

CONNECT	
What's Wrong With The News?	

2275 AD

Why is journalism in the establishment media so poor?

- 1 It's well known that the media platforms we all once relied upon to provide truthful, accurate and impartial news reporting are corporate giants, owned or funded – often, both – by billionaires. But what's wrong with their “news” stories?

The establishment media fails so often to present *stories* that are true, accurate and impartial. These *stories* also often suffer from extremely poor standards of reporting. Citizen journalists are doing an infinitely better job of informing us of what's going on – and what's NOT going on. I take a deep dive into a few mainstream “news” stories to ask – what's wrong with the news?

- 2 As Citizen Journalists at CONNECT, our aim is to present articles that are not simply *stories* but are truthful and accurate. We're not totally impartial, because we're human, but we do our best to avoid promoting any particular viewpoint. To us, no viewpoint is “proven” right or wrong.

We provide the sources of information and opinion in all our articles. We do our best to inform you, the reader, so that you can form your own opinion – a fully informed and rounded opinion. I will be writing an article soon about what Citizen Journalism is - and how people can become Citizen Journalists – perhaps even with CONNECT.

Meanwhile, a recent BBC article is the subject of my first analysis of some poor-quality reporting by an establishment media platform.

This short video and written article about how little plastic is recycled and how much plastic is simply exported by wealthier countries such as the UK to other countries could not be more timely. The video on [How much of our plastic 'recycling' is actually recycled](#) shows in graphic detail how all our waste is lying around everywhere in poorer countries. It makes a point that I made in a previous article on CONNECT, [Is It State-Sponsored Ecocide?](#) - that the “out of sight, out of mind” approach to “solving” the problem of waste is neither a sustainable, nor a decent, way to go on.

I have two criticisms of the BBC article and video.

Firstly, while I don't expect a short film like this to probe deeply into a subject, I need to flag up some significant cognitive dissonance. It's the same cognitive dissonance that I wrote about for CONNECT, in [Is It State-Sponsored Ecocide?](#) The BIG people cause the problem – governments, big

businesses and big organisations - the same ones who constantly tell us to pollute less, fly less, travel less, eat less and – if possible – breathe out less to reduce CO2 and save the planet. Meanwhile, THEY carry on flying, travelling, eating and – most important of all – THEY CARRY ON POLLUTING.

Despite this, at **2mins 29secs** into the video, the BBC presenter tells us that there are two ways to reduce plastic waste: to reduce and to re-use – that's for us, the ordinary Joes, to do. While, straight afterwards, she says that *Coca-Cola is the world's top plastic polluter*. So – a big business is causing the problem but it's up to us – the ordinary Joes – to solve that problem, as usual.

When it comes to plastic bottles, I do think that reducing use - buying fewer bottles of Coca-Cola being one way of doing so - is a great idea. It's good for our health - and our purse. It will, of course, be bad for Coca-Cola's bottom line - I expect the BBC will be receiving a stiff email from Coke's CEO about that idea.

But what about the idea of *reusing* plastic bottles? I'm a bit stumped by this. There's only so much re-use we ordinary People can do to re-use plastic bottles. *We could* stockpile petrol and diesel, that we bought at an extortionate price last week -as opposed to an eye-wateringly extortionate price this week - in plastic bottles in the garage. Of course, we'd have to hope they don't explode from a random spark or the heatwave the establishment media are constantly threatening us with.
Not recommended.

My second criticism of the BBC's article is the wording under the video. The BBC here tells us that an enormous amount of plastic waste *flows into the oceans* every year.

Er... say what? How and why does plastic waste FLOW? Is the plastic self-propelling? What does FLOW even mean in this situation? As we all know, plastic waste gets into the oceans in vast quantities. The question is – who puts it there? If nobody puts it there, how the heck does it get there? Where exactly is it FLOWING from?

Why does the BBC not explain this? To say that it *flows* there does not make any sense because it can't be true – that is, unless the bottles walk – or fly – drawn by the siren song of the sea, perhaps?

