


If you don't regularly receive my reports, request a free subscription at steve_bakke@comcast.net !
Follow me on Twitter at <http://twitter.com/@BakkeSteve> and receive links to my posts and more!
Visit my website at <http://www.myslantonthings.com> !

 **TODAY'S "QUICK HIT":
SPECIAL PROSECUTOR
MUELLER: A CONFLICT
OF INTEREST? THERE'S
GOOD REASON TO ASK
THAT QUESTION!**



By Stephen L. Bakke  June 21, 2017

Here's what provoked me:

Too often politicians on BOTH sides of the aisle refer to their opponents' "conflicts of interest" as if it were some sort of disease, or a crime punishable by at least "stoning." Conflicts simply occur, and there's no shame if you find yourself in that situation. But one's conduct in the context of a conflict is important. There is an old caveat I was taught in college while preparing for my career: If something appears to be a conflict of interest, one should behave as if that situation is, in fact, a conflict. In the case of special prosecutor Robert Mueller, there's concern about and him the staff he has hired. Are there conflicts there, or is it just troubling appearance of conflicts? Either way they should.....well, you decide.

Here's my response:

Special Prosecutor Mueller: Conflicts of Interest? There's Good Reason to Ask the Question!

Robert Mueller was named "Special Prosecutor" to examine well, we aren't sure what he will be investigating – probably whether there was a Russia/US political conspiracy in the last election; perhaps whether Trump obstructed an investigation. But who knows for sure?

What we do know is that Mueller is personally close to James Comey, a crucial character whose handprints are all over this swirling controversy. We also know that Mueller's choice of staff is heavy with attorneys who were active financial supporters of politicians opposing Trump in the last presidential election. Some had close ties to the Obama Administration, and Hillary Clinton in particular.

One new staffer worked for Obama's Attorney General Eric Holder, was a dependable financial supporter of Democrats, represented Hillary Clinton in the lawsuit over her emails, and defended the Clinton Foundation in a racketeering lawsuit.

In preparation for my professional career, I was taught that if a reasonable person would perceive a conflict, then it's incumbent on the "conflicted" person to act as if a conflict exists – without regard to personal feelings to the contrary.

Does that characterization fit this situation? It's a worthy question. What do you think?