

Local Politics Matter

The Media v. Clinton

Journalists or Provocateurs

WE SEE
 WHAT
 WE
 WANT

The public depends on the press to present the facts (journalistic truth), but of late, they're getting more opinion than fact. The Commander and Chief Forum provided the press with the opportunity to question the Presidential Candidates about their foreign policy expertise. Instead of using this forum to enlighten the public, the moderator, Matt Lauer, began by asking Secretary Clinton about of all things, her private email server! She had thirty minutes to speak, and he decided to waste precious 13 precious minutes discussing her private email server, like that topic hasn't been examined ad nauseam.

Republicans complain that there are different standards for Secretary Clinton. They believe that she is given leeway where others would be held to account. I've been watching the media coverage of Secretary Clinton for many years and I agree that she is held to a different standard, a higher standard, higher than for any other politician Democratic or Republican. Just ask Ruth Marcus of the Washington Post. During an appearance on MSNBC's the Andrea Mitchell show, Ms. Marcus stated that it's possible that the [Clinton's are held to a higher standard](#) and scrutinized more greatly. She went on to suggest that they (the Clintons) should be making sure that

they don't put themselves in this situation. I assume that by "this situation" she means that they should avoid situations that could be "perceived" as being untoward. I believe that in moments of candor, most in the media would agree with Ms. Marcus, they hold the Clintons to a higher standard. I find this puzzling because time and again, there is no there, there. However, instead of moving on, they just keep digging, certain that they'll find something to prove themselves right, eventually. Secretary Clinton gave [speeches for a fee](#). It has become a cottage industry that many of our former presidents Ronald Regan, George H W Bush, George W Bush, Bill Clinton and former high ranking government officials have benefited from. The media has decided that the public should know what Secretary Clinton said in her speeches. They're only interested in her transcripts, not those of other former government officials. They've never asked for this information from any other presidential candidate. They try to rationalize this request by suggesting that no other presidential candidate was paid as much as she was paid to give speeches. Besides, why won't she provide this information, she must have promised to give them something, yeah that's right!

The Bushes, the Clintons and the Trumps have foundations. [The Bush family foundations](#) and the [Trump Foundation](#) have been virtually ignored by the media. Now with less than 60 days until Election Day, the Trump Foundation has come under scrutiny for an illegal campaign donation. With the exception of the Washington Post, the media has paid little attention to the Trump Foundation's actual conflict of interest. The rest of the media is too busy hounding Secretary Clinton for "perceived" improprieties. They questioned her veracity, calling her dishonest, then were forced to admit that there's no there, there.

The media seems to have no interest in Donald Trump's business ventures, his [tax returns](#) or his [health report](#)? They make cursory efforts to question Mr. Trump and his surrogates about all of these issues, but somehow the tables get turned and the media sits mutely while Trump's surrogates spew untrue talking points about Secretary Clinton. Secretary Clinton has already disclosed more information than Mr. Trump and despite what the Trump campaign says she hasn't broken any laws. Where is the media outrage regarding Mr. Trump's lack of transparency? How many in the media other than Rachel Maddow and NBC News have actually investigated Mr. Trump's doctor's letter attesting that Mr. Trump is "astonishingly" healthy? That letter is an absolute insult to our intelligence. Mr. Trump is making a mockery of our political system and the media in its obsession with the Secretary Clinton has become a willing partner in this very danger-

ous game. When will the media question Mr. Trump about his business concerns? They've demanded to know what will happen to the Clinton Foundation if Secretary Clinton is elected to the Presidency. What about Mr. Trump's businesses? If he's elected to the Presidency will he continue to run his businesses, will his family continue to run his businesses? Here we are less than 60 days until Election Day and only a few in the media seem interested despite the fact that there are numerous indications that his businesses have financial involvements with governments hostile to the interest of our country.

Many in the media call Secretary Clinton a liar. If the media is not actually calling her a liar, they sit quietly while their guests do the name calling, their silence implying agreement. Who in politics dissembles more than Mr. Trump? What's odd is that the media acknowledges that he is a liar, but they don't hound him about his actual lies in the same way that they hound Secretary Clinton regarding her perceived lies. Never mind the facts that [Politifact has deemed her to be the most honest](#) candidate running for office during this cycle.

Eugene Robinson has written that [Secretary Clinton's defensive behavior](#) contributes to the media's distrust of her. In essence, he says that if she structures her affairs so that there is not even a hint of impropriety, she'll avoid media scrutiny. I don't believe it, not for a minute. You see, when it comes to Secretary Clinton, the media has become convinced that she's dishonest, incapable of telling the truth. Further more they've allowed this belief to become their guid-

ing principle, that is, they start from the perspective that she's guilty, then they spend time and effort trying to prove it. When they find no proof of wrongdoing, they grudgingly and quietly back away from the story. A recently released email between Colin Powell and Secretary Clinton proved that she told the truth about getting advice from him regarding her email use. It also proved that Secretary Powell engaged in email practices that were similar to what she has been accused of. But guess what the media never bothered to investigate his email practices and he got rid of all of his emails. Did the media acknowledge that they were wrong when they accused her of lying about Secretary Powell? No way! Don't hold your breath.

There has never been any proof of a quid pro quo on Secretary Clinton's part, only that nagging perception of one. However, on numerous occasions, the media's questioned her veracity and damaged her reputation implying impropriety and lack of honesty. Then they publically marvel that the public doesn't trust her. It's like stepping on a bug and then questioning why it's dead. Go figure! The media should evaluate its performance at the end of this election. Did they justly cover the election or did they try to control and direct the voters through disinformation and misinformation, deliberately or unknowingly? Did their reporting or lack thereof affect the election results? Only time will tell.

[Share Your Comments](#)

[Return to LPM](#)