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Introduction

The media has often been accused of irresponsibly depicting the news by slanting coverage toward a specific bias. Since very few people witness news-worthy events firsthand, they rely on the written media to reveal the facts, details, and implications of a given event. At times, the coverage is altered by the ideologies of the individual author, the publication, or the subject of the article. Therefore, the media serves as a form of Intellectual Leadership, abusing a relationship with the public by attempting to shape and formulate public opinion. The purpose of the following project is to research two major historical issues, analyze the print news coverage, identify any bias evident in the articles, and explore the connection between bias in the media and Intellectual Leadership. The hypothesis of this research project is that the print media serves either a liberal or conservative bias in their coverage of selected historical topics and as a result, exemplifies Intellectual Leadership.
The project utilizes a case study approach and for this reason, it is necessary to investigate the appropriate procedures involved with this type of study. According to Jacques Hamel, the first step is to "distinguish between the object of study and the selected case study for the purposes of observation."\(^1\) Then, the ideal case is selected from an initial theory, or, "the initial idea that a researcher had of the perceived social issue or phenomenon."\(^2\) For this project, the object of study is the presence of a liberal or conservative bias within the media and the cases for study are the testimony of Lt. Col. Oliver North and the Democratic Fundraising Scandal. The cases will be determined according to my "initial theory," that there exists a bias in the coverage of these topics by the written media.

Since the hypothesis of the following project deals directly with bias and the media, the next step is to explore the terms "liberal" and "conservative." Often times, these terms are overheard in the halls of Congress and are almost synonymous with certain politicians in Washington D.C. There exists a spectrum of political ideologies or, as it is more commonly referred to, the "left" and "right." Although a conservative or liberal tendency is often witnessed in Washington D.C., the media also adheres to this system of classification.

The print media, including The Washington Post, New York Times, Los Angeles Times, and the Chicago Tribune, was polled by survey to determine whether or not the staffs, which included the

---

\(^1\) "Case Study Methods." Jacques Hamel. 1993.
\(^2\) Ibid.
editor, exercise a liberal or conservative bias. L. Brent Bozell and Brent H. Baker reveal their findings in "And That's the Way It Isn't," a research guide to media bias. According to this survey, "liberals" outnumber "conservatives by more than three-to-one. Also, "the reporters and editors held extremely "liberal" views on foreign policy, or, "84 percent supported a nuclear freeze, 809 percent were against increased defense spending, and 76 percent opposed CIA aid to the Nicaraguan Freedom Fighters, the Contras." On social issues, the reporters and editors were also overwhelmingly "liberal," as "82 percent favored allowing women to have abortions, 81 percent supported affirmative action, and 78 percent wanted stricter gun control." In this case, the terms "liberal" and "conservative" have been defined by specific political issues.

The journalists were also polled on specific politicians and social issues. In 1990, "60 percent opposed Ronald Reagan, yet supported the Carter Administration . . . 95 percent favor government aid to those who cannot support themselves, 89 percent favored the hiring of homosexuals, and 78 percent supported stricter handgun controls." L. Brent Bozell and Brent H. Baker define "liberal" and "conservative" in the print media by social and political standards. There are "common liberal topics" (homosexuals in the workplace, affirmative action, minimizing defense budgets) which serve as a red flag for identification purposes. Overall, the "liberals" in the print media tend to support the Democratic Party as

---

3 "And That's the Way It Isn't." L. Brent Bozell: 1990.
4 Ibid.
5 Ibid.
6 Ibid.
"conservatives" favor the Republican Party. The terms are defined by a political ideology and the "left and right wing."\(^7\)

The "News and Observer" in Raleigh, North Carolina, featured an article entitled "What’s the bias" on November 18, 1996. The paper, admittedly, is considered "liberal" in nature for adhering to the Democratic platform and for having supported President Clinton in the last election. Bob Jacobson writes, "I find that in most ‘liberal-based’ articles Clinton is both praised and criticized, typical of a liberal attitude. In conservative articles he is only condemned."\(^8\)

Jacobson continues by stating, "That seems, to me, the real bias of the media. Liberals attempt to be fair while conservatives can only complain and attack."\(^9\)

In researching for the book "The Media Elite," the authors found that "54 percent of journalists called themselves ‘liberals’ and 19 percent ‘conservative’."\(^10\) Even in the 1972 landslide, "81 percent of journalists voted for McGovern."\(^11\) Once again, the terms are defined by political parties and specific candidates. Nixon was a Republican and McGovern a Democratic candidate for President. Therefore, it would make sense that the media (which has already been established to be mostly liberal) would vote for McGovern.

