
Subject: Re: Review - Studio Series one pi
Posted by [Wayne Parham](#) on Wed, 16 Feb 2005 23:04:56 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Don't mince words, John. Tell us how you really feel about Peter Aczel. Seriously, I kind of dig the articles in those magazines. I understand what you said about reviewer's hidden agendas. That kind of stuff is really bad. But to tell the truth, that's what I see from most commercial reviewers. Their business model is advertising, so they cannot avoid having some bias and a sort of built-in agenda. Unless complete anonymity is enforced and only nameless technical issues are described, all reviewers, magazines and E-Zine's are suspect, in my opinion. So basically what I'm saying, is that if an article isn't purely technical, I disregard it as being possibly tainted with hidden agendas, no matter what its source. I'd rather look at a sales brochure than a review because at least then the agenda is out front. I guess the matter is Peter Aczel got caught doing a review of something he sold. But isn't that true of most publications of this sort? If the magazine sells advertising, isn't the whole thing essentially doing reviews of products it sells? It is a process of selling opinions, so it is inherently problematic. The business of reviewing must be exceedingly difficult to do, and ethics could easily become blurred. I don't know, but I've come to the conclusion that that it's best to focus on the issues and not the players. That's how I've come to see things.
