

6-21-1993

The Press and Politics: A Comprehensive Examination

Heather Long
Boston College

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.umb.edu/nejpp>



Part of the [American Politics Commons](#), and the [Journalism Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Long, Heather (1993) "The Press and Politics: A Comprehensive Examination," *New England Journal of Public Policy*. Vol. 9: Iss. 1, Article 7.

Available at: <https://scholarworks.umb.edu/nejpp/vol9/iss1/7>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by ScholarWorks at UMass Boston. It has been accepted for inclusion in *New England Journal of Public Policy* by an authorized editor of ScholarWorks at UMass Boston. For more information, please contact scholarworks@umb.edu.

The Press and Politics

A Comprehensive Examination

Heather Long

This article is based on interviews and research on the press and politicians, whose relationship is shown to be extremely controversial. Views held by members of the press, who see themselves as dutiful to their readers, are radically different from those held by politicians, who see reporters as money-hungry thieves who do not stop short of invasion of privacy for a story. The views of scholars — who attempt to make sense of the relationship — are different from both. The author attempts to amalgamate these views, assess the picture of the institutional relationship as it truly exists, and discover means to resolve the apparent differences.

The auspice for this article arose during the five months I spent as an intern on Jon Keller's *Let's Talk Politics* weekly television program on WLVI-56, Boston, which is similar in style to *This Week with David Brinkley*. Keller interviews a locally or nationally known guest during the first half of the show, discussing issues germane to that person. In the second half, three representatives drawn from the local media, political consultants, scholars, or state representatives comment on the interview and discuss the events of the previous week.

During my tenure on *Let's Talk Politics*, I had opportunities to chat with many of these well-known figures, who harbor specific views on the role of the media in American politics. This article is a reflection of their views and, combined with research into the literature in the field, provides an insight to the relationship between the media and the politicians on whom they report. The questions posed to the guests were: With what ideas do you think the media approach politicians? Do you automatically assume that members of the media harbor an attitude of opposition to those in power, or do you consider them as agents of a fourth branch of government who operate as insiders?

In an era in which 73 percent of American adults claim to be newspaper readers and almost every American household has a television set in use an average of nearly

Heather E. Long is a master's candidate in political science at Boston College.

seven hours per day, the power of the press cannot be denied.¹ We as citizens owe it to ourselves to understand the way they report to us.

For the purposes of this article, the media comprise any person who reports on events that shape our lives. The type of reportage — print, television, and so forth — is largely irrelevant, except when specifically identified. Additionally, the terms “media” and “press” are used interchangeably.

The one constraint on the answers that follow is that many of the people interviewed were indigenous to the Massachusetts area. With the exception of Tom Harkin and several interviews in the literature, the respondents are based in Boston. Whether this affects their views is open to question. The Boston media are unique among peers. As one politician put it, “It is a common view that there are two newspapers in Boston. One tells you what to think and one shows you pictures.”²

Finally, while I have made a genuine attempt to keep election-time rhetoric out of this discussion, the unusually volatile nature of 1992 politics lends itself to the occasional slipping in of a review of events.

I begin with the history of the media and politicians, primarily during this century.

History

In *The Federalist Papers*, Alexander Hamilton states that “the public papers will be expeditious messengers of intelligence to the most remote inhabitants of the Union.”³ While Hamilton could not have foreseen the addition of television and radio to the media, we witness the importance placed on the institution from the onset. Indeed, it is an important starting point to recognize that the press is the only private institution enshrined in the Constitution. The First Amendment, which guarantees the freedom of the press, is the source of the U.S. media’s auspicious beginning.

One of the best works about the press and politics during this century is Douglas Cater’s *The Fourth Branch of Government*. The author points to the beginning of the press conference during Woodrow Wilson’s presidency and the specific earmarking of a room in the White House for the press as Theodore Roosevelt’s idea.⁴ During the next few years, the press room was an old boy’s network, largely informal and full of cigar smoke. By the New Deal era, reporters began to specialize according to agency or branch of government, but the process was still not entirely formalized.

