

[REDACTED]
Buffalo, New York
November 4, 1996

C-Span
400 North Capitol Street N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20001

Dear Sir:

As I watched C-Span this morning, it came home to me how much of its effectiveness had been lost in the last several months. Most of it disappeared simultaneously with its objectivity.

I tried to analyze what single event signaled its demise and I concluded it was the day Brian decided to forego sensibility, and substitute the ridiculous format of tit-for-tat, one for you, and one for me. Since that time it has been all down hill and any interest generated by the phone calls departed with the spontaneity they provided.

"That was a Democrat, this will be a Republican" became the ho-hum sentiment of the viewer, and reason enough to either turn the channel or go about the morning's routine a lot sooner than usual.

That was evident by the number of calls that protested the change, and the fierceness, bordering on rudeness, with which Brian tried to defend his indefensible position.

At the same time Brian began to lean precariously to the Left. That might explain why he was angrily resentful this morning when the woman caller questioned the necessity of revealing ownership of a particular newspaper, something I questioned last week with his quizzing Wesley Pruden about ownership of The Washington Times.

This morning, if it is to be the routine, he might have asked Korn(?) why The Nation bordered so closely on the Comunistic ideology. This is something I suggested a long while ago, namely, that panelists be revealed for their particular ideological bent so that viewers could determine what axe they are grinding.

Needless to say, the suggestion was ignored, which adds to the puzzlement now about the sudden desire to know who owns what newspaper and why Brian wants the viewers to know.

Another interesting event this morning was Brian's insisting on showing the asinine article from the extremist, radical Loony Left Washington Post about Newt Gingrich and the phony investigation of the Ethics Committee, the 67th or 68th charge against the Speaker.

Brian might have pointed out (after all, Newt has been one of C-Span's biggest rans) that 65 of the accusations have been dismissed thus far. Instead, he couldn't understand the rationale for the article's being printed.

Like the cliché has it, it didn't require the mind of an atomic physi-

g-wj

Page 2
November 4, 1996

cist to compute the reason.

If The Pist has a bigger enthusiast than Brian, it has to be Ben Bradlee. Two conclusions might be reached as to why the article was printed. One is that knowing the inevitability of the page's being displayed on C-Span, the story was planted to make Brian a dupe to denigrate the Speaker.

The other might be, in view of what is taking place in Washington these days, one more instance of the deviousness of the media of which Brian is part.

It seems far-fetched that on the day before this most important election, The Pist would make a point of emblazoning this entirely irrelevant and blatantly political article on its pages in the manner it did. It could only be intended to disparage Speaker Newt. We fear no one like we fear an intellect so superior to our own.

It also seems mighty intriguing that someone as astute as Brian would not recognize that he was being played for a patsy, if he were obtuse enough to fall for the ploy.

I still believe C-Span has done itself irreparable harm in the way it has joined the radical Left wing media in the past year.

Did you say,

