

C-Span

400 North Capitol St., NW, Suite 650

Washington, D.C., 20001

April 25, 1995

O-WJ

Hi, all you good guy's!

This morning Susan Swain suggested that your audience comment on the possible filtering of calls to eliminate the "hatred", and sometimes evil sounding venom of some call in's.

Does that mean that selecting calls should be restricted to those who have the subtly and carefully worded opinion? Frankly, when one listens to some of the politicians who can subtly create a response that *seems* well meaning but reflects some poisonous approach to our country's future, I feel that is more potentially harmful than listening to some tirade by a unthinking but essentially honest biggot.

Are there people joining in the debate who are less educated, badly spoken and perhaps venomous? It tells me that a larger portion of the population is listening, and while painful to hear some abuse of language, I'd rather know of the depth of feeling than have you or anyone 'select' those who instead manipulate words to control the direction of the country- they may be more dangerous!

I appreciate your staff having to suffer some of the calls, some of them are tough to handle, but you are dealing with a growing broader section of the American public as time goes on- is that bad, even if obnoxious? I work on an election board and sometimes I cringe to imagine how some people may be voting, how "uninformed " they may be, etc., but personally feel more anger at the local media who have manipulated the political scene by their personal views, all done with those same careful words you'd select in callers.

There is little local exposure for opposing views on many local communities news outlets, so in desperation, many turn to national programs in an effort to get a broader perspective. Are you then thinking to filter some of the calls, and how shall you do that? Will you start with "language " criteria, or "tone of voice"? Then perhaps one host will object to the vehemence of a few

callers, or someone else objects to anger as being offensive. Or perhaps it's a minority offense, with a caller evidencing bigotry... but isn't that reverse bigotry, preference for the minority?

Do you fear to offend the sensibilities of some viewers? Ah, but then you'd cater to the so called educated and well spoken, wouldn't you? Does this represent all the voters- I know that's not so, I see them at the polls.

Consider the appeals of the political parties, aiming at segments of the population, trying to garner votes, pitting classes against each other, carefully wording subtle language to appeal to various segments. Would you join that approach, weeding out some portions of callers ? If the politicians are stirring up aspects of the population to spew hate, violence, racial problems- shouldn't we get a sense of that too?

Irresponsible talk? What of those who have misled the public for years on the true state of the economy- all with honeyed words? What of those who rouse the public with panels of informants staged to expose some supposed injustice against classes of Americans that is politically charged? Is that not more frightening than a caller who is angry and perhaps unbalanced, but giving us a sampling of what many may suddenly be feeling?

Dear people, please, dealing with the public is hard. Ask any nurse or doctor in an emergency room who treats everyone from the great unwashed to the socialite, immediately and with as much equal concern as can be marshalled. Are opinions less valuable, is the spoken sense of democracy less important? Can you truly select calls.... I hope not! In the meantime, if you listen to the calls, I think you will find the range is incredible, and amazingly accurate as a reflection of the momentary reactions of the American people. I listen with joy. Bless you all for your tolerance, even if some Americans are among the 'wounded'. Ask instead how did they get that way?

Applause, Applause!

Sincerely,

Tucson, Az., 85704 Res: