The Starr investigation and the destabilization of the Clinton Administration: Readers respond

18 June 1998

I find that your articles are not credible. Every paragraph is laced with your agenda, i.e., supporting the Clinton administration at all costs and discrediting any investigations or comments which may have a negative affect on them.

Luckily, we still live in country based on freedom. I fear that if somehow our country could be controlled by those with your mind set, we would be free no more.

DR
27 June 1998

Dear Editor,

It's about time information came out in favor of the president. The article by Martin McLaughlin "US polls show disgust with Star investigation" clearly show that there is some biased reporting, from a cover-up of polling results to blaming the American people for the media frenzy. As an American, I am sick and tired of this obsession with what goes on in President Clinton's pants—it's ludicrous. Why aren't we concentrating on what matters, like balancing the budget and the Asian Crisis. It is quite obvious that this is leading to nowhere because of Starr running into walls.

Sincerely,
JA
26 June 1998

This is the first well-written unbiased article relating to the ridiculous articles found on the scandal in the White House. Both my husband and I agree with your assessment totally. It will be a wonderful day when we can get back to the real world of business, and leave sexual affairs to the paperback writers and readers without a life! Bravo to your views on this matter. My husband and I both look far beyond the ink and paper for a leader and challenge other readers to do the same. Back to work America!

GM
26 June 1998

I am in agreement with the article that addresses the public disgust with the Mr. Starr and the Investigation. This farce has a serious anti-democratic feeling to it and Mr. Starr is clearly anything but an Independent Counsel. His actions push the envelope of investigative ethics and he seems to be willing to break the law himself in his lust for blood. His obvious ties to right-wing causes and his background make him suspect. When looked at in connection with his methods, he is clearly narrowly focused on creating evidence that may not be there and is possibly attempting to get Ms. Lewinsky to lie! This is entirely inappropriate behavior and this diversion—sponsored by the "Grand Ol' Party"—should be stopped now!

JKR
26 June 1998

One reason not covered in your article about the public's fatigue with the Starr investigation is the eradication of the "presumption of innocence" from this whole hyped-up media presentation. Trials should take place in the courts — not in the press!

LM
Ketchikan, Alaska, US
26 June 1998

It is amazing to see people like Matthews, Buchanan and numerous others most probably paid by Scaife and supported by the majority in the legislature poisoning the country and attempting to destroy this administration. Eventually the truth will triumph and all the ugly dwarfs will be forgotten and hopefully disappear from media scene.

SPG
26 June 1998

The talk shows every night are a disgrace and prove that the networks have no better "entertainment" to offer the public. The guests on these shows clearly prove that the Democrats are for the president and the Republicans are not - that is the bottom line. If the president has lied about his relationship with Monica Lewinsky I would not blame him. I would like to protect my family and because it's nobody's business. I don't think anyone has the right to ask about another person's sex life. We should be protecting our president and thanking him for all he has done for our country, for women, for the poor. He is of very high integrity. He is such a successful president, no wonder the Republicans are angry with him. They are, in my opinion, still angry that Bob Dole did not become president. We elected the best man for our future. I do hope that Ken Starr will end this business soon. I am ashamed to know that many Americans have no respect for the presidency and compare his situation to that of Richard Nixon, who was a criminal.

BB
26 June 1998

Editor:

Bravo!

You spoke clearly and orderly, my guess for a long time, with convincing facts. You have my sincere appreciation for your work.

Let me also share with you my view on Susan McDougal who just been released from jail. The remark she made a few months ago—"There are worse places than prison"—deeply touches my sense of righteousness, and courage. My guess is that she would rather stay in prison than submit herself to intimidation to sell out a friend. I know of less than a dozen women in the 20th century whose courage rivals Susan's. She has my deepest respect!

GL
26 June 1998

I saw the headline of your article on the Internet and curiosity compelled me to click into it. It confirms my total disgust with the media and its

© World Socialist Web Site

everlasting polls that put a halo on the Clinton White House to the detriment of Kenneth Starr. I doubt I will be accessing any of your material again, no matter what the headline. I would not have even sent this e-mail, except that I want to make sure that when you count your hits you do not consider all of them as favorable.

CC
26 June 1998

I think the Starr investigation should be halted immediately. All this time and money for this is absurd. While I think all of the sexual allegations against Clinton indicates that there is something wrong there, this is a personal matter and as long as the president can do his job then leave him alone. We often times get a perverted representation of the actual facts through the media which is to me a far greater perversion than President Clinton's. Who knows what is really going on? The accusations against the president by his female accusers does seem to serve them well. They're probably making more money now than the president. Who knows? Who cares? I have to admire him for still being able to do his job in spite of all this.

WP
26 June 1998

The effort to destabilize the office of President and eliminate Clinton has other implications. Coming of age in the late 20s and early 30s and growing up with Roosevelt and the Trotskyists I cannot figure out the agenda of the right. Most of the socialization done in the 30s has been undone almost gleefully. No individual could ever fill the office of president, not even the Pope and at the same time the religious right has almost managed to impose its agenda on the country. In the late 20s I grew up with the great achievement of "In God we trust" on the money and none in the pocket resulting from the right's agenda, but what is their agenda today if not the same under a different name?

JW
18 June 1998

I agree with the excellently written June l6, l998 article titled: "Report Charges Illegal Links Between Starr and Media," by Martin McLaughlin.

I have always believed "the media" was out to get Mr. Clinton—and obviously so does the majority of "the people"—thank goodness.

