

NR_key_name: D692DE7C186E3ACD862563FB00047DBE
SendTo:
CopyTo:
DisplayBlindCopyTo:
BlindCopyTo: CN=Eileen Sullivan/O=ARRB
From: Robalini @ aol.com
DisplayFromDomain:
DisplayDate: 12/08/1996
DisplayDate_Time: 7:05:08 PM
ComposedDate:
ComposedDate_Time:
Subject: Rushkoff Strikes Back

If I'm going to sling mud at someone, I try to give them the opportunity to respond. And so I am now doing with Douglas Rushkoff, who was mercilessly trashed by yours truly in my last piece. I sent it to him, not necessarily expecting a response, but kind of hoping for one. My hopes were fulfilled. Sadly, Mr. Rushkoff responded with logical, persuasive arguments rather than name-calling trash talk. Personally, I think it's rather cowardly of him to fight fairly. More to my dismay, he certainly brings up some good points. The most inflammatory part of his piece was the title, which he claims to have been written by CNET themselves. Further, he argues the tone of his piece was actually supposed to be in defense of intellectual inquiry. He makes a good case that it was seriously edited. In any case, rather than have me as your filter, let Mr. Rushkoff speak for himself, which he does quite well. Following is his letter to me, followed by the original CNET article. Enjoy. P.S. Sorry if there were any problems with formatting of my last article. I'm still toying with this. Let me know if you can. P.P.S. Douglas Rushkoff has also written *Playing the Future*, *Media Virus*, and *Cyberia*. They are worth checking out. Subj: Dot-connecting Date: 96-12-02 09:46:55 EST From: rushkoff@interport.net (Douglas Rushkoff) What's amazing to me is how many people saw my CNet piece as an attack on conspiracy rather than a defense of it. Indeed, CNet retitled the column with a somewhat smarmy slogan, but the point of the piece -- even as edited -- was to stress the need for us not to throw out the baby with the bathwater. I was upset that, these days, an entire line of inquiry can be so easily dismissed just by saying "that was on the Internet a month ago." In the piece I clearly go on the record supporting the belief that the CIA brought drugs into the US. I don't mind critique at all, and I'm sure I'll get plenty more as a result of this letter. Several emails I have received this week simply say "What's the frequency, Rushkoff?" Others make reference to my clandestine relationship with the CIA (one that I don't, myself, know about or believe to exist). The thoughts of these paranoid folks doesn't change my suspicious posture towards the maintainers of the status quo -- which was the point of the piece. These crazy folks inhibit serious inquiry by folks like you. I'm just surprised how many people identify themselves with the crazies, and saw the piece as an attack. Also, that piece was my last for CNET, and not because it was supporting the "status quo." Try connecting the dots on that one.

Body:
recstat:
DeliveryPriority: N
DeliveryReport: B
ReturnReceipt:
Categories: