Rush Limbaugh interviewed MRC President Brent Bozell for the September issue of The Limbaugh Letter. Published here are excerpts of that interview.

RUSH: You started the Media Research Center in ‘87, a year before me. You’ve got 28 years in. How do you see your mission to date? And how do you stay enthused?

BOZELL: You won’t remember this, I bet, but you and I had a conversation very early on in this adventure. You asked me, “What is your end goal?” I said, “To win, to close down the MRC, and get a real job.” You laughed and said, “Then you’ll never have a real job,” your point being that this problem is never going to go away. You’re never going to stop the press from being left-wing. You can’t do a thing to stop that. But what you can do is expose their lack of credibility. You have to do it every single day. That’s what motivates me, because it works.

RUSH: What evidence do you have of that?

BOZELL: The polls tell me that our efforts are working. If you look at the public’s perception in 1987, when we started this organization, a survey showed that 75 percent of the public believed that what they were getting was objective truth. I’ve seen polls showing up to 89 percent of the public now believe it’s subjective opinion.

RUSH: You wrote a book a couple years ago, Collusion: How the Media Stole the 2012 Election and How to Stop Them From Doing it in 2016. What do you mean, the media stole the election?

BOZELL: In the 2012 primary process, every time a Republican came to the top, his or her head was lopped off by the press, including Sarah Palin, who didn’t even run. They did it with every single candidate. We said 2016 was going to be the exact same thing, and you’re already starting to see the stories. On the flip side, where is the coverage of the Democrats? Where is there even an issue with Planned Parenthood?

RUSH: Do you view part of your job as forcing the media into covering these things that they would rather not?

BOZELL: When we started the organization, that wasn’t the issue. It was the bias by commission, where
they were deliberately distorting news stories to fit an agenda. The bigger issue now is bias by omission. I’ve never seen anything like it. On story after story, where you and I and the average person says, “Of course that’s a news story,” night after night the decision is deliberately made not to cover it. That’s bias by omission. . . . But we can’t just complain. There’s been a fundamental breakthrough that now allows us to tell our story our way to the public. Through the Internet, we can reach just as many people as they can. So my call to conservatives is to tell your story as often as you can. Go to the blogosphere, go to Breitbart, go to CNS News. Go to all the different outlets we have and tell your story.

RUSH: That’s especially true with Millenials. They are cutting the cord on traditional delivery of news stories, and they’re getting it increasingly on their phones and tablets, streaming via websites. … Speaking of young people, it seems like the aspirations of young people in our movement are different than they were, at least for me and you coming up. I see so many conservatives in Washington to whom the objective is to get a book deal, or a Fox News analyst gig. It seems to me a squandered opportunity.

BOZELL: When I cut my teeth in this movement — 1979, 1980 — everyone I knew in the conservative movement wanted to change America. Everybody was participatory in the Reagan revolution because there was an opportunity to restore greatness. In the past 20 years, I saw a new reality emerge: young people coming into the movement as a means of advancing themselves. I saw less and less grounding in principle.

RUSH: William F. Buckley Jr. was your uncle. I think he was just so dominant intellectually that he set standards even after he retired. Do you wish you had the chance to ask your uncle questions about things going on today, or do you imagine what he would do?

BOZELL: This morning I was thinking about that very thing: How would Bill Buckley have handled Donald Trump? My guess is he would have been merciless. On the other hand, Bill did like a fun time, and I think there’s a part of Bill that would’ve been just giggling at this right now. But when it came time to be serious, he was profoundly serious, and he always had his own true north. . . . I knew who Bill Buckley admired, and who he didn’t admire. I knew who he had a fondness for and who he didn’t have a fondness for. I will tell you, as God is my judge, you were one of his favorite people.

RUSH: Oh, that makes my day, I can’t tell you! Brent, look, I don’t say it enough, but I shudder to think where the country would be if you hadn’t been doing what you’re doing. You do it tirelessly. You’re not resting on your laurels, and you’re not phoning anything in. It’s really admirable.

BOZELL: Thank you, Rush. It means the world to me.

To support the MRC in its work battling liberal media bias, visit www.MRC.org or call its headquarters at 571-267-3500.

The Media Research Center participates in the Combined Federal Campaign (CFC). MRC’s CFC number is 12489.

