

THE #FAKENEWS ABOUT IRAQI WMD GOT HUNDREDS OF THOUSANDS KILLED

Dana Milbank, who once had a fake news podcast in which he accused Hillary of preferring Mad Bitch beer, wants average news consumers to stop chasing fake news.

LOOK CLOSER TO HOME: RUSSIAN PROPAGANDA DEPENDS ON THE AMERICAN STRUCTURE OF SOCIAL MEDIA

The anti-Russian crusade keeps warning that Russian propaganda might undermine our own democracy. But there's a lot of reason to believe red-blooded American social media is what has actually done that.

WHEN YOUR LIVED REALITY BECOMES AN ALGORITHM OF THE POPULAR

Yesterday, as people panicked about Twitter's plan to present tweets to users using

algorithmic calculations of what that person might like, I wrote this:

What if humans started to experience time as an algorithm of the popular rather than lived narratively ordered experience?

Especially since I work from home and in flyover country, Twitter is very much a lived conversation for me. And if Twitter alters the way it appears to me – basically choosing who it thinks I want to talk to rather than what the serendipity of the unique collection of people I follow presents in time-ordered fashion – it will be fairly dramatically altering my lived reality.

The thought got even creepier for me as respondents to my tweet (author William Gibson was among those who retweeted it, so I got so really awesome responses) pointed out that associations divorced from lived time is much closer to dreaming than waking reality. Of course, as a shrink friend noted, in dreaming, we consciously and unconsciously select what those associations are, rather than having a computer do it for us.

So thought of as its almost most dystopian, Twitter wants to take the serendipitous global conversation we've been having and instead replace it with a living dream world chosen for us algorithmically.

But let me go one step more dystopian. As I noted yesterday, Google recently told the British Parliament that it is testing ways to show "positive" ad words and YouTubes when people look for hateful, potentially terrorist speech. Google's announcement follows an earlier one from Facebook, stating it would do the same.

In other words, since the early January meeting in Silicon Valley, two of the big tech companies announced plans to rejigger their algorithms selectively for users the algos identify as expressing an interest in terrorism. For those

interested in terrorism, Google and Facebook will create a waking dreamworld.

Thus far, Twitter has made no such announcement. Yesterday (that is, the same day this algorithm report came out) it did, however, announce how many perceived terrorists it has kicked off Twitter.

Like most people around the world, we are horrified by the atrocities perpetrated by extremist groups. We condemn the use of Twitter to promote terrorism and the Twitter Rules make it clear that this type of behavior, or any violent threat, is not permitted on our service. As the nature of the terrorist threat has changed, so has our ongoing work in this area. Since the middle of 2015 alone, we've suspended over 125,000 accounts for threatening or promoting terrorist acts, primarily related to ISIS.

The blog post making that announcement also addressed algorithms, admitting that they can't really work, linking to this report from December (which discussed Facebook and Google) on another presentation to the UK Parliament.

As many experts and other companies have noted, there is no "magic algorithm" for identifying terrorist content on the internet, so global online platforms are forced to make challenging judgement calls based on very limited information and guidance. In spite of these challenges, we will continue to aggressively enforce our Rules in this area, and engage with authorities and other relevant organizations to find solutions to this critical issue and promote powerful counter-speech narratives.

All of which might have left the impression that

Twitter, unlike its counterparts Google and Facebook, would not be fiddling with its algorithms in response to the request to magnify voices deemed to be positive targeted at those seeking terrorism content.

Except that at almost exactly the same time, came these reports that everyone would get (or would get the option of) the algorithmic treatment.

Now, having studied how, after 1848, the powers that be in Paris found ways to eliminate the growing newspaper public in the belief that it had led to that year's revolution (that's partly where the idea of high literature, as embodied in *Madame Bovary*, arose from), I'm pretty paranoid when I see the ways the elite would current neuter the voices that contributed to the Arab Spring, Black Lives Matter, and yes, terrorism.

But I have to say, I always get buggy when communications companies – like AT&T and Microsoft – don't have an apparently robust business model, especially when I consider ways they could (and do, in the case of AT&T) profit handsomely off working for the government. Most people assume Twitter is doing this as a way to monetize, which it has thus far failed to do. And that may well be the case.

If so, who is the customer, and what is Twitter delivering?

Update: Jack Dorsey just had this to say on Twitter.

Hello Twitter! Regarding #RIPTwitter: I want you all to know we're always listening. We never planned to reorder timelines next week.