A good many newspapermen look back with nostalgia to the [Franklin D. Roosevelt] press conferences . . . there was a spirit of informality and directness about the whole affair. The reporter shot his question at the President and received a quick retort, then hurried to get it down on the back of an envelope before the next round. There was no officially released transcript to challenge the reporter’s own notations. He and he alone conveyed information about top governmental policy from the White House to the public.⁵

Press coverage of the government became largely formalized under President Harry Truman. By January 1955, recording devices were allowed in press conferences for the first time. Today the placement of television cameras, microphones, and still cameras dictates the execution of a news conference. Press releases and leaks are strategically planned as a matter of daily measure. Scandals concerning our elected public officials — Watergate, Jimmy Carter in *Playboy*, Donna Rice, and on and

on — have all been discovered and disclosed by members of the mass media. Clearly, the face of the media and their importance in American society have grown considerably.

The Literature and Scholars' Views

During Grover Cleveland's first campaign for president, a Buffalo newspaperman discovered that the candidate had fathered an illegitimate child. Cleveland apologized, won, and was reelected four years later.⁶ Hugo Black, a Supreme Court justice nominated in the 1930s, was found by the media to have engaged in Ku Klux Klan activities. He apologized, said he no longer espoused such views, and took his seat on the bench without protest.⁷ Presidents John F. Kennedy and Franklin D. Roosevelt, and even Martin Luther King, Jr., are rumored to have had extramarital affairs during the course of their seat in public prominence. And yet, "Martin Luther King, Jr.'s indiscretions were shopped around by the FBI in the 1960's, but not even J. Edgar Hoover could find a reputable taker; among other dampers on the story, his liaisons simply had no visible effect on his civil rights crusading."⁸

In 1993, these reactions appear preposterous. The press harps on such issues unmercifully. A case in point is the early-on exposure of Bill Clinton's extramarital affairs or Dan Quayle's joining the National Guard in lieu of serving in Vietnam. What accounts for this change in the attitude of the press? Why can they not stop reporting on Gary Hart's dalliance with Donna Rice or Barney Frank's relationship with a live-in male prostitute?

Most scholars point to Bob Woodward and Carl Bernstein's uncovering of what came to be known as the Watergate affair as the beginning of the modern media. Doris Graber points to the irony in it.

It is ironic that the power of the press, which had done so much to propel Richard Nixon into the highest office of the land, ultimately launched his downfall as well. Without the persistent probing by *Washington Post* reporters into the misdeeds of the Nixon administration, the Watergate scandal would very likely have remained a minor story.⁹

Graber explains that the modern media want to entertain and excite, not necessarily educate us. Conflict and controversy are far more interesting than the so-called puff stories about good deeds and things going right. In addition, the press elects to give the public breadth instead of depth in its reports.¹⁰

Newspeople want stories that are newsworthy, judged by the usual criteria. They believe that their public is more interested in exciting events and human interest tales than in academic discussions of public politics, their historical antecedents, and their projected impact, expressed in statistics. Newspeople also feel a special mission, like Shakespeare's Mark Antony, "to bury Caesar, not to praise him." And, like Brutus, they claim that their criticism is not disloyalty. They do not love the government less, they only love the nation more.¹¹

However, not all scholars buy into the thinking that sees the intent of the media as altogether altruistic. Kiku Adatto, a student at the Joan Shorenstein Barone Center for

Press, Politics, and Public Policy of Harvard's John F. Kennedy School of Government, researched the difference between the 1968 and 1988 elections and found that in 1988

the focus of television news on media events, political commercials, media advisors and failed imagery, reflects the turn of political coverage to theater criticism. But this image-conscious coverage did not succeed in avoiding the manipulation of the campaigns. Instead, it shifted attention from the substance to the stagecraft of politics, and eroded the objectivity of political reporting.

Rather than report the facts, or the actual records of the candidates, there was a tendency simply to balance perceptions, or to air an opposing image. Fairness came to mean equal time for media events, equal time for political commercials. But this left the media hostage to the play of perceptions the campaigns dispensed.¹²

In other words, the media have shifted from substance to "puff" and allowed themselves to be guided by political consultants.

But if we accept this way of thinking, how would scandals such as Iran-contra and Watergate ever have been brought to the attention of the American public? Certainly these were not puff stories.

Denis McQuail attempts to answer this question by dividing the media's reporting methods in this country into three phases. The first, from the turn of the century to the 1930s, is characterized by empirical observation, not scientific investigation. In reports to their papers and radio stations, members of the press interjected their opinions as often as they interjected facts.

The next phase, from 1940 to the 1960s, saw the growth and application of the empirical method of research. Specificity was the key.

