We depend on it for its accuracy and rely on it for information regarding our well-being. It's always going to be there when we need it, seven days a week. It seems to never let us down from telling us if we should dress warm tomorrow to telling us if our favorite sports teams won. Obviously by now you have figured out I am talking about the news. You've depended on it all your life and it's been there since the moment you were born. When I think of the news I think of it as an official source that without a doubt will give me the vital information about any relevant matter. We ascertain news in different forms including newspapers, local television news, national television news (CNN), and a plethora of magazines. What is an enigma to me is why must we be skeptical when watching the news? Inevitably, there are going to be journalists with opinions that you will disagree with, when perusing the columns that are in your favorite newspaper that land every morning at 5 am on your front porch. But nonetheless the television news is more of a concrete display of information, and this we must be skeptical about also.

I bet you didn't know that less than twenty-five corporations have half of all the business in the major media of the United States. For example, among our 1,600 daily newspapers, about a dozen corporations control more than half the circulation. Among our 11,000 individual magazine titles, a half dozen corporations have most of the revenue. Among our four television networks and 900 commercial stations, three corporations have most of the audience and revenue. These dominant numbers show you what type of control the corporations can have on the information that is relayed to us. Apparently when it comes to the news, we are not dealing with a competitive field of myriad corporations, but it's moving...
Softballs Ascending

The question was innocent—and inevitable.

"Dad, who was the first girl you really liked?"

Unlike most questions posed to me by my children, this one took no time at all.

"Easy. Kristi Hansen. Starting in about, oh, fourth grade."

"What was she like, Dad? What did you like about her?"

The answer to that one: not so easy. Kristi was probably not the kind of girl to turn heads: thin, almost bony, with black hair pulled back into a ponytail, and a pleasant—not a dazzling—smile. She was fun-loving and athletic, but others were probably prettier or livelier or more socially adept. Why, then, did I like her so much?

As I consider this now over the span of some thirty-odd years, I realize that Kristi’s special appeal had essentially three sources: 1) she was a farm girl who grew up in a home entirely devoid of television, 2) she loved horses, 3) she could hit a softball higher and farther than any of the other girls.

At first the lack of television bothered me. How could any child alive in the 1950s and ’60s function without the com-}

forting, all-embracing presence of “Leave It to Beaver,” “Dobie Gillis,” “Ed Sullivan,” “Ozzie and Harriet,” “Mighty Mouse,” “Sky King,” “Andy Griffith,” “Danny Thomas,” “My Little Margie,” the Yankees vs. the Braves, John Cameron Swayze, “Axel’s Clubhouse”? She had probably not seen a single episode of “Lassie” or “Howdy Doody” or “The Mickey Mouse Club.” Talk about cultural illiteracy! On a certain melancholy morning some time around 1960, she didn’t even seem to be aware of the fact about cultural illiteracy! On a certain melancholy morning some time around 1960, she didn’t even seem to be aware of the fact that Gramps (the kindly old patriarch of “Lassie”) had died, and nowhere was that clearer than on the ball field. At an age, and in an era, when most girls would take a pathetic halfswing at the ball and shyly shrug their shoulders when the dribbled weakly toward the pitcher’s mound, Kristi would invariably rare back and smack it, hard as she could, and proudly watch the thing sail. Here, too, she specialized; Kristi hit fly balls only. Her swing was a curious, “U”-shaped affair. She would curl the bat around her head—the tip of the barrel almost touching her left ear—then jerk the bat suddenly downward with a scooping motion, and meet the ball with a ferocious uppercut that would send it flying in a long, majestic arc. The ball always made the outfield. In the early years, it would generally drop for a hit. By the time the small, terrified outfielder had gathered up the dropped ball, Kristi would be at least to third.