Twitter is live. Twitter is real-time. Twitter is about who & what you follow. And Twitter is here to stay! By becoming more Twitter-y.

DOES THE NYT PUBLISH “ALL THE NEWS THAT’S FIT TO PRINT” ANYMORE?

NYT’s ombud, Margaret Sullivan, dedicated her column today to whether the NYT should have done a story on The Intercept’s drone package a few weeks back. She concludes that given the NYT’s extensive coverage of this issue, it’s reasonable they gave the story just a mention, though suggests maybe they should give it more than that going forward.

I’m particularly interested in this subject because it says so much that is troubling about how our government functions – and yes, kills – in secret and often without adequate oversight. I’ve written about aspects of it a number of times.

Times journalists have done plenty of worthy coverage of the drone program themselves, with one national security reporter, Scott Shane, writing a significant **big-picture story** last April, covering some of the same ground that the Intercept is exploring now. He and Jo Becker also wrote a stunning **story** in 2012 detailing the existence of the president’s “kill list.” Mr. Shane is the author of a well-regarded recent book on the subject, “Objective Troy: A Terrorist, a President, and the Rise of the Drone.”

Since The Times has done so much on this subject, it is understandable that only a brief mention of The Intercept’s scoop has been made so far. Still, given the

revelations in the released documents – as well as the mere existence of a major intelligence leaker who is not Edward Snowden – Times journalists might have served readers well to do more on “The Drone Papers.” They also could consider doing so in the future.

I suspect there are two other things going on. Shane seems to still be on book leave, and to cover the Intercept stuff – which in significant part confirms his earlier reporting, most importantly that the government treats males killed in drone attacks as military aged males appropriate for targeting – might be a bit awkward. I think some of the documents – such as the ones showing that JSOC’s targeting was bad because it relied on CIA’s SIGINT, might advance questions about why we decided to build a CIA drone base in Saudi Arabia in 2011. That might be appropriate follow-up reporting from other reporters like Mark Mazzetti (I have long suspected the Saudis were fiddling with the intelligence to force our hand on a drone base, since they had been trying for years to get drones from us), but that would take further time. So, too, would be a report on what these documents say about the CIA versus DOD debate on drones.

Still, underlying the whole question is whether the NYT publishes all the news that’s fit to print anymore.

There was a time when a NYT reader could expect, by reading the NYT, to know everything the elite of this country deemed worth knowing. It promised comprehensiveness, at least for those subjects that the NYT judged important, for better and worse.

Now, I think the NYT (which still plays that agenda setting function, and will still get fed stories to place items in the news agenda) often limits itself to items it can claim a scoop on (though far too often, it borrows these scoops from outlets obscure enough they’ll get away

with it). As a result, when another outlet advances the news that's fit to print in a publicly recognized scoop, or when news comes without an exclusivity agreement, the NYT may not always report it, until such time as it can own it in the future.

I think we'll probably be better off when the NYT no longer serves as the agenda-setter for the country, in part because there are a lot of stories (like the Iraq War then, and now like anything pertaining to Israel or Ukraine) where other outlets are far more reliable, in part because the NYT's official perspective is often so jingoistic as to disinform its readers (as with the report that Russia might cut cables into the Middle East, which includes no acknowledgment that this is a tactic we make ample use of). But we're in a weird place now where the NYT doesn't claim to be comprehensive, but readers still assume it is. Which means that until something shows up in the NYT it won't be considered common knowledge, but the NYT will sometimes delay such reports until they can "own" it in some way. That, in turn, delays the time when something can be considered "official" and therefore worthy of debate.

I do expect the NYT to do more coverage on drones that reflects these documents, because both Shane and Mazzetti have already done so much.

But I'm at least as interested by this unacknowledged question about whether the NYT aspires to "print" all the news that's fit to print anymore.

THE UGLY POLITICAL SOCK PUPPETRY OF

ARIZONA'S TOP EDUCATOR



Despite the obvious heat surplus and water shortage issues, Arizona continues to be one of the most growth intensive states, and has pegged much of its future on what can be loosely called “smart sectors” such as information technology, solar, chip making and, indeed, higher education itself as evidenced by the recent Starbucks/Arizona State University partnership.

You would think, given the above factors, and many more, Arizonans would be meticulous and scrupulous about the leaders they elect to shepherd the state’s educational system. But you would be wrong.

