

Does the NCAA own the name, image and likeness of college athletes?

By Luke Wallace

On March 17, Geo Baker, the starting point guard at the University of Rutgers [posted a tweet](#) criticizing the NCAA. He stated that “The NCAA owns my name, image, and likeness.”

Baker definitely posted this, but it made me wonder if his statement is accurate.

To find out if Baker’s claim is true, we need to look at some court cases, both old and new, to figure this out. And hang on tight, this can get complicated pretty quickly.

The main issue here is the NCAA’s use of student athletes’ names, images, and likeness, or NIL. Because college sports are considered amateur sports, the NCAA has strict policies in place stating that student-athletes cannot be paid for playing their sport. These policies are designed to keep student athletic programs from becoming professional sports organizations, but it’s important to note that college sports do generate a profit of around \$1 billion a year, and that profit [goes to the NCAA and participating schools](#). Some student-athletes, like Baker, believe that they deserve more than just a scholarship since their work generates that revenue.

The notion of the NCAA owning student athletes’ “name, image, and likeness” has been contested before. In 2009, [Ed O’Bannon, along with 19 other former student-athletes](#), sued the NCAA over the rights to their NIL. The NCAA and colleges were making a lot of money licensing the players’ NIL for things like video games and advertising. The court ruled in favor of the players and said that the NCAA’s refusal to compensate players violated antitrust laws. The case appealed all the way to the supreme court, which refused to hear it.

So this statement needs context. The court did say that the NCAA is not legally allowed to use players’ NIL without compensation or restrict the players from being compensated for using their own NIL, but this is yet to be broadly implemented. And [while some states have passed legislation](#) for athletes to be compensated for their NIL, none of those laws are in place yet.

To make things even more complicated, on June 21, 2021, the [Supreme Court ruled in a different case](#), Alston vs NCAA, in a landmark 9-0 decision, that the NCAA cannot place limits on education-related benefits student-athletes can receive for playing college sports. Meaning, students can earn additional money for education-related expenses, like tutoring or a computer, beyond what the athletic scholarship covers, and this applies in all 50 states.

So, the Supreme Court has decided that the NCAA cannot restrict student athletes from being compensated for education expenses; however, nothing is in effect yet that would allow these

students to be compensated. One thing for sure, though, is that policy change is on the horizon for the NCAA.

Sources:

https://www.ncaa.org/sites/default/files/18-00180%20NCAA%20101_WheretheMoneyGoes-WEB-NEW.PDF

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/O%27Bannon_v._NCAA

<https://www.sportico.com/law/analysis/2021/supreme-court-rules-unanimously-against-ncaa-in-alston-case-1234632182/>

https://www.espn.com/college-sports/story/_/id/31086019/everything-need-know-ncaa-nil-debate

<https://www.usatoday.com/in-depth/sports/college/2021/05/26/how-name-image-likeness-laws-change-college-game/5184304001/>

<https://www.njleg.state.nj.us/bills/BillView.asp?BillNumber=S971>

Is It Illegal To Teach About Juneteenth In 15 States?

By: David Scibilia

On June 19, the verified Twitter account of The Daily Show tweeted “Happy Juneteenth! The first U.S. holiday that’s illegal to teach about in 15 states.” Is this story legit?



The Daily Show ✓
@TheDailyShow



Happy Juneteenth! The first U.S. holiday that's illegal to teach about in 15 states.

7:57 AM · Jun 19, 2021 · Sprinklr

26K Retweets 1,162 Quote Tweets 118.6K Likes



Start By Looking At Who Shared The Information

The Daily Show is a long-established satirical late-night talk show stemming back to 1996. The show is currently hosted by Trevor Noah and runs on Comedy Central. It puts many political issues in the spotlight and while it is satirical, isolated tweets could trick unknowing readers into thinking their claims are true. We felt the need to fact-check this tweet because it was getting a lot of attention from people who were spreading it as truth; at the time of writing, the tweet had just over 118,000 likes and 26,000 retweets.

Look For Evidence

Although nothing was cited within the tweet, it is clear they were referring to a string of states recently banning the teaching of critical race theory in public schools. And what is critical race theory and why has it become an issue among conservative legislators? By definition, critical race theory is a field of academic study that examines the correlation of race to cultural and legislative decisions. [Some also define it as](#) Recently, some Republican senators and representatives began arguing that critical race theory brings past racial problems into a modern-day scene where race is no longer an issue and maligns American history.

In reference to a ban on teaching critical race theory, Heather Scott (R), a representative from Ohio [said](#) “The longer we wait, the more our kids are indoctrinated with this garbage.” She, along with others, claim that teaching critical race theory could make a student feel bad or embarrassed about their skin color.

