Subject: Dixie Chicks Censored In Houston
Posted by FredT on Wed, 16 Aug 2006 11:56:44 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I'm so glad that Houston's top country music stations have forced the Dixie Chicks to cancel their plans for a Houston concert so Houstonians won't be exposed to their anti-American views. Chick fans will have to drive to Austin, that hotbed of liberalism, to hear them. So how did two or three radio stations manage to do this? Simple, they refused to accept the promoter's money for concert advertising. The reason given is that they don't promote artists whose songs aren't played on their stations, and needless to say they don't play the Dixie Chicks' songs on their stations.On the surface this shouldn't come as a surprise or be found objectionable by anybody who understands the country music radio audience. Based on reactions to their famous statement about the president I would expect that country music fans wouldn't want to hear them anyway, and I wouldn't expect a radio station to lose listeners (and revenue) by playing music or promoting a concert by a group their listeners find objectionable. Regardless of whether I like country music radio, I have to admit that country music radio execs are very effective at promoting their stations and avoiding mistakes that might cause them problems down the road.But let's go below the surface for a moment and explore what the real issues behind this decision might be. Of course the trouble started in 2003 when the group's music was banned from several country music stations' playlists. Subsequently, Edison Media Research did a national survey of 12 radio stations' listeners across the nation, including Houston's megastation KILT, which revealed that only 19% of listeners think radio should avoid the Chicks altogether. 51% took offense at the famous comment but thought the Chicks should still be on radio, 15% agreed with the statement (was Manualblock included in this survey?:), and 15% were undecided.The real underlying issue here isn't the actual refusal to accept ad money. It's the fact that a handful of public radio stations, which are many Americans' only source of news and opinions, have the power to block a group from even playing in America's 4th largest city, even though only 15% of their audience would support the decision. These stations, of course, are controlled by media giants with names like CBS, Clearaudio, etc. Scary!Of course a political/economic conservative would respond that CBS and Clearaudio are private corporations, and they have to right to control their own programming and advertising. I agree, but only to a point. I can see where a media source would be justified in not accepting ad money for an event that most of their audience would find objectionable, such as a liberal station not running ads for a KKK rally. But it's differnt when a media source abuses their subatantial power by blocking the free speech of others in venues that are not owned by their stations. Whether you have the conservative or liberal brand on your forehead I hope you can see this is potentially as much a threat to you as it is to the other side.Eliza, are you listening? Good topic for a new song!

Subject: Re: Dixie Chicks Censored In Houston
Posted by Wayne Parham on Wed, 16 Aug 2006 14:14:05 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Yeah, that's a tough one. It's the same kind of thing I see so much of in (all forms of) media, and in all public communications really. Since private companies own the infrastructures that provide

communications, they decide what content they will allow. But it does create a bully pulpit, one that has a great deal of power to influence large numbers of people. What I see are dozens of bully pulpits, all of which manipulate the masses to some degree.

Subject: Re: Dixie Chicks Censored In Houston
Posted by Manualblock on Wed, 16 Aug 2006 16:03:08 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Maybe we should have a return to the time before de-regulation of the airwaves; before Reagan. When media outlets had to provide equal access to opposing views; when advertising was limited in time and scope; when Presidents were requiered to give reasonable amounts of press conferences and reporters where not limited in what they were allowed to ask. Lot of changes could return us back to a more insightfull and serious time.When the airwaves were allocated by government fiat and not by huge sums of cash. Where no one media company could own more than a percentage of media outlets. Clearaudio is the Wal-Mart of broadcasting and should be indicted.Oh; and thanks for the mention Fred; you need to start a blog. That is something I would read. And hey; you have a lot of free time on your hands right?....Seriously; you have an easygoing style of expository writing that reads well. Better than Instapundit.

