

Overcoming Cynicism amidst Ethical Lapses in American Government and the News Business

Clint C. Wilson II, Professor of Journalism, Howard University

This paper examines how the free press theories espoused by John Milton and Thomas Jefferson have been undermined not only by ethical lapses in American government but also by the evolution of news media organizations into corporate entities that pursue financial profit at the expense of their social responsibility to serve public interests.

The resulting loss of citizen trust in both their government and news media institutions has led to cynicism and hampered the ability of citizens to make informed judgments as participants in their democracy. Although news media have been traditionally expected to serve as watchdogs over government as the so-called “fourth estate” in the political checks and balances system in the United States, examples of ethical breaches by journalists and government entities are cited.

Criteria are posited for effectively meeting the public affairs communications needs in a democratic society as well as the reasons corporate American media have fallen short. Public opinion research data suggests that Americans are turning to their publicly funded broadcasting system, established 40 years ago, as a trustworthy source of news and analysis that meets the criteria of socially responsible journalism and public discourse.

Overcoming Cynicism Amidst Ethical Lapses In American Government and The News Business

When Harvey E. Johnson stepped before a battery of microphones in October of 2007 all outward appearances suggested that the Deputy Director of the U.S. Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) was about to begin a routine press conference concerning the agency’s response to a series of deadly wildfires then raging across southern California. Johnson’s answers to the various questions posed to him painted an impressive scenario that suggested his agency had responded rapidly and efficiently to the largest American disaster since Hurricane Katrina devastated New Orleans and the gulf coast states in 2005.

Within a few hours, however, the event was exposed as a staged fabrication in which the assembled “journalists” asking non-penetrating questions were actually FEMA employees. Moreover, it was discovered that the “press conference” had been called only 15 minutes prior to its starting time, thus giving credentialed newsmen insufficient time to attend. Aside from C-SPAN, a public television operation, and a few other outlets that happened to be nearby, the room was devoid of press corps members. Johnson, however, only acknowledged queries from FEMA personnel posing as independent journalists. The major broadcast, cable and newspaper reporters had been given a telephone line over which they could call and listen in on the proceedings, but without ability to ask questions of their own. Although White House spokesmen

Forum on Public Policy

later apologized, the FEMA incident is recognized as being among the most blatant ethics violations committed by a United States government agency in recent history.

The administration of President George W. Bush has been criticized for various ethical breaches, perhaps none more so than its controversial justification for invading Iraq based on dubious evidence of Saddam Hussein's possession of weapons of mass destruction. As a result, Mr. Bush has registered some of the lowest job approval ratings in public opinion polls ever recorded among U.S. presidents. One month prior to FEMA's fake press conference the Gallup poll reported that Americans had expressed "less trust in the federal government than at any point in the past decade."¹ The litany of scandals over the years involving members of the U.S. Congress are legion and run the gamut from bribery to kickback schemes and sexual improprieties. There is little mystery, therefore, as to why public opinion of that legislative body ranks even lower than for those working in the executive branch of government. A poll by Congress Watch on Ethics in Government in 2006 found that 83 % of American respondents believed corruption in Congress to be a "serious problem."² Meanwhile, a Los Angeles Times/Bloomberg poll taken the same week found that 64 % of Americans believed that "ethics and honesty" in Congress were "not so good" or "poor."³

Much of the criticism that has been leveled at government emanates from the press in its role as "watchdog" on behalf of the public interest. But, the news media have their own credibility issues. In recent years the American press has recorded scores of ethical violations within its own ranks ranging from plagiarism and conflicts of interest to fabrications of stories and falsification of sources. One example was the case of Richmond (Virginia) Times-Dispatch reporter Paul Bradley whose employment was terminated for fabricating a story about a speech on U.S. immigration given by President Bush. Bradley's editors found that he had made up a quote from a director of a center for day laborers and plagiarized a description of similar workers he had found in a Washington Post article. Bradley then proceeded to give the resulting work a dateline that created the impression he had filed the story from a location he had never visited in the context of the story.⁴

Such journalistic malfeasance has contributed to an erosion of public confidence in the news media. In its 2006 annual report on the state of journalism in America, the Project for Excellence in Journalism reported a general downward trend in public attitudes regarding the news media since 1980.⁵ Central to that conclusion is the belief among Americans that news

organizations are increasingly motivated by profit incentive instead of the public interests. In 2005 the Pew Research Center for the People and the Press found that 75 % of Americans thought news organizations were more concerned with “attracting the biggest audience” while only 19 % believed they cared more about “informing the public.”⁶

If ethical breaches by government agencies and journalists operating within their separate spheres of endeavor seem to foster public distrust, then the unthinkable notion of collaborative dishonesty between them would most certainly engender cynicism among the citizens that both purport to serve. Unfortunately that dubious threshold has been crossed on numerous occasions. For example, a series of incidents in recent years revealed that the Bush administration paid several hundred thousand dollars in public funds to pay three journalists and commentators for writing favorably about government policies and programs.