The power and control of Arizona’s education system rests in the hands of an elected State Superintendent of Public Instruction. Sadly, it has been a position occupied by common, and morally bankrupt, conservative political hacks of late. From 2003 through 2011, the office, the fifth highest elected office in Arizona, was held by Tom Horne, the current embattled Attorney General of Arizona. Horne was a line construction lawyer who up and got elected Superintendent of Public Instruction. But, hey, how much worse is that than when a podunk lawn mower repairman got elected Maricopa County Sheriff (which was before the office went totally into the sewer with former travel agent Joe Arpaio).

Okay, Horne was awful as Superintendent of Public Instruction (and has disgraced the office of AG even worse since), but once he left, one John Huppenthal was elected to cover the educational interests of Arizona’s children. And

since January 2011, Huppenthal has been the one in charge of Arizona's education.

Who is John Huppenthal? Pretty much an up through the ranks of the bat shit crazy Arizona state legislature right wing political climber. People who lived in Huppenthal's district in the late 90's, when he was an Arizona State Senator, can attest that the man compulsively and inexplicably robo-called with all kinds of dogmatic messages, at all hours of the day and night. To the point to where some literally were forced to contact his office and threaten suit if it did not stop on their phone. Huppenthal and his office were stunningly cavalier and arrogant about Huppenthal's compulsive robo-calling. Yet he took to it again as Superintendent of Public Instruction in an effort to undermine the public schools he was entrusted with protecting and, instead, cravenly support private vouchers taking money away from public schools.

Such is great flavor as to the "measure of the man" that is John Huppenthal, but still mostly ancient history. How has the aggressively dogmatic Huppenthal done as Superintendent of Public Instruction, i.e. Arizona's top educator? Same old story; same old song and dogmatic nutjob dance. You may remember the controversy over "banned textbooks" by the Tucson Unified School District a little over two years ago from the somewhat hyperbolic and inaccurate "Jeff Biggers Salon expose". Well, that whole ordeal, contrary to Biggers' Salon framing, was never the fault of the Tucson Unified School District, but, was nearly completely the doing of the compulsively dogmatic conservative John Huppenthal. That is who John Huppenthal is.

To sum up, Arizona is a growing state, aggressively seeking the educated, who in turn want quality education for their young. Instead we give them the likes of Tom Horne and John Huppenthal. As a result, Arizona, for all the luster, is lagging pathetically in education because of dogmatically blinded and visionless

leaders.

So, who is this “education leader” John Huppenthal that has led Arizona to barely be above Mississippi and Arkansas in the bottom ten of American education? Well, as hinted above, he is an obsessive/compulsive right wing political animal. And, it turns out, his compulsive behavior is so obsessive that it carries well over into his duties as Arizona Superintendent of Public Instruction. In the form of Huppenthal being an obsessive political sock puppet blog troll.

Okay, granted, political blog sock puppets are a dime a dozen, or, you know, less. But it is a far different story when multiple anonymous sock puppets are being run by a major state’s Superintendent of Public Instruction. In this case Arizona’s one and only John Huppenthal. From Bob Lord, who has done yeoman’s work on this at Blog For Arizona:

Okay, for the few of you who have not figured this out yet, by all indication our friend Thucky is John Huppenthal, the Superintendent of Public Instruction, which is the fifth highest elected office in the state.

This may be a first. I don’t know of any other elected official who has led a double life as a serial blog troll besides John Huppenthal. Chalk that up to Arizona having the market cornered on political craziness, I guess.

The story here is that Blog For Arizona is a small, but quite important and statewide, progressive political blog in Arizona. For years it has taken on the assortment of right wing “conservative” nut jobs that have been dragging Arizona’s present, and future, down. Including, of course, John Huppenthal. For quite some time, a couple of aggressively defiant and apologetic “commenters” have appeared at Blog for Arizona to defend Huppenthal under, at a minimum, the

screen names “Thucydides” and “Falcon9”.

Turns out both sock puppet screen names are almost surely none other than Arizona Superintendent of Public Instruction John Huppenthal. In the Phoenix New Times, Stephen Lemons (aka the “Feathered Bastard”) relates many of Huppenthal’s erstwhile greatest sock puppet hits.

Here is a great video report by Brahm Resnik, and featuring excerpts from an interview he did with Bob Lord as well as comments by media expert Dan Gillmor of the ASU Cronkite School of Journalism. [I would embed it but for the fact there are no available reasonable embed controls and the thing auto plays, which just is not permissible on this site. Extremely poor form by Arizona Central and KPNX 12 News]

So, not only is Huppenthal a book banning right wing nut job, he is an anonymous political blog troll – with multiple identities – obsessively, albeit covertly, policing reporting on his own true life self. Not only does Huppenthal, through his sock puppets, aggressively defend himself at all cost, he also attacks other politicians he dislikes, like the outstanding current Democratic candidate for Arizona Attorney General, Felecia Rotellini.

