

Matt Gardner
Dr. Gordon
Mass History of Communications, 3200
October 22, 2013

History of Progressive Media and Government

All institutions, programs, ideologies and movements show a form of corruption, and the media and government are not an exception to the rule. Frankly, Americans do not have a free press as some would like to think. I believe in the statement that was expressed in class that while people are being enlightened by the media they are simultaneously being manipulated. The question becomes which side of the aisle do we prefer being manipulated by? Let me be clear, I try my hardest not to fall on either side of the political spectrums. I'm not a Republican nor am I a Democrat. I believe that the Republicans are just as big and nasty as Republicans would say Democrats are, and I also believe there really are very few differences between the two parties. Granted, there are some decent people left in the media and congress but they are few far and in between. It is hard to recognize who they are because the media does such a great job at isolating and smearing anyone who stands in their way of power and profit.

I once thought the mainstream press and government were at odds with each other but I was wrong. In fact, we currently stand at a time that historians will be writing about for years to come and I want my voice to be heard. I want people to know that I attempted to exercise my voice by trying my best to explain and articulate what is going on in this bizarre and exciting time that we now live in. I believe both the media and the government have been co-opted for the past hundred or so years. I call it Progressivism, and both Republicans and Democrats are found within this camp. The thing that historians will be debating about is whether or not people like me were wrong in thinking that the progressive movement was hijacked and ran America

into the ground. Perhaps I am wrong, but I would submit that the majority of the media only provides a one-size-fits-all narrative, e.g. issues favoring social and economic justice instead of equal justice.

We all see reality different and that's ok. I respect everyone's views, and I wholeheartedly will fight and uphold anyone's right to speak and to be able to articulate one's own views that differ than mine. The problem is the media and the press try their hardest to stop that from happening. The exception is if you buy into their media narrative, which I really don't think some care about as long it keeps them in the circles of power and control. I also believe that some media outlets are a bit more truthful than others. I believe there are certain principles that are better than others. I personally believe in the principles of a free market system including the principle of a free press and the principle of a limited government. However, these principles have been badly hijacked and damaged.

My overall theory is that there may have been a time where the Progressive movement started out with pure motives, such as Ida Tarbell and other muckraker journalists that squelched out corporate monopolies like the Standard Oil Corporation. I think it was justified to advocate for things such as elevating women and children's suffrage. Personally, I'm all for that, however, the progressive agenda didn't stop there, and perhaps these early progressive journalists didn't see how the government was as corrupt as big business. I think government officials hijacked the progressive message for economic and political gain. It is ironic that the Progressive movement has long since been used to monopolize the political and economic system, the very thing that muckrakers criticized big businesses for doing.

As I mentioned in class there needs to be a balance between government and business. I asked in class if the muckrakers really ever criticized the likes of President Woodrow Wilson.

Specifically, did the progressive press ever really push and question all of the executive orders that were issued underneath President Wilson? Did the progressives ever fuss when Wilson re-segregated the blacks in the military, and did they ever flinch when he created the Federal Reserve? I see no indicators.

In this regard, I was given a book to look up in class – *Wealth against Common Wealth* by Henry Demarest Lloyd. I have been reading the book and I do not see any real criticism towards too much government regulation or power. Interestingly, Lloyd only skims over a line that I think is worthy of discussion which he didn't seem to fully develop when he said, "Business motivated by self-interest of the individual runs into monopoly at ever point it touches the social life...(including) political monopoly" (Lloyd). Lloyd seems to see what I'm trying to point out, that the government can become an extension to big business. I agree wholeheartedly with that point. Nevertheless, the progressive party appears to have done nothing other than pick and choose economic winners and losses. Call it whatever you like, Crony Capitalism, Fascism, Socialism, Communism, or State Capitalism, they all lead to a select few ruling and controlling the masses. Some structures are better making at making the citizens feel that they are free to pursue happiness.

This still remains true today, but the players and the messages have changed underneath progressivism. It's a grand mirage, the press and the government have hidden underneath the banner of progressivism because they don't mind advocating forced equality, social justice, and redistribution of wealth as long as you don't mess with their piece of the pie. They don't care if the average American is taxed and has to pay for bloated government social programs as long as the media and government leaders aren't affected by it. For example, consider the Affordable Health Care Act. The President of the United States and Congress get free health care for life,

which includes better coverage than the average citizen, and they are exempt from the Affordable Care Act. Legislation doesn't affect them if they so choose. On the other hand, the owners within the media elite do take a minor hit, but not bad enough to make a fuss. The media owners believe that they not only can afford to be taxed but they even champion it by covering it on their very news networks chanting tax the rich. Why? Because it simply doesn't affect them because they are really the ones in real power who shape policy and legislature that never affects them in any drastic way.