CNBC ‘Debate’ Debacle Was Designed to Belittle and Discredit GOP Candidates

The so-called debate among GOP presidential candidates hosted by CNBC on Oct. 28 was nothing more than a vicious, liberal media hit job by the moderators who, with their skewed and insulting questions, tried to discredit the conservatives on the stage.

It was infuriating to see such blatant liberal bias on display. Fortunately the candidates fought back, challenging the questions and the moderators, and exposing their leftist agenda … and the nation saw it.

An MRC analysis of the 43 questions asked by the CNBC hosts showed that nearly two-thirds of those questions – 65% – included negative spin, personal insults or attacks. Typical was John Harwood’s smear to Donald Trump that he would “make Americans better off because your greatness would replace the stupidity and incompetence of others. Let’s be honest: Is this a comic book version of a presidential campaign?”

Or, in a question to Jeb Bush, Harwood claimed “the Republican Party has given in to know-nothingism – is that why you’re having a difficult time in this race?”

Moderator Becky Quick noted to Carly Fiorina that Hewlett Packard had fired her 10 years ago and, so, “I just wondered why you think we should hire you now?”

Quick also belittled Marco Rubio, claiming he lacked “book-keeping skills” and once faced foreclosure on a home. Thus, she snidely queried, “It raises the question whether you have the maturity and wisdom to lead this $17 trillion economy. What do you say?”

Moderator Carl Quintanilla nearly asked Rubio if he would quit the presidential race because he was “a young man in a hurry,” and as a senator, “why not slow down, get a few more things done first, or at least finish what you start?” Needless to say, the left-wing media never asked first-term Senator Barack Obama that question in the 2008 campaign.

Following the CNBC debate and the MRC analysis of the questions, MRC President Brent Bozell said, “Republicans had every right to be furious Wednesday night. Of all the terrible debates in recent American history — and there have been many — CNBC’s has got to be the absolute worst. The three main moderators, and in particular John Harwood, acted like petulant children trying to pick fights with the candidates.”

“When nearly two-thirds of your questions are comprised of negative spin, personal insults or ad hominem attacks, your agenda is clear: undermine the Republican candidates at all costs,” stated Bozell. “These CNBC ‘journalists’ exposed themselves to the world as left-wing stooges jockeying for a position in Hillary Clinton’s campaign press shop. It was embarrassing.”

CNBC gave Americans a front row seat to liberal media bias. In their arrogant and insulting overreach, the moderators exposed themselves and, ironically, made the conservatives on stage look like far better, stronger, and wiser people.
Left-wing journalist Jonathan Alter lectures there is “nothing conservative” about the GOP, it is filled with “radicals” who are “living in cloud coo-coo land.”

Alter’s Bias

Left-wing journalist Jonathan Alter fancies himself the arbiter of conservatism, thus it’s no surprise he dismissed the Republican candidates in the fourth presidential debate as “radical” and “crazy.” On MSNBC Alter lectured, “Ben Carson twice mentioned 1913. That’s when the Federal Reserve was created, when the federal income tax was put in, and he wants to turn the clock back to pre-1913. Not just pre-New Deal, but pre-federal income tax.”

“And it struck me that it’s really kind of crazy that we call this a conservative political party,” fumed Alter. “There’s nothing conservative about it. Big-c conservative, small-c conservative. They shouldn’t be called conservatives anymore. They are radicals who want, you know, radical change in the American system. And I wish that the press and the public would see this more for what it is.”

He also dismissed the candidates’ tax plans as “right-wing coo-coo economics” from people “living in cloud coo-coo land.”

Liberal Media Whiners

After the CNBC debate debacle, the organizer of the GOP debate hosted by Fox News Channel and The Wall Street Journal promised a different result and delivered beautifully. They focused on substantive economic issues and did not devolve into personal attacks and insults. And for this they were attacked by liberals! As the Nov. 10 debate was underway, The Nation’s Joan Walsh tweeted, “These moderators are terrified of becoming the story, and this is a farce.” Daily Beast columnist Dean Obeidallah mocked on Twitter, “Is there an applause sign that Fox Business keep lighting up?”

Politico’s Marc Caputo whined, “Bring back the CNBC debate moderators,” and complained of the questions, “Just how can we ask the least probing question of you so you don’t hate us?” Ana Marie Cox, also a Daily Beast columnist, yammered, “LIES. SCRIPTED COMEBACKS. SHADE. This isn’t a debate, it’s a Tyler Perry movie.” Conducting a serious debate about taxes, immigration, trade, and the national debt apparently is too much to bear for the liberal media.