The utilization of all aforementioned constructs of "liberal" and "conservative" results in one collaborative definition of both terms. A "liberal bias" is evident when the article reveals any level of support for a figure or issue which is usually associated with the

---

\(^7\) Ibid.
\(^8\) "What’s the Bias?" The News and Observer 18 November 1996:A10.
\(^9\) Ibid.
\(^10\) The Nation 10 June 1996: A5.
\(^11\) Ibid.
Democratic Party (Bill Clinton, more federal spending, tax breaks for lower and middle classes, etc. Conversely, a conservative bias exists when the author favors a figure or issue which is usually associated with the Republican Party (Newt Gingrich, Contract With America, tax breaks for upper class, less federal spending, etc.) Now, with a more clear context of liberal and conservative ideology and a bias toward either affiliation, the next step is to explore “Intellectual Leadership.”

James MacGregor Burns deals quite extensively with Intellectual Leadership in his book, "Leadership." According to Burns, an intellectual is a devotee of ideas, knowledge, and ideals. Furthermore, an intellectual is a person concerned with values, purposes, ends that transcend immediate practical needs. The person who deals with analytical ideas and data alone is a theorist, while the person who deals with both and unites them through disciplined imagination is an intellectual. The intellectual is the central figure in the process of Intellectual Leadership.

After establishing the differences between a theorist and intellectual, it is important to explore and arrive at one definition of Intellectual Leadership. "The intellectual "pervasively influences the intellectual temper of an epoch and the thinking and the actions of politicians and the public." Thus, the intellectual has a responsibility to recognize purpose and intention throughout this transformational process.

The process of Intellectual Leadership, or, intellectually influencing the ideas of others, utilizes a great deal of power.

---

13 Ibid.
14 Ibid.
Richard Hughes, Robert Ginnett, and Gordon Curphy define this phenomenon as expert power, or, the "power of knowledge."\textsuperscript{15} A certain core of people are often able to influence others through their relative expertise in a particular area. Furthermore, expert power is "a function of the amount of knowledge one possesses relative to the rest of the group."\textsuperscript{16} Clearly, the press and the media at large have expert power over the public because they are relaying the information. The reader, or follower, is exposed to new material which was originally discovered by the reporter. Therefore, the media exercises expert power over the general public.

Thomas Rosenstiel explores this power in his article, "News Analysis."\textsuperscript{17} Today, subtly, without any clear consensus, the idea of straight reporting is giving way to a new era of subjectivity. More stories are striving to interpret the meaning of events, utilizing story-telling techniques to compel audiences to keep reading. However, the shift is adding to the tension inside a world of written journalism that is already uncertain of its future. The critics fear "the new subjectivity will only further anger a public already suspicious that the press has a secret agenda."\textsuperscript{18}

So, the last question to address is "Does the media manage our minds?" Early studies of the media's impact on voting choices found that people seemed surprisingly immune to media manipulation.\textsuperscript{19} People exposed themselves to media appeals in a selective way,

\textsuperscript{16}Ibid.
\textsuperscript{18}Ibid.
\textsuperscript{19}Inventing Reality. Michael Parenti: 1993.
giving more attention and credence to messages that bolstered their own personal views.\textsuperscript{20} The press had a minimal impact and people seemed fairly self-directed in their responses to the media. However, the practice of "selective exposure" to the media to reinforce our established predispositions suggests begs the question, "Where do these predispositions come from?"\textsuperscript{21}

Even though these predispositions prevent us from completely trusting and being persuaded by the media, the media has actually contributed to those predispositions. Parenti states, "that some of our internalized political predilections derive from the dominant political culture that the press has a hand in shaping - and from earlier direct media exposure."\textsuperscript{22} In essence, our "screen" is not only covered with holes, but was originally provided, at least partially, by the media. The media has a unique control over public opinion.

