

what can be more fun than calling out someone , in this case the Dallas Morning News and having them [respond](#). The marketplace of ideas. Its a beautiful thing.

:Of course the fun in all of this comes from being able to respond right back. So here I go:

From the DMN

"See, that's the thing. Media don't present assertions in a "wanna bet" fashion. They use credible sources like the AP wire, hardly a sports blog. Transactions is a wire feature picked up and run by papers all over the country. It's not some blog rumor mill put together here. But Mark Cuban would rather rant than ask questions."

I have to admit that I wasn't sure how they filtered the materials they got from the wire services. I actually was giving them the benefit of the doubt when i asked if they had pulled the information from a blog. I thought they were trying to 'keep up'. But they weren't . I took that position because I had spoken to Chauncey's agent the day i wrote the blog, so I knew that there was no "transaction". I guess it was unfair of me to pick on the Morning News. They were using unreliable sources. Its not their fault.

Today, in hindsight it also occurs to me that in the NBA there can't be any free agent transactions till July 11th. So unfortunately for both the DMN and the AP, there can't actually be a transaction till then. Maybe they should rename the section of the sports page "Possible Transactions " ?

The DMN then went on to say:

"Journalism, at its core, is curiosity. No one has all the facts, but the search is there in black and white every day, and we're accountable. Besides, do a quick search on Billups and it seems he really has re-signed with the Pistons, at least that's what Sports Illustrated, ESPN, AP and the Detroit papers are reporting. What made Cuban think this was all some media lie? A blog. Doesn't he see the irony in that?

I certainly see the irony. He just got it backwards. He makes my point that the big media companies share in their inability to distinguish fact from rumor. As I write this, ESPNs [Ric Bucher is reporting that there is something to report, I guess all the references he made really did get it wrong.](#)

He also makes my point that if enough places write that its true, the media thinks it must be.

Newspapers also have the problem that their readers are never quite sure when a newspapers' curiosity returns a fact or opinion.

What is the distinction between what a reporter can write in an online blog vs what they say in the paper vs what they say when interviewed by a radio or tv station/network. Just which of these has the "accountability" the DMN requires,?

Which allows opinion ? How do readers.viewers.listeners know which is which and when ?

I know im never quite sure which job your employees are representing when i speak to them

im going to give you a suggestion that may be worth exactly what you are paying for it. Nothing

here you go...

Let your reporters be reporters and let bloggers be bloggers. Reporters dig in and find facts that bloggers usually dont have the resources to uncover. Take pride and PROVE that all of your stories written by reporters are fact checked. **Dont rush stories to print, print stories that cant be rushed.**