVISION

- FNC, The O’Reilly Factor, July 24
- FNC, Fox & Friends, July 22
- MSNBC, Tucker Carlson, July 12
- CBN, The 700 Club, July 10
- CBN, NewsWatch, July 10
- MSNBC, Countdown, June 28
- RNN, Frank Rich Live, June 28
- FNC, Fox & Friends, June 27
- FNC, Hannity & Colmes, June 27

RADIO

Sean Hannity Show, July 7
G. Gordon Liddy, July 7
NRA News, nationally syndicated, June 30
Right Balance, June 29
Focus on the Family, July 20
USA Radio Network, June 28, July 21
Catholic Connections, July 24
American Family Radio, June 27, July 19
Biz Radio Network, June 28, July 5
Investor’s Radio Network, July 24
KKLA, Los Angeles, CA, June 26, July 13
KAHL, San Antonio, TX, July 3, 17, 20
WNRI, Rhode Island, July 10, 13, 14
KSFO, San Francisco, July 22
WBT, Charlotte, NC, July 22
WAAM, Detroit, MI, July 19
WCLO, Madison, WI, July 25
KFNN, Phoenix, AR, July 26
KFTK, St. Louis, MO, July 17
WBT, Charlotte, NC, July 22
WAAM, Detroit, MI, July 19
WCLO, Madison, WI, July 25
KFNN, Phoenix, AR, July 26

PRINT

Wall Street Journal, July 12, 14
Atlanta Journal-Constitution, July 14
Chicago Tribune, July 17
Baltimore Sun, July 13
Washington Times, July 13, 18
Melbourne Age, July 18
Sydney Morning-Herald, July 18
Investor’s Business Daily, July 12
Charlotte Observer, July 19
East Bay Express, July 19
Chattanooga Times Free-Press, July 14
Cal Thomas, syndicated column, July 5
The Herald, July 10
St. Petersbur G Times, July 20, 27
Sun-Sentinel, July 5
Philadelphia Inquirer, July 9
Monterey County Herald, July 4
Seattle Post-Intelligencer, July 3
Augusta Chronicle, June 28
Jewish Press, June 28
Detroit News, June 24
New York Sun, June 23
San Francisco Weekly, July 19
East Bay Express, July 19
Orlando Sentinel, July 19
Washington Business Journal, July 14
U.S. Newswire, July 11
Florida Times-Union, June 30
Salt Lake Tribune, July 19
Windsor Star, July 22
Gwinnett Daily Post, July 8

INTERNET

Conservative Voice, June 13
CBS News.com, June 3
Yahoo! News, June 1
Rush Limbaugh.com, June 1
Agape Press, May 19, June 6
American Thinker, June 11
National Review Online, May 17, 24
Media Matters for America, May 19
Townhall.com, May 13, 21
Human Events Online, May 10, 15, 17, 18, 24, 31, June 8, 12

~PARTIAL LISTING FOR ALL MEDIA
A Tax-Saving Charitable Trust May Be the Answer to Your Non- or Low- Income Producing Stock or Real Estate

In exchange for a gift of cash, appreciated stock or real estate, a charitable remainder trust offers the following benefits to you or your selected beneficiaries:

- an increased lifetime or term of years income stream;
- an immediate income tax deduction;
- avoidance of all upfront capital gain taxes;
- estate tax savings;
- the ability to make a significant gift to America’s Media Watchdog at the end of the trust term.

Including the Media Research Center in your estate plans guarantees that America’s Media Watchdog will continue to document, expose, and neutralize the liberal media for years to come – a fine legacy indeed!

For more information and a free proposal, call Thom Golab at (800) 672-1423 or visit us online at www.mrc.gift-planning.org.