
IN OUR VIEW: Defending expression

Posted by leftintheuc - 2008/07/03 08:11

This thread discusses the Content article: IN OUR VIEW: Defending expression

Surprise that the right wing parrots comprising the worthless editorial board at the DH spew out this partisan piece of crap.

Right wing talk show hosts are not popular because they talk about issues, as these fools imply. They stir up emotions. They get people all riled up, easy to do in this divided country that they themselves helped create. Subsequently, we have become a less informed country. Look at the anti-science, anti-democrat filth this paper produces daily. Sure helps subscription rates in the red UC, a place, not coincidentally, known for free thinkers.

Redgardless what you think about fairness, it seems blatantly obvious why institutions like the D Herald, Hannity/Beck/limbaugh/Savage/Coulter and all their related, anti-rational, anti-intellectual garbage hacks are opposed to the introduction of opposing views. Because the suppression of ideas keeps people from thinking. And an uninformed population buys into this spin, keeping them in business.

=====

Re:IN OUR VIEW: Defending expression

Posted by megus - 2008/07/03 12:35

leftintheuc wrote:

This thread discusses the Content article: IN OUR VIEW: Defending expression

Redgardless what you think about fairness, it seems blatantly obvious why institutions like the D Herald, Hannity/Beck/limbaugh/Savage/Coulter and all their related, anti-rational, anti-intellectual garbage hacks are opposed to the introduction of opposing views. Because the suppression of ideas keeps people from thinking. And an uninformed population buys into this spin, keeping them in business.

You are so funny Left. Just how have these talk shows kept the left from spouting their views? Oh wait, the American people don't want to hear them when they try to put on a talk show of their own and so they don't generate the revenue necessary and so now you want the stations to give you the time for free.

Can't you see your free to start all the left wing talk shows you want? No one is stopping you. But the only way your brand of talk can succeed is if you can force it on others.

Not really the American way. Or at least the old American way.

=====

Re:IN OUR VIEW: Defending expression

Posted by aramyna - 2008/07/03 14:06

You obviously do not understand how the law stands now. Liberals have just as much right to produce radio shows with opposing views as conservatives. No one is stopping them. The only problem seems to be a lack of interest from the general populace in listening to them. So, their solution is to suppress those already succeeding in the market and force stations to host shows with opposing views regardless of whether the public wants to listen. What the liberals want is SOCIALISM.

=====

Re:IN OUR VIEW: Defending expression

Posted by leftintheuc - 2008/07/03 15:31

megus wrote:

leftintheuc wrote:

This thread discusses the Content article: IN OUR VIEW: Defending expression

Redgardless what you think about fairness, it seems blatantly obvious why institutions like the D Herald, Hannity/Beck/limbaugh/Savage/Coulter and all their related, anti-rational, anti-intellectual garbage hacks are opposed to

the introduction of opposing views. Because the suppression of ideas keeps people from thinking. And an uninformed population buys into this spin, keeping them in business.

You are so funny Left. Just how have these talk shows kept the left from spouting their views? Oh wait, the American people don't want to hear them when they try to put on a talk show of their own and so they don't generate the revenue necessary and so now you want the stations to give you the time for free.

Can't you see your free to start all the left wing talk shows you want? No one is stopping you. But the only way your brand of talk can succeed is if you can force it on others.

Not really the American way. Or at least the old American way.

First of all-I wasn't commenting on the pros or cons of the Fairness act: just the D.Herald's justification for opposing it. Specifically, that the right wing punditry facilitates the discussion of ideas. They don't; that's why they work, as opposed to liberal shows where ideas are considered. Nobody wants to listen to that; they want Emotion! Anger! Patriotism! Drug Abuse! (Rush only!) Sexual Harassment! (Bill O'reilly, here!)Fire us UP! Get Us Going! That's the reason why Rush just signed a huge multi-quadrillion dollar deal. Not because he's a thoughtful intellect pontificating over the culture of ideas. But because, if you love him, he fires you up- YES. And if you don't, he fires you up-NO. The result: misinformation.