First, an investigative report by USA Today noted that conservative columnist Armstrong Williams received \$241,000 in taxpayer money for promoting the Bush administration’s “No Child Left Behind” education policy.⁷

Shortly thereafter the Washington Post reported that syndicated columnist Maggie Gallagher received \$41,500 under two federal government contracts for writing brochures, a magazine article and a report briefing government employees in support of the Bush administration’s marriage and family welfare initiatives.⁸

Two days after the Gallagher matter surfaced the Los Angeles Times reported an incident wherein columnist Michael McManus was compensated for his quasi-journalistic support of the Bush administration’s “family values” agenda. McManus collected \$4,000 plus travel expenses, and an additional \$49,000 in taxpayer funds was paid to Marriage Savers, Inc., an organization with which he was affiliated. Ironically, McManus’ column, which appeared in 50 regional newspapers, was titled “Ethics and Religion.”⁹

These developments in the first decade of the 21st century raise the question of whether the current nexus of government and a free press was ever envisioned by the philosophers and statesmen who shaped the ideology of western civilization. We are left to ponder the fate of a society in which government and press conspire to manipulate public opinion for political and/or personal gain. Do such deeds undermine John Milton’s *Areopagitica* and his theory that an uncensored marketplace of ideas best serves the needs of a free society? Milton vigorously supported the vision of a society wherein “all the winds of doctrine were let loose to play upon

Forum on Public Policy

the earth, so truth be in the field, we do injuriously by licensing and prohibiting to misdoubt her strength. Let her and falsehood grapple.” Can truth still prevail in today’s communications environment?

Thomas Jefferson, another supporter of press freedom, once said, “Were it left to me to decide whether we should have a government without newspapers or newspapers without a government, I should not hesitate for a moment to prefer the latter.” Jefferson and other framers of the United States Constitution adopted its First Amendment provision of free expression in the belief that open discourse on important matters of public affairs would be in the public’s best interests. Indeed, the press soon acquired status as the “fourth estate” of American government, the “watchdog” whose task was to serve as an external check against the inevitable instances of abuse of power in the executive, legislative and legal branches of the system. But, did the Constitutional framers foresee a time when news would be a commodity produced by enterprises owned by corporate conglomerates operating on a national scale? Or did they anticipate a time when some journalists would sell their independence to the government in betrayal of public trust?

It is disconcerting to note that neither governmental entities nor news media industries lack formal conduct policies and codes of ethics. Congressional representatives are asked to abide by an ethics manual and an official code of conduct. However, both legal and ethical guidelines seem to be routinely skirted or breached. Elected officials are the subjects of criminal indictments, convictions and prison sentences that regularly fill American news columns, broadcast airwaves and cable television channels. Congressmen have found it extremely difficult to agree upon and enact strict self-regulating “ethics reform” legislation that would eliminate the influence of lobbyists and others offering financial incentives in exchange for their votes.

Meanwhile, instances of journalistic improprieties appear to have escalated in recent years despite the professional codes of ethics that have been promulgated by such groups as the Society of Professional Journalists (SPJ) and the Radio and Television News Directors Association (RTNDA).

While it is obvious how and why government officials have been tempted over the years by those who seek their favors, the corruption of their journalistic watchdogs has evolved in a more convoluted manner. The simple explanation is that over time the American news media business has become less about news and more about business. It is no accident that the decline

of public confidence in news media has coincided with the corporate consolidation of media enterprise. This issue was explored in Ben Bagdikian's seminal work, "The Media Monopoly," first published in 1983. While generally praising the ethical professionalism of most journalists, Bagdikian noted the influence of the corporate executives who oversee and evaluate their work when he wrote, "the emphasis and direction of their work is channeled by superiors more concerned with fast profits, market share, and corporate expansion than with reflections of the real world beyond the balance sheets."¹⁰

It is not likely that Milton or Jefferson envisioned a time when the "marketplace of ideas" pertaining to affairs of state would be dominated by a corporate communications industry whose interests would be focused on the financial profit margin motivated by corporate business instead of the people's business. In fact, by the latter decades of the 20th century it was not uncommon for journalists to describe their industry as the "news business." Thus, we come to the crux of public distrust in those ostensibly charged with serving the informational needs of the American republic: while governmental affairs are susceptible to the desires of persons seeking political power and personal wealth, their erstwhile watchdogs are operating within a system dominated by corporations seeking economic power. In turn, the corporate culture provides an environment wherein journalistic watchdogs are susceptible to seeking personal wealth at public expense.