As the years went by and the outfielders aged, their skills improved, and the automatic triples and homers became less automatic. Fly balls became less fearsome, and, more and more, Kristi was just another “out.” Yet, gloriously, this trouble-some inevitability never seemed to bother her. She just went on hitting beautiful fly balls. At one point during this period, I remember, Kristi had broken her left arm (probably from some horse-riding accident), and it was rigidly encased in a white cast. Naturally, this didn’t prevent her from playing softball. She simply gripped the bat a little harder in her right hand and complemented her vicious uppercut with a bit of a hop, giving the ball a springy, one-armed whack that sent it paradoxically aloft.

All games—all human endeavors, for that matter—are ultimately exercises in futility, and to see someone striving might-}

ily in the face of that cold fact is always an occasion for wonder. For me, then, one remembered image is all the explanation I need to give for my youthful admiration.

I see Kristi crouched over the plate, her one good hand clutching the bat, her left arm hanging helplessly in a sling: the ball begins to descend into the contested space above the plate, and she, the girl, skinny and fragile, reads herself for her swift and joyful pounce, coiling all her energy within that one bony wrist, aiming dead straight for the clouds.
Fifteen are dead, several are still listed as critical, dozens are left wounded, and a nation is enraged. We want facts, evidence, answers, but will it ever be enough?

The Facts:
* Two shooters, Eric Harris, 18, and Dylan Klebold, 17, both have been linked to the Trench Coat Mafia.
* The massacre started at 11:15 a.m., April 20. The last shots were heard at approximately 11:45 a.m., leaving fifteen dead, including the two gunmen.

The Evidence:
* April 20, being the date of Hitler's birth, the German conversations between the two shooters in the hallways, as well as student and teacher accounts of Nazi-like behavior led the authorities to believe the shooters had a specific motivation and influence.
* The girlfriend of one of the two shooters may have provided two of the firearms used in the shootings.
* One shooter kept a diary detailing a year-long plan to murder classmates and destroy the school.
* Teachers and students say the two boys talked about and acted out on videotape violent crimes similar to those committed on April 20.
* Neighbor of one of the boys reported hearing loud noises that could have come from the testing of homemade bombs.
* A sawed-off shotgun barrel, shotgun shells, and materials used in the pipe bombs were found in plain view in one boy's bedroom.

The Answers:
* None

CONTINUED ON PAGE 6
toward monopoly control. Now let's examine how well these corporations serve their public with their control of the news. The good news about American reporting is that it is the best in the world. There is no doubt about the talent that is possessed by the writers of the news. United States journalists are the best educated, far better educated than any earlier generation of American journalists. They operate under higher professional ethics than journalists elsewhere in the world do. Ben Bagdikian states, "American journalists lie less than journalists elsewhere, fictionalize less, and, on the whole, take seriously their duty to provide the public with accurate information." Then if our journalists are so good, why are things so bad? The problem lies with the corporations that employ the journalists. It's the journalists that work for them so they will write what the corporations want them to write about. Journalists have no empowerment of freedom when it comes to their articles. There are 50,000 print reporters and 50,000 broadcast reporters in the country, and each day, each week, each month, they are pointed toward particular tasks, particular stories, particular government activities, particular personalities, and particular foreign scenes. In the resulting mass of stories, there are often articles of importance and distinction, and there is a daily volume of routine factual, essential local and national information. But the problem lies in something more than the mass of useful items. The problem in the news today is not what is false, but what is missing. Each day, editors necessarily select some stories for emphasis, some for de-emphasis, and some for the wastebasket. Certain kinds of stories, certain public figures, certain social data, certain analysts of social and political events are regularly on the network evening news and the front page, while other stories, spokespersons, and analysts are mentioned obscurely if at all. Basically the news is very selective. When an executive is deciding what to run in the news a bunch of things are considered such as: Will it contradict the government? Will it offend affluent people's views? Will it offend the advertisers that contribute money to the news? Since most of the revenues of the news media are acquired from advertising, and there is an incentive to maintain an audience of as many affluent people as possible, news policies are designed not to offend the political sensibilities of the advertising target audience. And I am not saying things that contradict the government aren't exposed in the news, but news that contradicts governmental versions gets into the news with greater difficulty and is only mentioned briefly. And it is not done by official censorship, but by self-censorship. This self-censorship has no correlation with lack of talent of the journalists, but it does correlate with the fact that the top editors and executive producers are not
What is an enigma to me is why must we be skeptical when watching the news?

