

AMEY, MARJORIE

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, May 19, 1999 8:55 AM
To: mamey@c-span.org
Subject: RE: Last Chance for Mr Lamb & Viewer Services

Dear Mrs. Amey,

Of course, I am grateful for your reply. But I would like that point out that your reply seems inappropriate: review "action requested" item in my letter. It is possible that I am wrong in this supposition, I'll wait some period of time before taking any further steps.

And I'd like to point out that your reply was not signed by the person who sent me the note. It was you, of course, and I think I even know your first name, Marge, for I use C-Span in my work every day, and have listened to you, and listened quite carefully, I might add. Why viewer services messages are not signed by name can only mean that the management of viewer services does not know how to really engage those viewers who really want to offer their help to C-Span. This is most likely a top down management problem: that would be my guess. This supposition may seem a little harsh considering the willingness to innovate as reflected in the broadcasting content and product of C-Span, but, nonetheless, I hold to this supposition based on the evidence that I have seen.

If you would like to personally aid me in my desire to help C-span, then you should assign one named person--NOT associated with viewer services--who would commit themselves to work longitudinally and jointly with me to address my observations. This person must be willing to talk over the phone with me, in addition to e-mail correspondence. I lack a great deal of information about C-span operations and I need this information in order to work with C-Span. If you do find such a person and offer that named person to me, this should not be understood as a response in any way to my message to Mr. Lamb.

Best, [REDACTED]

(my address is at very bottom of this message)

At 02:28 PM 5/18/99 -0400, you wrote:

>Thanks for your suggestions...I'll forward your message along to our Journal
>producers.

>

>-----Original Message-----

>From: [REDACTED]

>Sent: Tuesday, May 18, 1999 2:27 PM

>To: viewer@c-span.org

>Subject: Last Chance for Mr Lamb & Viewer Services

>

>

>Action Requested:

>

>

>

>Telephone me, Mr. Lamb, at [REDACTED]

>

>and I will offer a simple suggestion

>

>which, if implemented, will dramatically improve your

>

>performance in a problematic management area

>

>(identifying all callers to Washington Journal

>

>by ideologic affiliation).

>

>

>
>Dear Mr. Lamb,
>
>I've just about given up dealing with Viewer Services, and this message to
>you is just about my last effort to help C-Span.
>
>This is coming from a real backer of C-Span. I developed the "C-Span Rescue
>Team" following Cox Cable New Orleans totally cutting out C-Span2 of their
>schedule some years back. That was a hell of a big effort on my part and came
>YEARS before any of this foolishness with TCI and your excellent featuring
>of and organizing of grass roots C-Span2 activists.
>
>I did not get on to speak with you on the phone today on New Orleans AM 690
>WTIX radio show "Politically Speaking, Louisiana Style," so I am writing
>this note to you.
>
>First a little digression:
>
>
>This radio talk show is an amazing talk show, and C-Span would do well to
>feature it someday. The co-hosts are two kids who are as smart as heck, and
>they talk politics on a very, very high level for two hours solid and draw
>in an incredible variety of callers. This politics show is among the BEST I
>have ever heard. They are ever respectful of one another even though one is
>quite conservative and the other is not. And they are scrupulously
>respectful of the callers. And the callers are so wide ranging in there
>demographics and views. These are two quick witted boys talking politics,
>and they get women to call in! Even black women call in! This is most
>unusual for talk radio, especially a political talk show. These kids are
>brilliant, and what they do is better than Crossfire. I tend to get
>nausiated with the constant demagogic hyperbole of Crossfire: these kids
>manage to argue in a lively and exciting way without the disgusting excesses
>of Crossfire food fight.
>
>
>
>But, on to my point. First, note that I sent a message (below) to you in
>January.
>
>Here's the beef I have with you in this message and the message below:
>Although you have a bone-head policy to place callers in three ideological
>categories, I accept that policy. Now having accepted that policy, it
>really irks me that you do not find a way to also do what you say you want
>all your hosts to do: to state the caller's ideological affiliation on the
>air.
>
>My God--see my message below which will document that--you as boss don't
>even follow your own policies! How can you expect others to do so?
>
>If you have a policy about stating the ideological affiliation of each and
>every caller on air, why don't you develop management policies that get to
>that goal?
>
>Could it be that you don't really much care about this complaint of mine
>because you lack the management tools to know what policies you have and/or
>is it that you do know you have this policy but it is simply "not
>important"? Bad form to have a policy and know that you will not do
>anything to implement it. Bad form.
>
>Or you do think it really is good to identify caller ideological affiliation
>on the air, but you have no way to collect management idea, try them out,
>and find one that works? If its the latter, then that is management fault.
>
>
>By the way, I would not be giving this one last shot unless I did not care
>for C-Span. C-Span, like Paul Weaver says in his book News and the Culture
>of Lying, is not a culture of lying, and the culture of news truth telling
>is sorely needed for an informed citizenry. The GENERAL lack of
>filters--the ideological caller affiliation being the bone-headed exception,
>and universal direct unfiltered presentation of news makers is WONDERFUL.
>But I sure have doubts about selected aspects of your management skills.

[illegible]

>
>I will give you a MANAGEMENT suggestion which, if adopted, should
>IMMEDIATELY increase host and caller compliance in this area
>to close to 100%.

>
>Best wishes to you and C-Span,

>
>John Schenken
>New Orleans, Louisiana

> [REDACTED]

>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>

>-----
>A caller log, Monday, 4 January, 1999, C-Span's Washington Journal,
>Reverend Jerry Falwell, guest. What Mr. Lamb described as the
>town of origin of the call, and upon which ideological line--liberal,
>conservative, moderate--the caller called in. Checked for
>accuracy from the videotape by [REDACTED]

>1. Lake City, Florida Moderate

>2. Chicago Liberal

>3. Hi-o-waa-see, Georgia Conservative

>4. Ho-queem, Washington Moderate

>5. Santa Cruz, California

>6. Alexandria, Virginia

>7. St. Louis, Missouri

>8. Augusta, Georgia.

>9. Galleon, Ohio Conservative

>10. Jonesville, Michigan

>11. Williamstown, New Jersey

>12. Solana Beach, California Conservative

>13. Thomasville, North Carolina

>14. Indianapolis Liberal

>15. Austin, Texas

>16. Califon, California

>17. Dunkirk, New York Liberal

>18. McComb, Illinois Liberal (Caller said: "I'm on the conservative line.)

>19. Minneapolis

>13. Greensboro, North Carolina Liberal

>20. Calrunt, Nevada Conservative

>21. Columbus, Ohio

>22. Scott City, Kansas Moderate

- >23. Bull Shoals, Arkansas Conservative
- >
- >24. Kansas City, Missouri
- >
- >25. Ava, Missouri
- >
- >26. Magerstown, Maryland Conservative
- >
- >27. Trenton, New Jersey Liberal
- >
- >
- >
- >
- >
- >
- >
- >
- >

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED] New Orleans, La. 70118
[REDACTED]
>

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED] New Orleans, La. 70118
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
New Orleans, La. 70118
[REDACTED]

5/18/99