Look for: polarizing strategy/ or "trash talk"(personal, derogatory), comment of interest . counter-strategy

April 11, 2011 @ 12:57 AM: **newtofc**

"She has a list of techniques and words that indicate a slide into dehumanizing and unproductive conversation:"..... You never see anything like that here..... more than 10 or 20+ times a day depending on the subjects.

April 11, 2011 @ 02:13 AM: **nwyrkghos**

Screw the tea bags and the blaine young they rode in on.

KR: This is vulgar, derogatory name-calling, i.e. "trash talk". Counter with *Name the frame* and *Civil citizen* (see my response below)

April 11, 2011 @ 04:49 AM: **fishbait96**

The liberal left can all go to H E LL! When they stop trying to take my rights away and stop stealing my money maybe, just maybe I will hate them a little less.

KR:20% of Americans "deserve" damnation. This is **scapegoating,** one group bearing all blame. Liberals are "stealing money" (i.e. they are "thieves"). This is **stereotyping**. Both are black/white polarizing strategies. Counter with *Muddy the puddle* (see below)

April 11, 2011 @ 07:14 AM: **fkeough**

Once the Nazi analogy is used, all credibility is lost! If this is the preponderance of what this woman is seeing, then I have to question her research. Farrell Keough

KR: Poster refers to "Godwin's Law", a sort of internet "rule": The first to mention Hitler in a political argument loses the argument. Not a bad rule, really, as the Hitler analogy has become overused and is made far too casually by most.

April 11, 2011 @ 07:20 AM: **thebensonfamily**

They're not Nazi's. They just all have German names. They are really nice folks. Just read the posts above if you don't believe me.

KR: This is an example of casual use, *implying* German-Americans are Nazis. This is **stereotyping**. (my response below)

April 11, 2011 @ 08:10 AM: **christmas**

Nothing new, free speech is here unlike in Germany or Japan where they were taught to hate all Americans as we were told to hate our enemys Japan and germany,WW2 its over, we do as we wish.No control from them.

April 11, 2011 @ 09:06 AM: **ratbird66**

Didn't this article run a few weeks ago, m'kay?

April 11, 2011 @ 09:54 AM: **fredneckian**

"April 11, 2011 @ 04:49 AM: fishbait96 The liberal left can all go to H E LL! When they stop trying to take my rights away and stop stealing my money maybe, just maybe I will hate them a little less." Glad to see you took so much away from the article! And Ratbird, I think there was a very similar article a while back, but don't know if this is the exact same one. It seems like I recall the original one being longer, and I seem to remember there was a particular quote in it that was very pertinent to this board that is not there now. M'kay?

April 11, 2011 @ 10:27 AM: **Paramour**

The GOP frontrunner has ties to the Council of Concern Citizens a white supremacist group that celebrates Nazism.

KR: In court, this could be considered slander or libel. If you accuse someone of "celebrating Nazism", best to have some darned good documentation of that.

April 11, 2011 @ 10:31 AM: **doreenmcgill**

I "cut my teeth" on political debate in the early 80s watching William F Buckley's Firing Line debates-- good manners and civility all around, each week, as they fiercely debated the issues of the day. I wonder if Ms. Ruud follows local Frederick County politics--because she need look no farther to find far too many examples of ad hominen and personal attacks.

KR: Poster is concerned re tone & civility. *Praise the positive!* (see below)

April 11, 2011 @ 10:33 AM: **doreenmcgill**

correction--should read "need look no further". Sorry!

April 11, 2011 @ 10:57 AM: **kathrynruud**

@newtofc: Hello, posters! Since **the article is about the workshop I gave yesterday**, I want to thank all of you for reading it. One small correction: I urge people to search for the facts, rather than "truth", as truth can be very subjective. Yes, newtofc: many of the polarizing strategies I talk about do show up on FNP threads. So let's take a look at what we see today :-)

April 11, 2011 @ 11:02 AM: **kathrynruud**

@ nwyrkghos Your comment: "Screw the tea bags" is a vulgar one. I don't think I remember the FNP editors allowing "screw" to be used frequently in our community newspaper. And "tea bags" -- I am not sure if you know, or are aware, but many conservatives, particularly religious conservatives, find that term offensive (see "Urban dictionary" definition). I use the initials for the Tea Party movement. Just as I call the Republican Party the GOP, I simply use "TP", and sometimes Tea Party. This brings the exchange back to opinions, away from name-calling.

KR: Counter-strategies of *Name the frame* ("vulgar.. offensive" words) and *Civil citizen* brought into the public square (blogosphere) here, i.e. (back to opinions, please!)

April 11, 2011 @ 11:09 AM: **kathrynruud**

@ fishbait: "The liberal left can all go to H E LL! When they stop trying to take my rights away and stop stealing my money maybe, just maybe I will hate them a little less."---------- Fishbait, is it really your hope to see the 20% of your fellow Americans who identify themselves as liberal Democrats fry and writhe in hell for all eternity? Do hope that I go to hell? Do you know me? Do you know what kind of person or wife or mother or neighbor or friend or citizen that I am? Ask some who know me. I think you will find most do not believe my life warrants eternal damnation -- even if I am talking about the problem of polarizing speech. As for "stealing your money". Can you be specific about that? Who, what person, which specific liberal is "stealing your money"?

KR: Response to **scapegoating & stereotyping**: *Muddy the puddle* by bringing it away from the out-group/in-group division and blame and making it personal.

April 11, 2011 @ 11:12 AM: **davedenn**

She was appalled by Ruud's reference to statements that equated social justice with Nazism and communism.....People really don't know this?....How sad is that.

KR: Sarcasm? Hard to know. Try to find out.

April 11, 2011 @ 11:17 AM: **kathrynruud**

@FKeough: "Once the Nazi analogy is used, all credibility is lost! If this is the preponderance of what this woman is seeing, then I have to question her research." Good point here. One has to be very careful about this analogy. Read the article again and you will see that I express the same frustration -- too many Americans are calling their fellow Americans -- very casually, "Nazis" or "Commies, Marxists", etc. This says something about how degraded our conversations over the neighborhood fence have become. FKeough, I would urge you to listen to my full talk (it is in video format) on www.stoppolarizingtalk.org And I want to emphasize again, these polarizing strategies are being used as marketing strategies on much of political talk radio. In my talk, I am not labeling any person or group using these strategies as being "Nazis" or "Communists". I am also critical of

the use of these strategies by the left. Ask anyone who has heard my talk or attended my workshop -- they will confirm this, I believe.
KR: *Woman's way*: reach toward common ground, recognize merit in argument ("Good point.. I agree"). I am trying here to **avoid stereotyping** an entire group ("all Republicans" or even "all political talk show hosts"). Avoid this by being specific. I should have posted "use of strategies by *some* on the left."

April 11, 2011 @ 11:22 AM: **kathrynruud**

@ thebensonfamily "They're not Nazi's. They just all have German names. They are really nice folks. Just read the posts above if you don't believe me." Benson, please -- we live in a community with a strong German heritage. I am glad to know many Ramsburgs, Brandenburgs, Rensbergers, etc. Germans are no less or more ethical than other groups in our civilized American democracy. And fascism was a European-wide phenomenon. In the pre-WWII era, there was a fascist movements in Britain, too --

KR: Counter **stereotyping** with *Muddy the puddle*. Speak of *specific* German Americans you might know. I know family members of the above.

April 11, 2011 @ 11:25 AM: **kathrynruud**

@ christmas "Nothing new, free speech is here unlike in Germany or Japan where they were taught to hate all Americans as we were told to hate our enemys Japan and germany,WW2 its over, we do as we wish.No control from them." Christmas, do mean my workshop brought no new info forth? I don't really understand your comment, but would like to hear more.. can you clarify what you mean?

KR: I am not sure what this poster means. Here I remember basketball coach John Wooden: "Be quick, but don't hurry". Try to get more specific info.

April 11, 2011 @ 11:27 AM: **kathrynruud**

@ paramour "The GOP frontrunner has ties to the Council of Concern Citizens a white supremacist group that celebrates Nazism. " Pretty strong statement there. Can you include a url or documentation of what, whom you are talking about? Thanks

KR: Just a reminder that such damaging accusations should be backed up by documentation. Otherwise, this is just *starting or spreading a rumor*. Counter-strategies of *Civil citizen* & emphasizing importance of *verification*.

April 11, 2011 @ 11:29 AM: **kathrynruud**

@ doreen: "I "cut my teeth" on political debate in the early 80s watching William F Buckley's Firing Line debates-- good manners and civility all around, each week, as they fiercely debated the issues of the day. I wonder if Ms. Ruud follows local Frederick County politics--because she need look no farther to find far too many examples of ad hominen and personal attacks."

April 11, 2011 @ 11:29 AM: **boycerensberger**

I think Kathryn Ruud is on to something significant in our increasingly strident political culture. All you have to do is read some of the comments on this article--from the left and the right--to see what she's talking about. She has already responded to some of these comments, but I want to add my thoughts. "Fishbait96" (wonder why he doesn't use his real name) thinks liberals are trying to take his rights away and steal his money. If that were so, I'd be right there with him. But I challenge Mr. (or maybe it's Ms.) Fishbait96 to name one or two rights that, say, the Obama Administration is trying to take away. I also ask him or her to say what or where is the attempted robbery happening.

KR: Here, another poster is being a *Civil citizen* in questioning the need for secrecy (anonymity) and requests *specifics*. Good counter-strategies! Moving from the general (**stereotyping/ liberals = thieves**) to the *specific* (ask for details). Also designates blogosphere/thread as public square ("our... political culture...the comments on this article").

April 11, 2011 @ 11:35 AM: **kathrynruud**

@doreen: "I "cut my teeth" on political debate in the early 80s watching William F Buckley's Firing Line debates-- good manners and civility all around, each week, as they fiercely debated the issues of the day. I wonder if Ms. Ruud follows local Frederick County politics--because she need look no farther to find far too many examples of ad hominen and personal attacks." Very interesting comment, here! I attended 2 colleges (U. of Colo. during the late 60's/ conservative atmosphere --- and Georgetown early 80's/conservative atmosphere). And I am really grateful for both perspectives, though none, I repeat, none, of my professors were ideologues who spent their time doing political indoctrination. All good people, all educated, doing

their best to teach young people how to approach & analyze the world & work toward solutions. There are many conservatives of integrity. Ditto with liberals. Per the county situation, that has not been my focus, though (since I keep my truck radio tuned to talk stations), I can say I have heard some ugly talk on local radio. Much of it is just chat, though.

KR: Here I am being pro-active, as it is common to hear all professors, teachers, etc. **stereotyped** as "ideologues" (not there to teach, but supposedly to indoctrinate. Other than one prof who was denied tenure, I have never run into this.) And labeling *all* universities, *all* newspapers, *all* national media as "liberal" is the polarizing strategy of **Poisoning the well**. This strategy is frequently used in political debate. The attempt is made to say: "This post has no value, as the info sources quoted have no value." At that point, the issue of verifiable fact-based info, and how to show if something is *factual and verifiable*, can be moved on to the front burner.

April 11, 2011 @ 11:43 AM: **kathrynruud**

@ davedenn: (referring to someone who had attended the workshop:) "She was appalled by Ruud's reference to statements that equated social justice with Nazism and communism.....People really don't know this?....How sad is that." Davedenn, it is difficult to tell if you are being straight or sarcastic here (usually we pick that kind of tone up from facial expressions or tone of voice) -- so I may be misunderstanding you, but I will take it as a straight comment, i.e. you are surprised that people do not "see" that social justice is the same as Nazism or Communism. I would really like to talk back & forth with you about this as this "link" between social justice and extremism is pushed by Glenn Beck -- and it does affect the political debate. Could you help us by defining what you mean by the term "social justice"? And where have you seen it as "part of" Nazism or communism? Looking forward to talking with you about this..

KR: Thinking of John Wooden again, "Be quick, but don't hurry". If you are puzzled, trust your instinct and seek *clarification, and specifics*. Don't just assume, or react emotionally.

Some tend to **stereotype** Beck fans with insulting labels such as "hillbillies", "rednecks", etc. But there are urban people & people in well-paid professions who buy into Beck's viewpoints, and blue-collar rural residents who do not.

Approach this as a *Civil citizen*, and *Emote, not remote* (i.e. no need for arrogance or condescension. No one likes this attitude & it persuades no one.)

April 11, 2011 @ 11:45 AM: **larsonpenny**

@FKeough: In regard to your post "Once the Nazi analogy is used, all credibility is lost! If this is the preponderance of what this woman is seeing, then I have to question her research." I understand your concern however I was at the presentation yesterday and Ms. Ruud was/is not calling anyone a Nazi. She was explaining the use of language to polarize citizens. Specifically, she was discussing "dehumanization" which was used in Nazi propaganda. If you go to Google and type in "What is dehumanization?" or go to Wisegeek.com for the definition, it will clarify Ms. Ruud's discussion.

KR: This workshop participant is making sure FKeough understands what I have shared in the workshop is *verifiable information*. The poster may see an attempt at using the **Poisoning the well** strategy of polarization at work here ("KR research has .. no credibility"). Guiding FKeough to a source that confirms the *independent documentation* of the polarizing strategy of **Dehumanizing Imagery** (i.e. dehumanization is *documented* Nazi-talk) is a counter-strategy: *Feel and heal* + guide to documentation.