This is **poor-quality journalism**.

- 3 My next analysis is of a news story by SKY [Number of pubs falls by 7,000 in a decade to lowest on record](#).

This article explains that there are 7,000 fewer pubs in England and Wales than there were ten years ago and that in the first half of 2022 the number fell to the lowest on record.

The article makes an inaccurate statement:

Pubs have suffered setbacks in recent years due to the coronavirus pandemic, which forced them to close.

Pubs were *not* forced to close by the pandemic.

Pubs were forced to close by *the government*.

As an aside - in a pandemic, most pub landlords would have closed their pubs – so why did they have to be ORDERED to close them?

To give a bit of perspective - *supermarkets never closed during the pandemic. Neither were they ever empty of customers.*

But, to return to the “news” story by SKY, the above inaccurate statement about *why* so many pubs have closed presents a one-sided, unbalanced view – the government's view.

The journalist has failed to include a different perspective - such as one from a pub landlord who disagrees with the government's closure of pubs. One such pub landlord is Rod Humphris of The Raven pub in Bath. Mr Humphris' coherent view of the political opposition's complete lack of opposition to the government's measures was covered by the BBC in April 2021 in [Starmer thrown out of Bath pub in lockdown row](#).

This reporting by SKY of a one-sided, unbalanced view – the government's view, in this case - is **poor-quality journalism**.

- 4 Next is a news story reported by a German media platform. Deutsche Welle [DW News] describes itself as “Germany's international broadcaster and one of the most successful and relevant international media outlets.” DW News says it gives people worldwide “the opportunity to form their own opinions.” That's a laudable aim – and in the mainstream media, it's found about as often as teeth in hens.

For me, however, DW's article [How Germany and the EU combat child abuse](#) is best summed up by one word: MUDDLED. The article's strapline says: *The perpetrators are babysitters, neighbours, teachers, or fathers*. This establishes the idea in our minds that child abuse is perpetrated by trusted adults, known by or indeed part of the family, who have easy access to children. The article, however, zooms between abusers being *trusted and known people* and *cybercrime* – in the latter case, the abusers start as strangers. The article talks about the problems of online grooming and people having photographs of children on their computers.

After reading the article twice, I found myself still muddled about what it was saying. I still had a question – who is this article meant for – who is its reader? Perhaps the answer lies in the headline: [How Germany and the EU combat child abuse](#). Could it be that the article is less about preventing child abuse and more about presenting the idea that SOMEONE IS DOING SOMETHING? I would describe this story as **confusing journalism**.

- 5 Finally, I turn to three establishment media “news” stories about the same event.

The three stories are:

[Suspect in fatal Copenhagen mall shooting is remanded in psychiatric facility for 24 days, police say](#) by CNN;

[Copenhagen mall shooting suspect remanded into psychiatric care](#) by

France 24; and

[Copenhagen shooting: police say no indication of terrorism motive](#) by The Guardian.

At the end of my article, I will refer to a "fact" reported in one of the three "news" stories. It's a BOOM, as Amazing Polly says.

These three articles, while far from identical, present many of the same *facts* - as would be expected. In my view, all three of them have the same problem.

The event was this. On the same day that the Tour de France professional cycling challenge passed through Denmark - **Sunday 3 July 2022** - that country's capital city suffered a shocking tragedy. 27 people were shot in a shopping mall in Copenhagen, with three people dying from their wounds. Two of the people who sadly died were teenagers.

All three articles tell us that the "shooter" acted alone, that he appears to have selected his victims at random, had no obvious motive, does not appear to be a terrorist and was known to mental health services.

All three articles tell us that the suspect was arrested in the shopping mall, soon after the shooting - and was carrying a gun at the time of his arrest. France 24 and The Guardian say that he was also carrying a knife.

All three articles tell us that he had posted videos online of himself posing with a gun - and talking about his medication for mental health disorders not working.

Two of the articles were later updated to say that the shooter is now in a psychiatric facility.

