Dear Friend,

As the Media Research Center approaches its 20th anniversary next year, we are excited and proud to introduce this new, glossy edition of the monthly Flash newsletter, now re-named The Watchdog. While the timely and useful content about liberal media bias and the effectiveness of the MRC — as was consistently relayed to you through Flash — will not change, the appearance, style, and quality of the newsletter have been upgraded and improved for you.

This will help to advance the mission of the MRC in a fiercely competitive (and frequently hostile) media world. It also will help us use our supporters’ donations in a more professionally productive and influential way. The goal of the MRC is to create a media culture where truth and liberty flourish in America. The Watchdog is a monthly step down the road toward that end.

We re-named our newsletter, Flash, to The Watchdog to more accurately reflect the MRC’s role as the leader in exposing, documenting, and neutralizing liberal media bias: We are America’s media watchdog.

In each monthly edition of The Watchdog there will be a letter from me to our MRC supporters. I will report to you what the MRC is doing, with your help, to expose and neutralize the leftist media. For instance, how the liberal media continue to undermine the war against terrorism with defeatist, negative coverage about Iraq, and even cripple our national security — as the New York Times did, twice! — by revealing secret anti-terrorism programs in the name of free speech … all during wartime!

The Watchdog will carry on page three each month a summary or profile of the latest MRC Special Report or latest MRC product, such as Profiles in Bias, Media Reality Check, Notable Quotables, CyberAlert, a grassroots Action Alert, reports from our Business & Media Institute and Cybercast News Service, or an item from our Web log (blog) NewsBusters.

This month, page three highlights a new Special Report on how the network TV stations promote illegal immigration. This report is so well-researched and conclusive that CNN’s Lou Dobbs Tonight ran a complete story on it and Congressman Lamar Smith (R-Tex.) wrote an op-ed based on it. As The Watchdog went to press, the report, “Election in the Streets,” was scheduled to be distributed to members of Congress as a “Dear Colleague” letter. Next month, page three will highlight the MRC’s new report on media coverage of the war against terrorism since Sept. 11, 2001.

The Watchdog will continue to feature “Bits & Pieces” and “Minibits” on pages four and five. The former are brief
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examples of some of the most outrageous or uproarious instances of liberal media bias, taken from television, print, radio and the Internet; the latter include the most liberally biased quotes from reporters, editors and, appropriately enough, Hollywood blowhards. I know that if they stun me when I read them, they will absolutely shock you!

Page six of *The Watchdog* will feature a column, either from CNSNews.com Editor David Thibault, Business & Media Institute Director Dan Gainor or yours truly. These columns almost always focus on one of the most egregious and topical instances of liberal media bias occurring in the news. This month’s column looks at *TIME* magazine’s laudatory cover story on Sen. Hillary Clinton — the 10th time she’s made the cover of *TIME*, a highly influential national magazine with a circulation of 4 million people.

*The Watchdog* will continue to feature on page seven the impact the MRC makes in the media, listing where and when the MRC was cited or its experts interviewed by the media — on TV, radio, print, and on the Web. It shows how our work is reaching tens of millions of people every single month. In the last several months, MRC experts or their research have been cited in the following places: CBS News; Fox’s *The O’Reilly Factor*; NewsWatch; Fox & Friends; Hannity & Colmes; MSNBC’s *Countdown*; Tucker; Scarborough Country; CNN’s Reliable Sources; Drudge Report; Rush Limbaugh Show and Rush Limbaugh.com; Sean Hannity Tuned Into America; Janet Parshall’s America; USA Today; Wall Street Journal; Chicago Tribune; Washington Post; National Review Online; Human Events; Pittsburgh Tribune-Review; Washington Times; Cal Thomas’s syndicated column... and the list goes on. Last year, in all, MRC experts and research were cited more than 1,500 times in about 750 different media outlets. Our message is getting out there. The MRC is effective. The MRC is America’s watchdog. And your support is making it all possible.

I think you will like the look and feel of *The Watchdog*. And I know you will value the information it contains. Each month, *The Watchdog* will provide you not only with the latest examples of liberal media bias but also the intellectual and practical means to fight against that bias: a weapon to help roll back the liberal media leviathan.