April 11, 2011 @ 11:51 AM: **kathrynruud**

CORRECTION to my 11:35 a.m. comment @ doreen: "I attended 2 colleges (U. of Colo. during the late 60's/ conservative atmosphere --- and Georgetown early 80's/conservative atmosphere." CU had a definitely liberal atmosphere & still does. A great place to study & ski.

April 11, 2011 @ 11:57 AM: **ratbird66**

Look it, there's nothing wrong with being a libtard, m'kay.

KR: Like the label "conservatard", this is derogatory, offensive to the intellectually challenged and their families. Counter-strategies: *Name the frame* and *Emote, not remote* (see below).

April 11, 2011 @ 12:04 PM: **boycerensberger**

And let me also take "nwyrkghos" to task for crude and ignorant comments from the Left. What, I wonder, is accomplished by saying "screw the [insert your most despised political entity here]"? As I see it, the only people who say this in public have nothing more intelligent to say. It's the wail of a desperate and hopeless partisan. C'mon nwyrkghos, do you have anything to

say that might help solve the problems you see?

KR: Great response! Here a poster takes his own side to task, and asks for constructive *input*, not just *put-downs*. Unless you are able to *nudge those on your own side of the political fence to take the high road*, you are in no position to ask it from those you disagree with. Poster has prepared for debate by using the *Train the brain* counter-strategy and knows the trashing can come from either side.

April 11, 2011 @ 12:07 PM: **Paramour**

Pollsters now project Obama can win the White House in 2012 with as little as out 3 out of 10 white voters regardless of voter turnout. This is preventing any serious competition with the exception of a candidate linked to a domestic terrorist organization and a millionaire posing as a billionaire who has been divorced 4 times and filed bankruptcy twice.

April 11, 2011 @ 12:08 PM: **boycerensberger**

Okay, ratbird66, cut out the name calling. Don't you have something to contribute that has value in this discussion? You surely recognize, don't you, that you are validating the alarms Ruud is raising? Libtard and Repthugs are two of the terms (both cited by Ruud in her talks) that simply debase the conversation in which you engage.

KR: Accurate. I do discuss both terms, and many other demeaning words used by *both* sides. Just one poster taking this tack consistently can lift the tone of an entire thread. This is *Stop the spiral* -- keep your eye on the prize.

April 11, 2011 @ 12:10 PM: **kathrynruud**

@ ratbird: "Look it, there's nothing wrong with being a libtard, m'kay" Hey, ratbird, I am glad you are on the thread cause it shows you read our community news & I assume this means you must care about what is going on around you. Part of what I notice going on around me is that there are people in our community with disabilities. Some of these are physical -- people in wheelchairs, or those with serious limps, some who are blind and others who sign due to deafness. Some are disabled by mental illness. When I hear someone call another person a "retard" or a "Libtard" or a "Conservatard", I find this very offensive --- and I think many other people reading your words find it offensive, too. That is because, whether we are Dems, Repubs, Tea or Green, we all know people who are intellectually challenged -- and many of these folks are kind and gentle people. It hurts their feelings to be called "tard" and it hurts the feelings of their families and friends, too. When I hear this expression, I think of my friend Charlie, who loads groceries into my car, or of Penny, a Special Olympics swimming competitor, who hands me my key & towel when I go to the YMCA. If you want to be persuasive, ratbird, you might want to drop this name-calling. I would love to hear what ideas you would like to bring to the board. What are your concerns? Do have ideas for solutions to problems, political issues, whatever?

KR: Counter-strategies to use of libtard:

Praise the positive: This poster reads community news.

Name the frame: This is unkind, offensive (tone & words).

Feel and heal: Make your own feelings, and the feelings of others known.

Emote, not remote: Show compassion.

Muddy the puddle: Counter any **stereotype** with your own personal experiences.

April 11, 2011 @ 12:12 PM: **boycerensberger**

By the way, my compliments to the reporter who covered the workshop. I attended it and found her story quite fair and accurate. I only wish her byline had appeared with it, so that I could send the compliment directly.

KR: Poster *Praises the positive:* democracy requires *accurate informatio*n on which to base debates such as this one.

April 11, 2011 @ 12:14 PM: **farm21702**

The Nazis were people too, you know. My uncle was prisoner on a camp there, and I heard it straight from him that the portrait of the evil Nazi was just propaganda. Most of them were just decent people serving their country, just like our military men and women. So if you're concerned about dehumanizing large groups of people, how about starting with your polarizing language towards Nazis.

KR: Very interesting comment. [KR to self: "Be quick, but don't hurry."] Where has this person gotten this impression, this information, this idea? -- and here he tells us. *Ideology is based on in-group truth*. Here the "in-group" is family. But in a sense this is still **Ideology over information**, a polarizing strategy. This is not division, though -- but the opposite: making two very different groups seem the very same ("just like our military").

Nazis definitely elevated and acted on inhumane values (I go into this in my talk, **Manipulation of key moral values**), but some U.S. soldiers did experience fair treatment in POW camps run by German military. See documentary "The Ritchie Boys". And it is true that those who became Nazis were people, and in that sense, were "like" us. This is one reason German history provides universal lessons for all people, everywhere. (more response below)

April 11, 2011 @ 12:17 PM: **kathrynruud**

@ Paramour: "Pollsters now project Obama can win the White House in 2012 with as little as out 3 out of 10 white voters regardless of voter turnout. This is preventing any serious competition with the exception of a candidate linked to a domestic terrorist organization and a millionaire posing as a billionaire who has been divorced 4 times and filed bankruptcy twice." Ok, moving into some ideas here... I am wondering where you saw this poll, Paramour. And what do these poll results mean to you? What should they mean to us? Whenever any of us hear "information" these days, it's always a good idea to ask: *is this verified info?* By that I mean -- *are the sources for the info given?* Are there clear facts given so that you ca*n make up your own mind* about what is accurate? Or *is your "information" interpreted for you* by some kind of mega-mouth like Olbermann or Limbaugh? Per "terrorists" & "4 times divorced", who are you referring to? It is not clear, at least to me.

KR: **Ideology over information**? I am trying to figure out if this poster has any verified info or is, instead, *apparently starting or spreading rumors.*

April 11, 2011 @ 12:22 PM: **farm21702**

And don't pick on ratbird, m'kay. He's our comic relief here, m'kay. He's a good guy, m'kay.

April 11, 2011 @ 12:23 PM: **alovelyplace**

The problem here is anonymity. It's why no one posts on the Gazette. And that FNP loves the income from allowing it. To improve the social discourse start with the press for publishing it.

KR: Poster shows concern over current tone of discourse. Bravo! S/he sees a problem And s/he recognizes trash talk may enhance media revenue (*Name the frame*), a big part of the challenge democracy faces. Also makes the suggestion "start with the press": Strategy of *Civil citizen,* expressing public's need, desire for standards.

April 11, 2011 @ 12:23 PM: **ratbird66**

kathrynruud, ya just have to be a tad bit smarter than who you're working with, m'kay.

April 11, 2011 @ 12:23 PM: **kathrynruud**

@farm21702: "The Nazis were people too, you know. My uncle was prisoner on a camp there, and I heard it straight from him that the portrait of the evil Nazi was just propaganda. Most of them were just decent people serving their country, just like our military men and women. So if you're concerned about dehumanizing large groups of people, how about starting with your polarizing language towards Nazis. " -------farm, this is a very important comment that you are making here, and one well worth spending some time on. My guess (and it is only a guess), is that your family is of German background. Is this correct? I speak German and have talked with many Germans (older & younger) about the Nazi era. I you are still on the thread, I hope you can stick around. Was your uncle in an American POW camp for German soldiers?

KR: Frederick County has many families of German heritage. I am seeking more info "Be quick, but don't hurry".

April 11, 2011 @ 12:25 PM: **kathrynruud**

@ ratbird: "kathrynruud, ya just have to be a tad bit smarter than who you're working with, m'kay." Sounds like you & McKay have an ongoing rivalry. Ever think about getting together over a cold beer? You might find you like each other.

KR: Counter-strategy: *Stop the spiral,* or at least mention there are other options. :-)

April 11, 2011 @ 12:27 PM: **larsonpenny**

When 9 year old Christina Green was shot and killed in Arizona, my heart felt torn in two. As I heard the news reports I instantly thought of how the hateful language used in some media can push people to hate without questioning. We live in a fast moving culture and it's easy to name call and blame. We need to go back to thinking about and discussing hot political

issues in a calm, rational manner. This is how problems really get solved. We many never know if the man in AZ was influenced by the media, or just mentally ill, or both, but I think it is clear that people can assume that all this name calling and unsupported partisan accusations can only hurt America. We need thoughtful compromise based on facts, long term goals, and commitment that overarches election cycles.

KR: Very rich, positive comment here. Poster *Names the frame*: calls attention to tone ("name call and blame"). Poster also shows compassion ("my heart felt torn in two"/*Emote, not remote*) brings up *various causes* behind decline in productive dialogue (**avoids Scapegoating**, emphasizes we do have a rational side, senses (correctly) that *name-calling and quick accusations* can hurt democratic debate and our country (shows love of country - important). Wants to solve problems, not just vent. This is all *Civil Citizen*.

When I discuss the counter-strategy *Civil citizen*, I emphasize the difference between *ethnic* nationalism and *civic* nationalism. When this poster writes that intense partisanship can "hurt the country", s/he is speaking of our *civic* values. Point made: we have big problems, big goals that go beyond election cycles. In pointing out the bigger picture, this poster also is keeping his/her eyes on the prize: *Stop the spiral*.

April 11, 2011 @ 12:28 PM: **kathrynruud**

@ farm21702:" And don't pick on ratbird, m'kay. He's our comic relief here, m'kay. He's a good guy, m'kay" --- It must be springtime. I am picking up a note of love (or at least like) in the air. --- But how bout those ideas, guys? And farm21702, I really want to hear your story.

KR: Counter-strategy: *Stop the spiral*.

April 11, 2011 @ 12:29 PM: **farm21702**

Did you just give a lecture on polarizing language to dehumanize people, and then just call Olbermann or Limbaugh mega-mouths? Hmmm...that's confusing. I call them men because I don't like to use polarizing language to dehumanize people. Mind you, I don't care for either one of them.

KR: farm21702 catches on right away, tries out an identification and counter-strategy himself. I like this. (See response below).

April 11, 2011 @ 12:30 PM: **ratbird66**

Sew, why can't a liberal just admit it, m'kay?

April 11, 2011 @ 12:35 PM: **kathrynruud**

@ alovelyplace:" The problem here is anonymity. It's why no one posts on the Gazette. And that FNP loves the income from allowing it. To improve the social discourse start with the press for publishing it." -- I agree, LP, anonymity allows people to show 'the dark side' with no consequences & many newspapers, are beginning to require poster to give some i.d.---- However, as one who has participated in many political blogs, I have found it has great advantages. I usually choose a gender-neutral handle (screen name). That is fun because you can argue with men & women, the old & the young, the radical & the moderate, and no one knows if you are male or female. It makes the exchanges more real in a way. Also, when you encounter a real political bully or a real extremist (at least in language use) you can assert your own views very forcefully & anonymity protects you , too.

KR: Here I use the Counter-strategy of *Woman's way*. I do not know if this poster is male or female (unless the screen name clearly tells me so). Just chatting, but maybe also connecting. I am reaching toward common ground, saying, *I get your concerns*. Of course, men can use this counter-strategy, too!

This poster also points out that media outlets benefit from conflict and may even promote it. That is a way of identifying the polarizing strategies of **Polarity of Tone** and **Ideology over Information,** used by media outlets, personalities that promote *affirmation/opinion-based journalism over verification/fact-based journalism*. The first may be entertaining, but takes listeners in *circles*. The latter moves us all *forward*.

April 11, 2011 @ 12:37 PM: **masterque78**

@kathrynruud Thank you for trying. I have limit the amount of the responses that I read on these blogs. I have found that there are some very unhappy and closed minded individuals. I often have to remember how I was raised not to judge all people the same way. Lord knows its hard but I do it. If you change one person thought process around then you were successful. Good Luck with that one.

KR: Last comment shows cynicism?? Find out. "Be quick, but don't hurry" (see below)

This is someone I would hope would continue to participate, on this thread, or elsewhere.

April 11, 2011 @ 12:39 PM: **farm21702**

No, not German. Just a plain old American with dark brown hair and brown eyes. And yes, my uncle was a POW. He was 6'5" and starved down to 100 pounds. That sounds evil, right? Except when you find out that his captors were starving too. There was no food, period. He was captured Christmas Day, so the head Nazi gave my uncle half of his sandwich and the rest of his beer. The evil Nazis let the prisoners write home too, and their families received their mail. To truly understand what happened in any war, you have to listen to both sides, and understand that history books are written by the side that won the war.