Think Huppenthal is a disgrace to his public office, and position as the leader of Arizona public education? Sure. But, wait, there is more! Much more. Huppenthal has done this on, arguably, taxpayer time on the job, and unquestionably via the misuse of state equipment and resources.

Arizona Administrative Code Title Two, Chapter Five provides, *inter alia*:

- R2-5A-501. Standards of Conduct
- A. Required conduct. A state employee shall at all times:
 1. Comply with federal and state laws and rules, and agency policies and directives;
 2. Maintain high standards of honesty,

integrity, and impartiality, free from personal considerations, or favoritism;

...

4. Conduct himself or herself in a manner that will not bring discredit or embarrassment to the state.

B. Prohibited conduct. A state employee shall not:

1. Use his or her official position for personal gain, or attempt to use, or use, confidential information for personal advantage;

...

5. Directly or indirectly use or allow the use of state equipment or property of any kind, including equipment and property leased to the state, for other than official activities unless authorized by written agency policy or as otherwise allowed by these rules;

The Arizona Republic and local Channel 12 NBC News, through the excellent Brahm Resnik, has reported Huppenthal used his office at the Department of Education in his anonymous sock puppet political blog trolling and commenting (see the video linked above). I have independently confirmed, via Bob Lord at Blog For Arizona – where many (but far from all) of the comments were made – that dedicated Arizona Department of Education IP addresses were used.

Pretty hard to look at Huppenthal's putative conduct here and not see how, at a minimum, it is in direct violation of R2-5A-501(A)(2 and 4), maintaining honesty and integrity and conducting oneself so as to not discredit and/or embarrass the state, not to mention R2-5A-501(B)(5) misuse of state property and equipment for other than official activities. The putative technical violations are patently obvious.

Most damningly, there is precedent for investigation, sanction and termination of governmental officials in Arizona for violative conduct such as misuse of governmental computer networks and political hatcheting. In 2008, high

ranking Maricopa County official Al Macias was terminated for conduct directly analogous to that which Huppenthal stands accused of, and under directly similar ethical guidelines.

While the firing of a county official is a far different thing than removal of a top elected state official, the previous standard should serve as a wake up call to both the press and state ethics officials in Arizona on the purported conduct of State Superintendent of Public Instruction John Huppenthal.

Should the students, teachers and citizens of Arizona expect any substantive investigation into Huppenthal's ethical lapses in conduct? Of course not, because that would almost certainly have to come from the Arizona Attorney General's Office run by fellow embattled conservative Republican, and Huppenthal's direct predecessor, Tom Horne. Hard to envision the scenario where Horne is not so busy fighting off his own charges of impropriety that he would be willing to take on a fellow kindred wing nut.

It is a story worth telling and investigating, and one the citizens of Arizona should hear; let's hope more of the press, both state and national, follow up on where Brahm Resnik, Stephen Lemons and Bob Lord have had the courage to lead.

THE CARNAGE IN ISLA VISTA, HASHTAG JUSTICE AND ECHIDNE

I have
not
been
there
in a
while,
but I
have
been
there
quite
a bit



before, and the Isla Vista/Goleta area surrounding UCSB is everything good and bad that surrounds any major university. It is a melting pot teeming with brilliant young minds, eager to expand and ready to experiment and socialize. It is also cliquish and too easy to separate the in from the out crowd and, sometimes, rich from poor. Above all else, at least from my visits there when I was younger, IV was one wild party that could be anywhere along a couple of key streets, if not indeed out in the streets themselves. It was one hell of a good time.

But not this Memorial Day weekend. Something different and jolting happened, leaving seven souls dead, seven more injured and yet another community, and national audience, grieving and reaching for answers.

I don't know what the answers are, and to a great extent, I do not think the pathology of this incident is yet ripe enough to draw them with any real definition. That has not, of course, stopped the light speed social justice court of Twitter and the internet.

The reaction on Twitter has run the spectrum from sober to hysterical. If you are on Twitter, you have seen it, if you are not, it is not hard to imagine if you are internet savvy enough to be reading the instant post. Speaking only for myself, however, I have been a little disturbed by the alacrity with which valuable social justice movements, and their participants, have glommed on to a tragic spree crime as the

defining vehicle for their arguments, whether it be women's rights, gun control or otherwise.