\textsuperscript{20}Ibid.
\textsuperscript{21}Ibid.
\textsuperscript{22}Ibid.
Methodology

The Senior Project will enable me to discover any contradictory facts or bias within specific news stories. The materials needed for this project are selected distributions of the New York Times, the Washington Post, *Newsweek* and *TIME*. These publications were chosen at random, so that the results of the project will not be altered by my media preferences and each will contribute a specialized ideology on the selected topics, exemplifying any liberal or conservative affiliation. All articles will be documented, bound, and separated by topic.

The two topics chosen for this project include the testimony of Oliver North during the Iran Contra Hearings and the recent scandal surrounding the fundraising by the Democratic National Committee. More specifically, the link between President Clinton and Asian contributors and Campaign Finance Reform. The above topics allow for an examination of scandal during two different decades. Furthermore, the research will reveal the nature of the relationship between the Republican and Democratic Party at times of crisis. As a result, they provide the liberal and conservative perspectives on these issues and will reveal any bias in the print media.

On July 7, 1987, Lt. Col. Oliver North testified before Congress and the entire nation to defend his actions during the Iran-Contra Affair. The Congressional Hearings were the most anticipated since those of the Watergate Scandal in the 1970's. The testimony dominated the national news market and the attention of the
American people. This case was chosen because Lt. Col. Oliver North, Edwin Meese, and President Reagan were under the spotlight and are labeled Conservative Republicans. The media may reflect this ideology in their coverage and perhaps, there will exist an inherent difference between the coverage by a liberal publication and that of a conservative nature.

Since the re-election of President Clinton in November 1996, the Democratic National Committee has been accused of accepting illegal campaign contributions. Furthermore, the critics claim that overnight visits in the Lincoln Bedroom were exchanged for large payments to the DNC during the last election. More recently, Vice President Gore has been accused of placing phone calls to elicit funding from within the White House, but denies all allegations. The DNC has accepted responsibility, apologizes for the acquisition of certain funds, and is currently investigating possible solutions to the problem. This case was chosen because President Clinton and Vice President Gore, as well as their staffs, are Liberal Democrats. This case provides a balance to the Iran-Contra Affair, as the Democrats are now in the spotlight. An article may include purely subjective information (opinions, public reactions, etc.), relying solely on the facts, or, the print media may reflect a certain bias in their coverage, according to their affiliation to a liberal or conservative ideology.

The hypothesis of this project is that the media adheres to either a conservative or liberal bias and therefore, influences the public opinion on specific issues. If the publications exhibit variations on the coverage of these two topics and subject matter, the hypothesis is supported.
The following project is a case analysis of specific documents. The research was divided by topics, which include the testimony of Oliver North, Democratic Fundraising, and Intellectual Leadership. The purpose is to investigate the level of bias evident in the print media and apply these findings to Intellectual Leadership. Basically, the evidence should reveal to what extent newspapers and periodicals serve as objective and informative sources and as a result, influence the common opinion. The research questions will be, “Does the article support or criticize the central figure?,” “Is the central figure affiliated with a specific political party (Democratic or Republican)?,” and “How does this bias relate to Intellectual Leadership?” Since we all rely on publications to depict the facts of any given situation, the effects of this bias are immeasurable. However, through awareness and education, the public will evaluate the media through a more critical eye.

Lt. Col. Oliver North

In the mid-1980's, Lt. Col. Oliver North was employed by the National Security Council, under the authority of then Director Casey. By 1987, North was on trial for allegedly conspiring with the C.I.A. and the Executive Branch of our Federal Government to sell arms and weapons to Iran. The profit from these sales allegedly benefited the Contras, a group of freedom fighters in Nicaragua. The operation as revealed, files were shredded, and Ronald Reagan still denies any
knowledge of this activity: Lt. Col. North was to stand alone and answer to the public.

The public had eagerly anticipated the testimony of Lt. Col. Oliver North and for those who missed the network coverage, the print media was the only source of the proceedings.

The Washington Post

The majority of coverage involving the testimony of Lt. Col. North was not on the front page or even in the first section. The front section did include a copy of the standard Newswire story which appeared in all papers throughout the nation. However, the Washington Post chose to incorporate the public reaction and feature these stories in the "Style" section. The length is 682 words and features a photo of Lt. Col. North being sworn in before his testimony.