On behalf of all the talented people who work with me at the MRC, I want to thank you, again, for your financial support of the MRC and for your moral commitment to our mission. Going on 20 years now, we’ve won a lot of battles but the war continues. Let’s take the fight to the enemy. Let’s keep them on the run.

Ever forward!

L. Brent Bozell III
Founder and President

---

**MRCAction Team — Grassroots in Action!**

As part of an ongoing strategy, the MRC launched an aggressive grassroots program along with a new Web site, www.MRCAction.org, last year. Since then, more than 250,000 conservative activists have joined with the MRC to become MRCAction Team members and to help expose liberal media bias by confronting the media directly.

The MRC provides MRCAction Team members, here and abroad, with examples of liberal media bias. They, in turn, identify themselves as MRCAction members and sign petitions, e-mail, fax, and phone the media to express their views — rapid response. (On a side note, the average MRCAction Team member will pass along MRC Alerts to an average of 7 people — meaning just one message sent to 230,000 Team members reaches 1.6 million activists.)

**Some highlights so far this year include:**

- In May, the MRC delivered 142,332 “Tell the Truth!” petitions to ABC, CBS, NBC, CNN and FOX - demanding they “Tell the Truth!” about the efforts of our brave military forces.

- Tens of thousands of petitions and e-mails were sent to the *New York Times* after it exposed — and hence scuttled — a national security program that tracked the finances of terrorists. Another 1,000 angry e-mails were sent directly to the *Times*’s lawyer, Barney Calame, demanding that the *NYT* apologize for its recklessness and be more responsible in its reporting during wartime.

- In July, hundreds of phone calls were made and thousands of e-mails were sent to the President of NBC when Keith Olbermann, in his “Worst Person in the World” segment on MSNBC’s *Countdown*, tagged the MRC as a “rabid right-wing spin group” and named MRC President Brent Bozell among his “Worst Person” nominees.

Each edition of *The Watchdog* will contain an update on the MRC’s grassroots work. To learn more about MRC Action, visit www.MRC.org.
New MRC Study Documents How ABC, CBS, and NBC Promote Illegal Immigration

When the U.S. House last December passed tougher restrictions on illegal immigrants and authorized more federal power to deport them, the networks — ABC, CBS, and NBC — didn’t bother to even cover the vote. Not a word. But when the U.S. Senate dawdled over its own spineless bill this past spring while illegals and their radical left-wing supporters took to the streets with demonstrations, the networks were all over that issue. And predictably, the liberal media spun the news to cast the illegals in a favorable, near-saint-like light while painting their critics as intolerant right-wing nativists.

The liberal media are flat-out ignoring polls showing that upwards of 90 percent of Americans view illegal immigration as a serious problem and that a vast majority of Americans want tough enforcement of existing immigration laws to stem the flow of illegal immigration. The MRC won’t let that stand.

Hundreds of thousands of conservative activists were alerted to the MRC Special Report, Election in the Streets: How the Broadcast Networks Promote Illegal Immigration, through our MRCAction Alert e-mails. On Aug. 31, CNN’s Lou Dobbs Tonight ran a full story on the study. Further, Rep. Lamar Smith (R-Tex.) wrote an op-ed based on the study, and the report itself is scheduled to be distributed throughout Congress as a “Dear Colleague” letter.

“This new MRC study proves that the liberal media at ABC, CBS, and NBC have a left-wing political agenda when it comes to illegal immigration, and they will ignore the views of most Americans and misinform the public and our policy leaders to advance that agenda,” said MRC President L. Brent Bozell III. “Journalists must provide a complete, balanced picture of the immigration crisis and stop peddling propaganda.”

Here are some of our major findings:

- Out of 309 broadcast network news stories between March 24 and May 31, the three networks aired only 16 mentions of nationwide polls on immigration. ABC, CBS, and NBC largely ignored poll numbers — including from their own polls! — proving that overwhelming majorities of Americans see illegal immigration as “out of control.”
- Networks gave advocates for amnesty and guest-worker plans twice as many sound bites as those wanting tighter border control.
- Networks used the “conservative” label 89 times while “liberal” was used only 3 times — all by ABC. CBS and NBC never tagged those pushing for more lenient policies as “liberal.”
- Only 6 stories discussed how illegals cost more to government than they provide in taxes.
- Networks never questioned the propriety of illegals protesting and lobbying on immigration while in violation of federal laws.