The teaching of critical race theory has been [banned](#) in five states so far (Idaho, Texas, Oklahoma, Iowa, and Tennessee), and 17 more have had bills introduced.

Is It Illegal To Teach About Juneteenth In 15 States?

No. [It is not illegal to teach about this holiday in any of the fifty states.](#) It is important to note that shows like *The Daily Show* are clearly satire, so they will take concepts like proposed bans on teaching critical race theory and apply some exaggeration to make their point.

Sources:

<https://www.nbcnews.com/news/nbcblk/map-see-which-states-have-passed-critical-race-theory-bills-n1271215>

<https://www.history.com/news/what-is-juneteenth>

<https://www.edweek.org/leadership/what-is-critical-race-theory-and-why-is-it-under-attack/2021/05>

<https://www.idahostatesman.com/news/politics-government/state-politics/article250869689.html>

Did Naftali Bennett, Israel's current Prime Minister, say 'I've killed lots of Arabs in my life and there's no problem with that'?

By: Calla Duffield

In the midst of the 54-year occupational conflict between Israel and Palestine, and as peace talks are opening up after a bloody 8 days of bombing and airstrikes which resulted in [at least 256 Palestinian and 13 Israeli deaths](#), Naftali Bennett's statement, "I've killed lots of Arabs in my life and there's no problem with that" [has resurfaced](#) since it made headlines in 2013. It turns out he did make the remark in light of [Israel's announcement](#) that it would release 104 Palestinian prisoners, a move pushed by then Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu.

Start by looking for who shared the information:

Bennett's statement was first reported in the [Hebrew-language print edition of Yedioth Ahronoth](#). Pictures of the issue were posted and widely circulated on Facebook.

This link was included in a [2013 Huffington Post article](#).

The quote has made a comeback, and has been circulating on social media. In an [instagram post](#) from IMEU, a nonprofit organization "giving you access to untold stories, facts, and expert sources on all things Palestine— politics, culture, art, and activism," the quote was pasted over

a picture of Bennett's face. The post has nearly 20 thousand likes, while the account has almost 400 thousand followers.

How people are reacting:

"Bennett's calling for the murder of Palestinian captives is in blatant disregard of international law and the Third Geneva Convention, which delineates the protections entitled to prisoners by international law upon their capture," the general delegation of the Palestine Liberation Organization to the United States said [in a statement](#). "It is extremely alarming that a public Israeli official at the ministerial level calls for murder and utters explicitly racist remarks without being held accountable." The PLO further called "on the international community and the US in particular to condemn Minister Bennett's remarks against Palestinians."

Palestinian supermodel Bella Hadid drew attention to the situation through several Instagram posts in May, including one [repost from IMEU](#). She specifically [called out Bennett on her story](#), writing that "if you know anything about [former prime minister Benjamin] Netanyahu, you know that Bennett isn't any better."

Bennett responded in a May 20 [YouTube video](#) titled "Bella Hadid, Trevor Noah & John Oliver: What would you do?," asking "if a terror organization like Hamas called to murder your families and launched thousands of missiles at your children while they are hiding inside of schools, what would you do?"

Could this have been misinterpreted?

A spokesperson for Bennett [said yes](#), his remarks were misinterpreted. The minister was speaking in the context of military combat, where it may make more sense to kill captured terrorists rather than release them. However, critics claim that his political stance and past statements such as one [comparing Palestinians to shrapnel in a soldier's behind](#) do not support this explanation.

Rating:

Needs context. Naftali Bennett has acknowledged making the statement, but claims that it has been taken out of context.

Is Denver airport entangled in a government cover-up?

By: Inaaya Firoz and Kylie Richardson

Link to claim:

<https://www.uncovercolorado.com/conspiracy-theories-denver-international-airport/>

Intro:

Conspiracy theories can be fascinating. You could spend hours reading into them and travelling down a deep rabbit hole. The danger in this, however, is that when a conspiracy theory gains traction, it can become difficult to trace the facts, if there even are any, hidden inside layers of bad information.

Body:

Today, we will be focusing on a conspiracy theory surrounding the Denver International Airport. First, let's check the credibility of the person making this claim. Looking at his tiktok, he talks about many conspiracy theories, but after further research, it seems he is not a credible source. A red flag here is that he sells merchandise related to his content. This tiktok user is in no way affiliated with the Denver International Airport, and this was most likely a gimmick he used for clout. Although the user did not cite the source, after a quick search, we were able to find the exact website and claim. The title of the article that was referenced is "Denver International Airport Conspiracy Theories and the Surrounding Facts". Now, this article is clearly introducing conspiracy theories, and the information complimenting them. This is a red flag because the claim is introduced in an article about conspiracy theories. There are also many books written about Phil Schneider and the conspiracy theories surrounding his death. Books can be published on Amazon by anyone about anything, and people can pretend to be others to publish false information too. Looking at the source he got information from, it doesn't cite any external sources, making it questionable if it is believable or not.

