
An unbiased and free press?

Posted by Bananaman - 2008/08/15 17:25

Boy is she naive!!!

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2008/08/14/AR2008081403048.html>

But then in the same paper you get this

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2008/08/14/AR2008081403053.html>

So its not always black and white.

My question is do we have a free press and is it freer now than it used to be or less free?

=====

Re:An unbiased and free press?

Posted by LYDIA REID - 2008/08/15 21:36

Our own "BBC" is trumpeted world wide as the most unbiased news feed in the world. If this is, the standard our media lives by I am frightened for this world.

The BBC is obviously and openly biased and antagonistic to Catholics in particular and Christians generally they will support unreservedly any Gay issue, Islamic issue, and American issue, womanâ€™s issues such as their right to be mothers and not allow fathers contact to children. They are anti fathers.

They support openly the Labour party north and south of the border. Sometimes looking ridiculous in their efforts to give support.

This organisation would not exist if not paid for by the public licence fee. In short, it is our media organisation so why do we sit back and allow this in our country. Particularly when we know that, this goes worldwide.

Perhaps the issue should be why we the fee paying public allow this standard of reporting such as this post highlights.

It has been suggested before that to bring back honesty, integrity and truthful reporting to our media we should all participate in a one day media strike no TV, no buying papers, magazines or reading news on the internet.

What would the members of Scotsgait think of that plan.

=====

Re:An unbiased and free press?

Posted by Bananaman - 2008/08/16 16:35

Go onto Google Video and type in Freedom Next Time for John Pilger's take on our western press.

=====

Re:An unbiased and free press?

Posted by TLJ - 2008/08/16 19:48

Whichever broadcaster / newspaper publisher you want to mention, it will always appear biased in the eyes of those who take a different view.

=====

Re:An unbiased and free press?

Posted by Clare - 2008/08/24 15:59

Bananaman wrote:

Boy is she naive!!!

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2008/08/14/AR2008081403048.html>

But then in the same paper you get this

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2008/08/14/AR2008081403053.html>

So its not always black and white.

My question is do we have a free press and is it freer now than it used to be or less free?

Hi B'Man

Why is it naive of the Russian journalist to express concern for the fact that the West has lied over the recent invasion by Georgia into neighbouring territory? I think its a perfectly reasonable question personally. Georgia WAS the aggressor and Russia got involved because the territory invaded involves an area that has chosen to remain part of Russia. Any reasonable government elsewhere in the world would automatically condemn Georgia's actions. Dead simple. Except we don't do simple in the West. We do sneaky, we get certain countries like Georgia to do what WE want through bribes (usually money and arms). The US involvement in this matter has already been exposed to an extent yet it has been played down by News organisations in the West, organisations like the BBC which, as Lydia correctly points out are publicly funded. It is quite disgraceful. For ultimately it exposes "the West" as the biggest liars on the planet and as a resident here I am thoroughly uncomfortable with that but what disturbs me most is that so many are happy to tolerate such a state of affairs.

On the subject of a free press I believe we do have a free press and that there is in place legislation to protect individuals when it comes to privacy. I think the main problem B'man is that the media here is committed to dishonesty and is hopelessly corrupt. That old adage "Why let the facts get in the way of a good story." springs to mind.

TLJ I disagree with you. We all have our views of course but any reasonable person should be able to view news items without automatically claiming bias if a Broadcasting organisation is simply reporting the news and not seeking to deliver it in a politically angled manner. That's what we're talking about and it is what goes on. We saw that only too clearly in coverage of the recent by-election in Glasgow East. We see it currently as the conflict involving Georgia unfolds. It is happening and lies are everywhere within our media. I'll give you some glaring examples of times when the media could have stopped Blair in his tracks. Over the illegal war in Iraq the media could have pointed out the illegality of such a move even before the Commons vote by quoting international law at Blair. They could have demanded his resignation when his shameful lies about the 45 minute claim were publicly exposed. They could have challenged the Labour Party to boot out a liar and a war criminal and they could have told him to take Reid with him. Reid, the man who dared to insult all of us, who marched against Blair's illegal war, by calling us supporters of terrorism and traitors! A media that stays quiet on such important issues is indeed as corrupt as Blair and his ilk and is equally responsible when it co operates so closely with dishonest governments by consistently failing to report the news in an honest and accurate manner.

=====

Re:An unbiased and free press?

Posted by dws - 2008/08/24 19:16

I fully realise that different people have different opinions; it would be a dull world if we all thought the same. However, a journalist has certain responsibilities to write the truth, uncluttered by subjectivity.