Moreover, the press doesn't want people to realize that those making \$250,000 dollars pales in comparison with the owners of the media networks and cable providers. By taxing the same percentage of those making \$250,000 with those making a billion dollars is what really creates the largest economic disparity gap in America. It's not the person making \$250,000 vs. someone making less than \$30,000 a year. This is a false narrative and that is what the media owners want. By classifying those making \$250,000 as being rich with those making less the \$30,000, it is pitting the wrong groups against each other. Meanwhile, the real money makers in the media are making billions of dollars, and they go unscathed and become all the more powerful.

Take the likes of billionaire George Soros who owns the Open Society Institution (OSI) which funds billions of dollars towards such things as Media Matters or Moveon.org, companies that are purposely designed to, "systematically monitor a cross section of print, broadcast, cable, radio, and Internet media outlets for conservative misinformation-news or commentary that is not accurate, reliable, or credible and that forwards the conservative agenda- every day, in real time" (MediaMatters.org.). In other words, these outlets exist to isolate and destroy anyone with a different narrative.

Even more, OSI shells millions to help hire journalists and newspapers such as Independent Media Center, Independent Media Institute, Institute of New Economic Thinking, Huffington Post, Democracy Now, and over 50 other media or government shadow parties.(Discoverythenetworks.org.) What do they have all in common besides the fact that they are funded by George Soros? They all push certain brands of progressivism that primarily focuses on social justice without ever questioning their own boss's wealth and never think to ask if their own boss has too much power like a John A. Rockefeller that the progressives hated.

There's no difference really between Soros and Rockefeller. Soros was fortunate to learn from the past and to use the progressive cause while Rockefeller didn't know was happening until it was too late. Rockefeller attempted to put out the PR fire by hiring Edward Bernays while Soros from the beginning has always loomed in the shadows because he buys or creates media outlets that will fight his battles and causes. What is his cause? Using Soros' own words, a new world order which is one of the brands that some progressives promote. "The main obstacle to a stable and just world order is the United States," (Soros)

George Soros' strategy is designed to create pressure from below using the so-called grass movements to look like the common people are advocating certain changes such as economic justice or immigration (which will be the next big thing that the progressive aim for). Eventually, it's designed to make those in power come down and regulate the system which turns things inside out. This strategy is familiar in progressive circles and is known as The Cloward and Piven Strategy. And to prove that it's not all coming from the left, Norman Norquist, a Republican, is helping the progressive campaign by working with Gorge Soros to advocate open borders, which incidentally are one of the major goals towards a new world order.

If you are a conservative and you question certain progressive leaders such as Gorge Soros or Barack Obama, you are immediately painted as a radical in the mainstream press. If you question the government and the media structure, you're done with! Just look at people such as Glenn Beck, Ted Cruise, and Mike Lee. If I or anyone questions the motives of a Gorge Soros, Barrack Obama, or even a progressive Republican like John McCain, you're either looked at as racist, anarchist, "tea bagger," conspiracy theorist, crazy, or brain washed!

In fact, that is what the media is designed to do to make you feel like a criminal if you don't go along with such things as Obamacare or economic stimulus packages. Again what's odd is that most journalist working for these rich corporate progressive elitists both on the right and left seem to conveniently forget to question where their own money comes from. These writers and opinion leaders are nothing but pawns. Americans who still think they belong to the home of the free are living in Neverland! They need to pull their heads out of the sand and start to question everything from Fox News to MSNBC News and everything in between.

