

The media has destroyed its own credibility. Almost two-thirds of Americans think mainstream news organizations publish “fake news.”

Almost two-thirds of Americans think once reputable mainstream news organizations publish “fake news”.

[View source](#)

Democrats trust mainstream news sources more than Republicans, but both now show high levels of skepticism.

[View source](#)

Related reading: “The Smear: How Shady Political Operatives and Fake News Control What You See, What You Think, and How You Vote” – Sharyl Attkisson

[View source](#)

Why is trust in the media so low? Journalistic firewalls that once separated news from opinion have been abandoned by news outlets.

Once-forbidden practices such as editorializing within straight news reports, and the inclusion of opinions as if fact, are not only tolerated; they’re encouraged.

[View source](#)

Journalist and author Sharyl Attkisson argues that the media got even worse with the election of Donald Trump, seeing the election as a threat to their establishment and their jobs.

[View source](#)

Many outlets, such as the New York Times and Washington Post have effectively suspended journalistic rules due to Trump’s election.

[View source](#)

WATCH: Sharyl Attkisson: “Well-Funded Actors” Manipulate News and the Way We Think

[View source](#)

Political interests often collude with journalists to engage in mass manipulation disguised as reporting.

Low standards in journalism make it easy for special interest groups and politicians to “feed” stories to journalists.

[View source](#)

Political interests often collude with journalists to engage in mass manipulation disguised as reporting. Journalist and author Sharyl Attkisson defines this transactional journalism as “reporters making inappropriate deals with the people they’re reporting on.”

[View source](#)

WATCH: Sharyl Attkisson on “astroturf” and the manipulation of media messages.

[View source](#)

Trust in the mainstream media is cratering. Only about a third of Americans trust the MSM to report the facts straight.

An August 2017 Pew Research Center study found that only 37 percent of Americans believe the mainstream news outlets report the facts accurately.

[View source](#)

Journalist and author Sharyl Attkisson says that journalists have “exempted ourselves from the normal rules that used to govern us, and so the most egregious kinds of reporting errors are becoming more common.”

[View source](#)

Related reading: “Stonewalled: My Fight for Truth Against the Forces of Obstruction, Intimidation, and Harassment in Obama's Washington” – Sharyl Attkisson

[View source](#)

Many journalists have become tools of special interests, who feed them stories in exchange for special treatment.

Many news reports now are based on information “fed” to reporters by special interest groups. Journalist and author Sharyl Attkisson says the media has only itself to blame, with special interests understanding that many journalists have low standards and thus special interests “peddle tasty bites of scandalous, dubious information, hoping one major news organization or popular blog will bite.”

[View source](#)

Related reading: “The Smear: How Shady Political Operatives and Fake News Control What You See, What You Think, and How You Vote” – Sharyl Attkisson

[View source](#)

Why is so much news so biased? One reason is that journalists are fed stories from political sources in exchange for one-sided reporting.

Low standards in journalism make it easy for special interest groups and politicians to “feed” stories to journalists.

[View source](#)

Example: Emails show in July 2009, The Atlantic reporter Marc Ambinder was promised an advanced copy of a speech by then-Secretary of State Hillary Clinton – if he followed certain conditions, as privately dictated by Clinton aide Philippe Reines.

[View source](#)

His resulting article reads in part: “When you think of President Obama’s foreign policy, think of Secretary of State Hillary Clinton. That’s the message behind a muscular speech that Clinton is set to deliver today.”

[View source](#)

Ambinder defended himself by saying that he found Clinton’s speech to be muscular so the adjective was appropriate.

[View source](#)