What is almost humorous is that "the media" is "out of touch" with the American people—the media "just doesn't get it". Or rather they want to brainwash the American public—but it isn't working.

I suggest that Mr. McLaughlin could have cited examples of corporate ownership of the media in his article, such as Mobile Oil owning NBC.

GREAT ARTICLE.

MZ
18 June 1998

Congratulations on a story that tells it like it is. This is the first time in any medium that I have seen or read it exactly as I knew it was happening. I am a former *Washington Post* editor, and I am sickened by the depths to which the *Post* and almost all other media in the US have fallen in the past few years. I have never read your Web site before, having just been referred to it by another site. Keep up the good work.

KM
16 June 1998

I think this report needs wide distribution! Great!

JM
16 June 1998

The report I just read "Report Charges Illegal Leaks Between Starr and Media" by Martin McLaughlin is apparently part of a "left-wing conspiracy" to discredit an honorable investigator, Kenneth Starr. Anyone who can look at all that has transpired against our current President and not see a huge problem in having him as the most powerful man in the free world has a problem themselves; and I believe it is a partisan problem. In other words, protect the liberal party at any price. And many of the accusations you have thrown at our independent counsel, Mr. Starr, could be lodged ten times over right back at the White House where there are experts in manipulation of the press, assassination of the character of anyone who crosses their path, smokescreens and stonewalling.

I firmly believe Mr. Starr will present a package to Congress that will vindicate him from all those who feel it necessary to ignore the facts and shoot the messenger. The fear of his report and the wrongdoing of the President is the purpose of all the "spinning" by the "damage-control experts" Clinton has had to hire to throw the focus off all the illegal stuff he's done and smear whoever might have the gall to attack him. He cannot use Truth as a defense so he must discredit those who accuse. Mr. Starr is criticized only because he has taken on the biggest sideshow in the world and this group of "leaders" in the White House are so much better at destroying character than they are at being forthcoming with evidence that should vindicate them if they are truly innocent. The mere fact that they hide and delay information is enough to make you question whether they could truly be innocent; and I personally have seen enough to know there is a lot going on in the White House that is much less than truthful.

What will our children think when they become adults and discover that this country, mired in illegalities and unethical behavior from the highest office in the world, condoned this behavior?

Do I expect a higher standard from the President than I do my neighbor? You damned right, I do! At least while his residence is the White House. If he can't keep on the straight and narrow for the years he has sworn to uphold the laws of this country then he's not good enough to be my President.

Personally, I feel Bill Clinton has done more to hurt this country than I could have believed possible about one human being; and he's had people like Martin McLaughlin to assist him and cheer him on.

Mr. Clinton, to my knowledge, has never accepted responsibility for anything that has happened in his administration, but he manages to take credit for anything positive even though he had nothing to do with it. Ronald Reagan deserves credit for the economy we enjoy today; Mr. Clinton has merely been successful in not destroying President Reagan's work.

In closing, what goes around, comes around. I believe Mr. Clinton will receive his just reward either while a sitting president or as his legacy.

HY
16 June 1998

I found your article of June 16 to be excellent. It is well written, concise and effective and I believe unassailable. The article had just enough venom to draw some attention. I want to offer my support for your writing. The people behind Starr are extremely dangerous. Clinton is not the issue. The important issue is the abuse by Starr's office, right-wing conservative politicians and their friends and an evil mass media. Thanks for the excellent work.

LR
16 June 1998

A great article—places everything in perspective and in a nut shell—-if anything good can come out of this travesty I hope it is a wake-up call to the American people to reach out and participate in protecting their rights to freedom and privacy. We must get out there and be aware of the needs of our communities, our environment, the world and then research, study, investigate where our political candidates stand and vote. But we can't afford to let our involvement stop there. We must be watchdogs of our elected officials. We must pursue their agenda and urge them to investigate and promote that which will benefit the people as a whole and not allow them to become blind-sited by conspiracy theories or political

© World Socialist Web Site

and monetary gain. We must make certain that our elected officials remain open-minded and labor for the best interests of their constituents and all Americans. We have fought too long and too hard for our freedom to be diminished or lost.

NT

16 June 1998

Reactionary interest, how about Clinton's welfare reform, how did you feel about that? He has done nothing for average Americans and made a total joke out of foreign policy. His greatest success has been that he has lucked up on a good economy, which may be turning south at this moment. Most REAL progressives see the Clintons for what they are: a bunch of elitists thugs who hold power at all cost and use the Constitution for toilet paper (don't forget those FBI files!).

JV

16 June 1998

Your last paragraph seems to suggest that you are still reeling with outrage over the ouster of Richard Nixon, in a media-driven coup d'etat originating with the *Washington Post* and other mainstream news outlets. Please expand on this important theme, for the benefit of those who have been misled into believing Watergate involved serious issues of executive corruption, as do the current White House scandals.

DW

16 June 1998

I am amazed that your article has naively assumed and accepted that everything contained in the Brill article is factual. And then you conclude your article writing, "What is shown on the television news each night and published in the daily newspapers each day is not an objective account of political events, but the outcome of manipulations involving small cliques who control the media monopolies, pursuing a definite political agenda."

Do you suggest that if it supports your own editorial beliefs it must be true, and anything else should be held to a higher level of scrutiny? Maybe you should examine Mr. Brill's possible agenda in trying to get a successful launching of his magazine. Or is he the only "journalist" with the truth that is beyond question and should be accepted at face value?

BD

16 June 1998

To contact the WSWS and the Socialist Equality Party visit:

wsws.org/contact

© World Socialist Web Site