It strikes me, while certainly all of these things figure into the Rodger situation to some extent, hitching up to a spree murder by a mentally disturbed individual is not exactly a great vehicle for your social justice movement. It is more complex than that, and it is too easy in haste to mistake manifestations for root causes. Post hoc, ergo propter hoc if you will.

And, while I know the intent was good, I have found the "hashtag advocacy" via such tags as #YesAllWomen, and the reflexively responsive #NotAllMen, to not necessarily do all that much to further the well meaning intention of their adopters. While some of those tweets have seemed germane and helpful, a great many seem

counterproductive. It is unlikely the battle over misogyny will be won by pitting intelligent men and women against each other, even rhetorically. That's just my thought, and I may be wrong in how I am seeing this. But there you have it. I'd rather see this discussion had under more sober terms and not hitched to a psychotic spree homicide.

Which leaves us to the last item in the title to this post. For all the, in too many instances, emotional, aggressive and wrongheaded discussion in the Rodger aftermath, one article has struck me as pretty remarkable for its reflection and view. It is by Echidne and, in discussing how different people read different things into the Rodger scenario, she says:

These are of the expected type and often reflect the writer's position on the political map. That Rodger had access to semi-automatic weapons made him a very efficient killing machine. That he suffered from clear mental problems was also pointed out. That he was a misogynist of rather extreme nature is given at least a nod in most places (though at least one writer disagrees on

that as the cause for the massacre). Whether he indeed was “a madman,” in the sense of an isolated, impossible-to-prevent-but-horrific event or whether something could have been done to prevent the massacre also seems to depend on one’s general slant about such things.

....

This has been a difficult post to write, a difficult post to write in the correct tone, a difficult post even to think about. And I have failed in finding the correct tone, failed in the distance I should have had, perhaps failed on the side of cold and hard anger myself. The victims of the massacre deserve my focus, not its perpetrator, and even though I justify my writing about the perpetrator as a search for greater understanding I’m not sure that I achieved that.

Yes, Rodger was a troubled individual with severe problems. Yes, he managed to slip through the police net, yes, he was able to buy three semi-automatic guns, apparently with no questions asked.

Perhaps all that is the framework, the flow-chart of what happened.

I think the above quotes are spot on, but are merely a taste of the fantastic discussion and analysis in Echidne’s piece. It is required reading in full, and it contains a superb background and synopsis of Rodger’s manifesto. It properly and fully draws in the the glaring issue of misogyny and degradation of women without making it a means unto itself without a nod to the underlying issues that may trigger it.

Rodger’s psychoses look like they go far deeper than just misogyny, though there is obviously an abundance of that. And it strikes me, very much, the real complexity behind this is being lost in

the screaming hashtag rush to peg it as the vehicle for discussion of all things misogyny and mistreatment of women. Such is a huge component to be sure, and ought be discussed, but there seems to be a lot more going on too. Echidne lays a lot of that out quite well, and her struggle in doing so displays why this is such a tough situation to peg in such simplistic terms as I have been witnessing, on twitter and the net, for the last two days.

GLASS SHATTERED: CALIFORNIA SUPREME COURT DENIES STEPHEN GLASS LAW LICENSE

The decision is in, and the California Supreme Court has made their decision to refuse to grant Stephen Glass a law license in the State of California.

We conclude that on this record he has not sustained his heavy burden of demonstrating rehabilitation and fitness for the practice of law.

The full opinion is [here](#).

Ironically, the California Bar's initial hearing officer, the entity that actually deals with line level lawyers and their practice on a day to day basis in California, found Glass had demonstrated reform and good character so as to be fit for practice. The The State Bar Court Review Department independently reviewed the record and agreed with the initial finding of character fitness for practice. Instead, it was the more insulated elitists in the Bar Committee, and ultimately in the California Supreme Court, who thought otherwise.

Glass's conduct as a journalist exhibited moral turpitude sustained over an extended period. As the Review Department dissent emphasized, he engaged in "fraud of staggering proportions" and he "use[d] . . . his exceptional writing skills to publicly and falsely malign people and organizations for actions they did not do and faults they did not have." As the dissent further commented, for two years he "engaged in a multi-layered, complex, and harmful course of public dishonesty." Glass's journalistic dishonesty was not a single lapse of judgment, which we have sometimes excused, but involved significant deceit sustained unremittingly for a period of years. (See *Hall v. Committee of Bar Examiners* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 730, 742 [applications may be rejected in cases of "numerous fraudulent acts" and "false statements"].) Glass's deceit also was motivated by professional ambition, betrayed a vicious, mean spirit and a complete lack of compassion for others, along with arrogance and prejudice against various ethnic groups. In all these respects, his misconduct bore directly on his character in matters that are critical to the practice of law.

and

Glass's misconduct was also reprehensible because it took place while he was pursuing a law degree and license to practice law, when the importance of honesty should have gained new meaning and significance for him.

Moreover, Glass's lack of integrity and forthrightness continued beyond the time he was engaged in journalism. Once he was exposed, Glass's response was to protect himself, not to freely and fully

admit and catalogue all of his fabrications. He never fully cooperated with his employers to clarify the record, failed to carefully review the editorials they published to describe the fabrications to their readership, made misrepresentations to The New Republic regarding some of his work during the period he purported to be cooperating with that magazine, and indeed some of his fabrications did not come to light until the California State Bar proceedings. He refused to speak to his editor at George magazine when the latter called to ask for help in identifying fabrications in the articles Glass wrote for that magazine.

The decision goes on to hammer Glass about as hard as could be imagined in every aspect of his prior conduct, rehabilitation and application for bar membership. The decision is every bit as venomous and scathing as the oral argument was (further discussed below).

Back in August of last year, I wrote about the attempt of failed, story inventing journalist Stephen Glass' attempt to gain his license to practice law in the State of California. I drew a comparison between the beyond commendable success Shon Hopwood has found in gaining an exclusive clerkship on the DC Circuit Court of Appeals and plight of Glass in California simply trying to get a bar card.

This is where the hope of Hopwood meets the flip side of the coin of chance, and both have strong nexus to the Supreme Court of California. From whence Janice Rogers Brown once came, the second part of this story now resides in the name and form of Stephen Randall Glass.

Mr. Glass never robbed a bank, terrorized citizens with firearms or stole money, but he took something extremely precious – truth and honesty –

from readers of his journalism. In pretty much exactly the same time frame Mr. Hopwood was robbing banks, Mr. Glass was robbing his readers.

Stephen Glass also, like Shon Hopwood, has a story of bottom to top redemption with a culmination in the love, study and practice of law – or at least hope to do so. Glass' case is now before the California Supreme Court (yes the prior haunt of Janice Rogers Brown) and has been for over a year and a half waiting...waiting...for a decision.

Subsequent to that post, oral argument was held in the California Supreme Court, and to say that it did not go well for Glass, and his attorney Jon Eisenberg, is the understatement of the decade. It was brutal. Bob Egelko of the San Francisco Chronicle describes it thusly:

The justices seemed unconvinced.

"They say character is what you do when no one's looking. Mr. Glass' performance when no one's looking is pretty abysmal," said Justice Carol Corrigan.

Justice Ming Chin said Glass reaped financial benefits from his misconduct with a \$175,000 advance payment for his semi-autobiographical 2003 novel, "The Fabulist." Justice Joyce Kennard asked sarcastically whether there would be "any harm in the court making up things in opinions."

"Being admitted to practice law is a privilege," said Justice Kathryn Mickle Werdegar, who drew a distinction between showing compassion for Glass and finding that he has been rehabilitated.

Character references from the workplace aren't enough, the bar's lawyer, Rachel Grunberg, told the court.

"He needs to go out and become a pillar

of the community ... giving back to those he harmed," perhaps holding seminars or teaching classes on ethics in journalism, Grunberg said. That prompted Eisenberg to respond that Glass still has to earn a living.

The video of all oral arguments that day at the California Supreme Court can be found here. It was painful to watch.

In closing, while what Glass did as a journalist is appalling, the unyielding and scathing tone of the California Supreme Court seems to be somewhat shocking in the face of the common story of America being a land of redemption and second chances. Especially when the lower tribunals, that heard the real evidence, found otherwise.

I guess second chances and redemption are only for banksters and war criminals, but not for a guy who made up some lousy digital media stories. You don't have to like Stephen Glass to see the disconnect here as to who in American life really gets the shots at second chances.

SAY HELLO TO OUR NEW FRIENDS AT JUST SECURITY



We do a lot of things here at Emptywheel including occasionally, goofing off. But our primary focus has always been the intersection of security issues, law and politics. I think I can speak for Marcy and Jim, and I certainly do for myself, we would love it if that intersection

were not so critical in today's world. But, alas, it is absolutely critical and, for all the voices out there in the community, there are precious few that deep dive into the critical minutiae.