KR: An interesting story. Good point about learning history from different perspectives. I did this with WWII history, studied it first in English, then in German. *Different perspectives, but (importantly) the same facts*. Countering *in-group truth* with independent *verifiable* info/facts. (more below)

April 11, 2011 @ 12:43 PM: **kathrynruud**

@larsonpenny: "When 9 year old Christina Green was shot and killed in Arizona, my heart felt torn in two. As I heard the news reports I instantly thought of how the hateful language used in some media can push people to hate without questioning. We live in a fast moving culture and it's easy to name call and blame. We need to go back to thinking about and discussing hot political issues in a calm, rational manner. This is how problems really get solved. We many never know if the man in AZ was influenced by the media, or just mentally ill, or both, but I think it is clear that people can assume that all this name calling and unsupported partisan accusations can only hurt America. We need thoughtful compromise based on facts, long term goals, and commitment that overarches election cycles."-------- It is good that you bring up this tragedy, awful as it was. That incident, in which 19 Americans were shot in their own neighborhood as they gathered to speak to their own representative, was a kind of terrible signal about our society. --- But it is very complex, and does not (in my opinion) just come down to language. Posters can read a full article (not too long) I wrote on the Tucson shootings on my blogsite Home page : www.stoppolarizingtalk.org --- What we can certainly say is that, in the way we use language in politics these days, we are becoming more venomous. It is not just Dems who are noticing this -- Repubs are noticing it, too. And many Repubs have expressed their concern about this to me.

KR: I reaffirm points made by this poster, also attempt to further break through black/white, in-group/out-group division (using *Muddy the puddle/* we are in this together) by making the accurate statement that *both* Democrats and Republicans see there is a growing problem with our political discourse.

April 11, 2011 @ 12:43 PM: **qoph**

@kathrynruud--I am a conservative, if I must be labeled. I make a great effort to avoid name calling and ad hominem arguments. I don't know that I would vote for her, but I have observed the absolute destruction of Sarah Palin and her family members by a liberal left that seems to respect no boundaries where Palins are concerned. Do you have any thoughts on that particular subject?

KR: Poster sounds very polite and has a good point re Palin, though he lumps "liberal left" together as "absolutely destructive": **Stereotyping, scapegoating**. Good manners matter, though.. so I hope I can connect with this poster.

April 11, 2011 @ 12:51 PM: **Paramour**

Most Muslims are conservative while most Christians are liberal.

KR: I cannot figure out where this poster is coming from. Vague statements with nothing to hold on to. So I'll move on.

April 11, 2011 @ 12:55 PM: **Paramour**

Jesus was a liberal and Muhammad was a conservative.

April 11, 2011 @ 12:55 PM: **thebensonfamily**

oh you bunch of Nazi's .hahahaha

April 11, 2011 @ 12:57 PM: **kathrynruud**

@ farm: "Did you just give a lecture on polarizing language to dehumanize people, and then just call Olbermann or Limbaugh mega-mouths? Hmmm...that's confusing. I call them men because I don't like to use polarizing language to dehumanize people. Mind you, I don't care for either one of them." --- Ok, farm, I would still like to talk about Nazis vs. Germans & your family experience, but will respond here. Yes, I use the term **"mega-mouth"** intentionally. Name-calling in and of itself has a long tradition in American debate. The name-calling gets dangerous when it gets into *dehumanization* (or even excessive,

derogatory labeling -- such as "evil" "traitorous", "destroying our country", "fascist", "communist" "Marxist" unless it is truly, genuinely warranted, and based on clear facts). If you listen to my talk on www.stoppolarizingtalk.org, you will hear that I studied manipulative speech as it was used in German history -- by fascists in the interwar period, and by communists, in post-war East Germany. Hitler used dehumanizing language relentlessly. He called Jews "parasites, leeches, maggots, the plague, a virus, bacilli" etc.----- He shrieked terrible things at his enthusiastic supporters, telling them these "maggots" were devouring Germany, and so on. --- Ask yourself -- what is your natural reaction, your personal reaction -- if you think your "body" is being "devoured" by "maggots"?? How did the Nazi party "solve" this "problem"?

KR: None of us like to be told what we can or cannot say (or think). I am no different! But many use labels such as "cops" for policemen, "jerk" for a rude person, "huckster" for someone selling nonsense . Such terms are common. **"Mega-mouth"** is my term for those who spout opinion to millions 5 x wk. But especially when we use the polarizing strategy of **Dehumanizing Imagery** - Nazi-talk -- the name-calling enters truly dangerous waters.

April 11, 2011 @ 01:00 PM: **alovelyplace**

Have any of you ever looked in the archives for an old FNP article ? Ever notice that every comment you've ever made is there and will even pull up in a Google search? Or that one day, like with Bruce Ivins, the post may decide to release them all, along with your name? will you stand behind the terrible things you write here, I wonder?

KR: This *Civil citizen* continues to raise the awareness of the whole thread. S/he speaks of personal responsibility for our words, in effect says "Words have consequences" (a Limbaughism, though he ignores negative consequences of polarizing strategies). Glad to see this. His/her efforts may seem futile, but they are not. We create reality with our words.

April 11, 2011 @ 01:01 PM: **thebensonfamily**

seriously.Read The war of the world by Niall Ferguson. The 20th century was the most murderous period in history WORLDWIDE.The Russians ,Japanese ,Cambodian and the United States among others killed millions and millions of their neighbors and fellow countrymen as well as anyone else who got in their way. Nazi's don't get a bad rap but they were hardly alone in their murderous sprees.

KR: Important to remember, and relevant to polarizing talk.(see below)

April 11, 2011 @ 01:03 PM: **kathrynruud**

@ master: " (to kathryn:) Thank you for trying. I have limit the amount of the responses that I read on these blogs. I have found that there are some very unhappy and closed minded individuals. I often have to remember how I was raised not to judge all people the same way. Lord knows its hard but I do it. If you change one person thought process around then you were successful. Good Luck with that one" ---- Master, thanks for the encouragement, but I detect cynicism here. --- Please note, it is not my intent to change anyone, say, from Dem to Repub (or the other way around). --- It is to hopefully give folks something to think about here & the next time there are on a thread. I do have a fierce concern about protecting democratic debate, because democracy is dependent on debate. It doesn't have to be nicey-nice, but we don't want to buy into using the language strategies of extremism, either. --- As citizens, standing by while that happens is the worst thing we can do. -- I hope you will continue to participate.

KR: I use the counter-strategy of *Civil citizen* to point out that "civility" is not about being sugary-sweet, especially in political debate. The fierce expression of opinion must be protected. But it is possible to be fierce without using trash talk. -- And a note of encouragement. It is good to be optimistic (it makes for better debate, and makes you more persuasive).

April 11, 2011 @ 01:05 PM: **sasquatch.the.pirate**

Kathryn, I would argue that a lot of the polarizing and dehumanizing language used on this and thousands of other forums is more a result of our 10 second sound bite media culture and lack of reason debate in all areas (media, campaign, legislative) in favor of the kind of debate where you walk in with an agenda and merely present your points without the other party even needing to be there. This stems not only for a lack of respect for the truth (or facts if you prefer) but also from a lack of respect for each other and each other's opinions. For example I personally have no problem having political debates with the most fascist guy in town simply because I know at the end he and I are both seeing the same problems, but disagreeing on the best way to fix them and I can respect that (even if I have great distain for his chosen methods). However, I can not have a debate with someone like Mr. Duck who, in my opinion, poses as something he is not in order to achieve the end goal of a seat on a certain congressional committee because I have no respect for him due to what perceive as a disingenuous front. I believe the key to it all is a return to being genuine instead of everyone wearing plastic corporate/special interest/religious masks. Once we accomplish that the language will self correct.

KR: Wonderful post. This person sees many things working together, understands the Info Age is at least half the problem (I agree), and expresses regret over diminished personal, face-to-face, openly public (not anonymous) debate. Note: Cognitive linguists theorize that only 2% of our thinking is consciously processed, the rest is unconscious (see George Lakoff). Much of that 98% of understanding comes from our observations of the other we are speaking with (tone, facial expression, pitch, loudness, gestures, etc.). No wonder we are misunderstanding each other so much these days!

April 11, 2011 @ 01:16 PM: **Paramour**

There are no conservatives in a nation with a 15 trillion dollar deficit only beneficiaries.

April 11, 2011 @ 01:17 PM: **kathrynruud**

@ farm: "No, not German. Just a plain old American with dark brown hair and brown eyes. And yes, my uncle was a POW. He was 6'5" and starved down to 100 pounds. That sounds evil, right? Except when you find out that his captors were starving too. There was no food, period. He was captured Christmas Day, so the head Nazi gave my uncle half of his sandwich and the rest of his beer. The evil Nazis let the prisoners write home too, and their families received their mail. To truly understand what happened in any war, you have to listen to both sides, and understand that history books are written by the side that won the war." ---- Interesting, farm. As I young woman (early 20's) I worked in Germany & Austria, and as an American, I was very curious, asked many questions, had many conversations. One of them was with an older German (a Nazi party member) who was captured by American soldiers. He was still griping about being stripped naked, left in the cold for three days with no food. Given that he had been a party member, I was not flooded with sympathy. In my own circle of family friends there is an 87 year-old who fought in the front lines and was one of the first to liberate the concentration camp, Matthausen. But all of these stories are important and I hope your uncle writes down, or records, his memories.------- Re Nazi vs. German, I would say this: (and these are generalizations) --- German soldiers were "just like" other soldiers from other countries in the sense that they were drafted & were "serving" their country. Nazis are a different story (regardless of how your uncle may have been treated) --- because they supported a particular, very narrow, rigid ideology -- that was not enthusiastically promoted or embraced by the rest of the German people. And Hitler was the leader of that ideology & that movement, which of course led the world into WWII and 70 million deaths, 40 million of them civilians. --- This is why it is so important to learn accurate, factual history -- not just the history you "hear" about or "wish" was --- these were real people who died due to causes & an ideology. This factual history is documented in thousands of books, some written by U.S. scholar-soldiers who did post-war research.

KR: Relying on just a few personal stories about WWII (even if accurate) only begins to scratch the surface of this extraordinarily complex series of events. Justifying one's own viewpoint based on one or two stories can easily turn into **Ideology over information** -- a strategy of polarization. But I am glad this poster shared this interesting story on the board.

April 11, 2011 @ 01:29 PM: **kathrynruud**

@goph: -"I am a conservative, if I must be labeled. I make a great effort to avoid name calling and ad hominem arguments. I don't know that I would vote for her, but I have observed the absolute destruction of Sarah Palin and her family members by a liberal left that seems to respect no boundaries where Palins are concerned. Do you have any thoughts on that particular subject?"----- Goph, very glad to hear you reject over-the-top name calling & personal attacks. I have noticed there are many conservatives who hold to these standards. Increasingly and fortunately, there are also more who seem willing to try to hold their own hot-heads to these standards as well. --- Per Palin & her family, I am very glad you asked this question. IMHO, Palin has been treated horribly. The dear woman's face has travelled a million miles in the land of cut & paste. More than anything, she has been subjected to intense, cruel sexism by both Dem and Repub men (and a few women, too). I feel there was a huge overreaction to Palin after she was selected as a V.P. candidate -- her opening speech seemed so formidable, and she was a striking presence. Every candidate's words, political philosophy, sources of information (reading interests) -- all of that is legitimate, necessary to crticize. But her looks and her gender should have been left out of it.---- And post-Tucson, she was **scapegoated** by the left. See my full article on that on my Home page at www.stoppolarizingtalk.org

KR: *Praise the positive:* I am a registered Dem, but can see this Republican, or conservative, is a good person and concerned about the ugliness in political discourse. *Women's way* comes into play here, because the sexism should concern women, and good men, too. **I should have been more careful** on the last statement, writing ***"some*** on the left". And Pat Buchanan & Joe Scarborough, both conservatives, also expressed strong concern over Palin's choice of words and metaphors.

What was illegitimate was blaming her as personally, nearly solely, responsible for the shooter's actions. History shows us, though, that *language can create a climate where such actions are more likely, even encouraged. Language can make such actions seem moral to some.* (See my chapter in **At War with Words**, amazon.com, or Video of talk, part 5)

April 11, 2011 @ 01:35 PM: **tuscanamia**

Kathryn, one finds lots of parroting of party line/pet agenda talking points here, but not as much evidence of real thinking. Real thinking and civility have waned in recent years. The coarsening of the culture and dumbing-down of the populace is reaching critical mass just when anxiety and rapid change are upon us. In addition, so many have traded faith for materialism. We are in the midst of a cultural tsunami! Re: anonymity, while it can get out of hand, it also frees one to express unpopular but important thoughts.

KR: Tuscamania also highlights problem of **Ideology over Information.** S/he is a *Civil citizen* poster who sees the complexities of our age and strongly affirms the freedom of expression of "unpopular, but important thoughts". Good post. I hope to *Praise the positive.*(see below)

April 11, 2011 @ 01:35 PM: **kathrynruud**

@ LP "Have any of you ever looked in the archives for an old FNP article ? Ever notice that every comment you've ever made is there and will even pull up in a Google search? Or that one day, like with Bruce Ivins, the post may decide to release them all, along with your name? will you stand behind the terrible things you write here, I wonder?" ------- Excellent, excellent point --- and it is "all there" not just for public view, but for your children, your grandchildren, your neighbors, your church members, your community. Even in our fast-paced info age, it pays to "think before you post". Or as basketball coach John Wooden put it "Be quick, but don't hurry"

KR: *Praise the positive,* and reinforce personal responsibility. Thanks to LP for being a *Civil citizen*.

