

October 22, 1994

*Viewer  
Programming*

Bryan Lamb,  
C-Span Comments,  
400 N Capitol Street,  
Northwest #650,  
Washington D.C., 20001

[Redacted]  
Houston, TX 77004

Dear Bryan:

On October 20th I watched C-Span's 1994 election panel of political consultants and media representatives.

It was a grimly amusing spectacle!

The panelists went out of their way to praise the sophistication and intelligence of the electorate ( though there was a statistic mentioned which stated that 60% of eligible American voters do not know which party has a majority in Congress! ). The reasons for this patronizing behavior, I believe, are the following:

- to compel viewers to look beyond the persuasive intent of their findings and comments.
- to somehow validate the quality of their data and observations.

One would have thought they were politicians.

It was disturbingly fascinating to watch these panelists try to persuade viewers that they are merely trying to present the real political picture and that they have little or no effect on public opinion - that they are just information gatherers and processors.

This "party line" explains why when the question of Clinton's surprisingly low popularity was discussed the reasons given were:

- the long public memory of early blunders.
- taking on too many issues.
- not strong arming representatives enough and not persuading the public enough regarding health care reform.
- the "character issue".
- being elected with only 43% popular vote.
- Whitewater.
- and a few other lame tidbits.

With the backdrop of a rising economy, legislative and recent foreign policy successes, there just doesn't seem to be enough good reasons to explain why Clinton's popularity should be so low.

There IS however, a very big and obvious reason. It has to do with the same reason why the panelists - and media at large - won't talk about it.

The sensational ( commercial ) media and the right wing agenda media have effectively politically assassinated the President.



To recognize and discuss this, with appropriate gravity, would be drawing attention to their own manipulative designs and raise very serious questions about the service we are receiving from the media. Perhaps we would see that media sponsors - from corporations to wealthy religious institutions to financially powerful special interests - are the ones being served.

This shocking level of political dishonesty does have precedent. It has accompanied the rise of every fascist state in this century.

Sincerely,

