Letters on "The media and Mr. Bush"

18 October 2001

Below we post a selection of letters on "The Media and Mr. Bush" *by Barry Grey.*

Barry Grey's article about the Bush press conference and the *New York Times* appraisal of it is both brilliant and chilling. It's brilliant because Mr. Grey told the simple truth and chilling because that truth was denied by the supposed vanguard of the American media. The *Times* for some reason has joined the most incredible fraud being waged against the American people and the world. This incompetent man has been given a pass from the beginning. I am at a loss to explain it. I have theories but beyond those theories is the stunning realization that the American public can be so easily maneuvered into accepting and believing the opposite of a glaring reality. Perhaps the need to believe trumps the truth. The accomplices to this campaign become more and more surprising. I always felt that the *Times* was the paper for the ruling class and perhaps this insane war will benefit the owners of the *Times* in a way that forbids the paper's pursuit and acceptance of truth and reality.

BD

16 October 2001

Dear Mr. Grey,

Thank you for your excellent, concise appraisal of the fraud that continues to be perpetrated by the American media in regard to George W. Bush's fitness to be president.

A man named Joseph Bernay (self-described nephew of Freud), the "father of public relations" who had a big fan in Goebbels, said that if you tell a big enough lie often enough it will become truth. Surely this is what Bush's handlers and wet nurses have latched on to.

I appreciate your insightful Emperor Has No Clothes style because I cannot watch or listen to this cretin. If he weren't the scion of a wealthy family he would be working at a Jiffy Lube—maybe.

The biggest lie of all is that America has a "liberal" media bias. This is ludicrous! About 25 years ago after the *Washington Post* played a pivotal role in bringing down the corrupt Nixon administration and also in the publication of the Pentagon Papers, this was a wake-up call for conservatives. They saw that a powerful newspaper brought down "their" president. That's when they decided, "We better get into the newspaper business, boys." From then on there has been a concerted effort by conservatives to add newspapers and other media to their already burgeoning portfolios.

I worked in the industry for nearly 14 years and watched it deteriorate into just another business. When newspapers are bought by wealthy conservatives, seasoned editors and publishers are replaced with bottom-line-fixated businessmen with absolutely no newspaper experience or concern with journalism. When I heard a publisher say, "I care more about circulation numbers than winning the Pulitzer," I knew it was all over.

Liberal media is a sham. Would you consider the biggest media moguls in the world today—Murdock, Turner, Eisner (or even the late Robert Maxwell)—liberals? Please!

Furthermore, the media industry is becoming more and more compressed—at one time New York City alone had some 11 daily newspapers, a.m. and p.m. editions. Today there are what? Three? Soon the entire world's media (print and electronic) will be in the controlling hands of two or three powerful conservatives who will mold "truth" and spin reality to their political ends.

And in regard to Bush, I've read that even hard right conservative TV pundits during breaks in taping, will mock and laugh about Bush's latest gaff. But when the cameras roll back on, it's a continuation of the fraud. That is why writing such as yours is so vital.

I see too many historic parallels to the McCarthy era and this nightmare in the making. Thank you again for your courageous writing. I look forward to more of your work.

Best,

MF

16 October 2001

Outstanding article. Please keep up the good work. While I frequently do not agree with your prescriptive articles, i.e., those that argue what "should" be done, I find your descriptive articles, i.e., those interpreting political situations, to be often the best anywhere.

The enormous challenge facing all of us is how to get the message of this article out to the general populace. For example, an author of a recent letter on your site claimed that the US foreign policy's aims were primarily human rights. As utterly laughable as this claim is, it is believed by the vast majority of the US population as well as a significant minority in Europe, Australia and Canada. I would be interested in hearing your thoughts on how to combat the US ruling class's monopoly on TV news and virtual monopoly on radio and print.

Best regards,

CG

17

Gentle person,

Though I enjoyed Barry Grey's essay very much and wholeheartedly agree with his and the ICFI's analysis of Bush and the media, at this point in time I find it both too easy a target and perhaps even a distraction. Suffice to say, I have never thought of this selected president as anything other than a ventriloquist's dummy, sitting on Richard Cheney's knee. I wish we could look more closely at the ventriloquist and his peers (inside and outside of government).

What about this vice president in seclusion that makes him so powerful that the press and Congress people won't touch him? How much power and wealth will he and his cronies add to their piggy bank by the eventual conquest in the Caspian Sea basin? What is in this for the Bush family in the long haul?

The *WSWS* is doing quite well already and I do not intend this note as a criticism of any sort, but your coverage of this fraud in the White House just leads to more questions.

Keep up the fine work,

GB

Maine

17 October 2001

So now we are told that Bush is a dimwit. But I believe his administration has enormous knowledge of the Middle East. Did you not know that? I also do not believe the media has been controlled by the elite for years. As to your assertion of the administration's lack of knowledge of the Middle East, I seriously doubt you are abreast of what is going on. I

© World Socialist Web Site

do wish you could write something of the truth and new.

