

---

## david icke

Posted by David Edge - 2010/02/24 01:17

---

I was listening to David Icke on Scott Chisholm's show and was amazed by the complete lack of journalistic integrity on the part of the host during the interview. At no time did Scott question the basic tenets of Mr Icke's beliefs or request any evidence of his theory. Icke now believes in a world conspiracy bent on global domination and enslavement of the population (what they do in the afternoon I have no idea). A pretty big thing, yet he was asked for and offered no evidence for this other than saying in essence I read it in a book or someone told me. By the same token, I could go on the show espousing my belief in a Lancaster bomber on the moon as I read it in the Sunday Sport. Scott did not even challenge on the most glaring hole in the theory - if the media is controlled by this conspiracy, why have you and others published several books on the subject, and why are you on the radio talking about it? Of course Icke would, like all fanatics, explain away this as proof of his theory; the media is using disinformation by making him appear irrational. I hope the callers were not stacked, but they all agreed with him - again requesting or offering no evidence - conspiracy theories are popular as they abrogate personal responsibility, everything wrong in your life is not because you are incompetent, it's because of THEM - Hitler used the technique to achieve and retain power. I do not want to get into a debate about David Icke, there are newsgroups for that, my gripe is with the so-called journalist Scott Chisholm. If he used this lack of technique on a political interview he'd be called a toady.

=====

## david icke

Posted by Phil Boardman - 2010/02/24 01:17

---

I was listening to David Icke on Scott Chisholm's show and was amazed by the complete lack of journalistic integrity on the part of the host during the interview. At no time did Scott question the basic tenets of Mr Icke's beliefs or request any evidence of his theory. To be fair to Scott, this is the tack he always takes on this slot - he frequently has people with extreme views on and they are permitted to preach without censure from Scott. Presumably to permit the caller to take them on. Usually you get a reasonable mixture of callers agreeing and disagreeing. If this didn't happen with Mr. Icke, perhaps it reflects on the quality of the man's presentation. (Only heard the first 5 minutes myself). Stacked calls? I doubt that - nothing makes for more interesting listening than a good argument. Phil

=====

## david icke

Posted by Nick Lawlor - 2010/02/24 01:17

---

I do not want to get into a debate about David Icke, there are newsgroups for that, my gripe is with the so-called journalist Scott Chisholm. If he used this lack of technique on a political interview he'd be called a toady. Unfortunately I missed this particular program, but I can imagine it. Sadly, there is a tendency for all presenters to take the attitude that science and the scientific method is beyond them, so they lose their scepticism. Indeed, how many times have you heard scientific ignorance expressed as a virtue? Hence the number of instances of astrologers, faith healers, quack nutritionists, Christians and other assorted superstitious loonies on the station. If there aren't RA guidelines about this sort of thing, there ought to be. I'm not suggesting that these people shouldn't appear, we all need a laugh sometimes, but there should be some method of holding them up to the ridicule they so richly deserve.

Nick

=====

## david icke

Posted by Merlin - 2010/02/24 01:17

---

Hence the number of instances of astrologers, faith healers, quack nutritionists, Christians and other assorted superstitious loonies on the station. If there aren't RA guidelines about this sort of thing, there ought to be. I'm not suggesting that these people shouldn't appear, we all need a laugh sometimes, but there should be some method of holding them up to the ridicule they so richly deserve. There is, Nick: you ring in and put some spurious twaddle to them in a very matter-of-fact way. If you get it just right, the presenter knows you're taking the piss but the expert doesn't. Most amusing.

=====

## david icke

Hence the number of instances of astrologers, faith healers, quack nutritionists, christians and other assorted superstitious loonies on the station. If there aren't RA guidelines about this sort of thing, there ought to be. I'm not suggesting that these people shouldn't appear, we all need a laugh sometimes, but there should be some method of holding them up to the ridicule they so richly deserve. There is, Nick: you ring in and put some spurious twaddle to them in a very matter-of-fact way. If you get it just right, the presenter knows you're taking the piss but the expert doesn't. Most amusing.

=====