In the third phase, from the 1960s to the present, the media have taken over the agenda-setting power in this country. By choosing what to report on daily, they assume the power to control the minds of citizens and politicians alike.¹³ Gladys and Kurt Lang elaborate on this point by discussing the two functions of the media — one to disseminate information from which the public may formulate opinions, the other to disseminate public opinion to American legislators for their interpretative use in shaping voting and policy positions. The Langs state that the media thrive on scandal, which influences what they choose to report.¹⁴ This turns the picture from reporting puff pieces to digging up scandal.

However, if it is true that the media thrive on scandal and try to ferret it out wherever they can to sell papers or get ratings, perhaps this may not be all bad. In 1975, *Los Angeles Times* reporters teamed up with Congressman Peter Stark to investigate the treatment of American prisoners in Mexican jails. The result of their combined efforts was a congressional investigation into the matter and an eventual prisoner exchange with Mexico.¹⁵ This reflects not the press in opposition to the parties in power but a joint effort of both, with which Douglas Cater would have agreed. His view, from a 1959 historical perspective, was that the press operates independently of the government, hence his title, *The Fourth Branch of Government*. Sometimes working in conjunction with the other branches, sometimes following their own agendas, the media answer to no one.¹⁶

Dom Bonafede takes these ideas one step further, stating that “in assessing candidates, helping to set the political agenda and weighing questions of morality, the press operates without formal guidelines, relying on ad hoc, self-defined, self-imposed and self-regulated standards.”¹⁷

Yet many emphasize that the press must remain accountable to the public, if for no other reason than to sell its papers or improve its ratings. In this light, “self-defined, self-imposed and self-regulated standards” can go only so far before the public stops believing in the media. Stephen Hess, a media/politics specialist at the Brookings Institution in Washington, D.C., says, “Given the constraints [the media] operates under, it has been unusually accurate. It deserves high marks for seeing through the tissue of lies and the smokescreen of irrelevancies put out [to it].”¹⁸

William Schneider and I. A. Lewis, in a report of a survey of journalists, editors, and their readers, agree. They found that journalists are more liberal in their personal views than the public in general; however, the public neither perceives nor is bothered by this in assessing their newspapers. And while “there are all sorts of subtle, unconscious ways that journalists’ values affect their professional performance — their choice of subjects, for instance, or the kinds of sources they find credible,” journalists feel that their liberal values are balanced by their editors’ more conservative tendencies.¹⁹

In lieu of journalists using their political bias in reporting, Schneider claims,

the press follows the polls. If a president is doing poorly in the polls, the press will dwell on his failures. If a candidate holds a steady lead, the press will portray him as a political genius. That is why the press treated Bush more harshly than it did either Clinton or Perot, as recent studies have shown. The bias is populism, not liberalism.²⁰

Gail Leftwich of the Kennedy School of Government describes the role of the changed media.

There is a tinge of sadness in the change [in the media] at the price that’s being paid. The problem is that we’re now seeing how the sausage gets made. In the past . . . the press was there watching, yet now there’s perhaps too much focus on irrelevancies, but there was also a time when behavior that we now think is inappropriate or when people who should have been a part of what’s going on were excluded because it was really a much more closed, controlled process. . . . It’s fine when you can trust that the people you are electing are in fact going to serve the public interest. But [that’s not always the case]. That’s where the press does have to play a role for the little guy. Somebody does in fact have to look out for the person who doesn’t always have access.²¹

Walter Guzzardi concludes:

In the end, the media have to make their way in the world of commerce. That may lead to many kinds of reporting that we don’t like, but it remains the best system. The media so often support the machinery of power because we, their audience, would not have them do otherwise.²²

It appears that scholars perceive no problem with the manner in which the media approach their reporting of politics. Let's see what the politicians think.

The Politicians

The 1992 presidential candidates seem to have a general politician's view on media coverage. Senator Tom Harkin said,

The one thing I have to say about the national media is that it tends to find one subject, one small story, and stick to it. [Politicians] then find it hard to break out of that mold. Otherwise I think the media's job is to probe and question everything without malice or malicious intent.²³

Paul Tsongas, after pulling out of the race, said,

I'm convinced that politics could not successfully exist without the media. . . . People need it because it makes them feel safe and it acts as a safeguard. . . . My only advice to the press would be not to use their power to write candidates off before they get a chance to get their message across. It's not allowing all to compete on an even keel.²⁴

Senator Thomas Eagleton said in a telephone interview that he thinks the press sometimes goes too far.