Subject: Re: Dixie Chicks Censored In Houston
Posted by Wayne Parham on Wed, 16 Aug 2006 20:06:47 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

You might be right. But if we regulate the airwaves, do we also regulate the internet? Newspapers? Magazines? Books?It's kind of a tough one. Kinda hard to force people to not be manipulative. And it's an ironic sort of hypocracy, because to force people to not be manipulative is in itself extremely manipulative. That one is a tough one.

Subject: Re: Dixie Chicks Censored In Houston
Posted by Bill Wassilak on Wed, 16 Aug 2006 20:25:46 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

The Dixie Chicks have had to cancel lots of shows in Canada and several here in the U.S. because of poor ticket sales too. So if the radio stations that are promoting there concerts, seems like nobodys buying there tickets anyway because of there B.S.. So the concert promoters are canceling there shows left and right. It's just not the radio stations accepting or refusing the advertising $$$. Concert promoters are in the business for one thing and one thing only MONEY. I know I've had to deal with a few of the a--holes mysyself and if they can't break even or if they

think there going to loose money they'll cancel a show.

Subject: Re: Dixie Chicks Censored In Houston
Posted by FredT on Wed, 16 Aug 2006 20:43:57 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I don't disagree. Another reason for poor ticket sales is that they are heading in the crossover direction, and dedicated country fans aren't as interested in that kind of music. But the fact still remains that the Houston stations refused to accept their promoter's ads, and it still bothers me that a public corporation has enough power to dictate what music I can hear at venues other than their station. I would be equally concerned if a station whose owners are atheists refused to accept ad money for a Christian music concert.

Subject: Re: Dixie Chicks Censored In Houston
Posted by FredT on Wed, 16 Aug 2006 21:09:33 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

True. As you say, the problem is how to enforce practices that are in the public's interest without over regulating an industry. The answer is in macro management of the most significant trends rather than micro regulation of practices.Many years ago America woke up one morning and discovered that a few "new aristocracy" millionaires with names like Rockefeller controlled the nation's economy through the monopolies they had built. They even had their own police forces to enforce their will, with no responsibility for anybody's civil rights. So we broke up the monopolies. Years later, when I began my career, there were 21 major oil companies operating in the US instead of just Standard Oil. When I retired 30 years later there were only three major players: Exxon/Mobil, Conoco/Phillips, and BP/Arco/Amoco. Somehow when these companies applied to the FTC for permission to merge, our politicians saw no potential problems. Ditto for the communications industry, retail goods, pahrmesuticals (need to check that spelling) etc.The trend is clearly in the direction of large companies merging to form even larger and more powerful ones that are responsible only to the politicians they support and not to the public. BP presently serves as the poster child for irresponsible behavior, but only because they've had a run of bad luck. Wal Mart would be much worse if they handled hazardous materials as their core business.The sad thing about this state of affairs is that people like me, registered Republicans, middle class middle-of-the-roaders leaning toward conservatism, are beginning to seriously question the viability of a free enterprise system controlled by mega corporations running unchecked in the economy. And to add to the frustration of our Republican adminsitration not addressing these important issues, Democratic politicians with their old worn out populist agenda don't seem to have a viable answer either.

Subject: Re: Dixie Chicks Censored In Houston
Posted by Manualblock on Wed, 16 Aug 2006 22:05:24 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Thats the point. There has to be some kind of enforceable regulatory legislation designed to level the playing field sort of. Freedom to devour corporations until you stand at the top of the heap alone doesn't work for obvious reasons. The de-regulation of many industries during the Republican Revolution combined with the lack of oversight and enforcement has lead to the conditions we have now.There is manipulation; on one side by the business and corporate entities and on the other side through the political sphere. On that side there is at least the vote; some kind of control by the people over situations and circumstances. There is no such thing as absolute freedom anywhere on earth ever. So I side with the popular vote as a control on extreme mis-use of rights and resources over the power of corporate beings. I feel safer with an elected governing body making the rules than with profit making structures defining our rights.

