According to the mainstream media, conservatives never win elections outright on our ideas or policies. No, there’s always something else – something sneaky and underhanded – that pushes conservatives over the top.

The latest liberal theory on conservative success – and it is now being pounded home with regularity by the mainstream media – is that the media have a powerful conservative bias.

You read that right. Believe it or not, a group of “mainstream” journalists and liberal politicians is now claiming an unholy alliance of conservative media outlets dominates the political debate in the country. According to this conspiracy theory Fox News Channel, the Washington Times, Rush Limbaugh and the Wall Street Journal relentlessly push conservative ideas and are almost solely responsible for the Republican victory in November.

This nuttiness sounds strikingly similar to the “vast right wing conspiracy” accusation advanced by Hillary Rodham Clinton in 1998 when her husband Bill was trying to dodge adultery charges. The “right wing media conspiracy” theory, however, is so ludicrous that it makes Hillary’s original accusation look credible by comparison.

Just because it’s ridiculous, however, doesn’t mean it’s not being advanced with a passion. And it started almost immediately after the Republican victories on Election Day.

“Some of the major broadcast media are simply biased in favor of the Republicans, while the rest tend to blur differences between the parties,” Paul Krugman, a columnist for the influential, ultra-liberal New York Times wrote on November 8.

Al Hunt of the Wall Street Journal and CNN’s Capital Gang agreed. Republicans in the last election enjoyed “the most acquiescent press corps since pre-Watergate,” Hunt wrote in his Wall Street Journal column.

Time magazine soon joined the chorus. “Even if Democrats pull together on some big issues,” reporter Josh Tyrangiel wrote on November 18, “they’ll still have to overcome G.O.P. bully pulpits in the White House and Congress – and a new reality: conservative bias in the media.”

Former Vice President Al Gore then expanded on the theme in an interview with the New York Observer. Conservative media bias is not only real, Gore argued in the paper’s December 2 issue, but it is planned, organized and directed by the Republican Party and its wealthy allies.

“Fox News Network, the Washington Times, Rush Limbaugh – there’s a bunch of them,” said the man, who, thank God, was never elected President. “And some of them are financed by wealthy ultra-conservative billionaires who make political deals with Republican administrations and the rest of the media.”
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Why The Charlie Daniels Band?
“...please try to realize that when you see news coverage [of Guantanamo Bay, Cuba] much of the time you’re not getting the whole story, but an account filtered through a liberal mindset with an agenda...It’s a shame that we can’t have an unbiased media who would just report the truth and let us make up our own minds...”
~ Charlie Daniels

The Media Research Center’s Third Annual DISHONORS AWARDS Roasting the Most Outrageously Biased Liberal Reporters of The Year!

Featuring a Private Concert by The Charlie Daniels Band

Continued from page 1

“Something will start at the Republican National Committee, inside the building,” Gore insisted, “and it will explode the next day on the right-wing talk show network and on Fox News and in the newspapers which play this game.”

Liberal journalist Juan Williams found this outrageous theory to be believable. “It seems to me that there’s some truth to the idea,” the former National Public Radio host said in his regular appearance on Fox News Sunday (a show that is, presumably, a part of the conservative media conspiracy). Williams went on to add – as liberals often do – that conservative media forces aren’t quite normal. “It seems to me there is more of a direct and sort of out there statement coming from Rush Limbaugh and the Washington Times, and people who are willing to say: Look, we are outright proud to be conservative and here’s what we stand for and we don’t think there’s any need to make an apology.”

For reporters and columnists to argue that the conservative press dominates political debate is absurd. The simple truth, as all of us know, is that the largest and most influential media outlets in the country – the New York Times, Washington Post, the broadcast networks and the national news magazines – all are directed by liberal publishers, editors and producers and they produce news that reinforces their worldview and promotes the causes and politicians they agree with.

But what’s also true is that these leftists are running scared. And they’ll say anything to keep control. The MRC realizes this and is more committed than ever to fighting liberal bias. In the coming months, the liberal media will be increasingly adversarial as conservatives take over the Congress and the MRC will be there to expose and counter this bias.

