

In response to 'alternative facts'?

(Re: Politics as Usual, January 26)

This is in response to Allison Collins-Mrakas opinion on 'Trump and his appalling talking heads' under the title 'Those are the facts, Jack.'

Perhaps the writer should have been more appalled by Obama's lies about Obamacare, including you can keep your doctor and plan and the costs will not increase, or his lies about Benghazi being caused by a video, or his lie about the hundreds of millions of unmarked bills flown to Iran in a plane not being a payment for American hostages.

Obama lied about ISIS being the Junior Varsity team and pressured the intelligence community to prepare their reports to support his false narrative.

Those lies were about serious issues.

The argument from the Trump administration about crowd size was raised in response to the media's constant attempt to belittle his presidency.

This is not worth even reporting on. The media ignored Trump's huge crowd sizes compared to Hillary's small turnouts throughout the campaign.

Where is the outrage that a reporter falsely tweeted that Trump had removed the bust of Dr. Martin Luther King to push the lie that Trump is a racist? The reporter had to retract his tweet after it had been retweeted 3,000 times.

The facts were not checked before the tweet was sent. This paper's negative focus on Trump is only a distraction from our homegrown scandals perpetrated by Wynne and Trudeau, and that is a fact.

Shelley Wister
Aurora