Into this mix of the media marketplace has come the personal computer and its byproduct of individual expression, the Internet. Certainly the technology, which spawned a cyberspace world that includes the blogosphere, websites and a myriad of other communications venues, has greatly expanded the "marketplace of ideas." Would Milton or Jefferson approve? There can be no doubt that truth and falsehood grapple mightily over the "web" where many disseminate their thoughts without distinction between fact and opinion or transparency of motive. Moreover, much of that communication is made without regard for the ideals of ethics or social responsibility to which the traditional news media at least pay lip service.

This state of affairs has caused some to question whether traditional journalism has become obsolete. In fact, the idea of obsolescence was the topic of a forum on "Journalism, Ethics and Democracy" at the University of Notre Dame in the spring of 2007. Judy Woodruff, a senior correspondent for public television in the United States, was the keynote speaker and noted that the question "no longer seems frivolous."¹¹ In today's corporate world of media monopoly the struggle to compete for more market share and ever larger profits has created an

atmosphere where some journalists feel compelled to work faster, cut corners and beat the competition as the executives reduce payroll and trim resource budgets for the sake of the “bottom line.” Concurrently mainstream news organizations have gravitated toward coverage of less substantive “news” about celebrities and entertainment personalities to meet the perceived demand of a public that has come to expect such information. As news content has grown more sensational in nature, public confidence has declined and adherence to ethical standards has suffered.

The question before us is whether the tide of public cynicism toward government and the news media business can be reversed or overcome. In the United States the most utilitarian answer in addressing the problem in government rests with the electorate: on election day citizens have an opportunity to remove scandalous and ethically challenged representatives via their ballots. This solution, however, is imperfect because the newly elected “public servants” may also succumb to the same ethical temptations as their predecessors. Moreover, much of institutional government is comprised of civil service personnel and appointees who are not directly within reach of the electorate. This circumstance places the burden of oversight directly on the shoulders of news media, the watchdogs of society. The shortcomings of the corporate business model, under which the traditional watchdogs operate, have been discussed. We are left, therefore, to seek another model that may better serve the public interest. It must be a model that allows citizens—to the fullest extent possible—the opportunity to develop trust and maintain confidence that the information and perspectives presented are genuinely purposed for public good.

Given the manner in which American public communication has developed since the republic’s founding more than 230 years ago, five fundamental criteria seem necessary for restoring trust in messengers of the modern era. If the ideals championed by Milton and Jefferson are to be fulfilled in the 21st century, the system encompassing the marketplace of ideas must (1) be independent (2) be accountable (3) be credible (4) be adequately financed and (5) provide engaging and inspirational content.

Independence

When Milton argued for a free and open forum for the discussion of public affairs, his concern was with the threat of governmental control of information. His *Areopagitica* is the basis for free

Forum on Public Policy

expression in virtually every libertarian society. The control of information was assumed to be a hallmark of authoritarian regimes to be effected by decree or enactment of censorship laws. This is the essence of Milton's concern that "so truth be in the field, we do injuriously by licensing and prohibiting to misdoubt her strength."

Similarly, when Jefferson opined that if given the choice the United States would be better served by a press without government rather than the reverse, he assumed the continuance of the newspaper milieu of his day. Although suffering vitriolic attacks in newspapers operated by his political opponents, Jefferson had equally passionate newspaper supporters espousing his political philosophies. In the environment of early national America, press independence was a function of zealous advocates for particular ideologies seeking to influence events perceived by them to be in the nation's best interest. Although today's corporate news media enterprises carry disparate ideological views over myriad venues, commercial interests taint the environment. Some outlets have become identified with specific polarized ideologies representing "conservative" or "liberal" philosophies. The result has been the development of audiences that are predisposed to the ideological messages of a newspaper, radio, television station or cable network. Ironically, commercial advertisers must tread lightly in sponsorship of polarized content in fear of alienating segments of the consumer public. A cursory observation of this circumstance may seem to suggest that the polarization of commercial news media is consistent with Miltonian or Jeffersonian principles. The problem, however, is the emergence of a society whose disparate parts are increasingly isolated by ideology without the vital interactive discourse and exchange required of citizens expected to make comprehensively informed decisions. Metaphorically speaking, American citizens find themselves shopping only in ideological tents within the marketplace of ideas. In such a segmented environment, the corporate objectives of the "bottom line" flourish at the expense of the public good.