Subject: Re: Dixie Chicks Not Censored Anywhere
Posted by elektratig on Thu, 17 Aug 2006 00:07:43 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

MB,The proposition that "[t]here has to be some kind of enforceable regulatory legislation designed to level the playing field" is just a terrible idea. Some government agency is going to require radio stations to play the Dixie Chicks? More likely, that power, if granted, would ultimately be used to require the dissemination of pro-, not anti-, administration messages. Foolish.Mercifully, we got rid of the FCC "fairness doctrine" in the 1980s (thank you, Pres. Reagan). There are so many outlets for ideas and messages that there's no reason for government censorship on the "fairness doctrine" model. If radio stations won't play their songs, then they can go to cable tv, or the internet (start a blog and post a sample audio or video there, or post a video on You Tube), etc., etc., etc. Hell, they can go sing on a streetcorner.In this regard, the title of this thread, "Dixie Chicks Censored", is exactly wrong. It's the remedy that is being proposed that would constitute censorship.

Subject: Re: Dixie Chicks Not Censored Anywhere
Posted by Manualblock on Thu, 17 Aug 2006 00:17:25 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

E; that all makes sense if there were fair competition in the media business. How do we deal with an entity like clearchannel that buys up over 38% of the markets then decide what gets played on those markets.Regulation and legislation would not dictate that the Chicks get played; only that they have an outlet that would support their opportunity to get played. They should have one of a multiple of outlets in the radio and media sphere that entertains their music and the people's rights who want to hear them. One company should not have the power to stop the playing of their

music for everyone.Thats the level playing field. You prevent one entity from deciding everything in music and what will be played. Like Wal-Mart; one company doesn't decide what goods and prices the consumer gets.

Subject: 10-4 Bucko!
Posted by wunhuanglo on Thu, 17 Aug 2006 09:38:28 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

That's hittin' the ol' tack with a sledge hammer.It's astounding how most people don't get it - they decry some form of entertainment (too sexy usually) and then go right out and support the same industry they're complaining about (movie tickets, DVD rentals, music downloads).You can hear Fox News watchers rant and rave about indecency in media, listen to Fox News on-air personnel agree loudly with them, and no one mentions just a couple of skips down the dial is a Fox-owned network where somebody is getting ass-raped in a junk yard.Show me the money!

Subject: The media / corporate monopolies don't decide
Posted by wunhuanglo on Thu, 17 Aug 2006 09:48:16 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

WE decide. You know how you keep Clear Channel from programming the same limited crap in every market? Don't listen. If you get an Arbitron diary put down that you're a male, 18 to 34, and all you listen to is NPR - two bad books and Clear Channel will dump the local turkey like a hot potato.Object to Sahron Stone flashing her near-50 beaver on screen? Don't buy a ticket, don't rent the DVD - bye-bye Sharon Stone's beaver. Don't like Wal-Mart? Don't go in there. If enough people with the ability to choose (not the desperately working poor who can't afford to) do that, Wal-Mar profitability will plummet and the family will change. Don't like broadcast TV? Neilson works just like Arbitron.It does, and always has, come down to one and only one thing (bless Cuba Gooding, Jr.)SHOW ME THE MONEY!

Subject: Re: The media / corporate monopolies don't decide
Posted by Manualblock on Thu, 17 Aug 2006 13:01:44 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Thats true except in many instances the deck is stacked. You no longer have that power to decide by your purchasing descisions. Just like cable tv. If you want one channell you got to buy ten channells. If you want a certain phone service you got to buy all the phone service.In music the bands that might have a chance of becoming the Next Beatles or Ramones are not allowed to play where anyone can hear them. Because they don't Generate Revenue. Without that you get

oogotz.

