

Submitted April 3, 2010

From its inception, even the title of the AC360° series on Scientology is biased. It is designed to malign, not to honestly frame the report.

To call the series "A History of..." when the instances were isolated, countable, and long past is sensationalism. When the instances are attributed by the majority of affidavits to a fired and disgruntled employee, it's clear the title is a grab for ratings.

As the most forgiving view, the series title betrays an unconscious prejudice that Cooper and staff cannot see in themselves. How can they be fair when they think they're not bigoted?

What's not so pardonable is that Anderson Cooper wants us to *think* he delivers an "unbiased" review.

Just add up the raw minutes Cooper spends one-on-one with each accuser on camera. Include the accusers' sole presence in the promos and teasers airing before and during the show.

Then compare that total, and the audience impression it gives, to the impersonal "group interviews" Cooper gives to four or five "exes" (very credible) of the accusers, and a mass interview of four or five church executives.

Notice that no accusers were interviewed as a group; all got individual face time with Cooper and camera.

Sadly, even the group interviews were short—and they get no exposure in promos.

So Cooper *is* covertly taking sides, though trying to give a benign impression of fairness.

One point of fairness is the time given to the Church's spokespersons, Davis and the attorney.

But add up all the minutes of coverage on Side A versus Side B, and you'll see it's lopsided in favor of sensationalism.

And we're still waiting to hear or see on-screen *even one* quote from the dozens of letters and affidavits AC360° received from witnesses who refuted the accusers' claims.