Writing before Obama won the election, Tucker Carlson and Neil Patel of the Daily Caller contended that bias, dishonesty, and corruption were helping to undermine and destroy the liberal media. "The broadcast networks, the big daily newspapers, the newsweeklies—they’re done," they said. "It’s only a matter of time, and everyone who works there knows it."

Unfortunately, there is no evidence this is the case. Although liberal news outlets are losing viewers and readers, Obama’s victory has invigorated these news organizations and given them a new lease on life. They are more powerful than ever because they correctly predicted the race. They understood the nature of the electorate and how it had shifted in Obama’s favor. What they have achieved is something that the conservative media were striving for—a measure of credibility. It came not through their reporting, of course, but through their emphasis on polls and an understanding of how a progressive infrastructure, financed largely by George Soros, has assumed great importance for the Democratic Party machine.

Many in the liberal media are gloating that so many Fox News commentators were proven wrong in their predictions of a Romney victory. Not surprisingly, the conservative predictions of a Romney victory were mocked on Jon Stewart’s The Daily Show.

By contrast, Nate Silver of The New York Times, one of the nation’s most prominent liberal outlets, has achieved enormous credibility, having correctly predicted Obama’s victory and the outcome in 50 out of 50 states. USA Today noted, “Silver had been under fire from Republicans for consistently putting Obama’s chance of winning in a range of 60-90 percent.” The FiveThirtyEight blogger turned out to be correct.

Bret Baier used his “Winners & Losers” segment on the Fox News Channel Special Report program to acknowledge that liberal or Democratic-leaning surveys and polls came out on top in predicting this year’s presidential election. He noted that a Fordham University study “credits the Democratic-leaning Public Policy Polling (PPP) as the most accurate of the survey companies this year.” PPP also does a poll in partnership with the Daily Kos and the Services Employees International Union (SEIU), and it was second.

Rasmussen, one of the favorite polls of conservatives, was near the bottom of the list of the 28 polling organizations. Rasmussen had Romney leading Obama 49-48 percent on Election Day.

University of Colorado political science professors Kenneth Bickers and Michael Berry, who appeared on Fox News and talk radio, had projected an Electoral College landslide for Mitt Romney based on a model using economic factors such as unemployment data and changes in personal income. On the Fox Business website, Gerri Willis cited the prediction, noting that “Obama faces the headwinds of history. No President since FDR has been re-elected when unemployment is above 8 percent.” How many times did we hear that statistic mentioned in the context of the belief that Romney was destined to win?

“The model was wrong,” Bickers is now quoted as saying. Eric Gorko of the Denver Post reported, “Bickers said the Obama campaign managed to neutralize Romney’s ‘strengths on economic stewardship’—exit polls showed voters held similar views on each candidate’s ability to steer the economy—in part by shifting attention to issues such as immigration and women’s reproductive rights that play to Obama’s strengths.”

None of this negates the fact that Carlson and Patel were correct in their analysis of liberal media bias. They wrote, “Not in our lifetimes have so many in the press dropped the pretense of objectivity in order to help a political candidate. The media are rooting for Barack...” continued on page 3
Editor’s Message

Dear Fellow Media Watchdogs:

With the re-election of President Obama, there has been a lot of finger-pointing and second-guessing on the other side. Here is my brief view of what happened. Yes, there are demographic issues, and issues regarding getting out the base voters. But number one was the impact of the media. Back in 2004, Evan Thomas, then of Newsweek, said that mainstream media support for John Kerry was worth 15 points. If you include late-night talk shows, prime time shows, and Hollywood, that figure is very believable in terms of how the media helped Obama. How so? By false narratives on topics ranging from Obama’s foreign policy to his “saving the auto industry,” from his handling of the economy to his use and abuse of executive powers; from his radical influences to his radical appointees; from his rewarding bundlers with billions in federal loans and grants to his selective enforcement of various laws; from his role in scandals such as Fast and Furious and Solyndra to his embrace of the radical Muslim Brotherhood, both at home and abroad; and the coverage of Hurricane Sandy. Also, by brutally caricaturing, mocking and distorting the views and character of Mitt Romney, though it must be acknowledged that he shares part of that blame.