Liberal reporters were quick to criticize the 4th GOP debate sponsored by the Fox News Channel, claiming it was a “farce,” and the Daily Beast’s Ana Marie Cox tweeting “LIES” and “SCRIPTED COMEBACKS.”

ABC Spins

Planned Parenthood’s harvesting of aborted baby parts is well-documented in the undercover videos released over the last few months and in the abortion group’s statement that it is changing its “fetal-tissue reimbursement policy,” as reported by AP. But ABC’s The View and ABC.com are having none of that. On Nov. 6, guest Carly Fiorina talked about “harvesting baby parts” and co-host Whoopi Goldberg interrupted, “You know that’s not true! Carly, you know no one’s harvesting baby parts.”

Goldberg stammered on, “I need to stop you. Because that is not — you know that’s not true!” Fellow co-host Joy Behar also jumped in and whined, “That offends my sensibility to hear you say something like that when you know it’s not true.”

Later, at ABC.com, reporter Jordyn Phelps characterized the harvesting-of-baby-parts fact as a “claim,” implying that it’s somehow debatable. This is not ABC spinning to protect Planned Parenthood and hide the truth from its viewers. This is ABC lying.
Rolling Lawsuits

Although the leftist media don’t want to talk about Rolling Stone’s liberally biased and patently false story about rape at the University of Virginia, the lawyers and the courts do. Since Rolling Stone had to retract the concocted story by “reporter” Sabrina Erdely from November 2014, punitive claims against the magazine now total $35 million.

Three members of the Phi Kappa Psi fraternity have sued for $225,000 each for defamation. Associate Dean Nicole Eramo, who was portrayed by the magazine as the “chief villain” in the faux-rape, is suing for $7.5 million for defamatory statements made “to present a preconceived storyline.” Phi Kappa Psi itself is seeking $25 million “for harm and injury to its reputation.”

When the story first appeared the liberal media ran with it to launch a “national dialogue” on the alleged “culture of rape” on American campuses. But like much from the left, it wasn’t true, and this time, the left-wingers may have to pay.

Smearing Carson

Although Politico and the Wall Street Journal ran grossly inaccurate stories about presidential contender Ben Carson, for which he strongly criticized the liberal media, CNN dismissed his objections as “crazy” and “ludicrous.” Within days in early November, Carson had refuted smear-stories against him about a West Point “scholarship” and a prank at Yale, but CNN’s Alisyn Camerota whined that this was “an attack on journalism. Let’s just call it what it is. It’s an attack on journalism.”

The Daily Beast’s Jackie Kucinich told CNN the idea of “going back into someone’s past is off limits” is absurd — “this is part of the process. Welcome to the big leagues.” CNN political anchor Errol Louis complained of Carson, “Do you want people to just never check anything that you’ve said and just clap for you?”

No, but checking your facts before publishing isn’t too much to ask, is it?

Minibits

■ NYT’s Frank Bruni dispassionately describes Republican Sen. Ted Cruz as “a menacing, stalking, relentless force to watch for and run from, like the body-hopping spirit in this year’s most celebrated horror movie, It Follows.”

■ Dr. Ben Carson is “putting a target on government officials” with his criticism of big government, complains Ron Fournier of National Journal.

■ As for Hillary Clinton’s first debate performance, she “was Beyonce, she was flawless,” hummed CNN’s Van Jones, and MSNBC’s Lawrence O’Donnell crooned, “the debate went so well for Hillary Clinton, so perfectly, that at times it was as if she had planned the whole thing.” ■ Journalist Carl Bernstein thumps that in Hillary Clinton’s appearance before the Benghazi Committee “she’s going to murder them because it has been a witch hunt, it has been partisan. It’s a great opportunity for her.” ■ CNN’s Ashleigh Banfield whines preposterously that Benghazi is “not even a scandal … no one has determined there’s any scandal there.” ■ Still-in-denial Dan Rather claims he would not “back off the story” about Bush and the National Guard even today because “the story was true.” ■ ABC’s Matthew Dowd lectures that conservatives are upset solely because “America is now less white, less married, less churchied, less conservative, and that is a difficult prospect for them to face in the course of this.” ■ Actress Jill Hennessy gushes to Bloomberg News, “But I love a lot of what Bernie Sanders is saying too, man. I find him really inspiring. I think he’s tremendous and we need a jolt of that.” ■ The View’s Joy Behar is of a similar bent, confessing, “I actually am aroused by him [Bernie Sanders]. I’m serious. I find him to be eye candy, not ear candy, eye candy. Bernie is hot.”
Comcast Keeps Faking Debates

A
ter the CNBC debate, Republicans were outraged at the vicious personal attacks not even disguised as questions from the moderators. Defenders of CNBC suggested the Republicans were just whining. President Obama joked that if GOP candidates can’t handle TV moderators, they could never handle Russian strongman Vladimir Putin.

