
Newsweek criticised for unflattering cover

Posted by Brenna1508 - 2008/10/10 14:26

When a magazine is taken to task for publishing an "unretouched" picture of a presidential candidate it surely shows the level to which US politics has sunk.

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/newstopics/uselection2008/sarahpalin/3171956/Sarah-Palin-Newsweek-criticised-for-unflattering-cover.html>

Critics have said the current affairs weekly was cruel to use the picture, which shows blemishes on the face of Mrs Palin, the Republican vice-presidential candidate, in sharp detail, with some accusing it of acting maliciously. If this candidate expects to be taken seriously then surely a picture of her as she is today is acceptable? Or is it a beauty contest to gain access to the White House?

=====

Re:Newsweek criticised for unflattering cover

Posted by Meg - 2008/10/10 15:25

I agree that it shouldn't matter what she looks like. Why Newsweek decided to do it is debatable. All magazine covers are touched up so I am wondering if it was done to create chat about the issue. Whether that is to get people to buy the issue or for the Republicans to then be able to 'complain' that she has been treated unfairly. I think many people, whether they like her politics or not, may feel sympathetic towards her if they think she has been treated badly compared to the other candidates. Whatever the reason it was done, I'm sure it was done for a cynical reason.

=====