April 11, 2011 @ 01:41 PM: **kathrynruud**

@ benson: "seriously.Read The war of the world by Niall Ferguson. The 20th century was the most murderous period in history WORLDWIDE.The Russians ,Japanese ,Cambodian and the United States among others killed millions and millions of their neighbors and fellow countrymen as well as anyone else who got in their way. Nazi's don't get a bad rap but they were hardly alone in their murderous sprees." --- A post worth reading & a reminder that the Nazis do not stand alone in their propensity to violence or in their members' vulnerability to propaganda. We know enough now to prevent such widespread devastation. We need to continually work in that directly: we can honor the sacrifices of the Greatest Generation by doing so, too,,, Sadly, they are all leaving us now, and we are on our own in battling extremisms of the future.

KR: *Praise the positive,* poster is a *Civil citizen* (reinforce by also acknowledging WWII generation, affirming concerns over destruction brought on by war, need to prevent future wars.)

April 11, 2011 @ 01:50 PM: **ratbird66**

So Kathy, how was your relationship with your father? You sound bitter and disgruntled, m'kay.

April 11, 2011 @ 01:52 PM: **kathrynruud**

@ sasquatsch (sp?):" Kathryn, I would argue that a lot of the polarizing and dehumanizing language used on this and thousands of other forums is more a result of our 10 second sound bite media culture and lack of reason debate in all areas (media, campaign, legislative) in favor of the kind of debate where you walk in with an agenda and merely present your points without the other party even needing to be there. This stems not only for a lack of respect for the truth (or facts if you prefer) but also from a lack of respect for each other and each other's opinions. For example I personally have no problem having political debates with the most fascist guy in town simply because I know at the end he and I are both seeing the same problems, but disagreeing on the best way to fix them and I can respect that (even if I have great distain for his chosen methods). However, I can not have a debate with someone like Mr. Duck who, in my opinion, poses as something he is not in order to achieve the end goal of a seat on a certain congressional committee because I have no respect for him due to what perceive as a disingenuous front. I believe the key to it all is a return to being genuine instead of everyone wearing plastic corporate/special interest/religious masks. Once we accomplish that the language will self correct. " ------ I do not know Mr. Duck and can't respond to that. ---- i would agree that we are up against 2 problems here: the use of derogatory, polarizing speech and the information age itself, which allows lightening speed transmission of every last gut reaction. They do go hand-in-hand, and I expect the problem of polarizing speech will continue (despite the booting of Olbermann and Beck from their respective platforms) because the information age continues. As do the huge profits coming to some who use these strategies to grab audience attention and to sell products. The use of extreme language (they call it "provocative talk") is a formula that is working for the mega-mouths. Problem is, the effects are showering down on the rest of us.--- You make a very good point about how fruitful face-to-face communication/debate can be. As we move somewhat away from print culture into a more oral culture, I hope this old tradition (which our founders studied as "rhetoric") can be revived. In the meantime, we have a growing problem on our hands.

KR: Reinforce good points here, *Praise the positive.* This person also promotes one-on-one, face-to-face open discussion, good *Civil citizen* practices.

April 11, 2011 @ 01:56 PM: **nwyrkghos**

@qoph,Sarah Palin is an uneducated,quitter.Can you argue against that.She has only a two year college degree,yet we are supposed to take someone like that seriously for President,or anything other than dog catcher? She was elected to a governorship by an equally uneducated populace and then quit to become a reality tv media whore along with her entire clan.She is no more sacred then Charlie Sheen or Lindsay Lohan and is irrelevant to anyone but tea bag loons.

KR: nwyrkghos is *a left-wing trash talker* (see below) He is using an ugly tone. **Polarity of tone** is a strategy of polarization. He uses it intensely, and therefore is a trash talker. Counter-strategy: *Name the frame* (see below)

April 11, 2011 @ 02:06 PM: **kathrynruud**

@ tuscanamia: "Kathryn, one finds lots of parroting of party line/pet agenda talking points here, but not as much evidence of real thinking. Real thinking and civility have waned in recent years. The coarsening of the culture and dumbing-down of the populace is reaching critical mass just when anxiety and rapid change are upon us. In addition, so many have traded faith for materialism. We are in the midst of a cultural tsunami! Re: anonymity, while it can get out of hand, it also frees one to express unpopular but important thoughts."--- Tuscanamia, very thoughtful post here.. Your insight is connecting the dots.. there is a relationship between the rise of "talking points" and the demise of thinking. Neuroscientists theorize (from studies, research, evidence) that it is a universal, human tendency to simplify information we are taking in. This is especially true now that we are being inundated with so much info. Just repeating "talking points" makes us feel like we are participating -- but on the more enjoyable, meaningful level, we are not. Things, good things, don't really begin to happen til we start using our own independent thought processes. This is something our Founders (students of the Enlightenment) definitely understood -- it is why they placed so much trust in people. They trusted us to think, analyze and question for ourselves.---- And your other insight here, that the huge changes we are experiencing (info age, globalization, digitalization, automation, etc) are hitting us at a time when we are losing faith and emphasizing materialism --- this is not new. History, including pre-WWII history-- shows this reaction is part of what tends to happen in scary times, rapid-change times. So people in Germany, which was very hard hit, were vulnerable to the false religion of Nazism. Polarizing linguistic strategies swept them in...

KR: This poster sees the complexities, many facets of change, and is bringing fresh, relevant ideas into the discussion. *Praise the positive.* Faith is a complex topic, but there are some underlying values most religions share (kindness toward others, for instance) that can help us through bumpy weather. That is another discussion.

April 11, 2011 @ 02:10 PM: **kathrynruud**

@ ratbird: " Kathy, how was your relationship with your father? You sound bitter and disgruntled, m'kay" --- Ratbird, this falls into the category of "none of your beeswax". Bitter? Disgruntled? -- With the results brought on the world from the rise of extremism & WWII. Yeah, I was affected by that. --- But I can guarantee you, I don't participate on threads with you or anyone else because I believe in pessimism. I am an optimistic American, through and through.

KR: I think Ratbird shows up primarily to needle others. This kind of poster has every right to post, but should mainly be ignored. It can contribute something to the board just to point out the annoying tone he uses. *Name the frame*.

April 11, 2011 @ 02:17 PM: **kathrynruud**

@nwyrkghos: Objection, objection here... good grief... I am a registered Dem, but your vulgar comments (now referring to Palin as a "whore") are really demeaning, an embarrassing to me as your fellow Dem. Not just to her, but to all female candidates . Ladies, if you dislike this kind of sexist trash talk as much as I do, visit the website **nameitchangeit.org** --- formed by Republican and Democratic female candidates to fight this kind of junk! --- And yes, I too found Palin unqualified to be in the powerful position of Vice President. Most Americans agree, it seems.

KR: Counter-strategy to sexism: *Woman's way*. Also, to counter **Polarity of tone**, *Name the frame:* (tone is demeaning, embarrassing).

April 11, 2011 @ 02:24 PM: **kathrynruud**

KR taking a break, but will check in later for more talk about polarizing talk. Glad to see the comments.

April 11, 2011 @ 03:05 PM: **boycerensberger**

Several of you keep referring to "the media" as some kind of bogeyman. The term is so broad that it has no usefulness in discussions like these. The media is a category that includes books, movies, newspapers, radio, pamphlets, TV, the Web and more. Let's at least be specific enough to distinguish between professional journalism, which has strict standards to strive toward accuracy and fairness, and, on the other hand, the talk-radio and talk-TV industries, which explicitly consider themselves to be entertainment, not journalism. (There is even a trade magazine for this industry; it's called Talkers. Check it out.) If you want somebody else's personal opinions and unverified assertions of supposed facts, listen to Limbaugh, Beck, Hannity, Savage, Ingraham and the like. BUT if you want actual facts that have been verified by professional gatherers of new information (news), go to real journalists--The New York Times, AP, The Washington Post, The Wall Street Journal, Politico, NPR News and many more. There is a wealth of verified, fair news out there and, with the exception of the WSJ and part of the NYT, it's free on the Web. Skip the editorial and Op-Ed pages. Go straight to the news stories and read all about it. If you're smart enough to form your own opinions, you don't need the opinionizers to tell you what to think. Make up YOUR OWN mind.

KR: Poster points out the strategy of polarization so common on much of political talk radio: **Ideology over information**. Again touches on democracy's need for *journalism of verification* as opposed to *journalism of affirmation*. Good arguments here. Our founders definitely did not want us following Pied Pipers.

April 11, 2011 @ 03:16 PM: **davedenn**

Hello, I wasnt trying to be sarcastic, I heard of this back in the 70's while staying with my Grandparents one summer, I was 10 they were in their late 50's early 60's then. they had friends over and had the tv on. and Carter was giving and address this was mid to late 70's and he mentioned Social or equal justice. and the guest of my grandparents starting talking about Hitler and Stalin being 10 all I knew of these two was what Combat and Hogans hereos, and every now and then one would catch the World at war seires on tv, so I listened. and they talked about the rallies in Germany and the promice of social and Equal justice that both Stalin and Hitler were talking about in the days before the war...they thought it was sad that people fell for this talk and were sad Jimmy Carter was now using it...That always stuck with me. and from school and over the years of reading and talking to people who are over 70 that the two are really the same. My Grandfather used to tell me about FDR wanted to go with a simular set up that the nazi's and the communist used in our country, and he said if it sounds to good to be true it is so the promice of free anything will always have strings attached.

KR: This poster comes across as speaking straight, this is his honest appraisal of the meaning of "social justice". (It should be noted that this interpretation is in line with Glenn Beck's take on "social justice": Beck exploits the polarizing strategy of **Manipulating a key moral concept**.)

But davedenn is correct when he says Stalinism and fascism can be very alike -- *at the regime stage,* they are. But t*heir starting points & ideologies* are *very different*. Poster does not seem aware of this. History takes more than a couple personal stories to understand (see below). But I am glad this poster has responded, telling us his impressions from childhood.

April 11, 2011 @ 03:34 PM: **dmreid2**

I'm guessing it's somebody's "time." Period.

April 11, 2011 @ 03:55 PM: **kathrynruud**

@davedenn:" Hello, I wasnt trying to be sarcastic, I heard of this back in the 70's while staying with my Grandparents one summer, I was 10 they were in their late 50's early 60's then. they had friends over and had the tv on. and Carter was giving and address this was mid to late 70's and he mentioned Social or equal justice. and the guest of my grandparents starting talking about Hitler and Stalin being 10 all I knew of these two was what Combat and Hogans hereos, and every now and then one would catch the World at war seires on tv, so I listened. and they talked about the rallies in Germany and the promice of social and Equal justice that both Stalin and Hitler were talking about in the days before the war...they thought it was sad that people fell for this talk and were sad Jimmy Carter was now using it...That always stuck with me. and from school and over the years of reading and talking to people who are over 70 that the two are really the same. My Grandfather used to tell me about FDR wanted to go with a simular set up that the nazi's and the communist used in our country, and he said if it sounds to good to be true it is so the promice of free anything will always have strings attached."------ Ok, dave, glad you are back to explain where you heard this. My grandparents also talked about history, the grandchildren of Holocaust survivors have heard some history straight from their grandparents, and farm21702 took the story of his uncle as a history lesson. --- This is fine, on one level. But history is large -- and something as large as WWII has many large roots & causes. I studied German history first as an undergraduate (in English) then later as a graduate student (all classes, papers, etc.) were in German. It is all so much bigger than one person's story.----- There was a lot of bitterness in Germany after they lost WWI, and it is true that there were calls for "justice", not just the payment of huge reparations the victorious powers (France, Britain) demanded be paid by average Germans. And it is also true that Hitler was a 'man of the people' who, in his speeches, spoke of bringing "jobs, bread, and shoes" to the poverty-stricken in Germany (they had 36% unemployment).---- So this may have been what your grandparents recall. --- As I understand "social justice" it is a call (Christian-based, but also in other religions, I think) to care for those who are born into poverty, or are mistreated for no other reason than having a dark skin -- that kind of thing. People I know who are concerned about social justice are definitely not the types who would've been on the streets marching with Hitler salutes. --- It is very insulting to those people, many of them deeply religious, to have "social justice" equated with Nazism and Communism. These are 3 very different things.

KR: Basing understanding of large events on just one story or two comes close to **Ideology over information,** a strategy of polarization. Broad events require broad reading to begin to grasp them.. Always good to ask "Where did you get this idea?" *Ideology is based on in-group "truth" (here, recollection from an early family conversation),* not objective, observed, recorded, *verifiable* facts) We can't just be expected to "take someone's word for it", especially when trying to see how the past affects the present/future. We need to read from sources that give us documented facts & then figure it out ourselves.

Counter-strategy to the polarizing strategy **Manipulation of key moral concept**s, as used by Beck and repeated by others: ***stick to, reaffirm the genuine definition*** of the moral concept, "social justice".

April 11, 2011 @ 04:16 PM: **farm21702**

Hmmm...in your seminar you advice to carefully check your news sources. I'll take my uncle's eyewitness account over a history book (which may or may not be accurate) any day. And you say the Nazi's caused the death of how many millions of people? How many deaths have Americans caused over its 200+ history? Don't forget to include Hiroshimo and Nagasaki in that count. Oh, but our killings are always justified, right? My advice is to also read history books written in languages besides English if you really, really want to learn history and politics in a neutral light.

KR: First statement is *in-group "truth"*: "A relative told me this", so it is not only true, but is "the whole truth" (no need to look further). Nazis treated him kindly, therefore Nazis were "no different than American soldiers". This is **Ideology over**

information.

Poster's 2nd statement: American forces, too, have rained down terrible devastation. This is verified factual information, accessible to all. And not all Americans feel deaths resulting from combat have been justified. This is another long, involved discussion.

The benefit of reading history in more than one language is good advice. My M.S. was done almost entirely in German.

April 11, 2011 @ 04:28 PM: **farm21702**

I think anonymity is a good thing here. How else will we learn what Americans really think? If we had to put our names to everything, this board would quickly turn into a politically-correct yawner. In a perfect world, everyone would respect everyone else's opinion, politically correct or not. But as it is...even bigots need to earn a living, right?

April 11, 2011 @ 04:36 PM: **kathrynruud**

@ farm: "Hmmm...in your seminar you advice to carefully check your news sources. I'll take my uncle's eyewitness account over a history book (which may or may not be accurate) any day. And you say the Nazi's caused the death of how many millions of people? How many deaths have Americans caused over its 200+ history? Don't forget to include Hiroshimo and Nagasaki in that count. Oh, but our killings are always justified, right? My advice is to also read history books written in languages besides English if you really, really want to learn history and politics in a neutral light." --- Farm, you tell me you heard these stories (that your grandparents witnessed in Germany) when you were 10, and they made a big impression. Nothing wrong with that, it is sometimes these family stories that make us curious, make us want to learn more. You would say you accept their stories over information written in history books. --- Consider this situation: If there was a poster on this thread, whose grandfather had been a Nazi, and he wrote "The Americans were all evil Jewish capitalists who deserved to die. I know this is true, cause my grandfather said it." --- How would you break through to tell this person the facts of WWII and its causes?

KR: I believe this poster when he says this was his uncle's experience. But only factual, documented history gives us the big picture and prevents (here, hypothetical) examples of the latter untruths being spoken & accepted now & in the future. Counter-strategy to **Ideology over information** : *verification journalism & history, not affirmation journalism & history*.

April 11, 2011 @ 04:47 PM: **kathrynruud**

@ farm: "How many deaths have Americans caused over its 200+ history? Don't forget to include Hiroshimo and Nagasaki in that count. Oh, but our killings are always justified, right?"--- farm, I did not say this. -- and here, I agree with you. Terrible things have happened in American history. If you are an African American or a Native American, the subjugation & elimination certainly must have felt like genocide. And the bombings in Japan... terrible. But I have spoken with many Americans who, after spending years fighting fascism in Europe, were slated to be sent to the Pacific to fight the Japanese. So these massive killings of civilians kept them from having to go into those battles. That is not a justification. But I understand those events in that context. I attend memorials on these days (anniversaries of Hiroshima, Nagasaki) once in awhile, as I have visited graveyards in Europe where thousands of American soldiers are buried. These are reminders to us all of the consequences of not paying attention to what is going on in our politics -- that is where these catastrophes started.

April 11, 2011 @ 05:01 PM: **jrrenn**

Qoph...I just watched a great documentary on this exact subject. It is called "Media Malpractice." Netflix has it to stream if you have a subscription with them. It is truly eye-opening!

April 11, 2011 @ 06:48 PM: **kathrynruud**

@jrenn: I did a quick read of that article and liked the concluding sentence: Qoph...I just watched a great documentary on this exact subject. It is called "Media Malpractice." Netflix has it to stream if you have a subscription with them. It is truly eye-opening! --- I did a quick read of that article and liked the concluding sentence: that *people often seek "information" that takes them in circles, right back to their original prejudices.* Also a good idea to ***watch out for big egos*** : are you getting your info from someone on radio or TV who puts himself/herself in the foreground? A genuine, facts-oriented reporter stays in the background. You may not even notice his/her name. That is a good sign -- you are being treated like an adult who can figure his own way through the news maze. -- Thanks for pointing out how manipulative much of the media has become...

KR: **Ideology over information.** Counter by asking: Should info move us forward (verification) or take us in circles (affirmation)? This poster sees this problem, too. *Praise the positive.* I have not seen the documentary, but it may be a good source of info -- I don't know. With movies, one has to be conscious of other manipulative techniques in play -- ominous music, images vs. uplifting music, images, etc. When I see too much of that polarization going on, I know it is likely either fiction or propaganda.

April 11, 2011 @ 08:07 PM: **qoph**

@jrrenn---Thanks. I do have Netflix and will watch this evening. To you and anyone still listening, it made my skin crawl when people like Letterman and SNL cast members made sexual references to the Palins' children (SNL: "those long Alaska nights"). Also, traditional feminists dismissed Sarah by asserting that she did not "represent women". Gosh, she looked pretty representative to me. The pro-abortionists really turned purple with rage because Sarah refused to kill her child. I am not a priori against abortion. But watching my daughter's 12-week fetus on ultrasound this week convinced me that he/she who is sucking that thumb is definitely human. So call it murder, legalize it in special cases, and be honest!

KR: I try to stay off hot button issues. And this thread is about polarizing talk, so goph is *hijacking the thread* a bit with his own most important topic. Still, he seems to be a nice guy.

Note: pro-abortionists and anti-choice are labels that attempt to frame the debate from a particular polarized perspective. When I do get into this topic, I stick with pro-choice and pro-life. Polls show most Americans see mostly gray on this issue.

April 11, 2011 @ 08:29 PM: **stinky.farmer**

That took a while to read through and I have a conclusion. Kathryn, you talk too much, take a break, I beg you.

April 11, 2011 @ 08:35 PM: **kathrynruud**

@ dear stinky.farmer: "That took a while to read through and I have a conclusion. Kathryn, you talk too much, take a break, I beg you." --- Great to hear that you read the entire thread, Stinky! If you think I talk or post too much (this is the first time I have posted after an article and am interested in what people are saying & seeing) --- you definitely have an option to exercise. It is your freedom to choose not to read, or to stop reading. Yet, for some reason, you chose otherwise. So maybe you might want to return to the TV now. Nobody on TV talks too much.

KR: Limbaugh says "Everyone has the right to free speech, but no one has the right to be listened to." I agree with him on that. Stinky is not passive. He has a choice to make.

April 11, 2011 @ 08:35 PM: **ribatejoluso**

IMHO: The system is broken because in part people pay far too much attention to the "media" . The "media" makes money exploiting other people's mistakes because people pay attention to what they are saying like a religion. NPR is the radio that asks the tough questions to reps, dems and everyone in between. Their standards of journalism is far ahead of many networks when they show both sides of the story, at least in my view. Someone that shows only one side of the story shows also signs of being ignorant and signs of living in an artificial bubble.

KR: Good observations re media. This poster is also aware of the **Ideology over information** problem and the polarization it leads to. (see below)

April 11, 2011 @ 09:23 PM: **kathrynruud**

@ ribate: "IMHO: The system is broken because in part people pay far too much attention to the "media" . The "media" makes money exploiting other people's mistakes because people pay attention to what they are saying like a religion. NPR is the radio that I think asks the tough questions to reps, dems and everyone in between. Their standards of journalism is far ahead of many networks when they show both sides of the story, at least in my view. Someone that shows only one side of the story shows also signs of being ignorant and signs of living in an artificial bubble. " --- And sometimes, it is just the easy path. I think good books, newspaper & magazine articles are the best way to get info, because your brain processes the printed word differently. When we listen to TV or radio, we are in a "catch-up" mode, trying to keep pace with the speaker -- and we tend to miss words or phrases. When we read, we set the pace, and we can "back-up" to read what we don't "get" right away. Also, reading is a linear, sequential process, and in that sense it is kind of like math -- reading strengthens the brain and enhances logic. --- But if you do watch TV for news The Jim Lehrer News Hour is top-notch. No arrogance there -- and there are rarely just 2 perspectives presented (which can easily lead to polarization) but more a a round-table of contributors, which is a much more balanced way to give and receive information. And yes, I like NPR, too. They don't market junk because it sells -- they give information that may be very important, but does not have commercial appeal. With political talk radio, it is all about sales and ratings.

KR: Reinforcing importance of using your own gray matter to figure things out and the importance of getting **genuine, factual information** over infotainment or ideology.

April 11, 2011 @ 09:43 PM: **newtofc**

qoph-why is it murder before a baby is born but it is not when 10,000,000 babies a year are guaranteed to die from starvation, disease, abuse, neglect, and many other causes. When they are born you know they will be dead before they are 5yo in many Countries. In Friday's WP there was an article about two medical clinics run by Catholic Charities who were charged with providing sub-standard care to poor immigrants in MD and D.C. Again, my question is why do pro-lifers stop being pro-lifers after a child is born. And why are so many pro-lifers against any form of pregnancy prevention? I will ask why a pregnancy terminated in the first trimester is any worse than a child born who is guaranteed to die a horrible death a year later, or even live a life of neglect and abuse?

April 11, 2011 @ 10:08 PM: **qoph**

@newtofc--I believe we have had this conversation, at least in part, before. First, I speak of one topic, while you speak of others altogether. I am discussing biology. You speak of sociology. I have no idea why people are so cruel, so careless, so unkind to one another. That is my answer to your questions on social phenomena. Your second topic is birth control. I believe firmly in birth control, but I have no power to enforce my will on others. On my topic, BIOLOGY, I stand firm. A three-month fetus is a human being. Watch an ultrasound exam, sometime. Look at the head, brain, arms, legs, hands, feet, and movement of that child in utero and tell me you would take a hammer and smash the life out of it. I don't think so. Remember, I am not a "pro-lifer" as you put it. I am pro honesty. In some cases, especially for political figures, I could even work up a case for retroactive abortion. (Postscript: the overwhelming majority of abortions in this country are of black babies. Margaret Sanger, a major feminist godmother, advocated abortion as a way to decrease reproduction by what she called the "swarthy" races.) Kathryn, you still out there?

April 11, 2011 @ 10:10 PM: **sasquatch.the.pirate**

Kathryn, I thought the article said you were local. Mr. Duck ran for the US house seat the last two times around. He is a military contractor who masquerades as whatever he thinks is called for in whatever situation he is in, including telling local peace activists (including some of us who started up the paths to peace series from your website) he was not a militarist, then telling others that his progressive views include preemptive war. He is our local prime example of a two faced politician (the right wingers are at least up front about who they are). I have been reading your responses and it seems like you are stuck on the theme of polarizing speech. Are you of the opinion that polarizing speech is being employed as a weapon or is a symptom of a larger problem? I can understand attacking it directly if you believe the media/wealthy/politicians are using it to destabilize the populous to meet a goal of further an agenda (much like we destabilized the middle east for half a century to get our hands on their oil). However, if you think it is merely a symptom of a larger problem (the death or rhetoric, debate, discourse, whatever) then would the argument not be better made if you also discussed logical fallacies (which are everywhere), communication ethics, etc.? I tend to polarizing speech is a little bit of both depending on who uses it, but in either case is a small piece of the puzzle.

KR: Good questions (see below)

April 11, 2011 @ 10:15 PM: **qoph**

@newtofc---And you have never answered my other derivative questions: 1-If women's bodies are holy temples which they alone control, why is prostitution illegal? 2-How come Scott Peterson was convicted of two counts of homicide for killing his wife Laci and unborn child Conner?

April 11, 2011 @ 10:38 PM: **kathrynruud**

@ goph: "Margaret Sanger, a major feminist godmother, advocated abortion as a way to decrease reproduction by what she called the "swarthy" races.) Kathryn, you still out there?" -- Yes, goph, but I am getting tired. I will respond though... Abortion is truly one of the most difficult topics to create bridges over. I usually stay away from it, and don't want to spend half the night on this -- but I have read this about Sanger, and I am not an apologist for that attitude, which was clearly racist. But there was a huge need for birth control for all women and she did fight for that. You seem far less rigid than many who oppose any abortions under any circumstances. I agree with conservatives on several things: we could do much more to emphasize personal responsibility and the emotional costs of premature sexual activity & parents need to be involved in this. I do support sex ed, as when I was still a teen, two of my 14 year old friends got pregnant -- and I don't think they had a clue about what was happening. The men involved were older and basically got away with it all, leaving these 2 girls with the consequences. They were both mothers by 15. --- And my own family is currently struggling to help a single mother in our extended family who is older, penniless and expecting. The situation is pretty dire because no one feels they have the $$ or resources or energy to put another 18 years into raising yet another child, and she'll have a hard time doing it on her own. So women find themselves in extremely difficult situations. I would hope Dems & Repubs can find ways to work together to reduce pregnancies before they happen. There are some groups who work together in this direction.

KR: The personal perspective can break through rigid ideology. Sometimes. This poster is *also using this counter-strategy*, in relating his (?) personal experiences in other posts.

April 11, 2011 @ 10:42 PM: **qoph**

@kathrynruud--Good night, then, and thanks for leading a lively discussion.

KR: Nice, seems like a good person. *Praise the positive*.

April 11, 2011 @ 10:51 PM: **kathrynruud**

@ sasquatch: "I have been reading your responses and it seems like you are stuck on the theme of polarizing speech. Are you of the opinion that polarizing speech is being employed as a weapon or is a symptom of a larger problem? I can understand attacking it directly if you believe the media/wealthy/politicians are using it to destabilize the populous to meet a goal of further an agenda (much like we destabilized the middle east for half a century to get our hands on their oil). However, if you think it is merely a symptom of a larger problem (the death or rhetoric, debate, discourse, whatever) then would the argument not be better made if you also discussed logical fallacies (which are everywhere), communication ethics, etc.? I tend to polarizing speech is a little bit of both depending on who uses it, but in either case is a small piece of the puzzle." -- Again, I just do not know Mr. Duck, and therefore cannot respond to your comments. --- Am I "stuck" on the topic of polarizing speech? Well, I have spent the last 20 years listening to talk radio, analyzing the speech I have been hearing, and I have published on the topic in an academic book that is now in university libraries around the globe. So, yes, it is a strong interest (and concern) for me. But if you listen to my talk, or come to a workshop, you will see my linguistic analysis is *not about content, it is qualitative* -- about the structures, *the how*, not *the what* -- about what is being said. From the viewpoint of the users (mainly political talk show hosts) I cannot assess or determine if they see it as a weapon. What I have been able to determine by reading talk industry publications is that these polarizing strategies are money makers and that is the bottom line for these hosts and the stations they broadcast from. Does the language do damage? Definitely. We know this from the effects these strategies have had in the past -- and in both fascist and communist systems. Also, I discuss ethics in some depth in my talk and in the workshop. You, and other posters, can hear the full talk (broken into segments so you can hit the fridge every 15 minutes) on my blog site www.stoppolarizingtalk.org Good-night everyone, and thanks for your interest in the article & thread & thanks for taking the time to post.

KR: In applying the counter-strategy *Civil citizen*, ethical and moral standards are critical.

April 11, 2011 @ 11:24 PM: **nwyrkghos**

There is no "polarizing speech" since all republicants are full of it.They were tol to shut up and sit down today in the state house when they were moaning over a lousy 3 cent tax on beer to build schools for all those non-aborted minority kids in PG and Baltimore.Hypocrites.They are a joke anywhere in this state east of Fredeneck.

KR: There is that "redneck" **stereotype** again. Every time nwyrkghos posts, I am reminded (and other posters are reminded) that trash talk does not stop on conservative political talk radio).

April 12, 2011 @ 12:48 AM: **newtofc**

qoph-I don't know why prostitution is illegal. In European Countries where it is legal, along with much more realistic attitudes toward sex, they have far less problems with crime, disease, unwanted pregnancy, and other sex related problems. As to your second question I will go with the comment I heard recently: "every 16 yo boy with a condom in his wallet knows that life begins at conception". So we have no disagreement there. My question is why is an unborn life more precious than one after birth? I read Ms. Ruud's response to you and agree with her. Abortion is tough because whatever path you choose a human life is lost, unless, ideally, the pregnancy never occurred. In abortion its obvious, after birth is more complicated. The World is far from perfect. But I guess if I had to choose, I would choose that I wish that all of those 10,000,000 babies that died suffering; I wish their mothers had terminated their pregnancies. I know it's way more complicated than that but that sort of explains why I am pro-choice for every woman.

April 12, 2011 @ 09:01 AM: **stinky.farmer**

I don't have a TV. Did she actually stop talking finally? Can we have a jaw transplant on isle 5 please.

KR: The listener, reader, poster is never passive. Stinky has a choice, and he chooses here to keep following the discussion.

April 12, 2011 @ 11:04 AM: **jrrenn**

newtofc...it is of course terribly sad when any child loses their life from disease, starvation, and all suffering. But you implied that children who are aborted do not suffer. I will tell you that when I was doing a research paper on abortion for a college class, I watched a video of an abortion online. You can find it online as well I am sure if you can tolerate the idea of going out of your comfort zone long enough to see what is real! Is it suffering when a baby's limbs are ripped off one by one while it curls up in the womb trying to escape the torture it is enduring? That is the REALITY of abortion. Now you tell me, does any person have the right to "choose" to do that to another person?!

April 12, 2011 @ 11:09 AM: **jrrenn**

qoph...did you get a chance to watch the film? If so, What did you think.

April 12, 2011 @ 12:17 PM: **alovelyplace**

Wow, did Ms. Ruud ever manage to wringe out the emotions and thoughts of this crowd! Some of you folks may need a therapist. :0) Along with revealing her own clearly huge issues about the word Nazi. I hear Glenn Beck is leaving. Perhaps she could swing that TV spot in the opposing direction. :0) I for one, have learned from her visit not to engage you all for political correctness any more. It's just too exhausting and detracts from the humor of off the top cynacism (sp) no matter how cruel. We do need to know your thoughts... it's how society self corrects.

Part 1 of this thread ends and Part 2 continues under the newly printed version at 6:19 AM of the same day, April 12.

April 12, 2011 @ 06:19 AM: **fkeough**

"The use of polarizing language has moved from the political fringes to become a core business model among political programs, starting from -- but not ending with -- the conservative side, she said." How fortunate she did not have a bias - sheesh! Farrell Keough

KR: Poster begins with the assumption of bias. It is always good to question whether bias exists. And I am a registered Dem, though not a Democratic activist in this county or elsewhere. So it is a legitimate question to ask.

April 12, 2011 @ 06:52 AM: **ManFromMontCo**

France is the latest Nazi state. It just made it illegal for a Muslim woman to wear a burka in public. The government justified the law on the grounds that veils imprison women, even though every woman in a veil could go wherever she wanted. So what does the government do to burka-bearing women now? It arrests them and puts them in prison! God bless those French idiots. If not for people like them the USA wouldn't exist.

KR: "Nazi" state is over the top (see below)

April 12, 2011 @ 07:45 AM: **qoph**

For those of you who missed it, yesterday's (Monday's) version of this article was essentially the same and was followed by 92 comments. Ms. Ruud jumped in and answered practically every poster. It was a lively all-day back-and-forth and people were a little more courteous, once they engaged with her. So I pick up from there:

April 12, 2011 @ 07:46 AM: **qoph**

@newtofc--You duck and weave and bob, but you don't ever answer me. 1-Could you look at that ultrasound and then, personally, kill that child? 2-Can you explain and accept the fact that something like 80% of abortions in this country are of black babies? (Margaret Sanger, feminism founder, said "swarthy" people breeding had to be limited.Is Planned Parenthood racist? Is it all about eugenics?)

April 12, 2011 @ 07:52 AM: **man_on_thestreet**

This is the third day in a row for this article and fourth overall. Come up with some new material

April 12, 2011 @ 08:15 AM: **jasonvarnadore**

fkeough... You should discuss the issues you have with her. I'm sure she will be making comments today. I noticed you made one of the first comments yesterday but never returned to back to follow up your statement. You might get a chance to tell her about your blog on the tentacle too.

April 12, 2011 @ 09:01 AM: **masterque78**

@ qoph = Is it fact because you say so or do you have verifiable evidence to back up your statement?

KR: A central question to ask over & over again. And *you are more persuasive* if you can refer the question to *a good information (not ideological) source.*

April 12, 2011 @ 09:13 AM: **christmas**

Gee we fought for freedom of speech, guess we got what we asked for.Just read some comments, some lies too.

April 12, 2011 @ 10:06 AM: **fkeough**

jasonvarnadore - thanks! I know newspapers can compress information to a point where it really does not display what was said. Hopefully she will check the comments again today... Farrell Keough www.TheTentacle.com

KR: Newspaper articles tend to be much longer, sometimes 4 or 5 full pages long. One rarely sees this on political blogs. *The more context, the better*.

Lots of loud debate, with every word posted, does not take us closer to accurate information than a well-researched, documented story with clear, accessible sources of information. The "venting" that takes place make give people a sense of short-term relief, but I don't see that it works toward building consensus. We need to work together, at least somewhat cooperatively, to solve big problems.

April 12, 2011 @ 10:14 AM: **qoph**

@masterque78--The 80% figure comes from recent statistics on New York alone, not the U.S. I will find and post that article. The overall statistics for the U.S. are 32% of abortions for a group (blacks) who represent 16% of the population. As for Sanger, she founded Planned Parenthood, with the first clinic in, of course, Harlem. If you really want to know the basis of the abortion crusade she started, try this link: http://www.citizenreviewonline.org/special_issues/population/the_negro_project.htm. And remember, I am not so much opposed to abortion as I am to lies.

KR: To make sure you are *getting information, not ideology*, it is always a good idea to Google the source. Here : "Citizen review online". I have not googled it, but usually Wiki will indicate if source is tied to an ideologically-oriented group. In that case, you may be exposed to **Ideology over Information**.

April 12, 2011 @ 10:24 AM: **firedupterp**

Everyone become so hyper sensitive and it is awful that people want to use the term Nazi and terrorist to make their point all the time.

KR: Good point (see below).

April 12, 2011 @ 10:25 AM: **ratbird66**

Gee, didn't this get beat to death yesterday? I sure hope Kathy has something better to do with her time today, m'kay.

April 12, 2011 @ 10:46 AM: **jasonvarnadore**

fkeough. I think she did a good job proving her point on having a civil conversation / debate. I'm guilty of making not so nice comments it's easy to let your emotions take over and blurb out the first thing that comes to mind. I've read your Blog on the Tentacle ... I Do not agree with every thing you write. But I do Like your style. You seem very level headed as shown in your March 8, 2011 story posted on the Tentacle.... Who Is A Stakeholder Here? I feel like you would be a great example of what she has been talking about the past couple of days. You could be like allot of people out there making overly harsh comments but you choose the High RD. Mind you I do not agree with everything you write about :)

KR: Honest comment, shows character. This tells me this person cares about being a *Civil citizen.*

April 12, 2011 @ 10:47 AM: **qoph**

@masterque78--This link cites a study over a 10-year period in New York City: "79% of all abortions in New York City in that 10-yr period – 726,845 babies – were Black and Hispanic."
Link:http://www.theologyonline.com/forums/showthread.php?t=70542

April 12, 2011 @ 10:52 AM: **ratbird66**

How many babies will have to die before anyone cares, m'kay?

April 12, 2011 @ 11:16 AM: **fkeough**

jasonvarnadore _ Wow! Thank you! Can I give you the email of some of the politicians who don't think I am so level headed? j/k I looked at "some" of the comments from yesterday. I would pose, when something is Socialistic, why call it something else under the rubric of "civil conversation"? Farrell Keough

April 12, 2011 @ 03:09 PM: **alovelyplace**

Omg, They ran he exact story again without saying it's because of all the posting and Ms. Ruud's decision to interact with it. Wow, did she ever manage to wringe out the emotions and thoughts of this crowd! Some of you folks may need a therapist. :0) Along with revealing her own clearly huge issues about the word Nazi. I hear Glenn Beck is leaving. Perhaps she could swing that TV spot in the opposing direction. :0) I for one, have learned from her cyber visit not to engage you all for political correctness any more. It's just too exhausting and detracts from the humor of off the top cynicism no matter how cruel. We do need to know your thin sliced thoughts... it's how society learns to self correct ideas and what's popping into the human mind, primarily, fear. So FNP, create a Blog and retire this article.

April 12, 2011 @ 04:10 PM: **newtofc**

qoph-I don't know how I could answer your questions more directly. I don't know why prostitution is illegal. In places in Nevada where it is legal they don't seem to have a lot of problems with it. My answer to your second question was "yes I believe there is human life at conception". Isn't that direct enough for you? As to today's question (by the way you answered none of mine) if I knew that the sonogram was of a baby that would be sold into sexual slavery at the age of 4, are was going to starve to death when the next baby came along and she was taken off the breast, or if they were going to languish in a Russian orphanage until they turned into a sociopath, or if they were born to a 14 yo teen who was raped and was being forced to carry the baby of her attacker, yes I could. Like I said,why is it worse for that baby to die humanely as a 3 month old fetus or to starve to death at the age of 1? Every woman knows what is best for her. Her rights supercede the rights of the baby and the law says she has the right to terminate her unwanted pregnancy. I understand your position. I lost a Granddaughter when my daughter was seven months pregnant when the umbilical cord separated from the baby. She had a name, she would have lived had she been born at that time. She was already one of us. Do you think I have stopped mourning her? Could I have asked my daughter to end her pregnancy at 3 months knowing the baby was being born into a loving home and a good life. NO! Yesterday's answers to you have not changed. Direct enough yet??!!

KR: I am not following this debate carefully, but just noticed this personal story. This poster is showing s/he is no foreigner to compassion. *Emote, not remote.* And whether male or female, this "I understand your position" is *Woman's way* -- expressing understanding for the other person's viewpoint.

April 12, 2011 @ 05:56 PM: **Paramour**

Hilter had some positive attributes.