There was a conscious and sustained effort to treat Obama with kid gloves when the media actually had opportunities to ask him questions. For example, in my article in this AIM Report, I cite Brian Williams of NBC News, who spent two days with Obama just before the election. It was long since clear that his administration had been lying about what they had done to protect Ambassador Stevens in Libya, but Williams failed to ask any of the tough, obvious questions.

There were many other factors that contributed to Obama’s victory. Voter fraud appears to have been a significant factor. There were, for example, 59 divisions (similar to precincts, with about 700 voters in each) in Philadelphia where Romney got zero votes. There were many counties in Florida, and other swing states, in which there were 110% or more people voting than there were eligible to vote. There was suppression of the military vote. There were many suspicious results that must be investigated if we want to maintain the confidence that we are a functioning democratic republic.

Part of Romney’s problem was the toll the primaries took on his campaign. And while Obama was spending many millions of dollars over a period of about a year trying to define Romney, often with egregious lies and misrepresentations, Romney had to wait until after the GOP convention to begin his campaign. And frankly, he wasn’t a great candidate. He rarely made the case effectively against a second Obama term, choosing instead to focus on the unemployment figure, which magically fell below the 8% figure just weeks before the election. Bottom line—Obama was re-elected, and he and the media that love him are emboldened and determined. So are we at AIM.

For Accuracy in Media

Roger Aronoff

Your Letters

Dear Editor:

Another great article. The only reason the dictator-in-chief has been untouched (on any issue) is because our “non-representatives” in Congress have refused to do what they have been sent there to do. America cries in the wake of it.

Mr. Harris
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Washington, DC 20008
or email to info@aim.org
Please keep your submissions to 50 words
Obama. They’re not hiding it.” They went on to say that “many in the press are every bit as corrupt as conservatives have accused them of being,” but added, “The good news is, it’s almost over.”

It’s not over. Conservative use of flawed polling data has played into the hands of the liberal media. In order to recapture credibility in covering politics, the conservative media will have to acknowledge not only the bias on the other side, but the bias on their own.

A good start was made by Breitbart’s John Nolte, who wrote: “Mea culpa. We were dead wrong about the polls. Not only did the Real Clear Politics poll of polls end up being almost perfectly precise, but the most accurate pollster of the 2012 election cycle ended up being the Daily Kos’ Public Policy Polling (PPP). My guys, Gallup and Rasmussen, didn’t even make the top twenty.”

Real Clear Politics, an aggregator of polls, had Obama winning by 2.5 percent. The actual results were Obama 50.8, Romney 48.3.

---

**Republication Campaign Failed to Confront Media Bias**

By Cliff Kincaid

The simple explanation for what happened on Election Day is that the American people voted for President Barack Obama because they didn’t understand the nature of his Marxist agenda. But it is inconceivable that the public would, on a fully informed and rational basis, choose a political ideology that guarantees American economic decline and foreign policy retreat.

Fortunately, there is a record of how this happened. The New York Daily News said that GOP strategist Karl Rove, who raised $330 million for his Super PAC to guarantee Mitt Romney’s victory and win Republican control of the Senate, had been advising Republicans to avoid calling Obama a socialist or left-winger. Rove believed that undecided, moderate or left-leaning voters would jump to Obama’s side if that charge were leveled against him.

“If you say he’s a socialist, they’ll go to defend him,” Rove said. “If you call him a ‘far out left-winger,’ they’ll say, ‘no, no, he’s not.’” Rove said Romney had to remain “focused on the facts and adopt a respectful tone” toward Obama.

We see where this got Romney. He was respectful toward Obama, especially in the third presidential debate, but got savaged by the media in the process.