The rules are much different from a half-century ago, during the time of Franklin D. Roosevelt. Then, the press operated under a gentleman's agreement; no pictures were published of FDR in a wheelchair or struggling on crutches. I suspect that more than half of the country didn't know he was a victim of polio.

Today, it is very doubtful that Roosevelt could be elected President of the United States. There would be pictures on the front page and on TV showing him being carried or trying to get into a car with his legs in braces. People would feel that we need a more vigorous President.²⁵

Eagleton sees the increased probing by the media as discriminating against would-be politicians who are somehow set apart from the norm.

Vice President Dan Quayle's political consultant and former Reagan White House aide, Joseph Canzeri, concurs with Eagleton. "[A] *National Enquirer* mentality exists among some members of the press corps. I'm sensitive to the media. They have to do their job, but sometimes they go beyond reasonable bounds."²⁶

Massachusetts Lieutenant Governor Paul Cellucci highlights the instigator attitude of the media in the context of the Republican candidates for the presidential nomination in 1992. "I think the press is trying to create a row within the Republican Party. Here's [Patrick] Buchanan, spending millions on a campaign and he can't even get 40 percent of the vote in *any* primary, yet the press keeps harping on the damage Buchanan is doing. It's ridiculous."

Regarding the media in general, Cellucci commented: "The press is always in search of a story. The more controversy they create, the more newspapers they sell. They're in opposition [to the people in power in government] to the extent that it sells newspapers."²⁷

Again we see represented the idea that the media will do anything to be popular and make money, a point of view magnified by Senator Charles Shannon.

While I think the media acts in a good way as a system of checks and balances on government affairs, I also think there is a great deal of yellow journalism today, slanted the wrong way and missing the true issues. In Ben Franklin's time people got *events* reported to them, but today the emphasis is more on people's personal lives than their leadership abilities. Most of the journalism today is trash, I wouldn't give a dime for half of it. I'm here to be whacked at, but don't undermine [my colleagues and myself] because of nonprofessional attributes, only on the basis of our jobs and what's going on there. Time is sliding by and [the public] is missing out. [Reporters should] tell me what the hell someone's going to do for the country, not this other foolishness!²⁸

Even angrier at the media is Democrat Frank Bellotti, former lieutenant governor, state treasurer, and longtime Massachusetts politician, who thinks that the media spend too much time trying to investigate politicians' lives and bring the wrong people down.

A lot of the newspapers seem to get a lot of enjoyment from bringing politicians down. Public service isn't what it used to be. . . . The media love to write what's bad about politicians. . . . A lot of this started after Watergate. It became like open season. You don't need a hunting license to write about politicians.

He gives an example of what he means and how it can have a detrimental effect.

The House bank scandal is dominating the news and it's going to bring a lot of congressmen down, but no one says a great deal about savings and loans, which is like \$500 billion dollars, and the checks on the bank [aren't] even the taxpayers' money, like the S and L is. But it's too big, so you bring congressmen down for foolishness like that. In this way you're not attracting the best people to run. . . .

You look at the people writing and editorializing about Warren Rudman. [They are saying], "Why is he retiring when he should have the courage to stand up and accomplish what he should be able to accomplish?" Then you kill these people and wonder why they're not there.²⁹

But not all people in politics are bitter about the press, even when they have been on the losing end of the scale. "Dukakis '88" press secretary Dayton Duncan does not blame the press for digging up scandals about politicians.

Part of a candidate's character and history also includes whether he spent weekends on yachts with young models, inflated his academic record, once used an illegal drug, led a wild life before a religious conversion, went into the National Guard instead of to a war he publicly supported, has exhibited streaks of "meanness" or sought professional help during times of personal tragedy. Such things are not just "fair game" for the press, they are bits of information the public deserves to know before choosing its president.³⁰

Keeping this information in mind, we turn to the pundits' opinions of their trade.

The Pundits Speak Out

It is interesting to note how much more altruism and trust in the public's ability to sift through the news is emphasized by the opinion on the other side of the camera. While no one denies that there are a few bad apples in every crowd, the media seem to think their attitude is necessary.