Another red flag is that other sources say different things. Some imply Phil Schneider was one of the ones affiliated with the airport, some imply that his friend is. The way he died is also heavily unique across different sources. Some say he committed suicide, and various sources list different methods of suicide that was used. Was it by a piano cord wrapped around his throat? Was he killed in his apartment. Some say he held delicate information that the government wanted to classify, so he was murdered and passed off as suicide to avoid any suspicion. Many articles that directly mention Phil Schneider are not too credible, a lot of them are unsafe for your browser, and are ones anyone can edit information on. Many amazon books were published on him but sources are not cited, and much of the information from them can be found online. When searching the web for information on Phil Schneider, the majority of the results are not credible websites, but sites that explore conspiracy theories and related topics. The airport itself refers to the DIA files, which, when selected, directs you back to their website. A wikipedia search shows that many people expressed suspicion due to the fact that several articles mentioning Phil Schneider were taken down. Some believe that the government is responsible for taking it down, however, this is not verifiable since anyone can add and remove items off of Wikipedia.

Conclusion:

It was extremely difficult to research this topic, which made it easier to be fooled by the sources online. What appeared to be a fact was really just a circle of references to the same sources. While conspiracy theories can seem like harmless fun to explore, it is important to think critically

about the information presented. Many websites reference the same sources, making fact-checking a very confusing task. As much as they might entertain or bewilder people, it's so important not to share information that is too wild and unbelievable to be true.

Was the filibuster created to block Civil Rights Acts?

By Ava-Claire Castleman

The filibuster has been gaining a lot of attention lately and it hasn't been positive. Even twitter verified accounts are talking about it, but does that mean they speak only facts? The Citizens for Ethics account is verified, let's see what they have to say. On June 21st they made the following statement, "Fact of the day: the filibuster was originally used by racist senators to block civil rights legislation. The filibuster is still being used to block legislation that would prevent the disenfranchisement of people of color." The tweet got two thousand likes and one thousand retweets, but is it true?

What is a filibuster?

The first question that should be asked is what is the filibuster. The dictionary defines the word filibuster as: an action such as a prolonged speech that obstructs progress in a legislative assembly while not technically contravening the required procedures. To sum that up, a few synonyms of the word include procrastination, stonewalling, and delaying tactics.

But what is its origin?

The Citizens for Ethics account would lead you to believe it was originally used to stall Civil Rights Laws, but that isn't really the truth. National Geographic claims that, "The concept of the filibuster has been around since ancient Rome." However, it's also important to take a look at its first uses in the United States. The United States Senate states that, "The tactic of using long speeches to delay action on legislation appeared in the very first session of the Senate. On September 22, 1789, Pennsylvania Senator William Maclay wrote in his diary that the 'design of the Virginians . . . was to talk away the time, so that we could not get the bill passed.'" While the purpose of that first session of the Senate is unknown, there is absolutely no possibility that the filibuster's purpose could have been to obstruct Civil Rights Acts because the Civil Rights Movement did not begin until 1954, almost 200 years after this event.

Has It Been Used to Block Civil Rights Acts?

While it was not originally created to do so, it is true that the filibuster has been used to stop the passing of Civil Rights Acts. In fact if you do some research at senate.gov you will find that Senator Robert C. Byrd filibustered for a total of 14 hours and 13 minutes at a senate session about a Civil Rights Act that, if put in place, would have greatly improved the day to day lives of Black Americans.

While the filibuster wasn't originally created to promote racism, it certainly has in the past. But is it still supporting the oppression of minorities today, and is that something we can actually prove? Finding records of every filibuster ever is immensely difficult, if not impossible. I

think the underlying message of this tweet, however, was not about a specific filibuster, but about how it could potentially once again be used to suppress minorities.

Overall Rating

Given the evidence, it really just isn't possible that the filibuster was originally created to block Civil Rights Acts. Unfortunately, however, it has had a racist past. It's irresponsible to disregard its usage during the Civil Rights Movement and the fact that it could potentially be used in similar ways today. But there's really no way of proving that it's been used for the disenfranchisement of minorities because of the lack of records on the filibuster. This tweet is mostly false, but it does shed light on how the filibuster has been used for the disenfranchisement of minorities in the past.