

[Archive](#) > [2009](#) > [Jan](#) · [Feb](#) · [Mar](#) · [Apr](#) · [May](#) · [Jun](#) · [Jul](#) · [Aug](#) · [Sep](#) · **[Oct](#)** · [Nov](#)

[October 7, 11:20 AM, 2009](#) · [No Comment](#) · [Previous](#) · [Next](#)

## The Media and the National Security State

By [Scott Horton](#)

The mainstream media's coverage of the [National Security State](#) leaves much to be desired. The Cato Institute's Julian Sanchez takes us through a recent Fox News report dealing with the Patriot Act. As you will see, it's not a question of Fox making a mistake here or there—the entire Fox report is essentially devoid of fact, concocted in some politically supercharged alternate reality.



And here [Glenn Greenwald asks](#) a simple question: what is the difference between a *Washington Post* article reporting on the Obama Administration's use of national security law tools and an Obama Administration press release? Answer: nothing. Greenwald makes his point very effectively just by collapsing [Anne Kornbluth's article](#) to its sources:

Obama aides pointed . . . administration officials said . . . a senior administration official said . . . officials said . . . a senior administration official said . . . senior Obama officials stressed . . . a senior administration official said . . . aides said . . . officials said . . . one senior administration official said. . . one senior official said. . . The official said . . . a senior administration official said . . . a senior administration official said . . . administration officials said . . . a senior official said.

The White House used to have a steno pool to help put out its messages. But who needs that when you have the staff of the *Washington Post* working for you?

[Previous](#) · [Next](#) · More [No Comment](#) · [Respond via email](#)