The headline of this article reads "Oliver North's Riveting Day in the Sun; The Capital Turn-On," which in itself, exemplifies the widespread anticipation leading up to the event. The article serves as an interview of several local citizens and incorporates their reaction to the proceedings. All public statements are positive and in some way, remain supportive of North. One man states, "He fascinates me," while another comments, "He just may be my hero." Throughout the article, the actual testimony is disregarded and the focus is the approval of the observers of the hearings. The article concludes with a statement by an Army Officer which reads, "I think

he was doing his job and he's going to take the fall. He's cool, though. Look at him. He's cool."

**Washington Post**

This article is vastly different from the first, in that the majority of the comments are from "anonymous" persons. The text is on the last page of the first section and is written by staff writers Dan Balz and Karl Payne. The only photo is of Lt. Col. Oliver North being sworn in during the hearing.

The content of the article focuses on the anticipation of the hearing and testimony by the public. More specifically, the authors quote several interviewees straight off the street. In general, the public was very intrigued by the proceedings but more importantly, in Oliver North as a person. In fact, the hearings were referred to as a "joke" and several people felt that Lt. Col. Oliver North would soon be vindicated. The longest quote is from a retired lieutenant colonel, who now works for the State of Maryland.

**New York Times**

In contrast to *The Washington Post*, the majority of original coverage of Lt. Col. North's testimony is featured on the front page and continues through the first section. The initial article is on page A1 and the entire first section is dominated by the Iran-Contra Scandal. The length is 3906 words, much longer than the article enclosed in *The Washington Post*. The featured photo is of the

---


Congressional Committee in charge of the Iran-Contra Scandal Hearings.

The content of this article represents the opposite end of the journalistic spectrum than The Washington Post. The headline in The New York Times reads, "Iran-Contra Hearings; The Testimony: Notifying Congress and A Threat To Go Public," which remains considerably unbiased in nature. The article begins with "The following are excerpts from the first day of testimony by Lt. Col. Oliver North." For two entire pages, the article becomes more of a transcript, revealing multiple lines of dialogue and formal statements. This type of journalism allows very little room for opinion, subjectivity, or bias.

New York Times

The second article examined was featured on the front page and is entitled, "North Sworn-In." The text is quite shorter than the first article and the tone remains one of predicting the outcome of the hearing. For example, the author writes, "... hopeful that the facts will now become clear and our most fundamental questions answered." The author has assumed that North had the answers and that through his testimony, the blame would be cast. This article, through its accusatory nature, suggests to the reader that finally, North will accept his punishment and the country will be able to move on.

Newsweek

The coverage of Lt. Col. Oliver North was somewhat limited in the edition of *Newsweek* published one week after his testimony. However, this periodical featured many reactions of individual authors to the testimony. The longest and most detailed article is found on page 28 and is written by John Dean, a contributing writer. The length is 1500 words and the two photos included, one of North's wife and the other of North and his wife together, are larger than most throughout the entire periodical.

The headline reads, "The Ugly Road Ahead" and can be found in the "National Affairs - North on the Stand" section of *Newsweek*. John Dean begins by stating, "To watch Oliver North testify last week was to view history unfolding through a rearview mirror." For three pages, Mr. Dean compares the Iran-Contra Hearings with those held during the Watergate Scandal. The article remains fairly balanced, constantly shifting between a positive and negative outlook on Lt. Col. North. However, the conclusionary section states that "Ollie's troubles are not behind him . . . (Ollie) is a marked man."

The author reveals that the news media was dissatisfied with the way Oliver North sought to free hostages or financially aid the contras and they (the media) want his skin (29). Dean claims the hearings have become a "show" and advocated private proceedings. Although the author presents the dominant argument of the disgruntled media, Mr. Dean seems to distance himself from their disgust. Overall, the article remains slanted toward a specific bias, but without the participation of the author.

---

Similar to the article in *Newsweek*, the longest and most detailed in this periodical dealing with the testimony of Oliver North is an opinion piece. It is written by a staff-writer and consists of 3227 words, more than double that of the previously mentioned article. The photos included are numerous and display North alone, North greeting hostage families with President Reagan, and seven additional contributions to a photographic collage.

