

# AT&T'S LATEST CENSORSHIP

It's a good thing I chose Comcast's oligopoly service for broadband internet service and not AT&T (my two easy choices for real broadband). That's because I tend to point out that our government is becoming a wholly owned subsidiary of AT&T. And AT&T just changed its acceptable use policy to prevent you from using AT&T's Toobz to tell others about the bad things AT&T is doing (via boing boing).

Failure to observe

---

## CHECKING IN

Things I'm going to get in trouble for saying publicly at Duke: That 80% of what is out in the blogosphere is crap. Hodding Carter had said half was. But I wasn't thinking about anyone in this corner of the blogosphere. That we bloggers were parasites on the legal teams of the mainstream media, who pay lawyers a lot of money to make sure things like the Libby grand jury recording gets released

---

## MR. SULZBERGER, TEAR DOWN THAT WALL

My buddy Pinch Sulzberger wrote me today. He said:

We are ending TimesSelect, effective today.

The Times's Op-Ed and news columns are now available free of charge, along with TimesFile

and News Tracker. In addition, The New York Times online Archive is now free back to 1987 for all of our readers.

Why the change?

Since we launched TimesSelect, the Web has evolved into an increasingly open environment.

---

## **FREE PRESS ASKS FOR DETAILS**

Ask and someone shall FOIA it for you...

A couple of days ago, I wondered why it was that DOJ would decide to intervene against Net Neutrality—months after the comment period to do so closed. Well, Free Press was wondering the same thing and has submitted a FOIA request to find out.

---

## **WHY WOULD DOJ OPPOSE NET NEUTRALITY ... NOW?**

McJoan has a post on how the DOJ intervened all of a sudden into the FCC's consideration of Net Neutrality. As she points out, there's something unusual about DOJ's intervention: it came after the comment period had closed.

It was a curious filing, as IP Democracy's Cynthia Brumfield describes:

What's curious about the filing is that, first, it's an ex parte, or late, submission in the FCC's Inquiry on Broadband Practices,

mostcommonly known

---

## **WE'RE SORRY FOR SPIKING THE NEWS**

The NYT has a really weird story out today which tries to explain why news outlets don't publish "open secrets" about public figures.

Old-fashioned as it seems, there are still tacit rules about when an open secret can remain in its own netherworld, without consequence to the politician who keeps it. But now that any whisper can become a global shout in an instant, how much longer can those rules apply?

---

## **TIME TO FIRE THE WHITE HOUSE WEBMASTER**

I thought it worth mentioning that the Administration has twice made claims in the last week that their website refuted. First came Senator Leahy, who noted that Cheney's claims not to be part of the Executive Office of the President were disproved by the White House website.

The Administration's response today also claims that the Office of the Vice President is not part of the Executive Office of the President.

---

# IX-NAY ON THE ONSTITUTION-CAY

This is ripe. Apparently, the conservative blogosphere realized there wasn't a good defense for Harriet's claim of immunity from being subpoenaed, so they called the White House and begged for talking points. And then they published those talking points. Which, first of all, exposes to all the world that conservative bloggers are willing to gobble any kind of shite thrown at them.

If Congress pursues criminal contempt and the DoJ refuses to

---

# NOVAK, I'LL BLOG YOU WHEN YOU'RE GONE

I've been trying to ignore Novak's publicity tour while staying on top of his ever changing story on Plame. But (via TP) this is just too inviting.

Iâ€™m 76 years old, and pretty soon Iâ€™m going to a place where there are no blogs.

Why, why, Novak? Why do you look forward to heading off for your time in the Eighth Circle of Hell, simply because we bloggers aren't there?

---

# TURNING TIDES

I gotta say, this post yesterday from Josh Marshall,

As regular readers of this site know, I've always been against the movement to impeach President Bush. I take this position not because he hasn't done plenty to merit it. My reasons are practical. Minor reasons are that it's late in the president's term and that I think impeachment itself is toxic to our political system – though it can be less toxic than the high officials thrown