

Integrity in Language Needed

To: The Epoch Times Editorials

Co: RAV "Zen Master"

by Sterling D. Allan, 228033

Jan. 11, 12, 2023

Perhaps my favorite course at BYU was a Writing class by Dr. Glade O. Hunsaker. He's one of those teachers who deeply impacted my life, especially by his accuracy mantra, "Say what you mean; mean what you say." That requires both integrity and sincerity.

As much as I love Real America's Voice (RAV) TV's programming, watching its fresh content daily, from (often as early as) Frank Gaffney's 3am (Mountain) Securing America, through the 8pm Turning Point USA show set with Jack Posobiec then Drew Hernandez; I have to say that I've grown quite disappointed at the general lack of good integrity by essentially all the RAV hosts/anchors. While decrying the "Fake News" propaganda of the Deep State establishment media (which certainly is the case), they (RAV) fall short of embodying ideals of righteous integrity in their own words/stances. It doesn't even seem like they have this as an objective.

A sample example of this is how often you hear something like, "One thousand percent!" That indicates that exaggeration is so commonplace that they have to turbocharge the exaggeration

②

to give unusual emphasis. While that's cute, it lacks integrity. "100%" should only be used when you really mean "complete."

And why don't talking heads politely correct each other when a misstatement is made? Silence is consent/agreement if a relatively easy correction could have been made. Do they not care about being accurate? Truth matters.

For example, today (1/12), filling in for host Steve Bannon, Cong. Matt Gaetz opened his segment referring to there being 21 stalwarts who stood up to McCarthy's appointment, bringing in a strong rule set for the House. Then, about 10 minutes later, a guest gave the number as "20," the number that has been predominating in discussions, but Gaetz didn't correct it. He could have easily said, "21," and set the record straight in a few seconds, but he didn't.

As another example of conservative media leaders not having adequate integrity, they're nearly as unfair toward the left as the left is toward us (MAGA). That's "hypocrisy"—a term they love to fling at the left. They're extremely slow/hesitant to acknowledge goodness when it occurs on the left. It's as if they can only portray them as bad, with rare exceptions. I found Jimmy Fallon's "XBB.1.5" rap that they showed, to be very entertaining,

(3)

and funny; but all four RAV reviews depicted it as untalented and unfunny, as if parroting a propaganda talking point they'd been given — as bad as any montage of leftists parroting of their propaganda narratives. I see that kind of peer pressure / go along to get along / group think, way too often on RAV TV — at least four items a day on average, repeated across many of the shows. Rightwing puppeteering should not be a thing.

I should also address the ads that show up on RAV TV, which have plenty of B.S., including from our beloved Mike Lindell who excels in using exaggeration to sell. "Best ever" is relative. Grossly exaggerating the retail price makes the sale price sound like a steal. (I should have said, "spoiler alert," ☺) Mike has been crucial to MAGA. That doesn't excuse him from using exaggeration as an advertising tool. He's not almost out of ^{sheets.} pillows.

Something that happened in my life for which I am very grateful, to get me thinking independently, not following the crowd, was getting wrongfully excommunicated for "apostasy" in 1993. You don't have to go through something so severe to learn to go direct with God rather than relying / leaning on your fellow men.

I wish the conservative media / leaders would think more for themselves, in line with God,

not man. They have this ability - as anyone does.
I wish they'd turn it on. It's a choice each person
must make for himself.

Sterling D. Allan
IndComing.com
#WordingIntegrity

p.s. A good, severe example of conservative
media / leaders' group-think being up-side-down
- suckered into conformity with Establishment pro-
paganda, was with their considering Derek Chauvin
guilty. See my 6/29/22 editorial, "Chauvin Innocent
of George Floyd's Death." Am I the only one who
can think independently and brave enough to post it
publicly? That editorial goes contrary to the left nar-
rative, which in this case the right also adopted. I
didn't hear anyone come even close to my conclusion.
I watched ~95% of the trial on Court TV. I've
not had anyone disagree with that editorial (that
I know of). It's blatantly obvious stuff, when point-
ed out minus the societal blowback.