April 12, 2011 @ 06:55 PM: **kathrynruud**

@ FKeough: "The use of polarizing language has moved from the political fringes to become a core business model among political programs, starting from -- but not ending with -- the conservative side, she said." How fortunate she did not have a bias - sheesh! " ----- G'day, Mr. Keough, glad to see you are back reading the article for a 2nd time today. I have not posted in the comments section of the FNP before, but did respond yesterday to nearly all posters, so that thread went up to 90 posts. I am very glad to see this level of public interest. --- Per my perceived "bias", I confess, I do have a bias. I have a profound and deep dislike of totalitarianism, whether from the left or the right. This comes from years of studying the language of propaganda used by the extremists of the far right (fascists) in interwar Germany and the language of propaganda used by the far left (communists) in post-WWII East Germany.

KR: *Civil citizen* : ok to express bias in favor of democracy, freedom, equality, fairness -- No one political party monopolizes these values (i.e. *Muddy the puddle*).

April 12, 2011 @ 06:58 PM: **kathrynruud**

@MFMCo: "Only Republicans are Nazis." --- Sorry, MFMCo, Republicans are not Nazis, and Conservatives are not Nazis. Contrary to Glenn Beck's imagination, Liberals and Democrats are not Nazis. Only Nazis are Nazis, and fortunately, Nazis are not popular in the U.S. --- Sadly, though, some of the linguistic strategies used by extremists are turning out to be profitable marketing strategies -- and that is my concern.

KR: Strategy of polarization: **Stereotyping**, making opposing group (Republicans) into a terrifying out-group/enemy. Very black/white strategy. See counter-strategy below.

April 12, 2011 @ 07:00 PM: **kathrynruud**

@ asteroth: "And all Democrats are Commies? " --- Great response, asteroth! -- Asteroth shows how ludicrous MFMCo accusation is..

KR: asteroth is using just a bit of a counter-strategy I call *Silly song,* spoofing extreme labels.

April 12, 2011 @ 07:05 PM: **kathrynruud**

@ MFMCo: "France is the latest Nazi state. It just made it illegal for a Muslim woman to wear a burka in public. The government justified the law on the grounds that veils imprison women, even though every woman in a veil could go wherever she wanted. So what does the government do to burka-bearing women now? It arrests them and puts them in prison! God bless those French idiots. If not for people like them the USA wouldn't exist. " --- Outlawing burkas hardly qualifies as making France a Nazi state. These repeated "This is Nazi, that is Nazi' accusations do a real disservice to a genuine understanding of what true Nazism was and how totalitarianism differs from the imposition of restrictions we disagree with. --- Over 400,000 Americans died fighting fascism. The least we can do is get the definition and understanding right. They did not die fighting anti-burka laws.

April 12, 2011 @ 07:09 PM: **kathrynruud**

@ goph: "For those of you who missed it, yesterday's (Monday's) version of this article was essentially the same and was followed by 92 comments. Ms. Ruud jumped in and answered practically every poster. It was a lively all-day back-and-forth and people were a little more courteous, once they engaged with her. So I pick up from there:" --- Hi, goph -- I don't know you, but from yesterday's exchange I know you are like many conservatives (and liberals) I encounter on blogs. "Common decency" and "basic respect" are not foreign phrases to you. I enjoyed exchanging views with you yesterday and look forward to what you have written today.--- Thanks to the FNP for posting the article 2X -- I am seeing tremendous public interest in the topic of polarizing talk, from across the spectrum.

KR: goph has a strong viewpoint but remains civil, *Praise the positive*.

April 12, 2011 @ 07:11 PM: **kathrynruud**

@ Man on the street: "This is the third day in a row for this article and fourth overall. Come up with some new material." -- There is a simple solution to your quandry. Move to another section of the paper. There is lots of news to read! --- But thanks for checking in again to read comments, anyway.

April 12, 2011 @ 07:14 PM: **kathrynruud**

@ jasonv: "fkeough... You should discuss the issues you have with her. I'm sure she will be making comments today. I noticed you made one of the first comments yesterday but never returned to back to follow up your statement. You might get a chance to tell her about your blog on the tentacle too." --- jasonv, I am curious. How does Fkeough's writings or his blog tie in to the topic of polarizing talk?"

April 12, 2011 @ 07:17 PM: **kathrynruud**

@ christmas: "Gee we fought for freedom of speech, guess we got what we asked for.Just read some comments, some lies too." --- Freedom of speech is a fascinating topic. Free speech also includes the freedom to mislead, to lie, to tell tall tales, to burn the flag, to act like creeps at the funerals of U.S. servicemen, and to produce crush videos. --- This makes it all the more important that you and I learn how to figure our way through to the facts -- and a bit of respect.

April 12, 2011 @ 07:19 PM: **kathrynruud**

@ FKeough: "Hopefully she will check the comments again today... Farrell Keough www.TheTentacle.com" --- Well, hello -- nice to be missed ;-). Tell me about your blog, FKeough.

April 12, 2011 @ 07:23 PM: **kathrynruud**

@ firedup: "Everyone become so hyper sensitive and it is awful that people want to use the term Nazi and terrorist to make their point all the time."

-- Firedup, you speak for many, probably the majority. Several recent polls (one @ the U. of Allegheny, I think) -- show Americans overwhelmingly understand that civility & democracy go hand-in-hand, 95% of Americans. --- Among women and bi-conceptuals (those who can understand the appeal of both liberal and conservative viewpoints) -- the standards for respectful debate are the highest. Thanks for making this comment.

KR: firedup is a *Civil citizen* and *Names the frame.* Respond and *Praise the positive*.

April 12, 2011 @ 07:26 PM: **kathrynruud**

@ ratbird: "Gee, didn't this get beat to death yesterday? I sure hope Kathy has something better to do with her time today, m'kay." --- I had a great day, ratbird, met a couple of wonderful Republicans and had coffee with a liberal friend. Good Americans, good people all around. But of course, now I am home and curious about what the home folks are saying. Fred. Co. has very lively political debates -- it is great fun.

KR: Counter-strategy: *Stop the spiral.* Also, part of *Civil citizen* is celebrating American values of *equality and fairness*. (Repubs, Dems, Liberals can all be good Americans, good people)

April 12, 2011 @ 07:29 PM: **kathrynruud**

@ jasonv:" fkeough. I think she did a good job proving her point on having a civil conversation / debate. I'm guilty of making not so nice comments it's easy to let your emotions take over and blurb out the first thing that comes to mind. I've read your Blog on the Tentacle ... I Do not agree with every thing you write. But I do Like your style. You seem very level headed as shown in your March 8, 2011 story posted on the Tentacle.... Who Is A Stakeholder Here? I feel like you would be a great example of what she has been talking about the past couple of days. You could be like allot of people out there making overly harsh comments but you choose the High RD. Mind you I do not agree with everything you write about :)" --- Said like a true gentleman. This is a style of expression that draws people in -- it doesn't turn them away, as trash talk does.

KR: Poster is looking in the right direction, knows he could work on his own tone, is looking for level-headedness. FKeough seems a bit entrenched/coming from a polarized viewpoint, but does not seem to be a trash talker- jasonv seems to confirm this. *Praise the positive* - and agree that polarizing strategy of **Polarity in tone** is off-putting.

April 12, 2011 @ 07:31 PM: **kathrynruud**

@ fkeough: (to jasonv) "Wow! Thank you! Can I give you the email of some of the politicians who don't think I am so level headed? j/k I looked at "some" of the comments from yesterday. I would pose, when something is Socialistic, why call it something else under the rubric of "civil conversation"? --- Nothing wrong with calling something socialistic, if it is truly socialistic. What does this have to do with civil conversation?

April 12, 2011 @ 07:37 PM: **kathrynruud**

@ LP: " Omg, They ran he exact story again without saying it's because of all the posting and Ms. Ruud's decision to interact with it. Wow, did she ever manage to wringe out the emotions and thoughts of this crowd! Some of you folks may need a therapist. :0) Along with revealing her own clearly huge issues about the word Nazi. I hear Glenn Beck is leaving. Perhaps she could swing that TV spot in the opposing direction. :0) I for one, have learned from her cyber visit not to engage you all for political correctness any more. It's just too exhausting and detracts from the humor of off the top cynicism no matter how cruel. We do need to know your thin sliced thoughts... it's how society learns to self correct ideas and what's popping into the human mind, primarily, fear. So FNP, create a Blog and retire this article. " --- Glad to see you back, again, LP. --- Yes, Beck & Olbermann are off the screen (two cheers from me!), but I am afraid the business model that promotes polarizing talk remains. So there will be new Becks & Olbermanns. -- I like your idea of an FNP blog devoted to tangling with trash talk and reaching toward the high road. My impression is that there are plenty of Repubs and Dems who might want to work & play in that direction.

KR: The need to try to *Stop the spiral* is not going away anytime soon.

April 12, 2011 @ 07:42 PM: **kathrynruud**

@ Paramour: "Hilter had some positive attributes." --- I would say these were well-hidden. --- The study of genocide in Germany has shifted from studying the victims (though this is terribly important and continues) to studying the motivations of the perpetrators. To that extent, it is important to understand what drew average people, normal people to support him so enthusiastically & fervently.-- In that sense, you may have a point here. They, at least, perceived something positive.

April 12, 2011 @ 08:53 PM: **fkeough**

kathrynruud - thank you for taking the time to reply to all, but I must admit, I do not understand your point. If you live in this area, please take the opportunity to go the "Forum" on this website. Many people speak back and forth there and some conversations get rather heated - being Irish, I have no issue with heated discussion. Where I am not getting your point is the distinctions - strong viewpoints and strong opinions should exist and should be put forward. But, this article implies you are seeing Nazi-like discourse. While there may be some radio shows that do that, (yes, "some" Conservative radio uses these tactics for rating, but heck, I tried Air America and that was all I heard) short of these programs, where are you hearing such vitriol? Please, jump over to the Forum - it would be a stimulating back-and-forth. [btw - www.TheTentacle.com is not technically a blog - our Editor would blow a gasket if he heard that! ;)] Farrell Keough (and I never post anonomously (sp) which may add to civil, but strong, conversation...

KR: This poster wants more specifics, and I am ready to give them. Question of *verification* here. Where is it *documented* that Air America hosts are using **Dehumanizing Imagery** (a strategy of polarization, and a form of hate speech used by extremists)? I have tried to listen on my own and followed conservative media watch organizations -- conservative organizations monitor the national, or mainstream media, which they label "the liberal media" -- and I have not seen the use of this strategy documented. The very few examples of this on the left that I have come across, I have found and documented on my own. And some other polarizing strategies are being used on the left, though mostly on blogs/threads -- not so much on radio/TV.

April 12, 2011 @ 08:59 PM: **fkeough**

btw - when ever Hitler or the Nazi's are brought up as an argument in the Forum, you will most certainly see the Godwin referential argument brought up. Farrell Keough

April 12, 2011 @ 09:25 PM: **kathrynruud**

@ fkeough: when ever Hitler or the Nazi's are brought up "as an argument in the Forum, you will most certainly see the Godwin referential argument brought up" --- fkeough-- I do post on national, but rarely on local blogs/forums, since the national dialogue is my research focus. --- I am familiar with Godwin's law, and I agree that Nazi analogies are used way too often by people who don't know what they are talking about. But I studied German, German history, and the linguistic strategies of totalitarianism. I cared enough about the threat of totalitarianism to make a real effort to understand its causes and genuine nature, and accumulated a couple of degrees along the way, so that I do speak from knowledge. There are lessons to be learned from that era. --- Per the strategies I have documented, I have not heard some of the more severe ones used on lw national political talk radio, as you assert. Do you have tapes, or transcripts of lw hosts repeatedly, relentlessly referring to Republicans as "parasites", "leeches", "cancer", a "virus", "maggots" -- I have many tapes of Beck, Limbaugh, Savage and others using this polarizing strategy of dehumanization. --- And yes, to use such terms is "Nazi-talk" : it invites "cleansing, elimination, and extermination". ---- It is not entertaining. It is dangerous, to those who use it as well as to those it is directed toward. Just ask any German who was living in E. Germany, as the "dehumanized" Russians fought their way to Berlin. ---- This is not stuff to play with, or to defend, fkeough--

KR: Documentation is critical, always, but especially when identifying and describing the use of dehumanization. Otherwise it would be simply slandering someone's reputation. My documentation comes from sources such as *Mein Kampf* and *Voelkischer Beobachte*r, the Nazi press, and from recordings of political talk radio hosts. So I provide **information, not ideology.** *And any reader can check these sources for him or herse*lf. And many, many German linguists have documented this language.

April 12, 2011 @ 09:37 PM: **ManFromMontCo**

I recall many 1930s, pre-Kristallnacht photos of Nazis humiliating Jews in Germany. Making them scrub streets, clean latrines with holy cloths, cutting their locks and beards, forcing them to have sex with each other. Now, fast forward to the Abu Grahib photos showing the prison guards humiliating the prisoners in the same way. That's Nazi behavior, isn't it?

April 12, 2011 @ 09:43 PM: **alovelyplace**

Olbermann was a leader of change. He created and enabled challenge to traditional thinking championing the poor. There would not have been free health clinics in major cities had he not cared. Help me think of one good thing Glenn Beck has brought forth aside from the metro full of red white and blue tea partiers I rode down with on my way to march in memory of Martin Luther King. We taught them that day, that we love them too.