Today we welcome a new and important player in the field, the Just Security Blog. It has a truly all star and broad lineup of contributors (most all of whom are listed as "editors" of one fashion or another), including good friends such as Steve Vladeck, Daphne Eviatar, Hina Shamsi, Julian Sanchez, Sarah Knuckey and many other quality voices. It is an ambitious project, but one that, if the content already posted on their first day is any indication, will be quite well done. The home of Just Security is the New York University School of Law, so they will have ample resources and foundation from which to operate for the long run.

Ironically, it was little more than three years ago (September 1, 2010 actually) that the Lawfare Blog went live to much anticipation (well, at least from me). Whether you always agree with Ben Wittes, Bobby Chesney, Jack Goldsmith and their contributors or not, and I don't always, they have done this field of interest a true service with their work product, and are a fantastic and constantly evolving resource. There is little question but that Just Security intends to occupy much of the same space, albeit it in a complimentary as opposed to confrontational manner. In fact, it was Ben Wittes who hosted the podcast with Steve Vladeck and Ryan Goodman that serves as the multi-media christening of Just Security.

Orin Kerr (who is also a must read at Volokh conspiracy), somewhat tongue in cheek, tweeted that the cage match war was on between Lawfare and Just Security. That was pretty funny actually, but Orin made a more serious point in his welcome post today, and a point that I think will greatly interest the readers of Emptywheel:

Whereas Lawfare tend to have a center or center-right ideological orientation,

for the most part, Just Security's editorial board suggests that it will have a progressive/liberal/civil libertarian voice.

From my understanding, and my knowledge of the people involved, I believe that to be very much the case. And that is a very good thing for us here, and the greater discussion on so much of our work.

So, say hello to our new friends at Just Security, bookmark them and give them a read. Follow them on Twitter. You will be better informed for having done so.

FUND UNCHAINED JOURNALISM OF EMPTYWHEEL: IT'S ALL BECAUSE OF YOU

[Note from Jim: There have some issues with the PayPal buttons taking you to PayPal's main page instead of the page set up for Emptywheel donations. Please use the link below and it will give a functioning button. On my machine and browser, though, you have to click the button and stay in the same browser tab for it to work. If you do "cntrl-click" to open in a new tab, you get the main PayPal home page. If there are any issues, please let us know. If you prefer snail mail, checks made out to "Emptywheel, LLC" can be mailed to this address: Emptywheel, LLC

P.O. Box 1673

Grand Rapids, Michigan
49501-1673 Thank you one and all,
you are the best readers and
supporters on the web!]

Okay, the Emptywheel blog has run a fundraiser
for a week now. For the most insightful, deep
weed analyzing, cutting edge and kick ass
journalism on the web. We continue to need your
support.

We started this ask a week ago, and I should
know because I agreed for it to start just ahead
of my Trash Talk post at the open of the NFL
football season a week ago last night.

But I am going to extend the ask for a short
time; such as through the weekend, because it is
a more than worthy effort. And it will stay on
top of this blog until some time Monday with the
hope that the Emptywheel model is kickstarted,
so to speak, further into success. Please, help
us make it so by going to this page and
donating.

If there is a more neutral, deep fact based,
deeply analytic, independent and proven
insightful blog, or voice than Ms. Marcy T.
Wheeler, better serving the relevant niche, than
this one, I would like to see it. Whether you
are on the right or the left, this blog is
incredibly valuable for its depth and
consistency of analysis.

The lioness share of this history is by Marcy
Wheeler and she alone deserves the support; but
you also get the cogent analysis of Jim White,
Rayne and, every now and then, me. I won't speak
for my own, but the rest is damn good work. And
worthy of your support as a critical voice,
whether you agree or disagree with us
politically, legally, and/or policy wise.


We need your support as independent journalistic
voices in the mass media milieu. Make no
mistake, your support of all of our work here
helps establish all of us as protected and
respected journalists, and we are thankful for

the same.

If you are reading this, you either know, or should know, precisely what level of outstanding journalism goes down daily on, and at, the Emptywheel blog.

As they say in my business, there is a certified record. And it stands up. Help us keep up that record, and add to it, with all that is going on in the world every day.

It is not about us. It is about you, and all of us, and what we should and can be. Support this journalism. From me, to Marcy, to Jim, to Rayne, to everything that is, and always has been, the Emptywheel blog, thank you.