A wake-up call to Romney came on September 21, when Democratic consultant Pat Caddell gave a speech at the AIM “ObamaNation” conference and basically warned Romney and his advisers that he had to confront liberal media bias immediately and alert the American people to the facts about the national security crisis in the Middle East that were being carefully concealed and covered up.

In this riveting speech, which went viral on the Internet, Caddell called the media an enemy of the American people and said it was absolutely imperative that Romney and his campaign understand they were up against two major forces in society—the Democratic Party and the media. But it didn’t happen. There was no urgency. It was if Romney and his advisers thought he could coast to victory.

The failure by the liberal and most of the conservative media to truly “vet” Obama continues to be a major failing of our democratic system. Professor Paul Kengor wrote a blockbuster book this year, *The Communist*, on Obama’s mentor, which is a great contribution to helping people understand Obama’s policies domestically and internationally. But because Obama’s mentor, Frank Marshall Davis, was a Communist, even conservative media organizations such as Fox News were reluctant to cover this topic in-depth. It is reported that Kengor was warned in advance of some of his media appearances not to even suggest that Obama was a Marxist. Joel Gilbert’s provocative film about the Obama-Davis relationship, *Dreams from My Real Father*, was not covered at all by Fox News. Advertising for his film was rejected by Newsmax, a conservative site.

As noted in a previous column, the predictions of a Romney victory by various Fox News commentators were based on the erroneous assumption that the election enthusiasm was on Romney’s side, and that the true believers behind Obama in 2008 would not be with him this time around. “I’ve got egg on my face,” Dick Morris now says, after predicting a Romney landslide.

“You have more than egg on your face,” countered one angry conservative, who copied me on his email to Morris. “You have misled the American public, the Tea Party and me by making an assumption. I thought you knew what was going on! Your job is to know how people are voting!”

It appears that Romney’s strategy was to let the conservative media take on the liberal press, in the hope that the bias would somehow be neutralized. Conservatives were also told that Romney had a natural advantage as a successful businessman over a President who was presiding over a lackluster economy. In the words of one clever pundit, the assumption was that Bain Capital would emerge victorious over Das Kapital. It seems like a common sense.

But voters didn’t fully understand that Obama did represent Das Kapital, which is the name of a book by Karl Marx that offers a critique of capitalism. And Rove’s...
Shameful Media Coverage of Benghazi Scandal and Cover-Up

By Roger Aronoff

Regardless of the outcome of the presidential election on November 6th, the most outrageous media malpractice of the election has been coverage of the terrorist attack in Benghazi, Libya on September 11th that killed Ambassador Chris Stevens and three others, including two former Navy SEALs. From the outset, Obama and other people speaking for the administration claimed that the attack was the result of a spontaneous demonstration sparked by anger from an anti-Islamic video made in the U.S. But that was just the beginning.

That argument was made repeatedly. UN Ambassador Susan Rice went on five talk shows the following Sunday morning claiming that their best intelligence at that point was that it was sparked by the video, rather than a planned terrorist attack on the anniversary of 9/11. President Obama, speaking before the UN General Assembly on September 25th, cited the videotape as the reason for his delay in demanding a U.N. Security Council vote to toughen its sanctions against Iran.

As the story unfolded, we were reminded that there had been a series of attacks in April and June of this year in Benghazi by so-called “militants” carried out on the U.N., the Red Cross, the U.S. consulate, and the British consulate. There had been requests for additional security by Ambassador Stevens and others who worked there, but they were denied. The evidence shows that President Obama and his national security team were able to watch part of the attack in real time, but failed to call in back-up support.

Within two hours of being notified that there was an attack under way at the U.S. diplomatic mission in Benghazi, the White House received an email from the State Department stating that a specific terrorist group with ties to al Qaeda had taken credit for the attack.