- For example if you run a story on how an airline is dishonest you will probably lose it as an advertiser. The advertiser will probably threaten to remove all its commercials. Advertising pressure can be most detrimental to small local papers that survive off the advertisers. An example is a Pennsylvania weekly editor who was once told he could run a story about purse snatchings at a local hardware store, which also happened to be a large advertiser. The publisher warned the editor if the store pulled its advertising as a result, the editor would be out of a job. The editor ran the story and the advertiser pulled its ads from the paper because the story swayed people to stay away from their store.

One example of a conflict of owner's interests that were undermined by a journalist just trying to expose the truth, was an incident where a reporter and an editor at the Dallas Morning News did a story about a bank in serious financial trouble. The reporter was immediately fired, and so was the editor who passed the story. Eventually the bank did fail and the story was confirmed. So even though the story was in search of the truth, this type of story conflicted with the interests of the affluent audience that had bank accounts in that specific financial institution, and it also conflicted with the fact that you never hear about a bank with problems.

Now stories that do affect the target audience's, owner's, and advertisers' interests do appear, but appear infrequently, and the articles usually focus on developments that are, in effect, unavoidable.

It is unfortunate that the news has to be debunked like this, but as U.S. citizens we have a right to know about all the news that is going on and there should be no bias whatsoever when conveying the news to the world. With people's interests always being protected we will never get all the news and it will be continued to be missing from our lives. To this day there is a zone of silence of negative effects of mergers, acquisitions, buy-outs, corporate debt, and monopolistic levels of the market. There needs to be more news stations controlled by independent corporations instead of the whole media ring being controlled by a few companies. If more of the news were controlled by more corporations, then there would be a better chance that they could expose more relevant news that gets left out and be fearless in telling the world the things that are missing from the other news stations.
He who makes a beast of himself gets rid

CONTINUED FROM PAGE 3

What could have driven the boys to commit such a heinous crime? What were they thinking and feeling when they put broken glass and nails in their pipe bombs? How could they laugh at every point blank shot they fired, joking about always wondering "what nigger brains looked like"? Or hysterically sorting through students, taking shots at well-known jocks and random students wearing sports related attire. Look down at what you are wearing right now as you read this article. Is it sports affiliated? BOOM! you're dead. One of the sickest aspects of this case, in my opinion, is the dedication, intelligence, and execution of a plan that had been in the works for over a year. High school is a gossip box, and while now several students recall hearing them talk about it, obviously no one took the Honor Roll boys seriously. There was such a devotion to such a sick belief that it kept a horrifying plan among a handful of people, plotting every day, smugly determining the fate of their fellow classmates. It suggests a level of insanity I can not fathom.

