

Re: Fifty-six Deceits in Fahrenheit 911

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.electronics.design/2004-08/2688.html>

From: Mark Ferguson (*nunya_at_biz.ness*)

Date: 08/16/04

Date: Mon, 16 Aug 2004 09:40:22 -0700

Ken Smith wrote:

> In article <118afaeb.0408110620.f0ae73c@posting.google.com>,
> Product developer <jdurban@vorel.com> wrote:
>
>>kensmith@green.rahul.net (Ken Smith) wrote in message
>>news:<cfcroc\$996\$1@blue.rahul.net>...
>
> [...]
>
>>>I strongly disagree. There is a strong right wing bias in the media and
>>>one of the lies they tell you is that there is a left wing bias in the
>>>media. Start at the bottom of the AM dial and work your way up in
>>>frequency through all the radio and TV signals you can receive and see for
>>>your self. I tried if where I am and hit the FM dial before I heard the
>>>first station that didn't have a right wing bias.
>>
>>Sounds like a scientific and accurate method of polling to me. With 87
>>percent of the press admitting being liberal there's no debate as to
>>their leanings in reporting, "editorializing" the news.
>
>
> No, 87% of the press "says" they are liberal. If you admit that their
> reporting is bias, you also have to admit that their reporting of their
> bias must be biased. So this is a case of you selectively believing them
> when they happen to say something that matches your preconcieved notions.

I don't follow your logic. Does that mean you'll accept that they're Liberal, but not that their political leanings influence what they report, and how they report it?

>>If there weren't a clear left wing bias in the reporting of the
>>news, Rush Limbaugh and FOX NEWS would have never evolved into the
>>powerhouses they have become. The market was ripe for alternative or
>>fair reporting

> Brad Pitt has become a famous actor even though there was not a clear bias
> toward being ugly in the existing pool of actors so I don't see that your

> *logic holds.*

You and I think he's ugly, but we don't run Hollywood.

> *People are more comfortable when their cherished notions are confirmed.*

I've noticed that. Which cherished notions do you have confirmed on CNN and MSNBC?

> *In the other new organizations, facts were sometimes checked and surprises
> found. This upset people so they switched off the news and turned on Rush
> who never bothered about facts.*

Past or present tense? He's gotten very good at being confirmed before airing anything.

>>*and there is a reason why the left can't create a huge
>>radio audience.*

>

> *There are other reasons that explain it just as well:*

>

> (1)

> *They have trouble getting on the air because of the right wing bias.*

AM radio was a very small segment of the "news media" until the Conservatives took it over. So what?

> (2)

> *The truth isn't funny*

Tell that to Lenny Bruce, George Carlin, FTM Mark Twain, Swift, Kipling, and so on. Why can't Al Franken make it funny?

> (3)

> *The people are more comfortable as explained above.*

Ever been to a Carlin show? Lotsa "things that make you go hmmm" after you stop laughing.

>>*There is no debating left wing bias.*

> *I'm debating it.*

Not very effectively. Why don't we know how many died (are dying) in Bosnia?

>>*You see it every*

>>*time you turn on network news*

>>*which might explain why audience share*

>>*is eroding year after year.*

- > *As you get more options for the same number of people to select from the*
- > *number selecting any given option will normally decrease. There are*
- > *several other reasons too.*

Uh, the "traditional media" are in serious trouble across the board. It's not just Conservatives who shun it, but the great "undecided" who don't like the constant stream of Liberal crap.

I'd like to point out that one of the things I hate about the two–party system is that once it's in place, and has polarized issues according to the tastes of the founders thereof, the great mass of the population gets described as "undecided" because most of us just don't polarize our thoughts the way the parties do. If we did, voter turnout would be larger every election (actual undecided numbers would be much smaller), and parties wouldn't have to go on about how "inclusive" they are, frinst the Dems umbrellaing Radical Feminists, Greens, Vegans, etc. while the Reps do the same with Big Business and Rednecks.

>>*There is a reason public radio and TV has*
>>*to be funded with taxpayer dollars.*

- > *Yes it is an attempt to keep it from having to take on advertizers and*
- > *hence end up with a bias. Remember 60 Minutes had to spike the report*
- > *about tobacco companies because of profit considerations.*

And the Annenberg Foundation has no bias?

>>*The only reason so many beleive war is bad is because so many do not*
>>*understand the cost of a safe and free society.*

- > *I'm sure there are some who would argue that a society that keeps its self*
- > *safe and free by killing and enslaving others is not something that works*
- > *in the long term.*

Many did throughout history, some for millenia.

BTW, did you expect to get away with that non sequitur?
Modern warfare has little to do with murder and slavery.

Warfare definitely sucks in any incarnation, but being willing to fight is the only alternative to accepting death or slavery on any level from the personal to the international, once diplomacy (the trading of threats) has failed.

- > *We've had the alert level raised and our right curtailed so it doesn't*
- > *seem to be working anyway.*

Well, since "profiling", the only sure way to rough-sort for terrorists is forbidden, what did you expect? Why the hell should civil rights be extended to non-citizens?

>>*The left believes that*

>>*if we could just sit down with terrorists and chant over some tea and*

>>*insense that they would change their attitude towards us.*

> *You really have some silly opinions about the left. Let me guess, you*

> *heard this line on Rush Limbaugh or perhaps Mike Savages show.*

I've heard similar from many self-professed Libs. Besides, true terrorists simply don't want to be our friends. They want us non-negotiably dead.

Mark L. Fergerson