

12 March 94

[REDACTED]
Moundsville WV 26041

C Span
400 Capitol St NW #650
Washington DC 20001

To Whom it may Concern,

On 11 March 94, I watched Journalist Round Table. There were various points that I wanted to comment on, however I could never get through as the phone lines were constantly busy. I am writing this to express my views on several issues being discussed.

First, there were several points made on the issue of Sexual misconduct. It strikes me as fascinating that despite the absence of any solid credible evidence, Anita Hill is still looked at as an feminist heroine. Despite her claims to the contrary, I can't help but wonder just how much she makes from her book "The Real Anita Hill" and/or speaking engagements. People are ready to crucify Bob Packwood, including using the "harrassment" of a woman whom he asked to his apartment some 20 years ago! And yet when the names of Jennifer Flowers and Paula Jones comes up, suddenly its "media hype", or "the past is past!" For the record, I voted for Clinton/Gore, and even I can see a very large double standard here. The media jumps all over people like Packwood & Thomas, but when it comes to Clinton we hear "Well, we (the media) feel that these stories have been covered enough". What gives?

While I'm speaking of media coverage, I also heard alot of comments about how Whitewater is mostly media hype, & the media should let it go, & let Clinton get on with his job. Correct me if I'm wrong, but it has barely been 2 years since the campaign where George Bush was highly criticized by the public and the media for complaining about biased media coverage. As one example, Bush has the dubious honor of vetoing more bills than any other President. The media let us know this. And yet why is it that we were never really informed as to his reasons? How many bills were vetoed because people like Sen. Byrd threw in extra money for his own special pork-barrell projects? How many millions of our tax dollars have been tacked on to emergency relief bills for hiways and train stations, with Bill Clinton's signature of approval, and we hear very little, if anything at all about his senseless spending? Now, these same individuals who 2 years ago were criticising Bush, are screaming "Bad Press"! or "Media Bias!" Double Standard!

Another sore point with me is Whitewater. I heard a fax from a gentleman who stated that "people in the real world were not interested in Whitewater" Well, I also live in the "real world" and I am very concerned. When the story first broke, I too thought it was stupid, and funny. The Clintons merely made a bad investment, & got burned!" Then all of a sudden, there comes a hush from the white house, documents being destroyed and or comming up missing, possible tax fraud, (a Time Magazine article

leaves little doubt in that aspect), government kickbacks, and possibly even worse. Now, rumors are that Vince Foster may have been murdered. I doubt it, but anything is possible. My point is that I was not concerned until all this apparent coverup started. If Whitewater is merely a case of "bad investment" then why not come clean. This thing needs to be investigated. And, if a crime or crimes of any magnitude have been committed, the guilty parties brought to justice. And this is regardless of who you are or what your current job is. To me it is not merely a matter of appearance or credibility. It has gone way beyond that. This should be nothing less than a criminal investigation. And to the individual who made a comment about why it took so long to deliver the thousands of papers, I have this comment to make. You are correct in stating the amount of time, but also that time could used to remove any incriminating evidence. This is precisely why Whitewater should be investigated.

There were also various comments made about the media, specifically Rush Limbaugh, and the distortion of facts. To start with, Rush reads what is already reported in various news media, then comments on them. And he did say that the Vince Foster rumor is just that, a rumor. Last time I looked, our constitution said that this was totally legal. Why is it that when a story breaks in the Star or Enquirer, people flock to the stands to buy it, and at an alarmingly increasing rate what is yesterdays tabloid soap opera is todays headline news? But yet when people like Rush talk about or comment on a newspaper story, he is "distorting facts"? Theres that double standard again!

Well, thats about it for this one. I appreciate your interest. Until next time, so-long.

Very respectfully,