Subject: Re: The media / corporate monopolies don't decide
Posted by Damir on Thu, 17 Aug 2006 16:11:59 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

But it`s a good thing that life can "flow" through some other "streams"...many good things aren`t in the "main", regulated flow. And if you need the alternative, you`ll find it... Who needs their TV, radio, concert halls, movies, press... anyhow?
http://www.plyrics.com/lyrics/clash/garageland.html

Subject: Re: The media / corporate monopolies don't decide
Posted by Manualblock on Thu, 17 Aug 2006 16:52:25 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

So then those who are able to get access by some means will get what they like and those who for some reason cannot access these "out of the mainstream" venues then they get nothing. Thats sort of an elitist outlook; that the well-connected are able to choose while the less connected are the victims of someone elses choice.

Subject: Re: The media / corporate monopolies don't decide
Posted by Damir on Thu, 17 Aug 2006 21:34:31 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Every man or women has a right (and somehow even a duty) to develop him/herself. It`s a called a culture, and acces to it today isn`t reserved for the small elite. Books, Internet, music... everything is acessible in the most of the countries. Yes, bad state politics, money, or whatever can be responsible for many things, but the individual is the most responsible for his/her level of knowledge and understanding, spiritual growth - if you like.

Subject: Re: The media / corporate monopolies don't decide
Posted by Manualblock on Thu, 17 Aug 2006 21:55:25 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Ill buy that. But that technically doesnt address the issue of access to things you may need to further your "spiritual growth"; like the new Dixie Chicks Album.

Subject: Re: The media / corporate monopolies don't decide
Posted by Damir on Thu, 17 Aug 2006 22:13:01 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Yes, I can live without it. But, if we under "iron curtain" somehow obtained LPs only a few months after they published in London, for example, and played similar "new wave" music on the same time, say 1980.- what`s the problem now? Is it "elitistic" to say that (my company and I listened (for example) NY new wave bands at that time when (even today) very small number of people heard of them?You can 5 hours a day watching the TV - or play the guitar, read the books, tinkering with tube amps...the choice is yours.
http://www.lyricsbox.com/television-lyrics-venus-tcc643d.html

---

Subject: Re: The media / corporate monopolies don't decide
Posted by wunhuanglo on Thu, 17 Aug 2006 22:44:19 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Ya'ain't lookin at this right.Access to the mass media gets you what? Crap suitable for mass consumption - the Beastie Boys and Carmen Electra.It is only recently that markets existed on the scale that Stones concerts happen. Musicians, great musicians from Mahler to Gershwin played to a couple of hundered seats at a time. Now the expectation is that an act will play to 10,000 or 50,000 or 25 million over the television.What can you put out that will appeal to 25 million people across the country? The lowest order of popular pap. Good stuff was, is and always be at the margins - don't look for it on ABC at 9 PM Wednesdays.And as far as your cable example goes - think about it, there's over-air, 2 satellite networks, internet tv feeds and video rental thru the mail as well as whole seasons of tv series from Amazon, Circuit City and the like - you have plenty of choices if you want to exercise them.

Subject: Re: The media / corporate monopolies don't decide
Posted by Manualblock on Thu, 17 Aug 2006 23:24:18 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Allow me to retort. In this discussion I am under the impression that we are not examining the most popular and promoted forms of art; as you say ABC at 9 on Wednesdays.Maybe I am wrong but it was my contention that we already have access to the Beastie Boys for all of us; ie. revenue generators. On the margins we have access to individual favorites of whatever entity you

name. But if those entities are old TV shows and satellite TV we have just executed a large circular train of thought. Those things you mention are available and will always be available since they are proven money makers. They have an existing track record.The Stones coming out of the old Merseybeat scene were not moneymakers. They became that due to their ability to access the media as a result of the BBC allowing time for the public to utilise the airwaves.It isn't the known entities I am concerned about; its what we will never see as a result of companies like Clearchannell owning the rights to broadcast/print and performance venues. How does new music become viable if it is secularised into one internet blog read by fifty people?