If I am reading someones opinion, I want it to be made clear that it is comment, not fact. Likewise if I read an article, I want the bare facts so I can draw an informed conclusion from it, not what the journalist wants me to think.

I don't want to read biased articles either for or against my stance, I want facts, nothing more, nothing less. Is that too much to ask? A newspapers political leanings can adequately be expressed in the editorials, leave the articles alone, please!:dry:

=====

Re:An unbiased and free press?

Posted by Levenax - 2008/08/24 22:24

Bananaman wrote:

Go onto Google Video and type in Freedom Next Time for John Pilger's take on our western press.

I quite admire Pilger but his prejudices shine through in everything he writes and broadcasts so he's no different to many other journalists. His stridently lefty polemical style can grate a bit when often the topic on which he's reporting needs a bit of detachment. Nobody has a monopoly on the truth (whatever that is).

=====

Re:An unbiased and free press?

Posted by Clare - 2008/08/24 22:27

dws wrote:

I fully realise that different people have different opinions; it would be a dull world if we all thought the same. However, a journalist has certain responsibilities to write the truth, uncluttered by subjectivity.

If I am reading someones opinion, I want it to be made clear that it is comment, not fact. Likewise if I read an article, I want the bare facts so I can draw an informed conclusion from it, not what the journalist wants me to think.

I don't want to read biased articles either for or against my stance, I want facts, nothing more, nothing less. Is that too much to ask? A newspapers political leanings can adequately be expressed in the editorials, leave the articles alone, please!:dry:

DWS, you could have headed that post "An Appeal To Douglas Fraser" :laugh:

=====

Re:An unbiased and free press?

Posted by LYDIA REID - 2008/08/25 11:11

There is an element of reality in all the above posts. We do need facts, we do need fewer opinions in the news we watch and read. We need the truth but even truth can be presented in such a way as to impact on our thinking.

We are influenced by what we watch and read but hopefully have the intelligence to decipher fact from opinion. Our opinions if we have any level of free thinking intelligence could be decided by what we read, see, and may change because of facts put before us.

I know that there are issues that I will not make a decision on until I have more facts.

An issue we have discussed is the detention of possible terrorist for 42 days. It may be that someone on Scotsgait will put forward facts within an opinion, which will make me decide on this issue. My indecision comes in part from a wish to know our country is safe a recognition that the people trying to do this job are in a difficult position but equally I want to protect the rights of others.

Where the dishonesty comes in is when news agencies decide to twist the facts or show a lack of reporting on vital issues when they decide we should not have this information.

This morning I looked on the BBC Wales and Northern Ireland sites to see the opinion on a British football teams for 2012 Olympics as oor Geordie it seems has decided Scotland should not have a team of their own. Not a mention is that because the news agencies have not reported on this, or because the people in those parts of the UK donâ€™t care as much as we do.

I listened to Scottish radio stations this morning and the phone in showed that Geordie would have a fight on his hands if he tried to stop Scotland having its own football team.

Why the media fuss in Scotland is this engineered to create discussion or a warning of a decision made already, will UK government force this through as a way of showing power. Is the media also used in this way?

=====

Re:An unbiased and free press?

Posted by DoricMan - 2008/08/25 11:18

dws wrote:

I fully realise that different people have different opinions; it would be a dull world if we all thought the same. However, a journalist has certain responsibilities to write the truth, uncluttered by subjectivity.

If I am reading someones opinion, I want it to be made clear that it is comment, not fact. Likewise if I read an article, I want the bare facts so I can draw an informed conclusion from it, not what the journalist wants me to think.

I don't want to read biased articles either for or against my stance, I want facts, nothing more, nothing less. Is that too much to ask? A newspapers political leanings can adequately be expressed in the editorials, leave the articles alone, please!dry:The press only are there for their own good dws. In my working years I avoided the press like the plague. Anyhow the internet has caused the press some difficulty in adjusting to the new reality, and long may that continue.

=====

Re:An unbiased and free press?

Posted by Clare - 2008/08/25 12:38

"An issue we have discussed is the detention of possible terrorist for 42 days. It may be that someone on Scotsgait will put forward facts within an opinion, which will make me decide on this issue. My indecision comes in part from a wish to know our country is safe a recognition that the people trying to do this job are in a difficult position but equally I want to protect the rights of others."