To download this Special Report or to order a copy online, visit our Web site, www.MRC.org, and click on “Special Reports” in the left-side column.
Katie ‘No Bias’ Couric

As asked at the Aspen Institute’s “Ideas Festival” in early July — but just broadcast Sept. 2 on C-SPAN — about the charge of liberal bias, CBS Evening News anchor Katie Couric was condescendingly dismissive.

When Laffey pointed out how Ronald Reagan’s tax cuts “worked very well,” Stephanopoulos retorted, “Ronald Reagan also increased taxes.” After Laffey touted the benefits of the Bush tax cuts, an exasperated Stephanopoulos resignedly concluded, “So it’s ‘read my lips,’ you’re never going to vote to raise taxes?”

Raise Taxes, Please?

ABC’s Washington Bureau Chief and host of This Week, George Stephanopoulos, loves tax increases — and the more often the better. For instance, in an “On the Trail” segment from Rhode Island on the Sept. 3 This Week, Stephanopoulos lectured Stephen Laffey, the conservative Republican primary challenger to incumbent liberal Senator Lincoln Chafee, about taking a pledge to not raise federal income taxes: “If the deficit continued to grow, it’s not responsible to say you’re never going to raise taxes.”

When Laffey pointed out how Ronald Reagan’s tax cuts “worked very well,” Stephanopoulos retorted, “Ronald Reagan also increased taxes.” After Laffey touted the benefits of the Bush tax cuts, an exasperated Stephanopoulos resignedly concluded, “So it’s ‘read my lips,’ you’re never going to vote to raise taxes?”

Rumsfeld ‘Quack’!

Keith Olbermann, host of MSNBC’s Countdown, never tires of bashing conservatives and Bush Administration officials, as he did on Aug. 30 by calling Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld “a quack.” In an ongoing attack against Administration speeches about the Iraq war, Olbermann ranted that Rumsfeld, “the man who sees absolutes, where all other men see nuances and shades of meaning, is either a prophet or a quack. Donald H. Rumsfeld is not a prophet.”

Olbermann then equated the Bush administration with “the English government of Neville Chamberlain” which “knew that its staunchest critics needed to be marginalized and isolated. ...The confusion is about whether this Secretary of Defense, and this administration, are in fact now accomplishing what they claim the terrorists seek: The destruction of our freedoms, the very ones for which the same veterans Mr. Rumsfeld addressed yesterday in Salt Lake City,

Liberals Love Katie

Liberals view CBS Evening News anchor Katie Couric more positively than conservatives do, according to a survey by the Pew Research Center. The survey also found that, among the words most associated with Couric, “liberal” was the second most cited, and “biased” also came up on the list. The survey showed that liberal Democrats viewed Couric favorably by 46 to 16 percent — a 30 percent positive margin — while conservative Republicans were evenly split, 30-30 on Couric.

The Aug. 24 report declared that “while Katie Couric is more widely known, she also receives more negatively-toned responses than do [NBC’s Brian] Williams or [ABC’s Charles] Gibson. These include some who describe Couric as liberal or biased, and others who say she is bad, annoying, overrated or that they just don’t like her.”

She blamed her viewers, calling it a “Rorschach test,” which demonstrated how “oftentimes people put their, they see you from their own individual prisms. And if you’re not reflecting their point of view or you’re asking an antagonistic question of someone they might agree with in terms of policy, they see you as the enemy.”

She did claim that Fox News Channel, however, has a bias, saying, “You have Fox, which espouses a particular point of view.” But just two years ago in May 2004 on NBC’s Today, Couric had asked liberal author David Brock, “Aren’t most people in journalism ... pro-choice, you know, against prayer in school, probably favor affirmative action? ... Isn’t it fair to say that liberals, sort of, are controlling the mainstream media?”

Liberals view CBS Evening News anchor Katie Couric more positively than conservatives do, according to a survey by the Pew Research Center. The survey also found that, among the words most associated with Couric, “liberal” was the second most cited, and “biased” also came up on the list. The survey showed that liberal Democrats viewed Couric favorably by 46 to 16 percent — a 30 percent positive margin — while conservative Republicans were evenly split, 30-30 on Couric.