And, unfortunately, I am not free to start up all the left wing shows that I would like. People are stopping me. Very sad. Turns out, my show is not about the liberal agenda; I just yell at people for four hours. Call them fools. Call them no good fools who read their Daily Herald editorials and think all's well. Call them ugly-lot's of that. And no one wants to air it. So very sad...

=====

Re:IN OUR VIEW: Defending expression

Posted by leftintheuc - 2008/07/03 15:37

aramyna wrote:

You obviously do not understand how the law stands now. Liberals have just as much right to produce radio shows with opposing views as conservatives. No one is stopping them. The only problem seems to be a lack of interest from the general populace in listening to them. So, their solution is to suppress those already succeeding in the market and force stations to host shows with opposing views regardless of whether the public wants to listen. What the liberals want is SOCIALISM.

Sarcastic voice: You obviously don't understand how the law stands now. End sarcastic voice.

Wasn't talking about the law. Talking about our good buddies of over achievers at the D herald's reasons for opposing it. Talking about the pathetic misinformation these boneheads on the right spew.

The fact is, these programs air opinions. And it seems utterly ridiculous to force an alternate opinion. Opinions don't inform, don't educate. The problem isn't these talk shows. It is the utter morons who listen to them. (Evidently the D Herald staff.)

=====

Re:IN OUR VIEW: Defending expression

Posted by truthhurts - 2008/07/04 08:58

What happened then was a burst of activity we now call talk radio. The medium became a hothouse for people like Rush Limbaugh, Sean Hannity and Glenn Beck. As those names suggest, conservatives dominate this segment, perhaps because the format forces discussion of issues, not sound bites or pretty pictures.

Discussion of issues. That's a good one. :laugh:

Here's the way "discussion of issues" goes on Rush.

1. Rush gives his opinion on something, and he is never short of an opinion. Would that they were factual.
2. Callers are invited to call in.
3. If anyone disagrees (he is preaching to the choir most of the time) Rush berates them, argues with them, makes fun of

them, etc.

4. If they really start scoring some points against him, he cuts them off and moves on.

Some "discussion of issues". This is one editorial fit for only one thing...the bottom of the bird cage.

As to why Democrats don't have the same kind of shows with the same listener levels, how about this? Democrats have better things to do than listen to talk radio, which in my estimation is one rung BELOW watching afternoon soap operas, and prefer to think for themselves instead of being told how to think. Yea, I think that's it.

Re:IN OUR VIEW: Defending expression

Posted by RogerWilco - 2008/07/04 09:10

aramyna wrote:

You obviously do not understand how the law stands now. Liberals have just as much right to produce radio shows with opposing views as conservatives. No one is stopping them.

What is more accurate is that liberals tend to form their own opinions from reading facts, rather than listening to pundits who filter the facts. Once the opinion is formed, liberals also tend to be more confident in the strength of their reasoning and therefore do not need to spend time in an echo chamber to reinforce their opinion.

Re:IN OUR VIEW: Defending expression

Posted by RogerWilco - 2008/07/04 09:18

truthhurts wrote:

What happened then was a burst of activity we now call talk radio. The medium became a hothouse for people like Rush Limbaugh, Sean Hannity and Glenn Beck. As those names suggest, conservatives dominate this segment, perhaps because the format forces discussion of issues, not sound bites or pretty pictures. Discussion of issues. That's a good one. :laugh:

Here's the way "discussion of issues" goes on Rush.

...

Rush Limbaugh makes money being a divisive and polarizing pundit. He has also just signed a \$400 Million contract with Clear Channel. He is now thoroughly vested in the polarization of American politics and society.

Rush Limbaugh is not interested in discussion. When was the last time he appeared in a moderated discussion with people who are allowed equal time to deliver opposing viewpoints? But why would he do so? His listeners are not interested in that, and I'm sure he has seen what happens to Bill "No Spin" O'Reilly who at least has the guts to do it every now and then.

Re:IN OUR VIEW: Defending expression

Posted by Hutterite - 2008/07/07 23:01

Defending experssion is commendable. Dragging it to the bottom is not. The lowest common denominator may not, in fact, be the demographic our nation and its' government should aspire to become. Seriously, sometimes I believe a person is an individual, and a group of individuals is an idiot. Leadership will steer the parade where it needs to go. Today's populists, however, will stay in front of it wherever it goes.