The headline reads, "Ollie's Turn; As North finally tells his story, larger questions remain." Throughout the article, the author stresses the importance of critically evaluating the testimony, for Lt. Col. North "has already been caught in a lie he told to Justice Department investigators before he was fired from the NSC (National Security Council). Also, North testified under a grant of limited immunity which, though "nothing truthful he says this week can be used against him, he can still be prosecuted on the basis of other evidence collected by independent counsel."

The staff-writer clearly states that very little truth will result from the testimony and basically, the facts will never be presented accurately. Lt. Col. North will reveal only what cannot be used against him at a later date. The Reagan Administration allowed North and other NSC officials to act independently and excessively. As a result, Lt. Col. North "wound up disastrously damaging the very causes he worked so fervently to promote."

---

28 "Ollie's Turn; As North finally tells his story, larger questions remain." *TIME* 13 July 1987:22.
Analysis

The coverage of the testimony of Lt. Col. Oliver North was extensive and widespread. There are, however, key issues involved with the cases chosen for this study.

The first *Washington Post* article paints North a "hero," while evading most of the hearings as a focus for coverage. In fact, the reader discovers in this article that North is "cool" and should be treated with the utmost respect. The second article even refers to the hearings as a joke." These examples suggest a sympathy for North and the tone of the article is one of support for North and the other major players. Therefore, by the parameters set earlier in this project, the *Washington Post* has been found to have a conservative bias.

The first *New York Times* article resembles a transcript and reveals the actual words spoken, instead of relying on individual interpretation. Although the spoken word is objective, in this case, the words are damaging to North and his reputation. The second suggests that North is responsible and will at minimum, be exposed through the hearings. The *New York Times* remains critical of North and the other key players, as well as doubtful of the Reagan Administration. Therefore, by the parameters discussed above, the *New York Times* has been found to have a liberal bias.

The article featured in *Newsweek* by John Dean is highly and grossly critical of North. True, John Dean is not a "staff writer" for *Newsweek*, but the periodical chose to feature the article in an issue which includes very little alternative material on the subject of North. Although John Dean may not represent the opinion of
Newsweek, by my definition of liberal and conservative and judging by this article chosen at random, Newsweek appears to have a liberal bias.

The article from TIME remains ambivalent and anticipates very little from the hearings. By reminding the reader of North's previous habit of lying, the article begins to become critical and accusatory of North. However, most of the article encourages the public to process any revealed information critically and responsibly. Therefore, the neutrality and focus on fairness leads to an inconclusive decision.

President Clinton and Asian Contributions

Since the Presidential Election of 1996, the Democratic National Committee and more specifically, President William Jefferson Clinton, have been plagued by accusations of acquiring illegal campaign contributions. The DNC, President Clinton, and specific Asian contributors have been the topics of national news throughout the past few months.

The Washington Post29

The following article represents the more recent belief that the DNC accepted not one, but numerous questionable contributions. The topic is addressed on the first page and the length is 2952 words. Written by Ruth Marcus, Washington Post Staff Writer, the article

features a photographic display of the players involved in the scandal.

The headline reads, "Oval Office Meeting Set - DNC Asian Funds Network in Motion." Throughout the article, Ms. Marcus details the unfolding story of numerous foreign contributors given special access to the White House. These sessions included Oval Office photo opportunities and invitations to private meetings within the White House. Although the subject matter is considerably damaging to President Clinton and the DNC, the author continually states, "no one has shown that the administration conferred any particular favors on the fund-raisers or donors . . . other than to allow them to rub elbows with the President" (A1). The issue is serious, but the actions not necessarily illegal.

The Washington Post

The article is entitled "Lake Says He Did Not Meet With Fund-Raising Principals" and reveals that CIA Director Anthony Lake held no meetings with controversial Democratic fund-raisers. Although the author continually provides information to vindicate Lake, the focus shifts to President Clinton and Vice President Gore. The letter, written by Lake and released by the White House, stated that "White House Aides sidestepped or ignored warnings from Lake's National Security Council staff about some contacts the President and Vice President had with Asian American fund-raisers." The article stresses that Clinton was aware of the warnings and chose to continue dealings with the Asian American fund-raisers in question.

31Ibid.
A shorter article than the one featured in The Washington Post, it totals 725 words. The author is an anonymous staff-writer and the story, which appears more like an editorial, is disclosed on page 22. No photos are included and just the headline suggests a more critical view of President Clinton.