Subject: Re: The media / corporate monopolies don't decide
Posted by Manualblock on Thu, 17 Aug 2006 23:28:15 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Yes but the Stones had to be commercialised first; in London, before you could see them. If clearchannel owned the BBC neither you or me would ever have heard of Mick Jagger.

Subject: Re: The media / corporate monopolies don't decide
Posted by Damir on Fri, 18 Aug 2006 10:48:57 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Totally disagreee, and I`ll illustrate this again with former Yugoslavia situation, an extreme example.From `77-`79. there are some punk/new wave bands, especially in "western" parts of Yu. Those bands were totally ignored by the radio, TV, recording companies and press, even "sotonized" from time to time like negative example. There`re not many places where you can play, and many concerts were registered like some other shows, etc. One friend of mine (who has punk band 1977. , at the same time like others in London:-)), actually was forced to bring the texts of the songs in the local Communists party committee - of course, he changed the lyrics a bit for that purpose :-). There`re comissions in recording companies who ordered what can be recorded. Even light politics critique were censored, and those LPs are taxed with special large taxes, and marked with "trash" stickers! And you usually can`t find those LPs almost anywhere. And foreign records were selected, too - Sex Pistols were never published in former Yu, but we all (my high-school company) have their records, haha.Eventually, a few very good band appeared, one was "Azra"...those guys played every f... day in every f... village and the city. Usually no posters, commercials, anything - just the word from the mouth. This band becomes so huge and popular (despite their sharp and politics lyrics), then one recording company recorded their first LP, 1980.I remember how I traveled 40km to the another city, where you`d can bought this LP at the time - by auto-stop...whole f... day, there weren`t enough petrol and just a few cars were on the roads. This band have had so big success in former Yu, than THEY started to order the rules of this r`n`r game, some freedom walls was broken, and many smaler new-wave groups recorded their songs, too.Even then, official TV and radios rarely played this music, but who cared for them, anyway...

Subject: Re: The media / corporate monopolies don't decide
Posted by Manualblock on Fri, 18 Aug 2006 11:56:02 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Well sorry but I never heard of them. They are probably good but we won't see them over here.

Subject: Re: The media / corporate monopolies don't decide
Posted by Damir on Fri, 18 Aug 2006 13:14:33 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

That`s all you can say?  After all that "cry" that some US country band can`t get commercial on some f... radio station(s)?I just tried to explain to you (smal example) what we went through... Screw the monopolist radio station or TV - I`m the witness that even whole state politics can be changed, even destroyed - if it`s not in people interest - one way or another.But today, with so many communications ways...Well, I`ll stop here.
http://www.plyrics.com/lyrics/clash/whiteriot.html

Subject: Re: The media / corporate monopolies don't decide
Posted by Manualblock on Fri, 18 Aug 2006 13:27:12 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Well the problem is the discussion isn't going anywhere. It seems people either understand that art is a comodity like everything else and when it is controlled by small highly centralised corporate entities then it declines and is stifled. Re-exploring the same arguments that there are ways to express your art that can reach those who really are interested just don't hold up in practice. You offer one experience; well I say thats the one exception that proves the rule. That sample you cite existed as a result of a one time set of circumstances that allowed a condition to be met and that enabled the band to reach people it ordinarily would not have; not to mention you know it is still a very small audience comparitively speaking.The answers to this discussion have all focused on alternative means by which we can access art by-passing the conventional distribution methods. Thats always been the case. What we are arguing here is; does the tightly concentrated control of the mediums that provide us access to art produce a climate of acceptance and make this art more or less available to people. I say no.

