Subject: At Last; the hardcore right-wing reactionary religiousos' are on the run.
Posted by Manualblock on Sun, 18 Dec 2005 13:58:49 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Hey; they're not Republicans and they are not Democrats. They don't speak for the majority or even a significant minority. They just speak the loudest. They yap like dogs on the right wing TV and Radio Networks because their message is geared for fanatics and simpletons who respond to quick and simple sound bites like Pavlov's subjects.Lets hope real reporters and commentators begin to stand up and be counted in this coming year. I for one am tired of these radicals appropriating the citizens airspace. Especially that Australian whacko who owns Fox news and the replicants that appear on there.

Subject: I'll Take A Stab at Part of This One
Posted by elektratig on Mon, 19 Dec 2005 14:36:56 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Mb,I'm not sure who you're referring to in particular, but I gather that Fox News figures prominently in there somewhere. I'll address only one part of your post -- the complaint about "appropriating the citizens airspace."What you really seem to be contending is that television channels are "the citizens['] airspace" in the sense that their content should be regulated by the government: unpopular or "irresponsible" (in your view) opinions should be suppressed.Despite the obvious free speech implications, the government used to do precisely this, on the rationale that television channels were a limited resource that needed to be "balanced" -- even here in NYC we used to get, at most, seven channels. Advances in technology have rendered this model obsolete, however. The average citizen now receives scores or hundreds of channels. Alternate modes of communication, including internet sites maintained by both print and television news organizations, as well as political blogs, raise the number of readily available sources of political information into the thousands.(As an aside, I must say that the internet is THE greatest boon to freedom of expression ever invented. The proliferation of political sites on the internet, from the far left to the far right, brings this country back to its roots, where early in its history every nut case printed broadsides, pamphlets, etc. It is more possible now than ever before to locate political views of every persuasion.)At all events, whether regulation of the content of television was ever justified, there can be no basis for it now. Subject only to traditional First Amendment limits (yelling "fire" in a crowded theatre, libel, pornography, etc.), both traditional and cable channels should have the same rights to say what they want as newspapers (and you and I) have always had.I may dislike and complain about the tripe that CBS news and The New York Times put out. It is my right to do so. You may dislike and complain about Fox News, and you too have that right. But all three likewise have the right to say what they want, and the government shouldn't censor them.The answer to free speech is more free speech!

Subject: Re: I'll Take A Stab at Part of This One

Posted by Manualblock on Mon, 19 Dec 2005 15:34:29 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Geez; what a love-in! How can I refute that? The precise point of my post; to express my opinion of the current News scene. But please give me this I beg of you; you are a bright guy; doesn't the pandering and condescending simpleminded reports on Fox irritate the hell out of you? Come-on. The repitition and bumper-sticker mentality has to get old and redundant; it just has to.The New York Times is at least readable by a responsible adult. Your a native New Yorker; can you read the New York Post?We have to demand of those who use the public airways some accountability and respect. On the internet everyone is so fractionalised that the opinions have no sequential focus; like a two-dimensional figure..they are missing the thought process needed to understand things in the larger sense so therefor they pose no threat because they are so easily manipulated. But the major news organisations need to be held to a higher standard.

Subject: Re: I'll Take A Stab at Part of This One
Posted by Wayne Parham on Mon, 19 Dec 2005 18:56:22 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Don't forget that news media is a for-profit enterprise. They get more viewers from controversy than they get from non-controversial factual reporting. So they have an incentive to polarize the public, to incite emotional responses. Rather than bore you with the facts, they'll excite you with an emotionally charged version, picking only those stories that might stir the viewers. Basically, the news media promotes propoganda for profit, all large media outlets, every one. If you want a higher standard, you'll need to turn off the television, avoid the daily rags and not watch any network news or read any newspapers. 'Cause they've all become tabloids. Both major political parties have become caricatures of themselves. The media is all too willing to exploit them to make "headlines" and the politicians enjoy the publicity so they have mutual goals fulfilled with this kind of exaggeration and hype.

Subject: Re: I'll Take A Stab at Part of This One
Posted by elektratig on Mon, 19 Dec 2005 23:29:26 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

