

0:00

Justin Danhof: I'm Justin Danhof, of the National Center for Public Policy Research, representing my colleague at the National Center, David Ridenour, a Time Warner shareholder.

Mr. Bewkes, after declaring that he was proud of CNN's exploitative reporting of missing Malaysian Airlines flight 370, CNN president Jeff Zucker recently explained the company's positions on covering the 2012 Benghazi terrorist attack and climate change.

In explaining how CNN has not reported extensively on the September 11, 2012 Benghazi terrorist attack and the subsequent lies and deception by the Obama Administration regarding what happened there that day, Zucker stated: "We're not going to be shamed into it by others who have political beliefs that want to try to have temper tantrums to shame other news organizations into covering something. If it's of real news value, we'll cover it."ⁱ If a terrorist attack that kills four Americans, followed by a coordinated cover-up by the White House, no longer constitute "news," then CNN should remove the middle N from its name. And let's not forget Candy Crowley's embarrassing showing at the second 2012 presidential debate, where she erroneously bailed out President Obama concerning Benghazi, and pretended she, not the American people, had the authority to render judgment on the candidates.."

Regarding climate change, Zucker noted that there "tend[s] to be a tremendous amount of lack of interest on the audience's part" for these stories, but he went on to state that climate change nonetheless "deserves more attention." But the network hasn't "figured out how to engage the audience in these stories."

In other words, CNN is going to try and force its viewers to eat their peas on climate change, while continuing to ignore the unraveling Benghazi scandal.

Last year, you told me that bias is a matter of perception. However, we have CNN's president publicly displaying hostility to Americans, particularly conservatives who are following the Benghazi scandal closely, in explaining his willingness to ignore four dead Americans while protecting liberal politicians. At the same time, he is trying to force the global warming regulatory agenda on the public despite the fact the Earth has not warmed since the Clinton Administration, and climatologists who tell us to believe in the catastrophic global warming theory simply don't know what that's happened.

That's not perception, sir. That's reality.

Also, in May, it was revealed that the "Chicagoland" producers coordinated directly with Chicago Mayor Rahm Emanuel to ensure that the miniseries was essentially a campaign commercial for Emmanuel.

That's not perception. That's reality.

A Google search for “CNN liberal media bias” yields over 940,000 results.

Not perception- reality.

And just last week, CNN promoted David Chalian to be its political director despite the fact that this is a man that during the 2012 Republican National Convention disgustingly stated that the GOP was “happy to have a party with black people drowning” as hurricane Issa was coming up the coast.

So my question is this: polls consistently show that many more Americans identify as conservative than do liberal, yet CNN, led by Zucker and now also Chalian, continues to plot a leftward course in reporting the news. Fox News, which is perceived as conservative, dominates the ratings, while CNN even fell below MSNBC in May. I am not asking that you replace your former anti-Second Amendment crusader Piers Morgan with Ann Coulter, but is there any chance you can at least admit two things: Admit that bias exists at CNN and second, start making changes to the network to make it less hostile to a large segment of Americans so we can grow the channel’s viewership and all its shareholders can reap the rewards?

3:19

Jeffrey Bewkes: Thank you. So your question is, whether I would admit bias at CNN? Is that the question?

3:33

Justin Danhof: The question is twofold: First, do you recognize that there is a liberal bias at the network and that may be hurting the ratings, and start doing something about it to increase the viewership. If 40% of American identify as conservative, 40% as independent, and 20% is liberal, why cater to the 20% and ignore the 80? It seems you’re automatically stubbing your toe and limiting your viewership?

3:55

Jeffrey Bewkes: Ok, Thank you. So, as I think we all know, many of us here are Americans – not all, but even if you aren’t – in whatever country if it is a democracy that you live in you know there is a lot of disagreement of what is your set of political values and so on. The issue of journalism – is and will actually – is realistic and a long one, and its complicated.

It’s a question of whether or not your question of journalist opportunity enterprise identifies itself as having an allegiance to a certain point of view, which the one that you cited- you cited Fox, CNN and MSNBC – actually I think that in the case of Fox, they don’t self-identify a point of view. Even though you just judged that they are...

4:50:

Justin Danhof: They do not self-identify

4:51:

Jeffrey Bewkes: Oh, they aren't self identified. So, what you have here is a question of perception and values on an issue .I don't think we should reduce it to just a point on the right or left- there are plenty of issues that are not right and left- they are cultural, religious, etc that people have different views on. That's why we have democracy. These news organizations- at least, our news organization, Time Warner, when it was here [in California] and CNN which is with us very strongly, we are trying to, and you are judging it a failure, we are trying to be independent and objective in these reports.

And- if I could answer this part of your question- we aren't making our news judgments and our news selection and treatment of stories based on serving a given part of the political spectrum, the religious spectrum or anything else. We are trying to be an objective news-journalism organization.

You know, you can- viewers and voters, none of us I imagine are satisfied with the political candidates we may be supporting just because there is this one we agree with and that one we don't, they are not satisfied with whatever news report they are getting, either in the paper or on TV. That's the name of the game.

Its going to be something whether we can agree on- and the voting and political structure, that's why we set up the political democracy the way we did. So that we can manage and handle the disagreement. So, I hear your views, I understand them, I'm not admitting what you ask, that we have any deliberate, rudiment belief that we follow one or another political point of view – I do however, take your question and your dissatisfaction as a very constructive thing. I think that is the way we should approach looking at how we are doing every day , I encourage you to keep doing it, believe me, we have people, you could describe it in a political way, as on the other side, who would say the same thing. It's a question of you as viewer's judgement of how we're doing – I think we're doing better, and it's a fair game, and it should be an open question. Thank you.