Some people get squashed crossing the
tracks
Some people got high rises on their
backs
I'm not broke but you can see the cracks
You can make me perfect again
All because of you

We can help check the government in its tracks, help fill the gaping cracks. The Emptywheel blog is indeed all because of you. True independent journalism, not bought off by anybody in the main; not subject to any corporate ball and chain. Real independent deep analysis, reportage and journalism.

Help us continue the tradition.

You can donate here.
Thank you!

**NBC NEWS HIRES
EDISON CARTER AND**

BLANK REG FOR BIG TIME TV

NBC News, showing it can move 20 minutes into the future, has made a new and exciting digital acquisition. From Brian Stelter (who was a great replacement for Howard Kurtz today on CNN's "Reliable Sources". Seriously) at the New York Times:

When a plane crashes or a protest turns violent, television crews speed to the scene. But they typically do not arrive for minutes or even hours, so these days photos and videos by amateurs – what the news industry calls “user-generated content” – fill the void.

Those images, usually found by frantic producers on Twitter and Facebook, represented “the first generation of user-generated content for news,” said Vivian Schiller, the chief digital officer for NBC News. The network is betting that the next generation involves live video, streamed straight to its control rooms in New York from the cellphones of witnesses.

On Monday, NBC News, a unit of Comcast's NBCUniversal, will announce its acquisition of Stringwire, an early stage Web service that enables just that. Ms. Schiller imagined using Stringwire for coverage of all-consuming protests like those that occurred in Tahrir Square in Cairo.

“You could get 30 people all feeding video, holding up their smartphones, and then we could look at that,” she said in an interview by phone. “We'll be able to publish and broadcast some of them.”

Such a vision fits neatly into the future many academics predict. That future has fewer professional news-

gatherers but many more unpaid eyes and ears contributing to news coverage.

Before we delve too far into the analogies with the once dystopian future we are now quickly inhabiting, it should be acknowledged that, while new and exciting, this is really just a big incremental step ahead of what CNN has been doing for a while with its “iReport” function.

But the Stringwire capability would look to provide even greater immediacy than CNN’s iReport and, perhaps, even streaming coverage. There is, of course, a very negative side to this potential should unfortunately slanted or particularly grotesque coverage be presented. Also a very real concern is the potential for interference in law enforcement investigations and trauma to people effected and/or prejudiced, including witnesses, defendants and future jury pools, by publication before news is ripe and edited.

The above being said, for my part, I find Groman’s Stringwire concept to be pretty exciting and think it a pretty smart move by Vivian Schiller and NBC News. But, boy howdy, does it bring to mind the once and, apparently future, dystopian information landscape of Max Headroom. From Wiki:

The series is set in a futuristic dystopia ruled by an oligarchy of television networks. Even the government functions primarily as a puppet state of the network executives, serving mainly to pass laws – such as banning off switches on televisions – that protect and consolidate the networks’ power. Television technology has advanced to the point that viewers’ physical movements and thoughts can be monitored through their television sets; however, almost all non-television technology has been discontinued or destroyed. The only real check on the power of the networks is Edison Carter, a crusading

investigative journalist who regularly exposes the unethical practices of his own employer, and the team of allies both inside and outside the system who assist him in getting his reports to air and protecting him from the forces that wish to silence or kill him.

To elaborate a little, Edison Carter of "Network 23" is one of several journalists, including another character by the name of "Blank Reg" of "Big Time TV", who scour the landscape as one man newscrews, just them and their own videocam, for breaking news that will live feed instantaneously to their national networks to drive ratings. So, you can see the analogy to NBC's Stringwire concept.

One difference between Max Headroom and the current television news existence is that, in Max Headroom, the television broadcasters wholly consumed and dictated to a puppet state government. The current existence of television news seems more tilted to the profit centered, shallow mass consumption oriented, stenography of government issued and manipulated propaganda. One need only look back at the coverage of the Iraq war, Afghanistan, Guantanamo, torture, the rise of the surveillance state or any report from Barbara Starr at CNN (thank you Michael Hastings) to see the problem.

So, while there is certainly potential for some concerns, maybe a function like Phil Groman's Stringwire at NBC News can not just bring an immediacy to television news, but eradicate some of the governmentally issued bullshit that results from "Breaking News" from the likes of Barbara Starr.

All hail the future. Big Time Television, "All day every day, making tomorrow seem like yesterday."