As a society, we start out wanting to blame something or someone. Movies, video games, and the recent media coverage and attention given to the past school shootings undeniably influence society; why else would writers write? But they are not to blame. Violence in the media dates all the way back to medieval literature. It is a symptom of society, everybody is exposed to it, and the majority of us come out okay. It is your attitude, mindframe, and upbringing you experience before you are bombarded with a society entertained by violence that determines the level of violence at which you will operate, what is appropriate, and what is acceptable. A child not properly raised, a child without discipline, a child without family values, a child without coping or communication skills, a child who is not heard or is given no attention (or maybe only negative attention) is a child who has the potential for irrevocable hate, anger, and rage. It is a child whose only outlet for these feelings is violence. The amount of exposure to violence on television does not matter; it is a psychological reaction. Violence is a symptom of society, not some foreign concept magically implanted by various forms of media into an otherwise healthy child that causes him to terrorize an entire high school.
Then are the parents to blame? This is a tricky one, too. I, personally, am beginning to lean towards holding the parents responsible. The parents of the shooters could face criminal charges if the Governor of Colorado, Bill Owens, gets his way, and most likely they will face numerous civil suits filed by the parents of the victims. It is hard to go back fifteen years and examine the way the two shooters were raised, looking at whether or not the parents ignored them, did not discipline them, did not instill morals. Most parents feel they are doing the best they can in raising their children. Aside from any obvious trauma that could have affected the boys, like an abusive father, etc., child-rearing does not come with a set of instructions; it is a hard job and every parent makes mistakes. If the parents were grossly incompetent in raising their children then they should join the club. Incompetent parenting is a huge problem that affects both our present and future society. Children who are poorly raised now will go on to raise their children poorly, and so on. The fact is that we can not hold every parent responsible for every crime committed by children under seventeen, nor can we forbid irresponsible and unstable people from having children. (But imagine if we could!). The only comprehensible solution is to educate future parents, and that is an endless task that can not possibly reach everybody. Hopefully the disaster at Columbine High has encouraged parents, teachers, and the community to pay attention to these children that will someday be our future. It is hard to say how the parent of the two boys could not have known what their children were doing. Had they tried to get involved, met resistance, and given up? Then yes, they are entirely responsible, but I know how easy it is to hide things from your parents, and I personally know several of my friends who could have built pipe bombs in their garages without interference from their parents. The parents trusted them, and let's face it, parents "ain't gonna learn what they don't wanna know." While it all raises some serious questions, I do believe the parents of Eric Harris and Dylan Klebold should be left alone. The anguish of parents not only losing a child to suicide, but also knowing that their child took fourteen other children with him is a punishment that will last a lifetime.
Originally the Turkish coined the name of the region at the southern crossroads of Europe and Asia which we know today as the Balkans. The term Balkans is Turkish for "mountains," and throughout history these mountains have served to help preserve serious political, religious, and ethnic differences. The actual history of the land dates back thousands of years and major fighting has been the only consistent ruler of the Balkans for hundreds of years.

As far back as 7000 B.C., hunters began populating the Balkan Peninsula. Around 1200 B.C., the Illyrians, who were ancestors of the Albanians, began to arrive in the region and, today, Albanians in Kosovo use this ancestral claim to say they arrived before the Serbs. So began one of the ethnic aspects of the continuous fighting in the Balkans that still exists today. Settlers continued to move into the Balkans throughout medieval times. From about 500 A.D. to 700 AD, the Slovanes arrived in the Balkans followed by Southern Slavs, Croatians, Serbs, and Bulgarians. Two of the

An interesting quote from Otto von Bismarck came about when he was asked what would start a general war in Europe prior to the start of World War I. To this he replied, "Some damn foolish thing in the Balkans." Today, the use of the phrase "Crisis in Kosovo" is scary in a way because it was crises like the ones just mentioned that led to World War I. It is for this reason that some people worry about what crisis in the Balkans may lead to World War III.

The fighting that continues today doesn't stop over issues of ethnicity and nationality. Religion also plays a very big role in the confused minds of people living in Croatia and Serbia. Beginning in the 800s, the Croatians in the Balkans came under the control of the Holy Roman Emperor. Soon after, missionaries arrived and began to convert Croatians into Catholics. Eventually, Croatia became entirely a Catholic country. During the same time, Serbia's religious beliefs developed, too. Because the Serbs were closer to the Byzantine Empire, they became Orthodox Christians. In the year 1054, the Roman Catholic Pope in Rome and the Greek Patriarch in Constantinople finally split over issues of doctrinal authority. This historic split in 1054 caused the church to divide and still weighs heavily on relations between Orthodox Serbs and Catholic Croats today.