Fox News, and in particular Jennifer Griffin and Catherine Herridge have led the way in reporting on the story. The evidence, including classified documents leaked to Fox News, and reported on October 25th, showed that the U.S. Mission in Benghazi had “convened an ‘emergency meeting’ less than a month before the assault that killed Ambassador Chris Stevens and three other Americans, because Al Qaeda had training camps in Benghazi and the consulate could not defend against a ‘coordinated attack,’ according to a classified cable reviewed by Fox News.” Calls for additional security went unheeded. Yet the administration had continued to argue that the attack came without warning.

The rest of the media largely stayed away from the story, deflecting it on numerous talk shows by changing the subject, and rarely, if at all, treating it as an Obama administration scandal. Brian Williams spent two days with Obama for a long feature story on NBC’s Rock Center on October 25th, asked him one softball question about Benghazi, which Obama answered with his standard delay-until-after-the-election answer, with no follow-up.

Here was the exchange:

BRIAN WILLIAMS: Mr. President, since we’ve been airborne, a person or persons of interest picked up in Tunisia in connection with Benghazi. The question becomes: Have you been happy with the intelligence, especially in our post-9/11 world? The assessment of your intelligence community, as we

continued from page 5

In his Wall Street Journal column congratulating Obama and his strategists on their win, Rove gripes about an “anonymous New York Times headline writer” who wrote the unfair headline, “Let Detroit Go Bankrupt,” over a Romney offer to reorganizing the auto companies. This occurred back in 2008. It was the only example of liberal media bias that Rove brought up in his piece. Even now, the lesson has been lost on this top GOP strategist.

Cliff Kincaid is the Director of the AIM Center for Investigative Journalism, and can be contacted at cliff.kincaid@aim.org.
stand here, is that it still was a spontaneous terrorist attack and were you happy with what you were able to learn as this unfolded? It went on for several hours.

PRESIDENT OBAMA: Well, as I've said, Brian, we're going to do a full investigation. Obviously, when four Americans are killed, you know, you have to do some soul searching in terms of making sure that all our systems are where they need to be. And that's what we are going to find out. But what I'm confident about is that we will be able to figure out who perpetrated this act, that we'll be able to bring them to justice and we are confident that we've got the cooperation of the Libyan government. We're going to continue to make sure that we figure out what intelligence was coming in when, how was it gathered, how was it analyzed? And my expectation is that as a consequence, we're going to be able to make sure something like this doesn't happen again.

The Washington Post finally editorialized on November 2nd that Benghazi “increasingly looks like a major security failure.”

Panetta Rule For Deploying Forces

Sec. of Defense Leon Panetta explained why no troops were sent in to attempt to save or rescue Ambassador Stevens and the others: “The basic principle is that you don’t deploy forces into harm’s way without knowing what’s going on, without having some real-time information about what’s taking place,” he said. “And as a result of not having that kind of information...[we] felt very strongly that we could not put forces at risk in that situation.”

But as Maj. Gen. Patrick Brady, U.S. Army (ret.) wrote in WorldNetDaily, “On its face, that is a remarkable, indeed incomprehensible, change from America’s doctrine in past wars. By that standard, there would have been no Normandy or Inchon. In fact, I can’t think of a war we fought in which we didn’t go into harm’s way without real-time information or to save lives—something the president refused to do in Benghazi.”

Brady, a retired general who has received the Medal of Honor, the highest military decoration one can receive, continued his critique: “To fully understand the doctrinal change, one has to understand President Obama. He has a dearth of understanding of our military and military matters. We hear he is uncomfortable in the presence of ranking military and defense men meets with them. He is not a person who can make decisions, and he takes an extraordinary amount of time to do so...He cowers from crisis decisions. He is a politician who thinks only in terms of votes and his image...I believe he is risk-averse—fearful of risk—and that is the basis of the Obama-Panetta doctrine.”