I want to leave you this month with a personal update. Word got out that I’d suffered a heart attack in early November, and what I’ve heard back from so many of our supporters – in letters, cards, phone messages and the like – has left me...speechless. I am happy to report that things are better now, and I expect will be back to normal soon. But I also want to say that I will never be able to thank everyone strongly enough for the outpouring of prayers and concern. You are the finest friends a man could hope for. I wish you all – us all – a blessed Christmas.

Until next time,

L. Brent Bozell III, President
Charitable Gift Annuity
A gift that keeps giving back

Charitable Gift Annuities (CGA) have become a very popular investment since traditional fixed income rates have all but evaporated and the stock market has remained sluggish. CGAs offer a fixed rate life income alternative for an individual or a couple.

More than an investment, CGAs combine a charitable contribution to the Media Research Center with a guaranteed rate of return, part of which is tax-free.

Recently a couple in Florida purchased a CGA with the MRC with $20,000 in cash. At ages 85 and 70, their rate of return is 7.5% (calculated based on their ages) and will pay them $1,500 per year, $876 of which will be tax-free. The hidden benefits of a CGA are the $5,284 charitable gift tax credit they will have for 2002 for their gift to the Media Research Center. This is a win-win situation, uncommon in the investment world.

For an example of how a Charitable Gift Annuity would work for your specific situation, please call John Corfield, Director of Development at (703) 683-9733 and we will send to you a complete breakdown and explanation.

The Media Research Center offers a full range of Gift and Estate Planning alternatives including bequests, gifts of appreciated assets, Charitable Gift Annuities, and Charitable Remainder Trusts. Leaving a planned gift with the MRC preserves your legacy and supports the critical work of the MRC into the future.

Payout rates are determined by the age(s) of the income recipient(s). Below are sample rates for one-life or two lives in the household.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>RATE</th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>RATE</th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>RATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90+</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>90+</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Payout Rates As HIGH as 12%

**Time’s Jack White:**
The MRC Should Declare Victory

The media bias war is over and the MRC has won.

That’s the judgment of soon-to-be Time columnist Jack White, who is currently the Howard University writer-in-residence. Appearing on C-SPAN’s November 15 Washington Journal, White said he was “constantly amazed when people complain about the so-called liberal bias in the press.”

“There are still people making a living complaining about the liberal bias in the press, our good friends, Brent Bozell and company for example, who run the Media Research Center, and I keep wondering ‘When are you going to declare victory, fellas?’” White said.

The MRC was pleased to learn that such a prominent correspondent – White was a Time reporter before going to Howard – thought we were being effective and immediately issued a press release to thank him for the compliment and remind him, and other liberals in the media, that our work is far from done.

“While we appreciate White’s vote of confidence in our work, it seems that it is hypocritical for him to declare the media bias free, when he is still wearing his liberal blinders,” the MRC’s Director of Media Analysis Rich Noyes said in the press release. “We will declare victory when fair and balanced reporting is the norm in every national media outlet.”
What Would Jesus Drive?
The media usually condemn church groups that mix politics and religion. But when a left-wing evangelical group recently claimed Jesus was an environmentalist, the cable networks and ABC all but cheered.

CNN, CNBC and ABC’s World News Tonight all dedicated sizable segments on November 20 to an anti-SUV ad campaign funded by the Evangelical Environmental Network. The ads asked “What Would Jesus Drive” and suggested that good Christians shouldn’t drive SUVs because they pollute, contribute to global warming and allegedly endanger the health of children.

Peter Jennings called an evangelical environmental group “conservative” but that wasn’t the case.

The coverage was predictably sympathetic at all three networks but Peter Jennings and ABC provided the most misleading statement. The organization behind the effort, Jennings told viewers, was composed of “conservative Christians.”

Conservative? A look at the Evangelical Environmental Network’s website makes it clear the group is made up of hard-core environmentalists who are more Sierra Club than Southern Baptist. What’s more, an Associated Press news story divulged that one of the group’s allies in the anti-SUV campaign is none other than the National Council of Churches, a radical left-wing bunch that has never been confused with conservatives. Except by Peter Jennings and ABC.