The Aug. 24 report declared that “while Katie Couric is more widely known, she also receives more negatively-toned responses than do [NBC’s Brian] Williams or [ABC’s Charles] Gibson. These include some who describe Couric as liberal or biased, and others who say she is bad, annoying, overrated or that they just don’t like her.”

She blamed her viewers, calling it a “Rorschach test,” which demonstrated how “oftentimes people put their, they see you from their own individual prisms. And if you’re not reflecting their point of view or you’re asking an antagonistic question of someone they might agree with in terms of policy, they see you as the enemy.”

She did claim that Fox News Channel, however, has a bias, saying, “You have Fox, which espouses a particular point of view.” But just two years ago in May 2004 on NBC’s Today, Couric had asked liberal author David Brock, “Aren’t most people in journalism ... pro-choice, you know, against prayer in school, probably favor affirmative action? ... Isn’t it fair to say that liberals, sort of, are controlling the mainstream media?”

Liberals view CBS Evening News anchor Katie Couric more positively than conservatives do, according to a survey by the Pew Research Center. The survey also found that, among the words most associated with Couric, “liberal” was the second most cited, and “biased” also came up on the list. The survey showed that liberal Democrats viewed Couric favorably by 46 to 16 percent — a 30 percent positive margin — while conservative Republicans were evenly split, 30-30 on Couric.

The Aug. 24 report declared that “while Katie Couric is more widely known, she also receives more negatively-toned responses than do [NBC’s Brian] Williams or [ABC’s Charles] Gibson. These include some who describe Couric as liberal or biased, and others who say she is bad, annoying, overrated or that they just don’t like her.”

She blamed her viewers, calling it a “Rorschach test,” which demonstrated how “oftentimes people put their, they see you from their own individual prisms. And if you’re not reflecting their point of view or you’re asking an antagonistic question of someone they might agree with in terms of policy, they see you as the enemy.”

She did claim that Fox News Channel, however, has a bias, saying, “You have Fox, which espouses a particular point of view.” But just two years ago in May 2004 on NBC’s Today, Couric had asked liberal author David Brock, “Aren’t most people in journalism ... pro-choice, you know, against prayer in school, probably favor affirmative action? ... Isn’t it fair to say that liberals, sort of, are controlling the mainstream media?”

Rumsfeld ‘Quack’!

Keith Olbermann, host of MSNBC’s Countdown, never tires of bashing conservatives and Bush Administration officials, as he did on Aug. 30 by calling Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld “a quack.” In an ongoing attack against Administration speeches about the Iraq war, Olbermann ranted that Rumsfeld, “the man who sees absolutes, where all other men see nuances and shades of meaning, is either a prophet or a quack. Donald H. Rumsfeld is not a prophet.”

Olbermann then equated the Bush administration with “the English government of Neville Chamberlain” which “knew that its staunchest critics needed to be marginalized and isolated. ...The confusion is about whether this Secretary of Defense, and this administration, are in fact now accomplishing what they claim the terrorists seek: The destruction of our freedoms, the very ones for which the same veterans Mr. Rumsfeld addressed yesterday in Salt Lake City,
so valiantly fought.” Olbermann concluded by claiming America “faces a new type of fascism.”

Katrina Holocaust?

ABC’s World News Tonight with Charles Gibson went off the deep, deep end of sanity on Aug. 29 when it seriously reported — relying on left-wing Tulane professor Lance Hill as a source — that white people cheered when black residents were evacuated from New Orleans following Hurricane Katrina. ABC reporter Steve Osunsami further cited Hill and declared that whites in New Orleans now see themselves as “victims” because “half of the African-Americans who once lived here are back. And dreams of a white New Orleans are dead.”

ABC, no surprise, did not tell its viewers about Hill’s other views. For instance, Hill wrote on his Web site that the soldiers and police officers he spoke with after Katrina said they were “ordered not to provide citizens with food, water, or medical aid.” Hill has also set up an “educational” Katrina Oral History Program to compare and contrast the victims of Hurricane Katrina with the victims of the Nazi Holocaust.

Punish Bush!