The headline reads, "The File on President Clinton" and begins with, "Having turned the White House residential quarters into a Democratic contributor's playground and sleepover camp, President Clinton now tells us that the Lincoln Bedroom was not for sale and no one actually promised anything in return for money" (A22). Already, the article has become critical and suggests a disbelief of President Clinton. Throughout the article, the author uses terms such as "direct involvement" and "deliberate(ly) work(ed) with associates to violate Federal Laws." The author condemns Clinton and his staff through harsh accusations and then challenges the President to clean the slate.

The author of this article, Neil Lewis, cites specific examples of questionable contributions to the Clinton campaign. However, the focus is not necessarily on Clinton, but more on John Huang, a senior fund-raising official at the Democratic National Committee. Specifically, the article reveals that the FBI seized documents

---

pertaining to contributors who had joined Clinton for coffee. "The main discussion at the meeting with Mr. Clinton over coffee involved United States policy toward China," was the only statement which mentioned Clinton. The accusations were focused on Huang and not Clinton.

**Newsweek**

This article is one of three featured in **Newsweek** on the topic of Asian contributions to the Clinton campaign. The authors, Mark Hosenball and Evan Thomas, diagram the "Asian Web" in three pages and utilize photographs and "The Widening Asian Web Map." The National Affairs Section features only this article on the week of February 24, 1997.

The headline reads, "A China Connection?" and begins with the subtitle, "How charges of Clinton campaign sleaze could turn into a spy scandal." While the headline forecasts a damaging report on Clinton, the article actually focuses on Huang, the most well-known of the foreign contributors. The theory? By recruiting Chinese nationals to donate heavily and gain access to privileged areas of the U.S. Government, Huang has initiated a potential spy scandal. The authors quickly shift the focus from President Clinton and point a finger at the Chinese, led by John Huang.

**TIME**

---

The "Nation" section of TIME features only one article dealing with the topic of Democratic fundraising. The length is 2030 words and included are three photos ranging from Bill and Hillary Clinton to Janet Reno. Once again, the headline sets the tone for the entire article.

The headline reads, "Johnny Come Often; Moneyman Chung Came Calling on the White House 49 Times, Often With His Asian Friends, and the Democrats Got $50,000 For One Visit." An anecdote reveals the presence of six Chinese businessmen in dark suits standing near the back of the Oval Office and further explains, "Their admission had been bought and paid for" (24). Throughout the article, the author suggests that contributions initiated legislature and Hillary Clinton visited foreign destinations with ulterior motives. Lastly, the author mentions that "Clinton, everyone knows, cares little about making money. But when it comes to winning, he takes no prisoners" (25).

Analysis

The Washington Post

The author of the case involving President Clinton and past fundraising tactics condemns the actual act but questions the factor of illegality. This article serves as a connector between Clinton and ethical issues, as well as exacerbates a somewhat negative reputation. Although contributors were able to "rub elbows with the President," the author doubts that this may be considered illegal and focuses more on an ethical standard. Despite the opinion of the author, the reader is introduced to skepticism and doubt as far as
Clinton’s ethical standards. Due to the size of the market served, this author is suggesting to millions of readers that Clinton possesses a disappointing ethical judgment, even though he may be imprisoned for his actions. Overall, the article was not severely damaging to Clinton, but stressed an apparent ethical void. Following the previously defined parameters, both articles suggest a conservative bias.

The New York Times

The first article covering the scandal of Democratic fundraising describes the Clinton White House as a "playground" for foreign contributors and condemns Clinton for losing focus on his job. The term “playground” has no place in a nationally distributed publication, especially when referring to the White House and the President of the United States. The author blasts Clinton and his "friends" for allowing foreign contributions to dictate the federal agenda. There has not been, as of yet, any evidence to suggest that Clinton allowed fund-raisers and contributors to alter foreign or domestic policy. This article remains damaging to President Clinton by including a multitude of personal opinions and biases. The second article, however, shifts most of the blame toward John Huang and almost portrays Clinton to be a third party. These two cancel each other out and in this case, no determination of bias is made.

