Subject: Something Has Occurred To Me
Posted by Manualblock on Sat, 19 Aug 2006 16:11:50 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I see a lot of folks disputing what they read in the papers and see on the TV news. And I have to wonder; if you feel the news or the TV is misleading then that implies that you know what the real story is; otherwisw how would you know they are not telling the truth?So my question is; since individuals know the real story that the news isn't telling; where do they get their information? And how do they know their information is accurate?I would love to see the sources of news and info that these folks have; and see their dedicated line to the undeniable truth.

Subject: Re: Something Has Occurred To Me
Posted by Damir on Sat, 19 Aug 2006 18:30:48 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

We have had lots of examples here - for example, one side fired a few hundreds of mortar shells on some city/village (with civilians inside, of course), and other side fired one 60mm rocket from the rocket launcher on the tank who went too close to the buildings.Then some TV station called that "the fire exchange". But, always some non-corrupted and so-so objective journalist find a way to tell someone else what`s really happened...people of this town sometimes find a way to tell their relatives and friend in another city/state, some UN/EU observers can be that blind, and so on...And even TV viewers are not that stupid...if they watch the story how dangerous terrorists damaged expensive tank, and in the distance they see demolished town, they`ll know that`s something isn`t quite right with this TV news...

Subject: Re: Something Has Occurred To Me
Posted by Manualblock on Sat, 19 Aug 2006 19:26:01 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

So who should the readers look to for the news?

Subject: Two points
Posted by wunhuanglo on Sun, 20 Aug 2006 13:12:41 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

First, anyone who has been involved in a news story knows that what's in the papers only roughly approximates what actually happened. I think people are rightfully circumspect about news

reporting.Second, the only way to get to the "truth" of the matter is to bounce as many sources as possible against each other. It's a lot easier today than it was 20 years ago when I had to go to the News in Harvard Square and scan ('till they got pissed) and buy a handful of out-of-town papers and read what they had to say.Today you can go to Google news and compare 300 or 400 news accounts and research the apparent conflicts, not to mention the personal web sites that beat the hell out some single facet of every major news story.In short, there's virtually no single resource for reliable, just-the-facts-ma'am reporting. Like most things in life, if you want it done right....

Subject: Re: Two points
Posted by Manualblock on Sun, 20 Aug 2006 14:22:22 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

At the risk of appearing completely out of touch it is my contention that the conventional News organisations are the only sources you can trust.True there may be an editorial slant to each major news organisation and that will influence which stories recieve coverage; how that coverage is expressed and who will ultimately be responsible for the words that appear in the paper.Here are the alternatives. The internet. No large organisation doing fact checking/ no serious attempt at editorial oversight/ no facilities to actually encounter first hand experience/ no source or witnesses. So they are in my mind useless as news delivery systems.Of course we read more than one paper and watch more than one station for news. That equalises the editorial slant aspect. These major news organisations are filled with people who are acountable. They are accountable to advertisers/ oversight commitees/ representatives of the people or organisations involved in the story; with lawyers at every turn waiting for the mis-representation of fact to pounce.They have connections with organisations that can actually provide information instead of just re-cycle it.They are taken seriously by governments and businesses and other large entities that have responsibilities and accountabilities to the various and opposing groups or players in the story.I can offer more of my opinion but it doesn't really matter. What I have seen in my personal experience is the folks who critisize the mainstream media the most seem to be those who have very evident personal agendas and views and are seeking to have those agendas supported in print. If they are not given the type and specific slant they seek; then they have no use for mass-media. They want their truth and refuse to accept any other. So as a consequence all media that doesn't agree with their world view is suspect and they resort to outlets that support their philosophy.I don't direct this to you Charlie; you know that; but it gets tiring hearing how the media is so useless from people who you know for sure don't even pay attention to it. Or follow some super-biased ranting foolishness like Rush Limbaugh or something.Your post is reasonable and serious so I can take that seriously. I hope the value of my opinion is accorded the same weight by others. I would love to see a serious individual contradict and argue with seriousness the opposing view; that alternative media has more weight and truth. Becuase I don't buy it.

Subject: I get that you don't want to hear more from me but
Posted by wunhuanglo on Sun, 20 Aug 2006 15:35:25 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

it's facinating to read the history of print journalism (newspapers and broadsheets) in this country since colonial times.It's only a recent innovation that the concept of unbiased reporting has even been accepted as a journalistic standard, never mind how well it's implemented. For at least the first two hundred years papers were as unbiased as a copy of The Watchtower.Most newspapers were worse than Faux News - not even pretending to state the facts no matter how they couched them. A tradition of opinion oriented news is an old and ignoble tradition in this country.

Subject: Re:Au' Contrair; of course I want to hear from you
Posted by Manualblock on Sun, 20 Aug 2006 18:52:02 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Yes; I know the whole history of print journalism. How the various political parties and business interests appropriated the editorial line as well as manufactured much of the news. Read about the wild west; was there ever any truth to that era printed?But I think that as the century progressed and the means of communication improved; stories were able to be verified and cross-checked. The concept of a company newspaper that printed only what would benefit them faded as people were able to verify facts and events.I guess the golden age of journalism began in the fifties with the big names Like Edward R. Murrows who defied the Senate to print stories that put an end to the M'Carthy trials. The news organisations had to bend over backwards to appear to be unbiased in response to so many years of favoritism; so we had a distinct wariness of big business and politics.Considering the pressure from Religous and business and political entities the fact that the newspapers were able to get any news out there at all is a miracle.Even now here on Long Island we have a major struggle between the Bishop of the Catholic Diocese and our Local newspaper about whether to print articles that might show illegal aliens in a bad light. Think it's a tempest in a teapot? We lost a good representative as a result of the pressure from the Religous vote to prevent any talk of apprehending illegals and deporting them.The paper stuck to it's guns disregarding a large loss of revenue from the parishoners complaining to advertisers at the request of the Bishop.That is journalism of the best calibre. Thats why I still trust the papers over most of the other available media.How is the reporting your way? On TV I see a lot of criticism of the local politicians from your area but a lot of defending of the federal government. Not in our newspapers.
