

RELEASE IN PART B6

Re: The Huffington Post: Secretary Clinton, Middle EastNegotiations and Her Hair? Get Over It. by David Helfenbein

From: dphelf [redacted]

B6

To: Hillary Clinton HDR22@clintonemail.com

CC: dphelf [redacted]

Subject: Re: The Huffington Post: Secretary Clinton, Middle EastNegotiations and Her Hair? Get Over It. by David Helfenbein

[redacted]

[redacted] I assume you are heading back to DC tonight or tomorrow, hope you had some rest, and then as I read, off to Egypt for more negotiation talks. If there is one person who can make a huge difference, it is you. Must be really interesting perspective for you, especially knowing the toughest parts of it from back @ the end of the 1990s. Look forward to you reading my piece. It's about the negotiations, women, and you. Wishing you the best, as always. D

-----Original Message-----

From: H
Date: Mon, 6 Sep 2010 18:56:37
To: 'dphelf' [redacted]
Subject: Re: The Huffington Post: Secretary Clinton, Middle East Negotiations and Her Hair? Get Over It. by David Helfenbein

Thx, David--I'll look forward to seeing it online. [redacted]

[redacted] All the best from Chappaqua--H

----- Original Message -----

From: David Helfenbein

To: David Helfenbein

Sent: Mon Sep 06 15:22:02 2010

Subject: The Huffington Post: Secretary Clinton, Middle East Negotiations and Her Hair? Get Over It. by David Helfenbein

Have you seen it? Secretary Clinton is in the midst of probably the most intense and arguably most important diplomatic talks in years, and what are some of the newspapers writing about? The length of her hair!

"In her latest act of defiance, Hillary Rodham Clinton gets a new, longer hairdo," The Washington Post titles an article on Sunday, Aug. 29, just before the talks began; The Buffalo News titled an article : "Clinton's longer hair opens debate for women of a certain age" on Sept. 3, toward the end of a week filled with talks. These articles delve into age and hair-length and psyche and what this all means for someone in her sixties to be wearing hair at, G-d forbid, shoulder length. And so, I say, who cares?

When John Edwards turned to Hillary Clinton during the South Carolina presidential debate in July of 2007 and criticized her jacket, that was painful enough -- but at this stage of the game one would think, or at the very least hope, that we would be past all of this. Sure, some of these articles are complimentary (i.e. The Washington Post piece). Yet, this is entirely beside the point.

Find me parallel articles where a man in the midst of such important meetings has running commentary on his hair length; they don't exist. Newspapers don't write articles about the length of hair or face wrinkles or growing bald spots or suits and ties on men. This is the case unless, of course, there is something patently absurd to write about.

Is this because our societal values are so overtly placed on the importance of women's beauty and men's machismo? And thus, in such a universe, we occasionally see a photo-op with a male politician throwing around a football or playing basketball or golf, but rarely does the media demand certain "look" standards of male politicians. Now don't get me wrong, I have studied media and recall the Kennedy-Nixon debates well. As many of you likely already know, the majority of those watching on television thought that Kennedy won. The majority of those listening on the radio thought that Nixon won. Why? Watch the video. Of course looks matter.

But overall, with men today is it possible that it is the opposite societal structure? If a man (back to Mr. Edwards) gets an expensive haircut that is over the top -- this is where the criticism comes in, not the other way around.

So, what does this tell us about society that we don't already know? That ultimately