To highlight a couple news stories as of late (October) regarding the debt crisis one can flick on the prime time news, not MSNBC or Fox, but ABC with Diane Sawyer. I watched for three nights ABC's coverage dealing with the debt crisis before and after the government shutdown. Every lead story was about how the tea party congressmen more or less hijacked the government and in turn hurt the American people. In my estimation ABC's first-level media settings were all directed at the republican tea party representatives trying to delay Obamacare. Moreover, I felt that ABC's second-level attribution agenda setting framed a negative tone regarding those who were trying to delay the one -year mandate for individuals. I never saw ABC once cover or question what I believe are fair questions and statements. Why didn't they ever refer to the fact that our government in 1985 and 1995 missed the deadline to pay our

national debt, and there was subsequently no crash in the stock markets or economy? Why did the press and the president warn Americans that the market would tank if we missed the deadline when in previous times the market never crashed? Why didn't the president and the press ever highlight the fact that in '85 and '95 they ended up paying the national debt? Why? Because they know and conveniently leave out that our 14th Amendment of the Constitution mandates that we pay are national debt without question. Why didn't the press bring that up? If the President and the press were so worried about a possible crash in the market, why didn't they then negotiate and allow for reasonable resolutions that gave an extra year for people to prepare for the individual mandate? Why only allow the delay on the employer's mandate?

I thought the progressive party was for the poor and not big business, and I see no social justice with these discussions and decisions. All I see is party politics on both sides, and I would have liked to see Senator Lee and others make a clear alternative to Obamacare, I even thought it would never win the PR game because they would never be able to make the case as the press was so busy ripping those opposing Obamacare. Furthermore, why didn't ABC ever mention that the Congressional budget stated that it takes seven million people to make Obamacare work and as of the first weeks after Obamacare went live only 7,000 people had signed up? Why do citizens have to put all of their personal information in before they can see what the plans look like? Why aren't the navigators certified or given a background check to see if they are worthy and fit to access people's most private and sensitive information? Why are people and private hospitals having to pay for Obamacare when it violates their religious code of ethics e.g. birth control? Why are private insurers being dropped from the likes of Blue Cross Blue Shield because Obamacare stipulates that they don't meet the requirements? What happened when President Obama said you can keep your own private insurance? What happened to the original

price of Obamacare saying it would cost \$900 billion, and now suddenly it will cost \$ 2.6 trillion dollars for only the first ten years? Why will there be 30 million people still left uninsured when Obamacare is fully implemented? Why doesn't the news cover Jacob Hacker, the architect of Obamacare, who stated that Obamacare isn't a "Trojan horse" for single payer healthcare, but it is right there and the plan is to have it become a government-run single payer system? Why do countries in Europe have to dump their universal healthcare? Why is the press and the president willing to risk Obamacare when we are \$17 trillion in debt including \$90 trillion in unfunded liabilities? These things are not being reported on the primetime news networks! America is in trouble on all fronts, both foreign and domestic.

I hope that we can come together and really discuss the issues, and that the media composed of right and left progressives will wake up out of their utopia-like world and stop lying to the American people. I hope that our government is exposed and ceases to secretly hide behind propaganda to fundamentally transform America to what? Greece? I sure hope not! Again, I don't like partisan politics, I don't like calling the progressive party dangerous, but that's how I view it. As I stated in the beginning I will either be wrong for labeling progressives as the problem including those who I believe are progressive. All I would ask is those who believe in the progressive banner to go and re-think what the progressive media is all about. I hope I am wrong.

If I am wrong, I hope I'm reasonable enough to say that I was wrong. If I come off as partisan, I'm not, but I do care about equal justice, and I care about sovereignty and freedom of speech. I care about where power resides and shifts. I feel it best resides in the individual and not the press or the government. They have their roles, but I wish it wasn't one-sided. The problem is that everyone points to the other as being one-sided. I feel like this paper comes off like that

and I hate that. I want to unite people on principle but it seems that everyone has different principles and values. I sure hope there are enough things that we citizens can unite on, and I truly respect those who fundamentally disagree with me. If individuals' voices in the public aren't being heard or valued, I guess all I can say is let it begin with me. I will try to listen to any who disagree with me and hope those who do can prove to me where I go wrong with the likes of the progressive media. I welcome it.

Sources

Henry Demarest Lloyd, *The Old Self-Interest (Wealth against Commonwealth)*, Harper Brothers, 1894): ch 34.

Gorge Soros, *The Age of Fallibility: Consequences of the War on Terror*. New York: Public Affairs, 2006.

MediaMatters.Org, *About US*. Retrieved December 3, 2013 from <http://mediamatters.org/about>

DiscoveroftheNetworkds.Org, *By Discover The Network*. Retrieved December 3, 2013.

<http://www.discoverthenetworks.org>