Being that all of the Balkan countries that exist today can be compared, in area, to small states in the United States, it might seem hard to believe that these countries can cause as many problems as they do for the entire world. In fact, Serbia, which is a little bigger than Kentucky, actually contributed a lot to the start of World War I. In 1906, the economic shutdown between Austria-Hungary and Serbia, known as the Pig War, created tension between these two countries when Austria-Hungary tried to crush Serbia's economy. However, Serbia was able to open up new trade with countries like Germany and Turkey, and instead of allowing their economy to be crushed, this actually caused their economy to boom. Further tension began when a Serbian nationalist assassinated the Austro-Hungarian Empire leader Archduke Franz Ferdinand. After all this, more conflicts arose which very quickly turned into World War I.
use today. It wasn’t until 1944 that the Communist leader Josip Broz Tito, the British, and the Red Army pushed Germany out of Yugoslavia. At the end of World War II, in 1945, Tito and his Communist partisans took power. Because Russia didn’t help back Tito, it was in 1948 that Joseph Stalin proposed a union between Yugoslavia and Bulgaria. However, Tito didn’t accept this union and Tito’s Communist regime continued to rule the Republic of Yugoslavia, without help from Russia, for the next forty years. In this time, Serbia, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Croatia, Slovenia, and Montenegro were all kept intact, and any rise in nationalist-democratic movements that threatened the Communist monopoly were all suppressed by Tito’s threats and interventions.

The most recent events in the Balkans are with the southern Serbian province of Kosovo and the Serbian President Slobodan Milosevic. After Tito died in 1980, many Serbs began protesting against what they called anti-Serb policies in Kosovo that existed during Tito’s rule and continued afterwards. The Serbs continue to claim that the Albanian majority in Kosovo represses the Serb minority. In the mid 1980s, Serbs wanted to solve this problem by creating a separate Serb state. This is the time when nationalism began rising again in Serbia and produced its leader, Milosevic.

Now, Milosevic is enforcing a policy of ethnic cleansing and trying to rid Kosovo of all Albanians and Muslims. This is the reason NATO has stepped in to try to stop the ethnic cleansing. In reality, Milosevic probably isn’t really a nationalist, but he is interested in having power for himself. Milosevic and his wife fire up Serbians to fight by telling them that they’re fighting over religious matters. One reason we see Serbians burning American flags is that sometimes when we bomb, we destroy the land and relics that Serbians see as very holy. However, Milosevic is really interested in creating power for himself in Serbia. He and his wife are good at distorting the facts of all the conflicts, and most people in the Balkans think they’re fighting for one thing when in fact they’re fighting for another. On a smaller scale, what’s happening in Kosovo right now is similar to Hitler’s executions of millions of Jews. Right now, NATO feels the actions they are taking will stop the ethnic cleansing and restore some sort of peaceful arrangement in the Balkans.

All the ethnic, religious, and political differences that are causing all the turmoil in Kosovo and the Balkans may seem like fighting over childish matters. Basically people are claiming their group was here first or that one religion is better than the others. Everybody wants land and control over land. It’s similar to the way our country pushed aside and killed Native Americans to take control over land in North America.

While some people support NATO in trying to stop the ethnic cleansing in Kosovo, others are upset that we even get involved. It is true that in the past two world wars, the Balkan region played significant roles in causing the wars to start. Also, the brutal killing based on religion and ethnicity is a horror that causes massive amounts of innocent people their lives. In addition, all of this is happening right next door to Europe. Any way that other countries can get involved to help stop this killing is beneficial to our country and the world. If the Balkans are left alone, problems would mount so high that, eventually, we would be forced to deal with them anyway.
Woody Allen doesn't make Hollywood movies - and most of his movies don't have happy endings. But in Allen's world, that doesn't necessarily make for an unhappy ending.

Despite the joyous, hopeful, upbeat climax of "Hannah and Her Sisters," most of Allen's films over the past decade have ended with characters who are resolved to the consequences of their lives - they haven't necessarily gotten what they wanted, and if they have it may not have been the best thing for them. Such is life, and such are Allen's movies.

"Crimes and Misdemeanors," Allen's film, which he wrote and directed, and in which he has a prominent starring role, fits into this motif, and though the picture rings...
clearly with Allen’s style, in many ways it is a startling departure. To put it in frivolous movie-critic terms, some might dub this “Fatal Attraction” meets “Annie Hall.” And yet that doesn’t come close to scratching the surface of what “Crimes and Misdemeanors” is all about.