As William McGurn, chief editorial writer for The Wall Street Journal wrote, “Libya was supposed to be the Obama success story, showing how this president achieves our goals abroad without committing American troops or treasure. However ridiculous it might have been to blame the whole thing on a YouTube video, politically the tactic was far preferable to admitting that the president who boasts about getting us out of war in Iraq and Afghanistan might have a whole new one brewing in Libya.”

The Washington Post finally editorialized on November 2nd that Benghazi “increasingly looks like a major security failure.” They argued that “sooner or later the administration must answer questions” about it and “the policies that led to it.” The Post even cited Fox News’ reporting, CBS withheld a snippet of their September 12th interview with Obama that could have cleared up the question that became famous in the presidential debate moderated by Candy Crowley as to whether or not he considered the attack to be a planned, terrorist attack, or a spontaneous attack resulting from the video. That day, during the CBS interview, the same day he had used the term “act of terror” in his Rose Garden comments, though not in specific reference to the Benghazi attack from the day before, he refused to identify it as a “terrorism attack.” But for some reason, CBS chose to hold that back until less than two days before the election.

What should have been a full blown scandal before the election was largely swept under the rug by the mainstream media, certainly up until the last week or two before the election. And even then, its coverage was limited and tepid. Obama certainly owes a debt of gratitude to his media allies who covered for him the best they knew how.

Roger Aronoff is the Editor of Accuracy in Media, and can be contacted at roger.aronoff@aim.org.
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Chris Matthews: Obama Will Lose the South Due to Republicans Stoking Racial Fears

By Don Irvine

On election night, during MSNBC’s coverage, Chris Matthews predicted that President Obama would lose the South because of what he considered to be Mitt Romney’s racially charged campaign, and he wasn’t sure that Virginia was Southern enough to swing Romney’s way.

“I’ve watched the appeals made by people on the Republican side—the right-wing side, in some cases—people like, sort of, screwball people making comments about race. I really think you’re going to see at the end of the night, when we look at the popular vote, when we look at how it’s broken out by region, the President will do well in the Northeast, the Midwest and the West. He’s going to do very poorly in the South among white voters.”

In other words, according to Matthews, white voters in the South aren’t voting against Obama because of the poor job he has done over the last four years, but because they, like the Republican Party, are racists.

Matthews then added his thoughts on Virginia:

“Virginia is somewhere in the middle, but it does have real Southerners there too. There’s been a real, I think, bad appeal made around the edges of the Romney campaign on race in this campaign. I do think it’s been more effective in the South than in the North.”

So Virginia isn’t really a southern state? I guess the Mason Dixon line doesn’t matter.

Matthews may have spent a lot of time accusing Romney and the Republican Party of running a racially tinged campaign, with scant evidence to back up his claims, but the main ones who really played the race card, by falsely accusing others of racism, were none other than Matthews and his colleagues at MSNBC.

In the Tank? Chicago Reporter Congratulates Obama on Re-election at Press Conference

By Don Irvine

Now that President Obama has been re-elected, at least one reporter decided that it was okay to shed any pretense of being unbiased, when she congratulated Obama at his first news conference after the election.

Obama received the kudo’s from Christi Parsons, the White House reporter for the Chicago Tribune.

“Thank you, Mr. President. And congratulations, by the way.”

The President noted that Parsons also covered his state Senate race in Chicago in 1996, to which she responded by saying that she had “never seen you lose. I wasn’t there that one time.”

That was in reference to Obama’s 2000 run for Congress, which temporarily halted his climb up the political ladder.

Parsons isn’t the only Obama partisan in the media, but she is the first one that I know of working for a major newspaper to so overtly show her true colors in public. But she probably won’t be the last.

Don Irvine
Chairman of Accuracy in Media

What you can do
Please send the enclosed postcards to:
• Thomas Friedman, the New York Times reporter who said that what happened in Libya is a tragedy, not a scandal;
• Marcus Brauchli, outgoing Editor of The Washington Post, for the Post’s continued biased coverage against Israel;
• Please make a donation to AIM