As we have seen, many ethical breaches occur as a result of informational operatives pursuing alternative means of reaching persons outside ideological tents through the use of deception or bribery for political or economic gain. If democracy is to function at its highest efficiency level, its marketplace of ideas must be independent of both government and business control.

Accountability and Credibility

The principles of accountability, credibility and independence are strongly related. Theoretically, it is presumed by many that independence of news media from government control is a guarantee of credibility. In the traditional system of commercial communication, some news media outlets have earned public trust over time by virtue of their record of reporting information that is factual and substantive. The absence of trivial, titillating, prurient and sensational information has distinguished the quality newsgathering organizations from those whose primary purpose is a crass commercial appeal to the lowest instincts of humanity. Quality news outlets have earned public respect over time for various and numerous exposes of improprieties in government and business enterprise. Moreover, many have played a major role in improving social conditions by campaigning for justice and holding persons in government and corporate power accountable for their actions.

In the 1950s, when American television was in its infancy, news was presented as non-commercial public affairs programming. Local television news operations were staffed by persons whose skills had been developed as working journalists in newspapers, news wire services and in radio news departments. There were few, if any, news “personalities,” anchormen and women who had been groomed, ward-robed and coached to attract viewers for the sake of amassing ratings points for advertisers. That phenomenon became a factor only after profit-seeking executives decided that news could be packaged and sold in the same manner as other programs that were designed to entertain the audience. Well before the onset of the 21st century the highly imitative world of commercial media in the United States found newspapers adopting many of the programming and content characteristics of entertainment television and other forms of popular culture.

Concurrently the credibility, trust and good will of the American public have become the reason commercial news media have been exploited and undermined by corporate executives. In the ethos of business enterprise, trust and credibility are the foundations of financial success. From the unprincipled point of view, what better opportunity for profit than to exploit a vehicle that enjoys a high level of public confidence? The fly in the ointment, so to speak, is the issue of accountability. That is, to whom or what is a news communication medium responsible? In the world of 21st century American journalism, individual news reporters may hold a sense of public service but the corporate executives for whom they work are accountable to stockholders for

showing a profitable return on investment dollars. And, not just a profit, but a sizeable profit. For example, in 2006 the Knight-Ridder media organization, by some measures the largest such chain in the United States, went out of business. It was purchased by the McClatchey organization that in turn sold off some of Knight-Ridder's major daily newspapers. As Judy Woodruff noted, "Knight-Ridder was a profitable company with margins that many industries would die for—just not profitable enough for Wall Street and this [economic] climate."¹²

In a democracy, any news and public information system that meets the needs of an unencumbered marketplace of ideas must ultimately be accountable to the citizenry rather than to persons or corporate entities with a vested financial interest.

Adequate Financial Resources

One of the ironies of the corporate system of news media in America is the tendency of such businesses to sacrifice the essence of their operational existence—trust and credibility—for perceived cost-effectiveness. In an era when the United States must increasingly function in an environment of global interdependence its corporate news media are scaling back their international operations. In a world of increasing complexity and nuance American citizens are finding daily newspapers shrinking in size and laying off editorial staff while television and cable networks are closing foreign bureaus and devoting less time to documentaries that explore issues in depth. The reality is that as the task of keeping the public informed has become larger the number of personnel and amount of financial resources dedicated to the task has become smaller.

The justification often expressed to explain incongruities in the operational values of the news business is that technological advances and shifts in the ways consumers (citizens) obtain news necessitate reductions in staff and resource allocations. Thus, the argument goes, because more people obtain information online via computer and PDA devices, traditional newspapers have lost readership, market share and advertising revenue. The business response is to "lighten" information content and replace costly news staff with electronic gadgetry. While that position makes some sense in the corporate boardroom, the realities of downgrading content and decreasing personnel in a world that demands more information and greater global understanding, does not. For example, it has been widely noted and discussed among professional journalists and elsewhere that when terrorists struck the United States on September

11, 2001 not a single American television network had a correspondent stationed in a predominately Muslim nation. Most major daily newspapers had already long since closed many of their international bureaus.