It seems only right to start with Jon Keller, with whom I had the most contact. In addition to hosting *Let's Talk Politics*, Keller is a political reporter for the *Boston Phoenix* and commentator for WBZ radio. He says of the press position toward politicians:

The press is adversarial in attitude not in any partisan way. I don't have a laser gun pointed at everyone, but I have the responsibility to the *public* to not do puff pieces on good little programs. Instead, I'm an ombudsman who owes the public the true story for them to sift through.

Regarding the allegation that the media just want to sell newspapers, Keller says, "I don't see a conflict between reporting to the people and selling papers. But some do. *Some* are self-serving and would film a man lighting himself on fire but not help him put himself out." In response to the Los Angeles riots of April 29, 1992, he said:

The press may be partly to blame for the continued rioting there after the first day, but what is the press to do, not report on it? That would be a travesty. However I saw a black kid on television state the point. When the reporter asked the kid why he was destroying his own neighborhood, the kid replied that he felt it was the only way to get the press there to listen and report their anger.³¹

Meg Vaillancourt, former Monitor channel correspondent, agrees with Keller and justifies the opposition of the press to those in power.

I see myself as a conduit of information. Information is power, and I see it as my job to dig deep for anything to give to the public that might help them make their decision in voting or opinion formulation.

As for the recent flood of "trash TV," there has always been trash media. Our roots are in institutions such as the British media where if there isn't a half-naked woman on page three no one will buy it. There's never been a lack of trash. Anyone who is nostalgic for that Eden of journalistic golden days is remembering what never was. We've come a long way from the good-ol'-boy days of [Dwight] Eisenhower and beyond where media elites made or destroyed a politician before the public had a chance. So, yes, I'm in opposition to the one who holds power; I'm on the side of the public.³²

David Brudnoy, political commentator for WBZ radio, agrees but cautions us: "I think what we have to watch out for is 'advocacy journalism,' in which . . . particular media persons' [own] views color the approach, quality, and content of their reporting."

Calling to mind the research done by Schneider and Lewis, Brudnoy adds:

While I know that the vast majority of the media is relatively liberal in their personal political views, I think there is very little advocacy journalism in our mass

media. In general I feel the media does its best to dig on both sides of the issue, not as a bedmate to the party in power or the party running against it.³³

Another word of warning comes from Fredric Smoller, who details the time he was interviewing Sam Donaldson in a San Francisco hotel room. From their window they could see a fire and Donaldson decided to cover it, so off they went.

As we made our way over barricades and water hoses, someone shouted, "Hey, it's Sam Donaldson." "Go get 'em Sam," the crowd cheered. Even some of the firemen who were involved in battling the blaze turned their heads, and an article in the next day's local paper made mention of the correspondent's presence at the fire.³⁴

In this light, we see media people with a high recognition factor, so high it nearly overshadowed a fire. This may affect the manner in which they approach their jobs by being egged on by onlookers.

In addition, the press can get angry at those they cover when they are kept in the dark. The press was kept in ignorance for sixty hours when the United States invaded Grenada in October 1983. They were enraged. "John Chancellor and David Brinkley later explained to a House judiciary subcommittee that there is a long history of conventions between government and the press that have allowed invasions to be covered, including Normandy in 1944, without compromising the military operations." After the press was finally allowed to cover that conflict, they filled their audiences with suspicion by overstating the fact that all films shown were cleared by the government. CBS carried a strip across the bottom of the screen stating that it had been "cleared by the Defense Department censors." In addition, Dan Rather kept restating the message. This left doubt in the viewers' minds as to whether the events took place as they were seeing them.³⁵ This was an extreme way for the press to let people in power know that they were not pleased at having been left in the dark on major events.

Albert Hunt, capital bureau chief of the *Wall Street Journal*, thinks that the increased presence of women in the press room has changed "the old boy view of sexual dalliances and other traditionally male misbehavior, such as drunkenness. 'When I began to cover politics, it was always, "Yeah, he's really something, that son of a gun." And now it's a good deal more pejorative,' he says. 'And I don't think that's bad.'"³⁶

The late Howard Simons, onetime *Washington Post* managing editor, agreed with Hunt.