None of the articles, however, have been updated on how the wounded victims of the shooting are.

6 There was something really important, in my view, missing from all three articles.

The victims.

Where is the sense that the people who died - and the people who were wounded - and everyone harmed and affected by the shooting - matter?

Two of the three people who died were only 17 years old. Not one of the articles gives any sign of empathy for their families or friends. Not one of the articles shows any concern for the injured people, who may or may not recover fully from their wounds.

Not one of the articles contains any sense of caring about any of the victims of this crime - or anyone else, who wasn't shot but who was at the shopping mall and witnessed the shooting. People who are wounded psychologically

and may well suffer trauma for the rest of their lives. None of this appears in any of these three articles. Why is this?

Mass shootings are rare in Denmark, a country considered to have some of the most restrictive gun laws in Europe. The shock, trauma and pain must be palpable in the city of Copenhagen and probably the whole country. Yet, apart from a mention that the Danish Prime Minister expressed sympathy – which appears towards the end of all of the articles – the focus is the shooter.

How he is a lone nutter [*déjà vu!*]
How there is social media evidence of that “fact.”
How the shooting was not an act of terror.
How it was not racially motivated.

This is **poor-quality journalism**.
It is also **disturbingly inhuman journalism**.

It leaves me with a question: If a *news story* tells the world that someone has done something terrible to other people, yet that story fails to convey a sense of caring about the people who have lost lives and been hurt – what is the purpose of that *news story*?

7 What is the *purpose* of these three *stories* about the Copenhagen shooting?

I cannot answer this question. Only the media companies that have published them can answer it.

To me, these *stories* hint at something dark. It's down to the misdirected attention of those stories - towards the perpetrator and ONLY the perpetrator – but there's another reason as well.

I said above that I have a BOOM to reveal.
Some readers will see something WRONG with this “fact” that appeared in the [France 24 story](#) about the shopping mall shooting in Copenhagen.
It appears just before the sub-heading “Sufficiently psychopathic”:

Police confirmed that the suspected shooter was present at the mall at the time of the shooting.

Some readers may not, on the other hand, see what is - to me - so revealing about this snippet from the “story”.

But I see it – and now, I cannot “unsee” it.

8 There are some people who believe that mass shooting crimes often have an element of orchestration about them. Their perpetrators invariably have mental health issues and are loners. The three news stories I have analysed about the Copenhagen shooting, in my view, do nothing to invalidate the orchestration theory.

PS1 There appears to be plenty wrong with the *establishment* news media - and a view of this enlightening video - [Busted](#) - should give those people who still hold onto an unshakeable faith in it, something more to think about!
IT IS A MUST WATCH!

CONNECT'S Maxim and Oath

Connect is only interested in finding and sharing the TRUTH.
In search of that TRUTH, we only pose questions – we have no answers.

By: Helen King

Source: CONNECT: [Magazine](#)

- 2 [LINK](#) BBC: How much of our plastic 'recycling' is actually recycled?
- 2 [LINK](#) CONNECT-M3: Is It State-Sponsored Ecocide?
- 3 [LINK](#) SKY News: Number of pubs falls by 7,000 in a decade to lowest on record.
- 3 [LINK](#) BBC: Starmer thrown out of Bath pub in lockdown row
- 4 [LINK](#) DW: How Germany and the EU combat child abuse
- 5 [LINK](#) CNN: Suspect in fatal Copenhagen mall shooting is remanded in psychiatric facility for 24 days, police say
- 5 [LINK](#) France 24: Copenhagen mall shooting suspect remanded into psychiatric care
- 5 [LINK](#) The Guardian: Copenhagen shooting: police say no indication of terrorism motive
- PS1 [LINK](#) Busted! Media Crimes Exposed!

FURTHER READING

[LINK](#) Amazing Polly

[LINK](#) CONNECT-M3: Our Plastic Waste Problem

PLEASE DOWNLOAD AND SHARE THIS ARTICLE



Opportunity to join the CONNECT [team and network](#)

END