Lydia on the specific 42 day detention issue one fact you repeatedly refuse to address involves the circumstances which led us to that obscene proposal. The illegal invasion of Iraq by our own country is right at the centre of those circumstances. I accept you are anxious to ensure our own country is safe but equally you should want to make sure our own government does not itself breach international law - which is a form of terrorism too - and put its own citizens in mortal danger. That is what our government did by invading Iraq and consequently making this country a potential target.

=====

Re:An unbiased and free press?

Posted by DavieDites - 2008/08/25 13:26

Clare wrote:

Lydia on the specific 42 day detention issue one fact you repeatedly refuse to address involves the circumstances which led us to that obscene proposal. The illegal invasion of Iraq by our own country is right at the centre of those circumstances.

Clare

I agree that the invasion of Iraq was an affront to many. But Britain was already in the front line for its role in the Jewish occupation of Palestine and its continuing support for Israel. Getting back to this thread, this is a subject which is rarely mentioned in our free press. Generations of people have grown up in this country with no knowledge of the circumstances of the founding of Israel and they can have no insight into the causes of "Islamic terrorism".

I cannot believe that exclusion of this fundamental issue from the media is not an official policy implemented through informal channels. (Yes, I know. Conspiracy theory alert!)

=====

Re:An unbiased and free press?

Posted by LYDIA REID - 2008/08/25 13:29

Clare wrote:

"An issue we have discussed is the detention of possible terrorist for 42 days. It may be that someone on Scotsgait will put forward facts within an opinion, which will make me decide on this issue. My indecision comes in part from a wish to know our country is safe a recognition that the people trying to do this job are in a difficult position but equally I want to protect the rights of others."

Lydia on the specific 42 day detention issue one fact you repeatedly refuse to address involves the circumstances which led us to that obscene proposal. The illegal invasion of Iraq by our own country is right at the centre of those

circumstances. I accept you are anxious to ensure our own country is safe but equally you should want to make sure our own government does not itself breach international law - which is a form of terrorism too - and put its own citizens in mortal danger. That is what our government did by invading Iraq and consequently making this country a potential target.

Hi Claire

You are right when you say I refuse to agree with that point of view when discussing the use of 42 days detention and I have I am sure used the exact words I am about to use. The Iraq war was and is illegal and no doubt has contributed to the terrorist faction in our country. Just because that is true that does not mean I must condone a terrorist attack in this country. That does not mean that I want any less care taken to ensure they are caught and punished, I did not start the Iraq war. I did not support the Iraq war. We have this problem and must be practical and deal with this.

I just cannot see why even recognizing this makes a difference to how we decide on the 42 day detention issue. No matter what we must deal with what we have now.

The issue of whether or not we use 42 days detention must be a separate issue, we must look solely at whether this is what is needed and wanted and right on so many fronts for our country.

I cannot see any use in discussing this issue repeatedly as that is my view.

=====

Re:An unbiased and free press?

Posted by Clare - 2008/08/25 14:09

Lydia

I did not ask you to condone a terrorist attack in this country at any time so please don't twist what I said. Nor have I, incidentally, ever condoned any of the attacks on this country. I oppose all forms of terrorism, including the type practised by our own government.

What I said was not to debate the 42 day detention issue without taking into account what led us to a point where such a proposal was even necessary. The beginning was our illegal invasion of Iraq and that is a fact not an opinion for it was that very action, with the US, which made us a target of "terrorist" attacks. We have what you term "this problem" BECAUSE of our own terrorism. There are over a million people dead in Iraq Lydia. We did that illegally

To ignore the whole picture is to refuse to acknowledge our responsibility for the shocking state of affairs we now have. The present government could take steps via the UN to address the terrible damage we have done through our own actions under Blair. Putting legislation through to lock Muslims up for at least 42 days without evidence that they are even terrorists is not the answer. For a start it fails utterly to address the simple philosophy that if you attack someone they will hit back. To deny the fact that we instigated the terrorism is to bury your head in the sand and leave you unable to deal with the issue properly or, indeed, fairly. It also gets us nowhere when it comes to setting up meaningful dialogue at UN level with a view to sorting it all out.

=====

Re:An unbiased and free press?

Posted by dws - 2008/09/22 15:42

Bananaman wrote:

My question is do we have a free press and is it freer now than it used to be or less free?

Today's Herald: Iain Gray urges Labour in Scotland to reunite against SNP

Today's Scotsman: Labour urged to unite against SNP challenge

Two "articles" each a carbon copy of the other. It appears our "quality" dailies are giving up the pretence of independent thought and publishing Labour party press releases without thought.

I wonder if they even bothered to read it before publishing...:dry:

=====