There was a time when there was a big wink-a-wink at what a politician did, because it was the private life of a politician. Between that decade and this one, there's been an awful lot of change . . . and some of that has been for the better. There's been Vietnam, and Watergate, and this generation is more cynical. It's the same generation that goes not to the National Press Club bar after every assignment and knocks down a few, but goes home.³⁷

By and large, the media view themselves as doing a good job relaying information. They see it as their responsibility to tell the public everything they can find and

then let the public draw its own conclusions. Simons again responded: "All [information] is fair game. The public is not dumb, it can sort out what is trivial. It does a pretty good job given the choice it gets."³⁸

Putting It All Together

This examination has revealed three distinct views on the attitudes of the press toward the politicians on whom it reports. The scholars seem to feel that be it to sell papers or to disseminate information to the public, the press is interested in scandal and will indeed dig it up where they can. The politicians, somewhat angrier than the scholars, while agreeing that the media are necessary, think they go too far in looking for issues to report. In the process they bring down politicians unnecessarily. Media people, on the other hand, seem to feel that what they do is warranted. While there may be a few who abuse the institution, for the most part the media today do a better job than previously of reporting to the American people the events that affect their lives, owing in large measure to the growth of cynicism and the increased role of women in the profession. What conclusions can we draw from these viewpoints?

Where is the fine line between the public's right to know and the politicians' right to privacy? Or do politicians indeed have a right to privacy? Do they effectively surrender that right when they decide to spend their lives in the public sector? The line lies somewhere between Frank Bellotti's view that the wrong people are being brought down for the wrong reasons and Howard Simons's view that the press should dig for everything and let the people ponder what is and is not valid information before making a decision. How do we distinguish that line and force the media to obey it?

While the fine line will be debated eternally, the reformation of the press is something that appears to be universally agreed upon. Senator Shannon says:

The bull needs to be taken by the horns. However, journalists should do this themselves. They should band together and not allow themselves to fall under peer pressure or pressure from their editors [to cross the line of decency]. There needs to be a rebirth of independence from the powers of the editors in chief.³⁹

Complementing Shannon's ideas, Schneider and Lewis point to the public's view of how the press should be handled.

A substantial minority of the public, however — 40% — feel that the news media abuse their power. How should these abuses be handled? Surprisingly, the public agrees with professional journalists: The media should regulate themselves, rather than be subject to more government regulation or stronger court sanctions.⁴⁰

While all seem to agree that there is at least some irresponsible reporting in the media, no one thinks that increased legislation or government intervention is warranted in this situation. Instead, the First Amendment should be respected and we should trust that the media can correct themselves. Perhaps it is as Meg Vaillancourt says, that we are not really any worse than other countries from which we got our media roots. Gail Leftwich adds that we are now seeing the messes our political leaders get themselves into. For years we were not aware of their indiscretions. Now

that it appears we have become increasingly cynical, we are seeing our leaders for what they are — human.

Once we learn to get past the fact that no political leader is a Mother Theresa, we can either accept all of them for their faults or reject them on the basis of their judgment. I for one would rather be privy to the information and make the decision for myself than not be told and perhaps elect an official who might not possess the judgment I thought he or she had. Indeed, this may be the current trend in political reporting. Commenting on the differences between the 1988 and the 1992 presidential races, William Schneider writes:

The 1988 election proved that negative campaigns work. A negative campaign got George Bush all the way to the White House. Negative press coverage drove two candidates out of the race. As a result, negativism began to seep through the press and the political system like poison.⁴¹

In contrast, 1992 saw a rejection of negatives by the electorate, reflected in the press's treatment of campaign reporting.

When the press attacked [Bill Clinton] on his draft record and his relationship with Gennifer Flowers, Clinton took his campaign directly to the people. He insisted on face-to-face meetings with the voters. . . . Clinton used the voters to defy the press and force it into submission. The press essentially dropped the womanizing and draft issues.⁴²

Here we see the beginnings of a new idea, bypassing the media to get ideas across to the public.

Schneider concludes:

What was new about 1992 is that the candidates figured out ways to use public opinion to set the agenda they wanted — and to outsmart the press.

If the ultimate symbols of the 1988 campaign were Donna Rice and Willie Horton, then the ultimate symbols of the 1992 campaign will be Edmund G. (Jerry) Brown Jr.'s 800 number, Perot's live appearances on "Larry King Live" and Clinton's playing the saxophone on "The Arsenio Hall Show."⁴³

In other words, perhaps during the course of the 1992 election we witnessed the beginning of a new era, one in which the politicians will not stand for the agenda setting and offensive techniques of the press, as they see them. Instead, it is the politicians who have gone on the offensive in protest of the media's treatment of them. Future campaigns and continuous coverage of the issues and events that affect this country will give way to conclusions regarding this seemingly new trend facing us.