Then the Obama-lovers at Comcast proves Republicans’ point. When NBC anchor Lester Holt sat down for an interview with the president on November 2, there were no attacks. It was business as usual, just another syrupy Brian Williams-style lovefest.

“So many hopes and aspirations were placed on you as the first African-American President,” Holt oozed. “As you approach this area of criminal justice reform, is this, in your mind, your defining moment, that would seal the legacy of what we would expect from the first African-American President?”

The NBC brand is in shambles. There is no pretense of impartiality anywhere. The Comcast empire is firmly vested in the Democrats. After the CNBC mess, Sen. Ted Cruz suggested Republicans should moderate Republican debates, not as cheerleaders but as real moderators, not gotcha Democrats. Liberals scoffed, of course. They truly believe only they can, and should, run the show — all the shows.

Need more proof? On November 6, it was time for an MSNBC Democrat “debate” of sorts, or a “forum” with cozy one-on-one interviews with Rachel Maddow in a theater full of liberals. This MSNBC event was by Democrats and for Democrats, loaded with questions from the left, and designed to advance the party and its candidates.

Before Maddow started the interviews, each of the three Democrat candidates appeared after a gooey, musical video tribute to them, making them all look like terrific, inspirational leaders. With that, Maddow gunned the engine with her leftist agenda, imagining a gloriously all-powerful state remaking the country. She asked O’Malley:

“How does a state like, you know, Louisiana with its offshore drilling, or North Dakota with its fracking, a lot of states have their economy and a lot of good blue-collar working-class jobs tied up in the energy economy. How do you help them through the transition?...Doesn’t the rest of the country have to fill in and help North Dakota into a post-fracking age?”

The federal government should have the power to ban fracking for a “post-fracking age,” and stop Louisiana from aiding offshore drilling.

Maddow wanted to know from Hillary why children should be subjected to police officers in schools.

“Should there be police officers in classrooms at all, handling school discipline matters?” If not, “should they be in all high schools, so that we are not looking at a discriminatory use of, basically, the criminal justice system for some kids and not all?”

Having a stronger police presence in more violent schools is discriminatory. (We weren’t sure you followed the logic.)

Sanders didn’t get a utopian question, but Maddow pestered him for being too conservative on gun rights and the war in Afghanistan: “You famously voted against the Iraq war, but you supported the war in Afghanistan....Do you regret supporting the Afghan war?” (He said no.)

MSNBC wants to move all the Democratic candidates further to the Left – “Lean Forward” as much as possible. But NBC, CNBC, and MSNBC relentlessly caricature the Republicans as comic-book characters and right-wing extremists who have permanently sacrificed any hope to capture women, minorities, and sensible centrists in the electorate. Their favoritism is obvious to everyone.

The GOP needs to wash its hands of Comcast.

Does your employer have a matching gift program?

Your gift could double today! • www.mrc.org/mgp
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, social media, 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**

**CBN TV:** CBN News, Corning, NY, Oct. 29  
**FBN:**  
- Cavuto Coast to Coast, Oct. 29  
- Making Money, Nov. 12  
- Risk and Reward, Oct. 29  
- Varney & Co., Oct. 23, 29, Nov. 2, 9, 11, 17  
- Fox and Friends, Nov. 6  
- THE BLAZE TV: Dana Show, Oct. 29, Nov. 5

**NEWSMAX TV:** Daily Wrap, Oct. 29  
- Steve Malzberg Show, Sep. 2, 17

**OANN:**  
- Daily Ledger, Oct. 22, 26, 29, Nov. 2, 5, 12  
- Tipping Point, Oct. 22, 26, 29, Nov. 2, 5, 12  
- Daily Callier, Oct. 27, 29, Nov. 4, 6, 12  
- Daily Mail, Oct. 27  
- Drudge Report, Oct. 27, 28, Nov. 5, 6, 9, 12  
- El Online, Nov. 10  
- Examiner.com, Oct. 29 (2)  
- Fox Nation, Oct. 29, Nov. 3, 5, 6, 9, 12  
- FoxNews.com, Oct. 23, 28, Nov. 2, 10  
- Hannity.com, Oct. 28, Nov. 12  
- HotAir, Oct. 26, 27, 29, Nov. 9, 12  
- IJ Review, Oct. 30, Nov. 7, 9, 10, 12  
- Investor’s Business Daily, Nov. 4  
- PARTIAL LISTING