MB,I love the Post! After all, the Gray Lady doesn't give you Page Six!In all seriousness, Fox is a mixed bag. Some of it is ridiculous. On the other hand, I think the Britt Hume evening program is the best one-hour news program on television. I watch it every chance I get.The big difference between Fox, on the one hand, and the other networks (CBS, CNN, et al.) and the big print media (NYT, Washington Post), on the other, is that Fox makes no bones about the fact that it is basically pro-administration -- although I've seen harsher overt criticism of certain administration policies on Fox than I have on CBS. The others pretend that they are "objective" and express outrage when anyone questions their impartiality, even though everyone knows it's not true.I've

been reading a good deal of history about pre-Civil War America over the past several months, and I much prefer the honesty of the press back then. Papers made no pretense that they were impartial. To the contrary, they touted the fact that they were pro-Jackson or pro-Whig or whatever. There was truth in advertising, the reader knew what he was getting and could factor that in when assessing the information he was receiving. Fox, by and large, and many internet sites represent a return to those roots, and I think that's a good thing.As for the internet, it may be "fractionalized" in the sense that there are so many sites that it's hard to focus on any one. But I disagree to the extent you are suggesting that particular sites present only half-digested opinions and rants without reasoned analyses of the underlying facts and considerations. There certainly are many such sites (Democratic Underground being a prime example). But to pick our last topic (torture) by way of example, I've come across many, many lengthy discussions of the issue, pro and con, on the internet that discuss the topic in far greater depth than I've seen in any print publication, including the revered NYT.Let the love begin!

Subject: Another Internet Example
Posted by elektratig on Tue, 20 Dec 2005 00:11:24 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

In support of my contention about the depth of analysis on the internet, here, by way of further example, is a thorough, if necessarily tentative, analysis of the legality of the NSA domestic surveillance program. It's far more informative than the hysterical nonsense published in the NYT the other day -- and the Times, apparently, had a year to put its article together.
Legal Analysis of the NSA Program

Subject: Re: Another Internet Example
Posted by Manualblock on Tue, 20 Dec 2005 00:33:41 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Before I read this; who is Orrin Kerr?

Subject: Re: I'll Take A Stab at Part of This One
Posted by Manualblock on Tue, 20 Dec 2005 00:42:52 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Wayne and E-man; It is my position that the purpose of the media is not to guarranty that every word they write is a fact. First there are no facts. Only perceptions. It's like the old legal maxim that says the most unreliable witness is an eyewitness. After posting on this forum for several years now I see that there is very little agreement on what constitutes a fact even in this little

corner of the world. The purpose of media is to describe events. Thats what they should be doing. As far as bias in reportage; can we agree that the human brain is wired to operate under conditions of bias? So thats why we just tell what we see and then let the people ponder the meaning of the report.The Times is an imperfect example of perfection but it is all we have in terms of integrity. What would you use as a reference; Fox? The Daily News?So the responsibility of the reader is to bring his experience and intellect to the events reported on. At least thatts the way I see it.So let me ask; has there ever been an honest reporter; (except for Chris Mathews that is.)

Subject: Re: I'll Take A Stab at Part of This One
Posted by Bill Martinelli on Tue, 20 Dec 2005 03:29:46 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Why not use Walter Cronkite as a reference? I'm the guys from the 60's had their lines to tow; but there isn't anything so demanding as American corporate profit structure as there is today. I think Wayne's on the right track here. It's all about ratings and profit. The high profile and controversial shit is where the most money is. Then, they hide behind free speech, 1st and 5th amendment.

Subject: Law Professor . . .
Posted by elektratig on Tue, 20 Dec 2005 10:29:19 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

He's an Associate Professor of Law at The George Washington University Law School. I've found Professor Kerr analyses quite reliable. The essay is not required reading, although you might like it because it tentatively suggests that the program may be illegal. The real point is that there's a wealth of information out there.
Orin Kerry Bio

Subject: Re: I'll Take A Stab at Part of This One
Posted by Manualblock on Tue, 20 Dec 2005 12:01:19 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Now you have it; Walter was one of the last of the real reporters; with enough personal power to see that the stories he felt were important to the American people got noticed. And he pandered to no one either right left or center.The era of yellow journalism back in the early 1900's was worse than it is now. So there is hope. But let me ask. Does anyone think there can be a media outlet that would be considered fair and honest by everone? Under any conditions?You and me as readers must do some of the hard work of thinking and assimilating required to allow for some

understanding of whats being reported. Or we could watch Fox and not think at all.

Subject: Re: Law Professor . . .
Posted by Manualblock on Tue, 20 Dec 2005 12:10:23 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Thanks Bud for the link. I find also the Jurist News to be reliable; I can offer a link but you may have it. Regarding the torture debate; I have considored the different reports available to me. I have decided that it is not going to be an option for me. I must unfortunately remain firmly against the sanctioning of torture in any form by our government. I know the arguments and understand what some think is at stake. But I know that the price is not worth the candle. But it is an interesting debate witnessing how others feel about policy. I also see McCain backpedalling slightly; that is sad. He must have recieved so many letters and e-mails from torture supporters that he is fearfull of his carreer.After seeing the devastation from 9/11 and knowing some of those killed as I am sure you do also; I still can't see how reneging on the purpose of our nations historical legacy will enhance our safety. No amount of spying on the citizens and removing sacred rights and chaining the press would have prevented that event. Hey; the price of liberty is high.