AW

16 October 2001

Thank you for pointing this out in "The media and Mr. Bush" by Barry Grey. I find this statement humorous, but the sad truth about our leader:

"What accounts for this simultaneous display of ignorance and dishonesty? Bush is a man who has not read a serious book in the last twenty years, if not in his entire life. He knows almost nothing about history, and even less about Central Asia. He is making war in a part of the world about which he is uninformed. It is doubtful that prior to September 11 he could have named the countries bordering Afghanistan."

Additionally, the Bush administration even tells all major media networks what to do and what to broadcast. This is absurd! So much for freedom of speech and press. Why are they only showing the last few seconds of the bin Laden tape where he mentioned that he'll kill all Americans? How can the American public understand who the terrorists are, what cause they are fighting for or why they hate us, if we are not informed correctly/fairly?

Thank you for keeping us informed beyond the controlled mass media.

HH

California

16 October 2001

A simple note, thanking you for your insightful analysis and maintaining an intelligent perspective on the current round of (Washington-based) madness. Keep up the great work—you offer hope in dark times.

BH

New Jersey

16 October 2001

Dear Mr. Grey

Re: "If you see suspicious people lurking around petrochemical plants, report it to law enforcement," and, by all means, "if you find a person that you've never seen before getting in a crop duster that doesn't belong to you, report it."

We are in serious trouble, and your excellent article makes it all too clear that the media have abdicated their responsibilities to the American public.

Thank you for your article,

MP

Arizona

16 October 2001

I would like to ask the author of that article what he would have done different to protect Americans and have to give a speech at the same time? Surely he thinks his bearded Gore could have done better. Tell him to get off the hate train and get on the backing Bush train. The hate train for Mr. Bush left several months ago.

S

16 October 2001

Thanks for authenticating my own feelings about that ridiculous and embarrassing public display of ignorance by our fearless leader. Except for the last couple of paragraphs where you predict the "worker" uprisings, the articles on this site are among the most thoughtful and factual I have read anywhere. Please keep up the good work. In the current nearly total information vacuum, we need you more than ever.

JA

Massachusetts

16 October 2001

This is a well-written article and I agree completely. I wish you could start a new broadcast medium called "Radio Free America." We need a media both in print and by broadcast that isn't controlled by corporate America sanctioned by the corporate White House. However, I take exception to your reference in the first paragraph to the "liberal media." What liberal media? Since all broadcast media and most print media in the US is controlled by major corporations your referring to the media as "liberal" is like saying corporate America is controlled by liberals. This is an insult to liberals everywhere! Liberal means freedom.

America is still searching for freedom that it has yet to find. The word liberal has become in America today a dastardly word like the word communism was in '40s and '50s. I however, am proud to say I am a liberal, which should equate to being pro-American at least in the sense that America is supposed to stand for freedom.

Thanks for a well-written article!

Regards,

JM

16 October 2001

This is completely and utterly ridiculous. Bush had answers to all questions poised by the media, and he answered each question in a commanding manner. Socialists are trying to make trouble where trouble should not be made. Bush cannot use facts and big words to support his reasoning and actions, not because he is lacking in the intelligence department, but because you need to speak to the American people in laymen terms or we will sit staring at the screen after the whole showing and say what the hell did he just talk about. I don't think the media is exercising mass deception, I think they truly believe and support what they write and say. Ridiculous *WSWS*!

JR

16 October 2001

I agree totally with your article except for your reference to the press as being "liberal." It seems to me that it's just the opposite. A liberal press would want to describe Mr. Bush in the worst possible light. I think a common misconception that's been perpetrated throughout our country is that the press is "liberal." The evidence is just the opposite.

Thank you and keep up the good work.

MF

16 October 2001

Simply put, thank you for being here on my Internet service. How else would I, and others, out here in the boondocks of Southwestern New Mexico have access to the real news of today? The analysis of the Bush press conference was terrific.

MS

16 October 2001

I also was amused by the *New York Times* editorial, "Mr. Bush's new gravitas." Given his penchant for simplistic statements such as, "Wanted, dead or alive," "You're either with us or against us," "This is good versus evil," "They hate our freedom" etc....

Then I have to wonder... Gravitas?

Everybody knows that the law of Gravitas doesn't apply to cartoon characters.

RB

16 October 2001

I appreciate your news. I take it to be more factual than what I read in the *New York Times*, which is so blatantly censored. Why isn't there more honest reporting on TV? What can people do? The mainstream media coverage has been bizarre because of the focus on details that have nothing to do with the real issues. People are all concerned about this Anthrax. They should be more concerned about the underlying reasons for this situation and should be questioning their government. I'm disgusted. Please keep up the good reporting. It's the only hope we have.

RR

16 October 2001

© World Socialist Web Site

To contact the WSWS and the Socialist Equality Party visit:

wsws.org/contact

© World Socialist Web Site