Basically there are two parallel stories at work here with their own sets of ensemble characters and one (Sam Waterston as a rabbi) who crosses over into both. Then at the end of the film they all converge at a wedding where dangling storylines are resolved. One story has Martin Landau in a magnificent, dignified, restrained portrait of a man about to break under stress; he is the fellow in the “Fatal Attraction” relationship. Actually, his mistress (Anjelica Huston) does not seem violent, but she’s still lethal in Landau’s eyes because she is hysterical and threatening and about to blow the whistle on their two-year affair and Landau can see his entire life crumbling as a result.

The other story has Allen as a documentary filmmaker with a conscience trying to make a film about an intellectual philosopher no one has ever heard of. When he gets an opportunity to do a film on his superficial, self-absorbed brother-in-law (Alan Alda), an enormously successful television producer, Allen at first balks. But then he decides to do it for the money, so he can fund his own movie. During the process he meets a PBS producer (Mia Farrow) who is bright, intelligent and witty. Allen falls in love with her, but while she’s divorced, he is stuck in a loveless marriage. Meanwhile, Alda begins to pursue Farrow, and Allen does everything he can think of to keep them apart.

There are some great surprises here as Allen mixes up his characters with drama and humor, his own hilarious one-line zingers providing most of the comedy. In this context, however, even they have a bitter edge. (Even the film’s most hilarious scene, as Allen shows his movie about Alda to Alda, ends with Allen getting fired.) This is by far the most stark blending of humor and tragedy to come to the movies in some time - complete with murder, romance, suicide, pathos - and it’s exhilarating. The stories are strong, the characters very realistic, the dialogue convincing and the performances superb - Landau is a standout, but Alda and Huston are also quite memorable.

This film takes a glance at different moral worlds people see themselves in. There is the world of structure and goodness, which the rabbi lives in. There is the real world where bad things happen which Judah’s brother Jack lives in. Then there is the world of luxury where nothing bad ever happens and this is the world Judah is in. This movie offers a salacious anecdote to the millions of people in this world who are carrying around sins in this world. The anecdote is how one can justify his wrong actions and live with what he has done. Apparently the wrong action in this film is Judah’s affair and how he manipulates himself to freedom from the guilt.

But “Crimes and Misdemeanors” is still another great accomplishment for Allen, an artist whose films are vastly under appreciated by American moviegoers at large.

By: Mike Miller
Joshua is a fictional story written by Joseph F. Girzone. The story takes place mainly in the small town of Auburn. Auburn is made up of people who live fairly simple lives and, for the most part, have a close relationship with God. However, many of the religious leaders and followers in town don't quite have a solid understanding of the message Jesus brought when he was on earth.

The story begins with people of the town wondering who the new man is that lives at the edge of town in an old cottage. Everyone is talking about him and nobody knows just what to make of this man. His name is Joshua (which is another name for Jesus), and he appears to live a very simple life as a carpenter and woodworker.

Slowly throughout the story, some people in town get to know Joshua a little better each day. Most people in town really like Joshua and are amazed by his insight on religion and God. There are some people who really don't like Joshua, though. A lot of people are scared by the ideas he talks about and feel their religious beliefs threatened by Joshua.

The story follows the life of this unusual and simple man. It takes us through the way he is able to help solve people's problems and even perform unbelievable miracles. The story takes many twists and turns as Joshua is harshly confronted by many different people about his teachings. It's interesting how Joshua is able to deal with the threats and hatred that he is confronted with.

Joshua is based on an accurate reading of scripture and allows us to see Jesus' true message. How much have people changed since Jesus last walked the earth? How do they deal with this simple man who loves to talk about God and helps people who are suffering. In Joshua, can this man really be who people think he is? How will his life end up when even the highest religious authorities don't like him and feel threatened by his words? Joshua is a book for anyone wanting to better understand Jesus' true message.