

ALS & LETTERS

Los Angeles Daily News
4/27/97

PUBLIC • FORUM

Why the 'liberal' press wants to get Clinton

Richard Cohen's plea for fair treatment of President Clinton, fairly cries out for an explanation of why both conservatives and the so-called "liberal" press are so vehemently out to get him. ("When railing Clinton, keep facts straight," Opinions, April 17.)

First, years ago, conservatives put their trust in Richard Nixon and got Watergate and the first president to resign rather than face impeachment.

Later, they put their trust in Ronald Reagan, and got the trillion-dollar debt, the savings and loan debacle and the Iran-Contra scandal. Over time, in spite of a brave facade, shame and embarrassment ate away at conservative self-confidence.

The natural response was to look for liberal wrongdoing sufficient to balance the scales, even if only a little. Bill Clinton, with obvious personal flaws and a smart, aggressive wife who threatens America's male power structures, is a virtual godsend in the conservative search for "balance."

Second, the mainstream press, while never admitting it, has been deeply wounded by repeated accusations of liberal bias. It thus needs to prove it can be as hard on a Democrat as it was on Richard Nixon. Jimmy Carter was too clean, but Clinton is made-to-order.

The "liberal" press was also embarrassed by its cowardly, kid-gloves treatment of Ronald Reagan's foreign and domestic policies. Thus it delights in showing it can again be tough on a sitting president.

— **Bill Becker**
Woodland Hills

But the commission did more than just pick a capable interim chief. Its action tends to promote a neat-and-clean transition of leadership, avoiding the awkward or harmful possibility of an interim chief going for the permanent job and failing to what is a generalization which isn't at Parks or anyone else in (r.)

the commission's decision eliminate the possibility of an interim chief in the position improperly to boost his ego of getting the permanent job. (So, is a hypothetical generalization aimed at anyone in particular.) a third excellent reason for the — and a loud, clear message from the commission — is the asserting of proper independence from the

sin Riordan's recommendation.

mi
l st
O
ly
wl
r te
inc
alle
an
civ
ating
Commission report.
job, commissioners.

Responses To
my LETTER

DAILY NEWS,
5/2/97



The press vs. Clinton

I was really quite amused by Bill Becker's letter. "Why the 'liberal' press wants to get Clinton," Public Forum, April 27.

It seems to me that he overexplains "why conservatives and the so-called liberal press are so vehemently out to get him."

I really don't believe that it has anything to do with conservatives feeling betrayed by Richard Nixon and Ronald Reagan.

I don't believe that it has anything to do with Clinton having "obvious personal flaws and a smart, aggressive wife who threatens America's male power structures," although those seem to be good, liberal, politically correct arguments.

I wonder if it has ever occurred to Becker that the so-called 'liberal' press is simply doing its job: reporting patterns of corruption in the Clinton White House that have simply become too blatant to ignore.

— John McFadyen
Canonaka Park

Re Bill Becker's theory about why the liberal press wants to get Clinton (Public Forum, Sunday, April 27):

How simplistic and unrealistic of Becker to conclude that the conservatives' "shame and embarrassment" is at the root of the liberal press motives.

There are many media watchers who didn't note the print media doing any serious investigative reporting before the election, and now the networks hardly mention any of the current print revelations, so the majority of the TV news-watching public is unaware of the alleged illegal activities of the first couple.

It's always disturbing to see the radical left and the radical right both so close-minded that they forget about the true nature of democracy and freedom. The Clintons are not innocent victims, but the arrogant perpetrators of disrespect for the office of the president, without shame and embarrassment.

— E.L. Bihary
Mission Hills

Ironically, the only two letters printed in rebuttal of my argument come from people I know well. John McFadyen is the brother-in-law of an old high-school friend. He and his wife are musicians, and we worked together on the nuclear freeze movement.

Elaine Bihary is a former girlfriend, whom I met in a support group for the United Farm Workers Union in 1974. We had an intense and stormy relationship for about a year-and-a-half. She wrote here under her Hungarian maiden name thinking I would recognize it and get the joke. She and I are still good friends, and had lunch together two days ago.

— B.B. November 19, 2001