**Internet & Twitter**

- American Energy Alliance, Oct. 28  
- Associated Press, Oct. 28  
- BizPacReview.com, Oct. 29, Nov. 5, 7, 12  
- Breitbart News, Oct. 29, 31, Nov. 2, 7, 9, 11  
- Christianity Today, Nov. 9  
- Daily Caller, Oct. 27, 29, Nov. 4, 6, 12  
- Daily Mail, Oct. 29  
- Drudge Report, Oct. 27, 28, Nov. 5, 6, 9, 12  
- El Online, Nov. 10  
- Examiner.com, Oct. 29 (2)  
- Fox Nation, Oct. 29, Nov. 3, 5, 6, 9, 12  
- FoxNews.com, Oct. 23, 28, Nov. 2, 10  
- Hannity.com, Oct. 28, Nov. 12  
- HotAir, Oct. 26, 27, 29, Nov. 9, 12  
- IJ Review, Oct. 30, Nov. 7, 9, 10, 12  
- Investor’s Business Daily, Nov. 4

MRC President Brent Bozell analyzes how some reporters in the liberal media challenged President Obama after the Paris attacks, but predicts that behavior will not last long once the White House complains about coverage being too tough, on Fox’s Varney & Co., Nov. 17.

Scores of alternative media outlets turned to the MRC for statistical proof of the CNBC debate moderators outrageous bias.
Increase Your Income, Reduce Taxes and Help America’s Media Watchdog

The end of the 2015 is fast-approaching. To help you claim every tax advantage possible, send less money to Washington, help America’s Media Watchdog fight the liberal media and provide guaranteed income for life for you, we want to make sure you are aware of some important options regarding year-end stock gifts.

Despite the recent volatility in the markets, stock prices remain at historic highs. However, if you sell stocks that have enjoyed significant appreciation, you will have to pay a tax as high as 43.4 percent on that appreciation.

One way to avoid paying this tax is to donate the stock directly to the Media Research Center prior to outright sale. A stock gift will also provide you with an important income tax deduction for the value of the stock, which you may claim immediately to the extent allowed by law.

Here’s another idea. You can also give stock to the MRC in exchange for a one- or two-life charitable gift annuity. A gift annuity provides a fixed, guaranteed, lifetime, partially tax-free income stream to one or two individuals whom you designate. Additionally, you also receive an income tax deduction and, for gifts of appreciated stock, partial avoidance of capital gain and capital gain taxation. A gift annuity also provides important support to the MRC to fund any area of operations.

For more information or a free gift annuity proposal or for information about transferring gifts of stock, please contact Carl Sperapani at (571) 267-3445 or csperapani@mrc.org.

The MRC requests that you consult with your tax consultant or advisor before making any tax-related financial decisions.

Legacy Society members have included the MRC in their estate plans by naming it as a beneficiary of their will, by setting up a Charitable Gift Annuity, a Charitable Remainder Trust, or through a variety of other planned giving vehicles.

“IT IS A WIN-WIN. WHEN GIVING APPRECIATED STOCK THE DONOR CAN AVOID SOME OF THE CAPITAL GAINS TAX AND YOU FUND AN ORGANIZATION THEY WANT TO HELP. YOU GET THE DEDUCTION AND THEN YOU GET MONEY FOR THE REST OF YOUR LIFE. IT IS FABULOUS, AND I MEAN EVERY WORD.”

ANN SCHUTT
Member, MRC Legacy Society

CHARITABLE GIFT ANNUITY
One-Life Rates Two-Life Rates
Age 55 4.0% 55 and 60 3.7%
Age 60 4.4% 65 and 70 4.4%
Age 70 5.1% 70 and 75 4.8%
Age 80 6.8% 80 and 85 6.1%
Age 90 9.0% 85 and 90 7.3%

Rates subject to change. A $5,000 minimum.

A Charitable Gift Annuity (CGA) is one of several Planned Gifts available to you that will support the MRC and provide income to you.