

Objectivism in News Reporting

With my collection of documentaries over recent political events, I have produced rather one-sided (subjective) manuscripts which are clearly confronting what is served by mainstream media [MM]. Although such are my most frequent source, I admit that the selection is subjective, but so is that found in MM. That is indeed the justification for making it, seeing the stories in another light. The obvious crimes behind, e.g. 9/11 and 7/7 makes it mandatory to pose doubt on MM reporting in general. Frequent 'terroritis' turn out to be false-flag actions with the purpose of reducing civil rights (at some point also silencing my activity). Let us enjoy it as long as possible, the right to identify propaganda as such, the right to see developments in a different way. Then the painful question must be made, if also my – admittedly subjective – documentaries and essays are to be considered propaganda as well, just from the other side?

It is indeed possible, although I do exert some criticism towards my sources. Certainly, I believe in my descriptions but I do not pretend they are objective – what is, anyhow, objectivism? It is possibly only leaving room for various conflicting subjective presentations. Also in my previous occupation, medical research, objectivism proved to be an illusion, frequently dogmatism prevail. Therefore, although I believe in the integrity of my writing, I must admit that it can be interpreted differently. So what? If those open to other opinions regard it simply a different way to see the World, I shall be satisfied and even thank for offering a deviating opinion. Too often, even that is denied.

September 10, 2006
John Schou, M.D.