CNN’s Hypocrisy

When news broke in mid-November that Fox News Chairman Roger Ailes had written a memo to Bush adviser Karl Rove shortly after the September 11 attacks, several media outlets claimed it was unethical and none of them were more outraged than Fox News’s main rival CNN.

CNN slammed Ailes on American Morning, devoted segments of Talkback Live and Wolf Blitzer Reports to the memo and used it as fodder on the political talk show Crossfire.

The sky is falling! The sky is falling! Bill Moyers all but claimed the world was coming to an end after conservative victories in November. As MRC Vice President Brent Baker noted in a November 19 CyberAlert, Kaplan’s actions were far worse and presented a much greater conflict of interest than a single memo sent during a time of national crisis. Add hypocrisy to the list of CNN’s problems.

Moyers on the Election: The Country is Doomed!
The Republican victory in November appears to have had an emotional effect on Bill Moyers.

Shortly after the election, Moyers used his taxpayer-funded PBS show Now to deliver a panic-stricken diatribe against the victorious party. Republicans, according to Moyers, plan to use their new power to “enforce their radical ideology.” This plan includes forcing “pregnant women to surrender control over their own lives,” will involve transferring “wealth from working people to the rich” and “giving corporations a free hand to eviscerate the environment.”

These ridiculous statements came at the end of a program that prominently featured left-wing critics of the Bush administration. Earlier on the show, a Harvard professor had explained to Moyers that the election results “confirms for people abroad that the President has support for an imperialistic agenda” and the editor of Harpers magazine told the former CBS newsman that Bush won because he appealed to “the country’s weakness and fear not to its courage and strength.”

One of these days, the conservatives in Congress will develop the “courage and strength” to eliminate public funding for PBS.
Warning! Conservatives are taking over the Senate.

On November 7 a Post article included short biographies of the 13 Republicans scheduled to become committee chairmen when the GOP takes over the Senate. Ideological labels were applied to 11 senators. Nine were identified as conservatives and two were described as moderates.

Compare these descriptions to the short biographies the Post carried 17 months earlier, on May 27, 2001, when Sen. James Jeffords sudden defection from the Republican Party gave Senate control to the Democrats. Staunch liberals such as Ted Kennedy, Tom Harkin and Patrick Leahy went unlabeled. Only Sen. Paul Sarbanes of Maryland was identified as a liberal.

That’s the Post’s idea of fairness in labeling. Identify all the conservatives because they have an agenda and the public should be warned. But don’t bother to label people the likes of Leahy, Harkin and Kennedy. Apparently, these politicians are perfectly reasonable since they agree with the Post reporters and editors on almost everything.

Post’s Dionne: The “Ever-Alert” MRC

The Washington Post’s E.J. Dionne is another prominent journalist who recognizes the work MRC does.

“When Katie Couric had the nerve to ask some tough questions of EPA Administrator Christine Todd Whitman on Monday’s Today show, the ever-alert conservative Media Research Center trashed Couric for bias,” Dionne wrote in a December 6 opinion piece in the Post.

While his words were complimentary, the premise of Dionne’s column was hardly positive. Like several other liberal columnists over the last month, the former New York Times reporter argued that the media now has a conservative bias. The rise of talk radio and the Fox News Channel are proof, according to Dionne.

File this one under wishful thinking. Liberals control everything in the media except talk radio, Fox News and a couple of newspapers. That’s why the MRC has to be “ever-alert.”

Torture... By Air Conditioning!

As we’ve noted on several occasions, ABC News has a fondness for filing reports critical of American actions in the war on terrorism. A mid-November story by ABC’s Bob Woodruff about a Pakistani recently released from Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, however, had to contain the strangest criticism of the war effort to date.

The man was captured in Afghanistan and like the other battlefield detainees blindfolded, tied up and flown to Cuba. While at Guantanamo he claims he was punished for praying, hit on the head and “grabbed by the neck.” Then, he had to suffer through air conditioning.

