

# The Word's Eye View

The Word's Eye View is a newspaper column written by  
Dr. James Modlish

## Media Bias (Article 19)

This column is being written two days prior to the election, but we should all know the results by the time you read it. Even though this is somewhat of a disadvantage, it seems prudent to comment on some things that will never change.

The mainstream media has finally admitted that they have been overwhelmingly in favor of the Obama campaign. The Associated Press on November 1st reported that the Center for Media and Public Affairs stated that comments made by sources, voters, reporters and anchors that aired on ABC, CBS, and NBC evening newscasts over the past two months reflected positively on Obama in 65 percent of cases, compared to 31 percent of cases with regard to McCain. Late night talk shows have made even less of an attempt to veil their bias. The above mentioned reporting organization tracked jokes by Jay Leno and David Letterman from September 1st through October 23rd; in 475 jokes Republicans were the target while Democrats were the victim 69 times. A variety of other statistics have been released, and they all point in the same direction.

The larger question to be pondered... why is the media, which is allegedly a voice of unbiased objectivity, so jaundiced in its reporting? Several possibilities come to mind: the primary players in the news cartel unofficially endorse the candidate that most closely supports their present agenda. One has to look long and hard to find conservative programming on the major networks. Even on the so-called innocuous "Dancing with the Stars" some of the participants wear just about enough clothes to wad a shotgun.

The movers and shakers who formed public opinion in Jesus' day were known as Pharisees; the Lord found Himself under constant attack and verbal abuse from this conglomerate of self-righteousness. They did all in their power to persuade Pilate to crucify Christ, and when he presented them with the choice of Jesus or a common criminal named Barabbas, they opted for the freedom of the previously condemned. The reason is simple; in comparison to Barabbas they looked exemplary, while next to the Son of God, their righteousness became as "filthy rags." (Isaiah 64:6) The networks will never rally behind an individual with more character than they themselves possess.

Further still, it would be incredibly naive to think the media shuns controversy. Indeed, they thrive on it, because controversy generates more listeners and readers. The ratings go up as does the revenue, so it is not too difficult to comprehend the motive behind some stories that are repeated so often they could be compared to Chinese water torture. If you can't understand a thing, follow the buck. Senator McCain represents in all probability a more benign administration as opposed to the professor of change who will cause a great deal of resistance---hence, deep division of thought and philosophy.

It has often been said we are what we eat, and so it is mentally as well as physically. The vast majority of media moguls attended universities that have long been dominated by socialistic professorship. The parrots go forth repeating and believing what they have been told. When

candidates seek election on the judiciary we are told essentially nothing about their positions on critical issues. This information is avoided in the name of impartiality; we are given facts about their education and credentials. The average citizen has not the resources, time or the will to do all the necessary research to make an intelligent decision. It may be a poor system of evaluation, but there are times when all we can do is examine at which trough they have been fed. Berkley would generally receive a NO! One of the greatest Bible teachers I have ever known holds three degrees from accredited secular universities. His conclusion is, "I went to college, but I got over it."

Finally, a candidate who exhibits any affiliation with a church or organization which uses the Bible as its source of doctrine must be rudely denounced. The Scriptures are considered to be lethal, and consequently, the Sarah Palin's of politics need to be quickly discredited. The Pharisees didn't vote for Jesus, and I'm reasonably certain few in the main stream media would either. Perhaps we should send Brian, Katie, and Charlie a ballot. I speculate that none of these three would vote for the re-emergence of John Adams, our second President. In 1756 he said, "Suppose a nation in some distant region should take the Bible for their only Law Book, and every member should regulate his conduct by the precepts there exhibited...what a paradise would this region be!"