Subject: Re: The media / corporate monopolies don't decide
Posted by Damir on Fri, 18 Aug 2006 16:21:05 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Well, we obviously have different views what`s art and the way it "must" be expressed. If some good artist paint a picture, and it wasn`t shown on largest TV channel in America - than it doesn`t exists (both artist and the picture)?"Re-exploring the same arguments that there are ways to express your art that can reach those who really are interested just don't hold up in practice."Not true. Many people really interested in some art forms/artists will find a way to specific painter and his atelier/paintings - this is happened all the time. If you think that his art must be shown on "Discovery" channel, than you are wrong.And today you have many, many ways of sharing art forms, songs for example, unknown only 10 years ago. The band can have their own studio, recording label and Internet (downloading) page, plus fanzine, various forums, various places for concerts, alternative radios, connections with fans, everything.And what`s "tightly concentrated control of the mediums" that somehow prevents the access of the art to the poor people? Even in Stalin`s USSR there`re many artists banned or unliked by the goverment, but many reached domestic and international success.And somehow, art is a personal, original thing, usually "out of the stream"... You probably won`t hear some classical music/composers on TV...does it means that the "access" to the classical music is somehow banned? Today you can have all sorts of informations about such a music, you can download it, even buy CDs, all on-line...

Subject: Re: The media / corporate monopolies don't decide
Posted by Manualblock on Fri, 18 Aug 2006 19:00:54 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

See; thats what I am trying to say. You are focused on thinking that somehow my argument has something to do with exposure on the typical most popular delivery systems. Do you think that back in the 1950's that Muddy Waters or Robert Johnson were played on TV channel 2?No; they were played on pirate radio stations that could; using large wattage transmitters reach large audiences across the rural south of America and in places like Detroit or Baltimore. Those radio stations were illegal; but they were able to function outside the law and to keep that music alive as well as to become primary in the creation of Rock and Roll by bringing this music to the masses.That is one example of how art is transformed by a medium. Now with large corporations owning and guarding their wares with lawyers and technological devices designed to prevent people from accessing their wares; they can funnel very controlled and organised systems that decide who or what gets played anywhere in any medium. To equate small internet blogs that address small individual audiences targeted by small individual outlets and who are very flimsy and fickle; so that one day there is one song and the next day another and the original is long gone; with the ability to show your art to many thousands of people who can then show it to many thousands more until they create a market and that market drives the popularity of the art independant of any organised entity; like the early days of the Britsh Invasion in Music so to speak. For that you need access; to the medium. This is a very long rant; I have to say on some level you got to appreciate what I am saying and deal with that if you disagree. repeating the theory that art will always find its way to those who want it; well thats the past ten posts already. For some reason the thread can't get past the notion that art is inviolable and will prevail. Thats not simply the case; it can be marginalised by monopolistic control; even on the fringes of the market; and the market is everything; including whatever examples we can think up.

Subject: Re: The media / corporate monopolies don't decide
Posted by Damir on Fri, 18 Aug 2006 20:57:53 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

"...and the market is everything; including whatever examples we can think up."I`m not interesting in the market when I`m thinking about the art. And the market isn`t everything - screw it.And monopolistic control - too.I`m just listening to the pop-punk band CD (two sisters, bass and guitar and one kid on the drums, 16-17 years old). They made their own CD with 6 songs - their own songs. And know what - those kids are not that bad at all... You can now say that those kids need lawyers, menagements, big companies, TV and other parts of the industry...but they don`t.
http://lyrics.rare-lyrics.com/J/Johnny-Cash/The-One-On-The-Right-Is-On-The-Left.html

Subject: Re: The media / corporate monopolies don't decide
Posted by Manualblock on Fri, 18 Aug 2006 22:05:28 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Well; there you go. It works for you.

Subject: Re: The media / corporate monopolies don't decide
Posted by Damir on Sat, 19 Aug 2006 05:55:50 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Did you see the movie about de Sade? When they locked him up in Asylum and forbided him the writing, he just wrote on the sheets and his shirts - with his own blood. When authorities discovered that and take up all the clotches, he wrote on the walls with his shits.That`s what I`m talking about.

Subject: Re: The media / corporate monopolies don't decide
Posted by Manualblock on Sat, 19 Aug 2006 13:22:51 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

You make a good point there.