The man had never seen air conditioning before and “thought it was a kind of torture,” Woodruff explained. “They pumped cold air from a hole in the ceiling. This was the punishment. The air was very cold,” the man told the ABC reporter.

Hmmm... Maybe next summer they should just turn the air conditioning off.

mini-bits

Hearst White House columnist Helen Thomas says “I wake up and ask myself ‘Who do I hate today?’”  More from Helen: “Bush’s policy of pre-emptive war is immoral – such a policy would legitimize Pearl Harbor”  Newsweek’s Michael Hirsh claims “The war policy is a crock. This is a hugely risky operation for potential gains that probably won’t justify the risk”  “Were you cheated out of the Presidency,” Barbara Walters asks of Al Gore  Who’s right? New York Times headline on November 27: “Bush Officials Praise Saudis for Aiding Terror Fight” versus same day’s Washington Post headline: “Bush Aides: Saudis Can Do More to Halt Terror Funds”  George Will explains part of the problem with the press: “The media is in league with professional hysterics in the environmental movement.”
Your CNSNews.com Dividends Are In

I’ve spent the majority of my adult life working in the private sector, and have been accused, from time to time, of having a corporate mindset.

Just as a corporation has shareholders, I’ve always thought of you and all the supporters of the Media Research Center as our shareholders. And just as a corporation is responsible to its shareholders, the entire staff of CNSNews.com, the Internet newswire of the MRC, is responsible to you.

Part of my responsibility involves reporting to you on our progress so you can be confident that your investment in us is being put to good use. You support our work because you share our passion for fighting liberal media bias and delivering the truth to the public. But you also have the right to expect results from CNSNews.com – a dividend, so to speak.

One way to put your CNSNews.com dividend into perspective and to show you results is via Internet audience. The November 26 issue of the Washington Post reported that the top-ranked Washington think-tank website between July and September was the Cato Institute with a total of 188,901 unique visitors in September, according to the Alexa Internet rating system.

The same report showed that the Heritage Foundation logged 157,019 unique visitors in September, while the Center for Defense Information recorded 99,644. These are all very respectable numbers.

How does CNSNews.com stack up against these giants? In the interest of full disclosure, it should be stated that we do not subscribe to the Alexa system; we use the Webtrends system and track total visitors rather than unique visitors, which, in our case, number about 62.5% of our total visitors.

During the month of September, CNSNews.com logged 688,803 total visitors, according to the report to which we subscribe. That’s about 430,501 unique visitors. In October, that number surged to roughly 561,936 unique visitors, and November’s unique readership was 566,453.

With more than half a million unique monthly readers after less than five years, there are any number of things to which this success can be attributed: a dedicated staff, a sharp eye for compelling news, a tireless pursuit of keeping our promise to deliver ‘The Right News – Right Now.’

But the biggest factor to which this success is attributed is you. Without your support and confidence, none of this could be possible. And without your continued support, we can’t continue waging our campaign against liberal media bias by providing an alternative source of quality journalism served up to nearly a million visitors every month.

Your support has resulted in more than just a big fat readership statistic – a lot more. It’s allowed us to expose and derail plans to muzzle the nation’s religious broadcasters, detail the duplicity of liberal policies and politicians, uncover radical education proposals and keep them out of the classroom, alert authorities to the advocacy of murdering conservative luminaries and end it, and help train the next generation of journalists.

This is important work and we want nothing more than to continue doing it. With your help, we will. And we’ll continue to return the dividend you’ve come to expect and deserve from your investment in CNSNews.com.
The MRC conducts the battle against liberal bias on many fronts and one of the most rewarding is our work with other conservative organizations.

Communications Director Liz Swasey directs MRC’s coordination with other groups. These organizations want to work with the MRC because they need help in overcoming unfair coverage by the liberal media, Swasey says. “Conservative groups know the media actively oppose them,” she notes. “What they often don’t know, until they work with the MRC, is that they can fight back and win.”