April 12, 2011 @ 09:51 PM: **alovelyplace**

Man from: It's all horrid. And are both sides capable of such hideous acts. In the joy of freedom in Egypt, men isolated and raped a CNN Reporter. In Libya, the same to a woman lawyer trying to cross the border. In the ivory coast, today's msn photos show the brutal presidents wife now captured by the brutalized and now liberated rebels, her dress torn and head yanked back in submission. The right can be wrong. Our own soldiers can be caught up in hatred, revenge and anger on behalf of the whole. Is it fueled by what we say?

KR: Good question. Words do matter: "Words have consequences" -- another Limbaughism i agree with. Though again, Limbaugh does not reckon with the possible ugly consequences of his own words.

April 12, 2011 @ 09:56 PM: **kathrynruud**

@ MFMCo: "I recall many 1930s, pre-Kristallnacht photos of Nazis humiliating Jews in Germany. Making them scrub streets, clean latrines with holy cloths, cutting their locks and beards, forcing them to have sex with each other. Now, fast forward to the Abu Grahib photos showing the prison guards humiliating the prisoners in the same way. That's Nazi behavior, isn't it?" ---- MFMCo, I just recorded an interview of a Frederick resident who, in his early teen years, witnessed exactly the humiliations you are describing (Kristallnacht and after..) What you describe is documented fact. --- What happened at this prison for terror suspects was certainly torture, and dehumanization. As awful as this was, and as deserving of condemnation as it is, that is still not Nazism. Nazism (National Socialism) as it developed in Germany was much broader and deeper than these acts. It is too complex for me to go into on a thread (indeed, historians are still working out a consensus on the definition of fascism and Nazism -- somewhat different phenomena with overlapping similarities--) but Nazism is also a particular political philosophy (not just the use of polarizing & dehumanizing linguistic strategies). I'll give you a url where you will find an interesting debate on this (next post).

April 12, 2011 @ 10:03 PM: **kathrynruud**

@ MFMCo: A few years ago, right-wing activist Jonah Goldberg, who has a B.A. in Journalism, I think (no background in history of note), wrote a book titled "Liberal Fascism" that was enthusiastically embraced by the hard right (not genuine conservatives). --- But this book is completely misleading, and I believe it was meant to mislead, and the top historians on fascism around the world immediately saw it as the fraud it was.--- Unfortunately, the mega-mouths (Beck, Limbaugh, etc.) actually repeated the false garbage within over & over to their audiences. -- You can read the debate yourself by going to this site. -- There are also excellent books on fascism that are available by the historians that participate in this debate.

KR: This book by Golberg was very manipulative in that it was disinformation. Disinformation is not necessarily lies, but leaving out huge areas of information, so that a pre-conceived, ideologically-based conclusion is reached. **Ideology over information**. Check out the url for the History News Network listed below for details.

April 12, 2011 @ 10:08 PM: **kathrynruud**

@ LP: "Olbermann was a leader of change. He created and enabled challenge to traditional thinking championing the poor." --- Still, LP, Olbermann was frequently over-the-top in his style, often labeling Republicans (as an entire group) as "fascistic" and making frequent personal derogatory statements about individuals. --- And he has this non-stop tone of righteous indignation. Which is effective -- once. If you see it every evening, it is impotent. --- Americans who want to see strong voices on the side of the poor can do better than Olbermann.

KR: It is also documented that Olbermann (one time, noted by me) called Tea Partiers "vermin". That is using the polarizing strategy of **Dehumanizing Imagery**. Even the intermittent use of dehumanizing imagery is a marker of demagoguery. No ethical leader should touch it. *Feel and heal*: try to guide political dialogue away from this darkness.

April 12, 2011 @ 10:12 PM: **kathrynruud**

@ LP: "Man from: It's all horrid. And are both sides capable of such hideous acts. In the joy of freedom in Egypt, men isolated and raped a CNN Reporter. In Libya, the same to a woman lawyer trying to cross the border. In the ivory coast, today's msn photos show the brutal presidents wife now captured by the brutalized and now liberated rebels, her dress torn and head yanked back in submission. The right can be wrong. Our own soldiers can be caught up in hatred, revenge and anger on behalf of the whole. Is it fueled by what we say?" --- LP, you sound like a pretty articulate spokesperson yourself. I would much rather listen to what you have to say, and how you say it, than to listen to Olbermann any day. --- I am noticing a growing interest and participation in women's rights around the globe. This is a very good trend, good for democracy, I think.. I would like to see more American women engaging in the political debate here at home, too

KR: Making a connection with LP, finding more common ground, shared concern about women. *Woman's way.*

April 12, 2011 @ 10:19 PM: **kathrynruud**

OOPS, sorry MFMCo: Here is the url for the historians' debate---- http://hnn.us/articles/122231.html Also, anyone interested in listening to my talk on the polarizing strategies currently being used in political discourse (and historical examples) can hear it on www.stoppolarizingtalk.org

KR: Taking this poster straight to top-notch, **verified information** & research. Just for any single prof alone, you will scroll down through dozens of pages of publications. These historians (debate is on History News Network) have devoted their lifetimes to clarifying the roots of totalitarianism. The debate among them over defining fascism is interesting -- if you like reading about history.

April 13, 2011 @ 06:44 AM: **fkeough**

so you only have studied one side, (no tapes of Air America, etc). I am sure that has worked well in academia. You are losing your credibility with me - study only one side and make sweeping generalizations about Nazi's. The "soft sciences" allow for a wide berth, but this is not very legitimate.

KR: This poster does not know me, has not seen my blog site, heard my talk, attended a workshop, or read my published chapter, but he seems to believe he knows enough to find me lacking credibility and coming to "illegitimate" conclusions. I would say this is **Poisoning the well** (me/my research/my education as an information source).

April 13, 2011 @ 09:17 AM: **kathrynruud**

@ fkeough: kathrynruud - so you only have studied one side, (no tapes of Air America, etc). I am sure that has worked well in academia. "You are losing your credibility with me - study only one side and make sweeping generalizations about Nazi's. The "soft sciences" allow for a wide berth, but this is not very legitimate. " ---- Several things, Mr. Keough--- 1) Should you take the time to listen to my talk, or come to one of my workshops, you will see me play segments from Olbermann, Schultz, O'Donnell, Uygur (Schultz substitute) as well as segments from the right. --- 2) I get regular messages from some who listen to Air America on the West coast and alert me to particular hosts & statements they find alarming and/or manipulative --- so far, I have not come across anything nearly as strong as what I am hearing on the right, but (and I mean this quite sincerely) I do not believe the left is immune from using the strategies, even the worst strategies, I have documented and described-- 3) You seem to be making an additional assumption: that I am a professional academic. I am not. I am an educated citizen with a background in linguistics. My M.S. is from a Catholic university with strong reputation in linguistics. Half my professors were priests, and they were not ideologically inclined, right or left.--- 4) In terms of "studying only one side", please know that I love this country and its democratic republican government so deeply, and find the 20th Century history of totalitarian dictatorships so appalling, that I put in 9 years of effort to study how democracies can succumb to such terrible powers.--- I did this first by studying International Relations and German as an undergraduate. Then, struggling financially, I moved to Germany, to study and learn German. While there, I was also employed by American and other corporations and got some business and travel experience. Then I returned to the U.S., where I studied German History & Linguistics in the M.S. program, done entirely in German, and I was taught by Germans, Austrians & Swiss who directly experienced much of the history I was learning about. So I got the same facts in English and German, just two different perspectives.---- Mr. Keough, please be careful about categorizing people and making brash assumptions about their character or credibility. Your quick judgments say more about you than they do anyone else.--- And finally, I correct myself. I do participate in local forums, through the print media. So keep your eye out for my LTEs.

KR: Counter-strategy to **Poisoning the well:** Affirm importance of *verification of facts vs. affirmation of opinion*. Verified facts are found through *lots of reading* (much of it pre-determined to be critical and therefore required, at least at colleges/universities)*, learning from others who are qualified to teach*, etc. *History should not be make-believe according to our wishes.* That will lead us to repeat previous mistakes. (Prominent journalists Bill Kovach and Tom Rosenstiel offer excellent guidelines for determining the differences between what they call "the journalism of verification" and "the journalism of affirmation". See their book BLUR: How to Know What's True in the Age of Information Overload, Bloomsbury, 2010.)

April 13, 2011 @ 11:06 AM: **fkeough**

kathrynruud - please read before you make accusations. I said this will play well to academia, you made the assumptions. That you don't hear hateful speech from the Liberal, Left, Progressive, whatever is much more telling. Farrell Keough

KR: This is an assumption. It does not accord with the facts, since I have heard and recorded voices from the left.(see counter-strategy below).

April 13, 2011 @ 01:50 PM: **kathrynruud**

@ fkeough: One more time, Mr. Keough. I do hear hateful statements coming from some on the left. Let me repeat: I do hear hateful statements from some on the left. --- And in my talk, and in my workshops, I not only feature clips of hosts using polarizing strategies, I also display many quotes showing this very basic reality, that nearly every person experiences: on both sides of the fence there are respectful people, and not-such-respectful people.---- If you can break out of your polarized worldview, you could see this, too. --- It is all on display in the 2 threads following the the 2 online postings of this article. --- And let me know if your affiliated parties would be interested in hosting my talk, or the workshop. It is free, and as I say repeatedly, this language is everybody's business.

KR: *Stop the spiral*. This knowledge does not belong to one side. It belongs to all.

April 13, 2011 @ 04:46 PM: **fkeough**

kathrynruud - let me use your own words: "I have not come across anything nearly as strong as what I am hearing on the right..." While you say the Left says mean things, you have a bias that it is the Right that is on the cusp of Nazi-speak! Your tendentious perspective is where you credibility is lost. Farrell Keough

April 13, 2011 @ 06:16 PM: **kathrynruud**

fkeough: These are the documented facts, recorded, and verifiable: --- There is intermittent use of dehumanizing language on prominent "conservative" talk radio programs (Limbaugh, Beck, Savage). The words they use -- calling liberals and others "parasites", "vermin", "leeches" -- are the exact words Hitler used to dehumanize Jews. These words also have shown up prior to ethnic cleansing/genocide in other countries (Rwanda, etc.). This is all documented, recorded, verified. --- Some of these materials are documented in the huge volumes kept at the Nuremburg trials. --- But I do not see Limbaugh as a Nazi, or even the more fringe Beck. --- This language is being used by these hosts as a business strategy. --- Because it grabs attention, it sells. ---This, too, is something you can read yourself, as trade publications ("Talkers", etc.) have articles re the "role" of talk show hosts to "polarize" opponents into "good guys vs. dreaded foes".---- Having listened to many hundreds of hours of both left & rw hosts, I have heard, recorded and documented far greater use of ALL of the strategies of polarization on the R than on the L. ----Were it being used broadly by the L (only 9% of programming), I would be alarmed, and even the limited use I have heard, I find despicable (but I have recorded, and documented, and written, and published their foolish statements as well). --- C'mon, fkeough, try focusing, breath deep -- and open your mind. It is not impossible.--- If you consider yourself a patriot (and my guess is you do), you want to do right by this country and protect it. That includes rejecting such ugly descriptions, regardless of their source. You can do this.

KR: *Countering ideology with information*: should this poster ask for specific sources, I can direct him there. There are hundreds of books in many different languages documenting the assertions I make above re WWII history. My own documentation of political talk radio is on tape. *Verification.*

I am also assuming the best from this poster, that he wants to protect democracy. At some level, I sense he is a *Civil citizen*.

April 13, 2011 @ 08:13 PM: **fkeough**

kathrynruud - "vermin", "leeches", and "parasites" - yet the Left states Republicans want to kill old people and the poor. My mind is open - but I do not believe yours is... Maybe you should focus on an Amendment to the Constitution, (the Fairness Act is a way around that) so "correct" speech can be used. kathrynruud, you are so hyper-focused upon the Right you do not seem able to see the truth. Farrell Keough

KR: Again, this poster attempts to **Poison the well**.

April 13, 2011 @ 08:53 PM: **kathrynruud**

@ FKeough: Since you were one of the first posters after the initial article posted Sunday, and are still responding Wed. evening (tonight) re the 2nd posting of the FNP article, I can guess one of 2 things: ---- either you are hanging in to get in the last word, or you are genuinely curious (which means you are sharp enough to see a new idea when it appears). I'm willing to assume the latter. --- What you won't get from me is a food fight. --- So I am happy to try to meet you on the points you bring up, though is would save us both time if you would go to my blog site. www.stoppolarizingtalk.org -- On the Home page you will find an Open Letter I posted to 2 Democratic representatives who used very derogatory descriptions of Republicans. As I note in the introduction before the letter, I have sent similar print letters to other representatives as well, including Alan

Grayson (D) who was making the kinds of comments you describe, and who compared fundamentalist Christians to the Taliban. That was reprehensible, and I let him know I thought so. --- Re censorship, I do not want to censor you or anyone else. This is one of the things I learned from reading about totalitarianism-- even in the most repressive societies, censorship never can eliminate free speech and free ideas completely. The answer, as I say in my talk, is not censorship, but more free speech.

KR: FKeough is a tough customer, so I offer *more evidence of my informational, non-biased approach* to the problem of polarizing talk. In a final response, he does seem a bit more open-minded, and maybe there is room to talk in the future. He has the virtue of perseverance, and seems curious, too.