News and information needs in America have been relegated to analysis through the prism of revenue stream and market share and whether a modicum of the need can be met while cutting financial resources to enhance the “bottom line.” Concurrent with the reduction in the amount of news disseminated to citizens is the increase in content that caters more to reporting celebrity trivia and conveying information aimed at titillating human sensibilities than to substantive affairs of import to the well being of society.

Engaging and Inspirational Content

Modern media technology has brought many enhancements in communications including the presentation of images in three-dimensional format, high definition and digital transmission of audio and visual images. At the same time there is little, if any, debate over whether the content of general popular media in America has reflected a change in public standards. Scatological terminology, sexually suggestive images, graphic violence and other material once considered taboo for dissemination over general public communications venues are commonplace. Corporate communications media have taken full advantage of the technological pallet and the exploitation of public morality standards in the quest to attract the widest possible audience for their advertisers.

Any alternative to the corporate business model of news media communications must necessarily compete against it for the public’s attention in the existing technological and moral environment. It would be challenged to match the corporate delivery system in terms of state-of-the-art presentation yet be able to elevate public taste regarding content and utility as a forum for the marketplace of ideas. It must be engaging, interesting and appealing to an audience sophisticated enough to appreciate the higher standard while approaching subject matter at a level that will attract persons heretofore unaware of the possibilities and responsibilities of citizenship in a democratic society. Corporate media content may be engaging to the senses but, with rare exception, lacks inspiration.

A System Worthy of Trust?

Restoring trust and overcoming the cynicism that has become the albatross of traditional media in America is not likely to be achieved in an atmosphere where corporate greed prevails. Fortunately, there are strong indications that a parallel system, created 40 years ago has slowly emerged to fulfill the role that Milton and Jefferson envisioned as a cornerstone of democratic societies.

In 1967 President Lyndon B. Johnson signed legislation that created a different kind of media corporation in the United States; the non-profit Corporation for Public Broadcasting (CPB). Most important, the legislation stipulated that while CPB would get a portion of its funding from the federal government, it would be protected from government or political party control. In his speech announcing the legislation Johnson said its government seed money would be used to “assist stations and producers who aim for the best in .broadcasting reports on the whole fascinating range of human activity” and it would try to prove that what educates can also be exciting.” Johnson emphasized that public broadcasting would be free, independent and “belong to all of our people.”¹³ Although the notion of publicly funded, noncommercial media outlets was a novel idea to Americans in the 1960s, the United States was decades behind other countries throughout the world that had long since created such operations for the benefit of their citizens. With commercial television having experienced a phenomenal 20-year growth period from 1948, the impact of corporate profit motive on program content had become clearly evident by the time President Johnson signed the noncommercial broadcasting legislation.

The establishment of CPB fostered the development of a national array of independent television stations under the Public Broadcasting System (PBS) and radio stations under the National Public Radio (NPR) system. According to Federal Communications Commission (FCC) data the private non-profit public outlets have broad national coverage with approximately 225 television stations offering general programming and with about 680 radio stations operating across the United States. Neither figure includes stations operated by local and state governments dedicated to providing public announcements about official municipal and state matters.

PBS data indicates that 73 million Americans watch public television in an average week, representing 63 % of the nation’s households.¹⁴ A research survey in 2006 found that the NPR listening audience had grown steadily over the past 20 years and ranked fourth among all radio programming formats.¹⁵ One manifestation of the growth of NPR was an article in the

Washington Post that noted “With the rapid growth and expansion of its online divisions, the nonprofit radio programmer has outgrown the headquarters it owns.” As a result, the article revealed that, “NPR is in the market for a building with at least 400,000 square feet.”¹⁶

Although the non-commercial public media system lacks a print component to directly challenge the daily commercial newspaper press, it is interesting to note that in 2007 the newspaper industry continued a readership decline that began two decades earlier.¹⁷ The trend has accelerated in recent years as Americans have shifted to the Internet for news and information where nonprofit media also have a presence.

