

THE OBSERVER



Monthly Publication

Volume 2 | Publication 15

Reporting Accurate and Objective Information Based on Facts, not Agenda-Setting Theories

Dominic Casey | Private Investigator

11:38 PM EST | June 24, 2010

Vetting – What Are They Hiding

The man with the secrets - knows. It could be a professional investigator, a secret service bureau, a research organization, the MI5, the FBI, the CIA or any one of the numerous specialized agencies that scrutinize and evaluate one's background, finances and integrity.

Those involved in business or politics have undoubtedly experienced a "vetting". *Depending on your source of etymology, [vetting](#)* is a term that derived from the word veterinarian in the 1860's. In the early 1890's it became a term associated with horseracing. The gamblers wanted to know if the horses had been vetted aka examined. Currently, the word vetting is associated with politicians who are 'running their own race'.

The media takes pride in their skills of vetting candidates and celebrities and have been credited to cause a turn of events for many candidates. One such Presidential hopeful [Senator Gary Hart](#) taunted the press with his daring comment "*put a tail on me*" which revealed his fling with Donna Rice on a boat called Monkey Business. How apropos! Personnel known as fact-checkers are often used by the media.

Verification of data by two independent sources is often accepted as factual. However, investigative data by a professional investigator [must be sourced numerous times](#), cross-referenced and scrutinized more thoroughly before acceptance.

Vetting political candidates is traditional. However, the U.K. has a different policy.

Although it's thought that the MI5 "vets" Ministers, Members of Parliament, and every government employee... that is a myth. "Ministers and MPs are not subject to vetting. An incoming Prime Minister will only be told of any information gained on a potential member of the new Cabinet if that information is both serious in the context of national security and it appears likely that the individual concerned will need access to sensitive information." A record comparison is made for employees who are exposed to sensitive government documents and do not investigate/interview candidates on behalf of the UK. That the [MI5](#) only works in the UK is another myth.

When does vetting cross the line and become a sensationalized morsel?