As for the disagreement between the press and the politicians, Stephen Hess gives us an ironic anecdote: "Without prompting from me, White House Press Secretary Larry Speaks and White House correspondent Andrea Mitchell on the same day complained in the same words, '[Reporters and officials] push the stories they want.'"⁴⁴

Therefore, if you're waiting for the end of the conflict between the press and the politicians, get set for a long siege. ♣

Notes

1. Interview with Republican state Senator Charles Shannon of Winchester, April 29, 1992.
2. Doris Graber, *Mass Media and American Politics* (Washington, D.C.: CQ Press, 1989), 2.
3. Alexander Hamilton, "Number 84," *The Federalist Papers*, ed. Clinton Rossiter (New York: Mentor Books, 1961), 517.
4. Douglas Cater, *The Fourth Branch of Government* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1959), 32.
5. *Ibid.*, 35.
6. Michael Wines, "In Bed with the Press," *Washington Journalism Review* 9, no. 7 (September 1987): 16.
7. William H. Rehnquist, *The Supreme Court: How It Was, How It Is* (New York: Quill, William Morrow, 1987), 72.
8. Wines, "In Bed with the Press," 17.
9. Graber, *Mass Media and American Politics*, 1.
10. *Ibid.*, 84.
11. *Ibid.*, 113.
12. Kiku Adatto, "Sound Bite Democracy: Network Evening News Presidential Campaign Coverage, 1968 and 1988," discussion paper (Cambridge: Joan Shorestein Barone Center for Press, Politics, and Public Policy, Harvard University, June 1990), 13.
13. Denis McQuail, "The Influence and Effects of Mass Media," in *Media Power in Politics*, ed. Doris Graber (Washington, D.C.: CQ Press, 1984), 38.
14. Gladys Engel Lang and Kurt Lang, "The Media and Watergate," in *Media Power in Politics*, 204.
15. Susan Heilmann Miller, "Reporter and Congressmen: Living in Symbiosis," in *Media Power in Politics*, 274–281.
16. Cater, *The Fourth Branch of Government*.
17. Dom Bonafede, "Scoop or Snoop?" *National Journal* 20, no. 45 (November 5, 1988): 2793.
18. *Ibid.*, 2794.
19. William Schneider and I. A. Lewis, "Views on the News," *Public Opinion* 8, no. 0149-9157 (August/September 1985): 6–9.
20. William Schneider, "When Issues, Not Personalities, Rule," *Boston Herald*, December 5, 1992,
21. Interview with Gail Leftwich on *Let's Talk Politics*, WLVI-56, Boston, April 24, 1992.
22. Walter Guzzardi, "The Secret Love Affair Between the Press and Government," *Public Opinion* 8, no. 0149-9157 (August/September 1985): 5.
23. Interview with Democratic Senator Thomas Harkin of Iowa, January 7, 1992.
24. Interview with former Democratic Senator Paul Tsongas of Massachusetts on *NBC Sunday Today Show*, March 22, 1992.
25. Bonafede, "Scoop or Snoop?" 2792.
26. *Ibid.*, 2793.
27. Interview with Lieutenant Governor A. Paul Cellucci, March 16, 1992.
28. Shannon interview.
29. Interview with Frank Bellotti on *Let's Talk Politics*, WLVI-56, Boston, April 24, 1992.

30. Dayton Duncan, "Press, Polls, and the 1988 Campaign: An Insider's Critique," discussion paper (Cambridge: Joan Shorenstein Barone Center for Press, Politics, and Public Policy, Harvard University, August 1989), 9.
31. Interview with Jon Keller, May 1, 1992.
32. Interview with Meg Vaillancourt, January 7, 1992.
33. Interview with David Brudnoy, April 24, 1992.
34. Fredric T. Smoller, *The Six O'Clock Presidency* (New York: Praeger, 1990), 140.
35. Stephen Hess, *The Government/Press Connection* (Washington: Brookings Institution, 1984), 59.
36. Wines, "In Bed with the Press," 19.
37. Ibid.
38. Bonafede, "Scoop or Snoop?" 2793.
39. Shannon interview.
40. Schneider and Lewis, "Views on the News," 11.
41. Schneider, "When Issues, Not Personalities, Rule," 21.
42. Ibid.
43. Ibid.
44. Hess, *The Government/Press Connection*, 109.