Newsweek

By beginning the article with the term "campaign sleaze," the author immediately set a negative tone. The consumer is now not
allowed to judge the campaign, but is told by the reporter that the campaign was "sleazy." However, there exists a shift in focus from President Clinton to John Huang. The author theorizes that the Chinese nationals have benefited from privileged access to the White House and basically, Clinton is at fault. Although the majority of content is the "spy scandal," the author blames Clinton for what may become a major international situation. Nevertheless, the article remains only slightly damaging to President Clinton.

The two articles examined presented very little evidence of either a Conservative or Liberal bias.

TIME

The next article dealing with Democratic fundraising blasts the Clinton Administration for opening the doors of the White House to foreign contributors. In addition, Hillary Clinton is accused of hosting such visits and establishing friendships with Chinese nationals. Basically, the author suggests that to raise money to win an election, Clinton will stop at nothing. The article had remained fairly unbiased until the author lashed out at Clinton and attacked his sense of decency. Clinton will stop at nothing? There must be limits, even for Clinton. The author utilizes a conservative bias.
Conclusion

The media has exhibited either a conservative or liberal bias in all cases save two. In the case of The Washington Post, the content fit the guidelines for a conservative bias as defined in the literature Review. Conversely, the majority of coverage within The New York Times fit within the parameters of a liberal bias. The periodicals each represented a specialized slant, though with a better balance of ideologies throughout the issues. Actually, the type of bias (liberal or conservative) is not as important as the existence of any bias. However, the cases have revealed an inherent bias and therefore, the media is utilizing expert power.

The use of expert power, or, the power of knowledge is best exemplified by the media, The Washington Post and the New York Times, TIME and Newsweek all serve the immense media markets of New York City, Washington D.C., all surrounding areas, and achieve worldwide distribution daily. The bias evident in the previous cases is potentially dangerous and destructive to the individuals featured in the coverage and to the public at large.

The media has been given the responsibility of relaying information to the public on a daily basis. We, the consumers of the market, have enabled the media to provide us with their interpretation of the facts, figures, and implications of any given event. The follower assumes the material to be objective, when in reality, no coverage is truly without opinion or interpretation. It is virtually impossible for a reporter to relay information without
allowing, even subconsciously, personal opinion to alter the written word, especially in the current market.

Thomas Rosenstiel discusses the changing market and need for reporters to entertain and interpret for the constantly growing field. In the era of soundbytes and hourly television news coverage, the print media is struggling to compete. However, Rosenstiel suggests that at some point, the public will grow angrier with a news medium for altering the facts and including personal bias or that of the publication. The first step toward resolution is awareness.

Michael Parenti begins the process of awareness by revealing the origin of our predispositions. The media is filtered through our own screen of skepticism, critical thought, and ambivalence. However, that screen (our predispositions) has been created in part by the media. For example, if living in New York City and moving to Virginia in 1993, you would have had the opportunity to vote for Oliver North for United States Senate. The alternative is Chuck Robb, a fairly unfamiliar character to a native New Yorkian. After months of reading liberally biased information regarding North, you vote for Robb, confident that you were aware and made an intelligent choice. However, your current feelings regarding North were shaped and configured, in part, by the media in New York City. So, although you believe your choice to be your own, it was in fact affected by The New York Times.

The awareness does not solve the problem completely, but initiates a media paradigm shift. The current system is, as proven through the aforementioned cases, one of bias and individual interpretation. Then, the consumer understands and learns to
recognize the expert power and resists. Eventually, the media begins
to act more responsibly and fulfill the characteristics of true
Intellectual Leadership.

Not only should the media “influence the intellectual temper of
an epoch,” but also, “recognize purpose and intention.” It is not the
purpose of a publication to provide transcripts of the Iran-Contra
hearings, giving North the benefit of the spoken word when Clinton
was never directly quoted. This is an example of a harmful bias,
through which the people may acquire a different opinion of both
men. Intellectual Leadership is a transformational process, but not a
vehicle to transform public opinion to match that of a specific
publication.

The media is currently abusing the leader/follower relationship
between publication and consumer. Until the media alters the
current system and responsibly handles purpose and intent, the
consumer should beware, buy a new screen, and personally foot the
bill. Otherwise, the market will become completely saturated with
purely subjective accounts of events. If the current trend continues,
not only will our predispositions become obscure, but our critical
though unnoticeable.
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