On the Aug. 23 Countdown, Newsweek Senior Editor Jonathan Alter, a left-winger, told MSNBC’s Keith Olbermann, another left-winger, that Democrats regaining power is the only way to hold the “incompetent” Bush administration accountable.

Two liberal judges’ dubious rulings against an anti-terrorism program “mean President Bush violated his oath of office, among other things, when he swore to uphold the Constitution of the United States [and] it means he’s been lying to us about the program since it started,” rants CNN’s Jack Cafferty. President Bush “makes Nixon look like St. Augustine,” opines director Oliver Stone, adding, “at least Nixon had some intelligence and a conscience. Bush is The Manchurian Candidate.” “Love him or hate him, there is no denying that Fidel Castro has had a great run,” cheers Fox’s Geraldo Rivera. ABC’s George Stephanopoulos breathlessly reports that Sen. Hillary Clinton “has called on President Bush to accept Secretary Rumsfeld’s resignation….It’s a dramatic sign of how much the support for this war effort is slipping on Capitol Hill.”

One liberal judge’s dubious ruling against an anti-terrorism program “means President Bush violated his oath of office, among other things, when he swore to uphold the Constitution of the United States [and] it means he’s been lying to us about the program since it started,” rants CNN’s Jack Cafferty. President Bush “makes Nixon look like St. Augustine,” opines director Oliver Stone, adding, “at least Nixon had some intelligence and a conscience. Bush is The Manchurian Candidate.” “Love him or hate him, there is no denying that Fidel Castro has had a great run,” cheers Fox’s Geraldo Rivera. ABC’s George Stephanopoulos breathlessly reports that Sen. Hillary Clinton “has called on President Bush to accept Secretary Rumsfeld’s resignation….It’s a dramatic sign of how much the support for this war effort is slipping on Capitol Hill.”

Like Frank Sinatra in the 1950s, America “grew from a nation of hungry dreamers fleeing the Depression and fighting ‘the good war’ into an arrogant empire drunk on power and angry at the failure of the American dream to bring utopia,” whines New York Times critic Stephen Holden. Russia’s Vladimir Putin “is perceived to be an effective dictator. What we have in this country is a dictator who’s ineffective,” says Newsweek’s Eleanor Clift. NBC’s Brain Williams reveals a conspiracy: “Many economists and administration critics say the White House has deliberately inflated its own deficit projections in the past few years to score political points when the actual numbers came in lower.”

Bush is not doing enough about Lebanon, fumes NBC’s Andrea Mitchell: “The President has not picked up the phone and, and exerted himself. We still are a superpower, no matter how constrained we are because of Iraq and Afghanistan.” Dan “Still in Denial” Rather tells Larry King: “People always want to put a sign around you and call you something bad if you refuse to report the news the way they want it reported.”
TIME’s Insular Take on Hillary

L. Brent Bozell III’s April 26, 2006, Nationally Syndicated Column

Hillary Rodham Clinton was featured in a flattering black-and-white photo on the Aug. 28 cover of TIME magazine — the 10th cover story for Hillary Clinton since she appeared on the national scene hitched to Bill Clinton’s wagon in 1992. That’s got to be a record of sorts. But one thing was very different this time. The headline featured a poll question with two little boxes to check: “L-O-V-E HER” or “H-A-T-E HER.”

What? Someone might not love her? This must be the handiwork of TIME’s new Managing Editor, Richard Stengel. He’s made a public fuss about his desire to see TIME be a major player in the shaping of America’s opinions.

This newest cover story is a departure from the norm, the royal covers she’s so often received, with titles like “Ascent of a Woman,” “Turning Fifty,” “Hillary In Her Own Words,” and the late-Lewinsky-scandal classic, “It’s Nobody’s Business But Ours.” The normal TIME magazine Hillary cover could be mistaken for the cover of Ladies’ Home Journal. (There was one exception. One cover in 1996 carried the caption “The Truth About Whitewater” and featured a harshly spotlighted Hillary, but it wasn’t advertising a TIME article inside, but a book excerpt from James Stewart’s Blood Sport.)

TIME treats Hillary Clinton like she was America’s Princess Diana, someone we’re all supposed to root for because she never got that storybook marriage with the Prince of Arkansas. There’s a big problem with the metaphor, however. For all her hatred of land mines, Lady Di never aspired — craved? — to rule England with an iron fist.