In 2002, the MRC worked with several groups. Religious coverage was examined in partnership with the Heritage Foundation and Focus on the Family, and the American Conservative Union sought MRC assistance in its examination of reporting on the free enterprise system. The MRC also conducted a study of CNN’s Cuba coverage in conjunction with the CubaLibertad organization.

Conservative authors – and even a few non-partisan ones – are increasingly making use of the MRC’s vast collection of taped and written material. Ann Coulter used MRC material for her number one best selling book Slander – just as Bernard Goldberg did for his 2001 number one best seller Bias – and two magazine publishers recently researched the MRC tape archives for information to use in their upcoming book on how the media depict women.

The MRC also speaks to policy groups about media bias and its effect on the political process. Over the last year, MRC staff has spoken to the Claire Booth Luce Policy Institute, Conservative Women’s Network of Washington, D.C. and the Leadership Institute.

The MRC’s work with other organizations helps strengthen the entire conservative movement and we plan to expand our work in this area in 2003.

Forcing a Change at The Times

The MRC has helped expose the hypocrisy of the New York Times crusade against Augusta National Golf Club’s membership policy.

The MRC weighed in on the issue in a December 4 national press release that took Times Executive Editor Howell Raines to task. In an effort to force the club to admit a woman member, the Times had run more than 30 articles on the subject in previous three months. President Bozell noted that such a campaign “can be driven by only one thing: personal obsession.”

The release also condemned Raines for his refusal to run two sports columns that disagreed with the paper’s editorial stance. “This intolerance is itself intolerable,” Bozell noted.

Washington Post media critic Howard Kurtz found the comments interesting and interviewed President Bozell in an article on the Times controversy. “You would think a newspaper would encourage debate within its columns,” Bozell told Kurtz in the December 5 Post. But, that’s obviously not the case at the Times. “You can have an opinion at the New York Times as long as it reflects the opinions of the editors,” the MRC President added.

Rich Noyes, the MRC’s Director of Media Analysis, was also interviewed on the subject, appearing on the MSNBC talk show Press & Buchanan on December 5 for a 20-minute discussion. Noyes noted, among other things, that there should be more pressing issues for the nation’s most influential newspaper than campaigning to have wealthy women admitted to an elite private club.

The pressure from the MRC and others had an effect. The Times, after aggressively defending its position during the first week of December, relented on December 6 and ran the two sports columns the following Sunday.
MRC Condemns Media Non-Coverage of Daschle Attack

Rush Limbaugh is dangerous. And so is his audience.

That was the message Sen. Tom Daschle delivered in his latest press conference as Senate Majority Leader. On November 20, Daschle accused Limbaugh of inciting threats against him and compared talk radio and his listeners to “religious fundamentalism” overseas.

And what did the networks have to say about this blatant attempt to link Limbaugh with violence and muzzle a critic that has consistently – and fairly – railed against Democrats and liberals? Practically nothing.

ABC’s World News Tonight and Good Morning America didn’t mention Daschle’s diatribe that day or the following morning and neither did Dan Rather and CBS. Nothing on CNN’s Newsnight or CNBC’s The News with Brian Williams either. Tom Brokaw did run a short item but only Fox News Channel’s Special Report with Brit Hume and CNN’s political show, Inside Politics, covered the story in-depth.

The MRC jumped on this hypocritical lack of coverage immediately in a Media Reality Check. The Reality Check noted that journalists were quick to condemn John Ashcroft and Ari Fleischer for statements they claimed might have a “chilling effect” on the First Amendment rights but that the liberal attack on Limbaugh was overlooked. “There has been no hue and cry about a top Senate leader’s seeming attempt to muzzle a critic by falsely linking him with threats of physical harm,” the release noted.

MRC President Brent Bozell expanded on this idea in his nationally syndicated column, noting that linking Limbaugh and conservatives to violence has been done so often that it doesn’t seem unusual to reporters and editors. “It must have seemed like a plausible complaint in the eyes of the press, because most of the media ignored it as if it was unexceptional,” Bozell wrote.

Once again, the national media demonstrate a double standard. Attacks by conservatives are covered in depth while attacks against them are all but ignored.