It is likely that citizen confidence in noncommercial media is high because an increasing segment of the American public is aware that the medium is accountable to the audience. In 2005 CPB funding provided only 16.3 % of the stations’ operating budgets while 26.5 % came directly from audience contributions. Charitable foundations contributed 6.8 % and business (taking note of the medium’s popularity) contributed 15.3 % through non-advertising underwriting.¹⁸

In keeping with the objectives set forth by President Johnson when he signed the noncommercial broadcasting legislation, the medium has provided an educational forum by exposing its audience to the arts and has produced insightful documentaries on the human condition. It has done so while maintaining the neutrality that invokes criticism from every part of the political spectrum. This has not, however, prevented periodic attempts by the Congress to curtail or eliminate the federally funded portion of CPB’s allocation. Legislators who have attacked the system rationalize their position with the claim that it has become biased in favor of the opposing political party. The system’s survival of such attacks has thus far seemed to strengthen and validate its adherence to its mission. It has been the arena where truth, falsehood and various shades of opinion in between have grappled, thus leaving audience members to make informed decisions on important matters confronting the republic. It has achieved its standing by offering content that inspires, uplifts and challenges the human spirit. Publicly supported non-commercial media provide the alternative to their corporate counterparts that have allowed the profit motive of business enterprise and breaches of journalism ethics to bring distrust and cynicism to the news information experience.

The system, of course, is vulnerable to the machinations of ethical breaches of journalism. It is staffed by human beings who are susceptible to temptations inherent in the high credibility the medium enjoys. An ethical standards code was developed in 1995 and expanded

Forum on Public Policy

in 2004 to assure NPR listeners that the system's journalists are at least as honorable as their commercial media counterparts.¹⁹ The difference is that organizational profit motive is mitigated by the lack of need to be accountable to stockholders. Success and survival is instead dependent upon audience approval. Four decades after implementation of America's Public Broadcasting Act of 1967, one would think that John Milton and Thomas Jefferson would be pleased with the development of an independent communications medium that belongs to—and can be trusted by—all American citizens.

END NOTES

1. Jones, Jeffrey. "Low Trust in Federal Government Rivals Watergate Era Levels," Gallup News Service, September 27, 2007.
2. Congress Watch, "Opinion Poll on Ethics in Government," January 22- 25, 2006. www.citizen.org/congress/govt_reform/ethics/congethics/articles.cfm?ID=14945(accessed November 19, 2007).
3. Los Angeles Times/Bloomberg Poll, "President Bush's Popularity Slides," January 26, 2006.
4. Society of Professional Journalists. "Press Notes," <http://www.spj.org/pressNotes.asp?REF=15136> (accessed December 2, 2007).
5. Project for Excellence in Journalism. "The State of News Media 2006," http://www.stateofthenewsmedia.org/2006/narrative_overview_publicattitudes (accessed November 19, 2007).
6. Pew Research Center for the People and the Press, "Public More Critical of Press, But Goodwill Persists," June 26, 2005. <http://people.pew.org/reports/display.php3?ReportID=248>. (accessed December 2, 2007).
7. Toppo, G. "Education Dept. paid commentator to promote law." USA Today, January 7, 2005. http://www.usatoday.com/news/washington/2005-01-06-williams-whitehouse_x.htm. (accessed November 19, 2007).
8. Kurtz, Howard. "Writer backing Bush plan had gotten federal contract." The Washington Post, January 26, 2005. Sec. C, 1.
9. Hamburger, Tom. "Federal Contracts With Columnists Prompt Change in Policy," Los Angeles Times, January 28, 2005. Sec. A, 30.
10. Ben Bagdikian, *The Media Monopoly*. (Boston: Beacon Press, 1987), 236.
11. Woodruff, Judy. "Are Journalists Obsolete," Red Smith Lecture, University of Notre Dame, April 12, 2007.

Forum on Public Policy

12. Ibid.

13.

Remarks of President Lyndon B. Johnson Upon Signing the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967, November 7, 1967. Corporation for Public Broadcasting www.cpb.org/aboutpb/act/remarks.html, (accessed November 25, 2007).

14.

Public Broadcasting System. "The Public Television Audience," http://www.pbs.org/aboutpbs/aboutpbs_corp.html. (accessed December 2, 2007).

15.

Study conducted by The Media Audit, July 2006. http://www.themediiaudit.com/july_fyi.pdf (accessed December 2, 2007).

16. The Washington Post. November 19, 2007, Sec. D, 3.

17.

Perez-Pena, Richard. "Newspaper Circulation in Steep Slide Across Nation." New York Times May 1, 2007. www.nytimes.com/2007/05/01/business/media/01paper.html?_r=1&oref=slogin. (accessed November 25, 2007).

18.

Corporation for Public Broadcasting. "Public Broadcasting Revenue Fiscal Year 2005." March 2006.

19.

See Corporation for Public Broadcasting, "Ethics Guide for Public Radio Journalism" at <http://www.cpb.org/stations/radioethicsguide>.

Published by the Forum on Public Policy

Copyright © The Forum on Public Policy. All Rights Reserved. 2008.