Hillary’s long-held desire for the presidency, visible all the way back in the “two-for-one special” co-president talk of 1992, is never portrayed by TIME as unseemly ambition. Her ambition is natural. She’s a Clinton.

That’s why the love her-hate her boxes are inadequate. What many conservatives hate is not Hillary but the glaringly obvious way in which the national news media circle around the Clintons like vicious attackers. Her campaign for the White House could face every attack Bill faced, and more, since “he never had to contend with the blogosphere or the newer kind of independent operation that turned swift boat into a verb in the 2004 presidential election.”

Tumulty’s report still carries the usual courtier’s curtsies, starting with talk of the “outsie status of both Clintons” and how Hillary’s husband is, hands down, “the best Democratic political strategist on the planet.” (Now if he could only keep his hands down.) They are “the most fascinating tango act in politics,” even if now “the choreography is reversed.” Bill Clinton is “still the superstar;” even though the list of candidates he’s supported in recent years, and who have gone down in crushing defeats, seems endless. Hillary pleases her neighbors by having “story time for tots the day she picked up her public-library card.” In a sidebar, their Chappaqua fans confess they’re not usually “royal-watchers.”

If you think the whole thing reads like an internal memo at a Democratic club, you’re not mistaken. In more than 4,000 words, there’s not a single conservative or Republican detractor — not one — quoted. TIME explained that since the question of Hillary’s forthcoming presidential campaign is so sensitive, neither Clinton would speak on the record, and discouraged all their insiders from speaking on the record. So the whole article is filled with the Clinton inner circle, often speaking anonymously.

That’s not to say they don’t ponder, inside the Clinton tank, how their marriage might be a political problem, or he might outshine her on the stump, or she might be seen as liberal. But imagine TIME devoting an entire cover story to anonymous insider chatter from Reagan or Bush insiders, without a single sound-bite from a liberal critic. Then see a doctor for shortness of breath if you can’t handle the incessant laughter.

Conservatives do surface, in the usual role of vicious attackers. Her campaign for the White House could face every attack Bill faced, and more, since “he never had to contend with the blogosphere or the newer kind of independent operation that turned swift boat into a verb in the 2004 presidential election.” Tumulty’s most ridiculous sentence is this one: “Hilary has already figured as Lady Macbeth in enough volumes to fill a bookmobile.” That’s just servile exaggeration, just as there isn’t a bookmobile of George W. Bush-bashing books.

That said, Tumulty is kind enough to finish the sentence by mentioning two forthcoming titles of the vicious critiques of Hillary, one from Jonah Goldberg of National Review, and my book with Tim Graham on how the media are trying to pave Hillary’s path to the presidency. Tumulty is only making the conservative argument stick: the first way the media pave Hillary’s path to power is by publishing cover stories in which only the Clinton political family is allowed to speak.

That’s why the love her-hate her boxes are inadequate. What many conservatives hate is not Hillary but the glaringly obvious way in which the national news media circle around the Clintons like royal scribes and Secret Service protectors, incapable of telling a story straight, all the while insisting their final product is “objective news reporting.”
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, *Your World w/Neil Cavuto*, Sept. 8
- CNN, *Showbiz Tonight*, Sept. 8
- FNC, *Fox & Friends*, Sept. 8
- MSNBC, *Scarborough Country*, Sept. 6
- CNN, *Lou Dobbs Tonight*, Aug. 31
- FNC, *Fox News Watch*, Aug. 19

### Radio

- Hugh Hewitt, Aug. 15
- American Family Radio, Aug. 15, 25, 29
- Janet Parshall’s America, Aug. 22
- Right Balance, Aug. 22, 31, Sept. 1
- Entertainment USA, Aug. 21
- Thom Hartmann, Aug. 22, 29
- USA Radio, Aug. 31
- Dateline, Aug. 29
- Money Matters, Sept. 1
- WIBC, Indianapolis, IN, Aug. 16

### Internet

- Drudge Report, Sept. 8
- Seashell’s blog, Sept. 7
- Powerline blog, Sept. 6
- Townhall.com, Sept. 6, 7
- TwinCities.com, Sept. 6
- Minuteman Project, Sept. 6
- Agape Press, Aug. 17, Sept. 5
- World magazine blog, Aug. 16, 28
- Laura Ingraham.com, Aug. 29
- Rush Limbaugh.com, Aug. 24, 29, 30, 31
- Investor’s Business Daily, Aug. 28
- Pasadena Star News, Aug. 16
- Associated Press, Aug. 16

On CNN’s *Showbiz Tonight*, the MRC’s Tim Graham rebuts the liberal attacks against the TV movie “Path to 9/11” as largely cheerleading for the Clinton Administration.

### Print

- *Wall Street Journal*, Sept. 2, 8
- *Arkansas Democrat-Gazette*, Sept. 5
- *Duluth News Tribune*, Sept. 7
- *Gwinnett Daily Post*, Sept. 6
- *Pittsburgh Tribune-Review*, Aug. 27
- *Christian Science Monitor*, Sept. 5
- *Washington Times*, Aug. 28, 29, Sept. 4, 6
- *World Peace Herald*, Sept. 5
- *Akon Beacon Journal*, Aug. 6
- *Texas Assoc. of Business*, August Issue
- *Winspear Business News*, Aug. 11
- *Detroit News*, Aug. 19
- *Investor’s Business Daily*, Aug. 28
- *WDC Media News*, Aug. 16
- *Pasaden Star News*, Aug. 16
- Associated Press, Aug. 16

On MSNBC’s *Scarborough Country*, MRC President Brent Bozell discusses the liberal attacks against the TV movie “Path to 9/11.”

MRC Director of Media Analysis Tim Graham explains how the networks promote illegal immigration on CNN’s *Lou Dobbs Tonight*.

WIBA, Madison, WI, Aug. 24, 29, 30, 31
KSLR, San Antonio, TX, Aug. 28
WACV, Montgomery, AL, Sept. 5
WVMT, Burlington, VT, Sept. 6
WCHS, Charleston, WV, Aug. 29
WRVA, Richmond, VA, Sept. 4
WJR, Detroit, MI, Aug. 22, Sept. 4
WGIR, Boston, MA, Sept. 1
WOOD, Grand Rapids, MI, Sept. 4
KAGM, Albuquerque, NM, Sept. 1
WEZS, Boston, MA, Aug. 26
WESB, Bradford, PA, Aug. 29
New Law Allows Tax-Free IRA Rollovers

On August 17, President Bush signed the Pension Protection Act of 2006. Among its many provisions, this new Act allows Roth and traditional IRA owners, age 70 ½ or older, to directly transfer up to $100,000 from their IRAs to public charities, such as the Media Research Center. While no charitable deduction would be allowed for this rollover, the amount of the distribution would also be excluded from the donor’s adjusted gross income (AGI) for federal income tax purposes.

Under the old law, any IRA distribution (even for charitable gifts) would have to be reported as income by the owner. If the distribution was then given to a charitable organization, the donor could claim an offsetting charitable deduction up to 50% of his/her adjusted gross income (AGI). Because of the increase in taxable income, however, the deduction could be further reduced by a variety of deduction limitations and exemption phase-outs. The net effect was often an increase in taxes for many philanthropically-minded Americans.

With the new law, not only is the distribution to a qualified public charity excluded from the donor’s AGI, but the Joint Committee on Taxation has also indicated that the qualified IRA charitable rollover will fulfill part or all of a donor’s required minimum distribution from an individual retirement account.

If you are looking for a way to make additional cash contributions above your current 50% of AGI limit, don’t itemize your deductions, or fear that an increased AGI will push you into a higher tax bracket, cause more of your Social Security income to be taxed, or result in more deduction limitations or exemption phase-outs, the IRA rollover might be right for you.

Because this provision expires on December 31, 2007, rollovers can only be made in 2006 and 2007 at a maximum amount of $100,000 per individual per year.

For more information, please call MRC’s Director of Development, Thom Golab, at (800) 672-1423.

IRS Circular 230 Notice:

We have advised you to seek your own legal and tax advice in connection with gift and planning matters. The MRC does not provide legal or tax advice. This communication (including any attachments) is not intended or written to be used, and cannot be used, for the purpose of avoiding tax-related penalties.