THE THEODORE H. WHITE LECTURE

WITH

SENATOR WARREN B. RUDMAN

1992

TABLE OF CONTENTS

The Theodore H. White Lecture on Press and Politics commemorates the life of the late reporter and historian who created the style and set the standard for contemporary political journalism and campaign coverage.

White, who began his journalism career delivering the *Boston Post,* entered Harvard College in 1932 on a newsboy's scholarship. He studied Chinese history and Oriental languages. In 1939, he witnessed the bombing of Peking while freelance reporting on a Sheldon Fellowship, and later explained, "Three thousand human beings died; once I'd seen that I knew I wasn't going home to be a professor."

During the war, White covered East Asia for *Time* and returned to write *Thunder Out of China,* a controversial critique of the American-supported Nationalist Chinese government. For the next two decades, he contributed to numerous periodicals and magazines, published two books on the Second World War and even wrote fiction.

A lifelong student of American political leadership, White in 1959 sought support for a 20-year research project, a retrospective of presidential campaigns. After being advised to drop such an academic exercise by fellow reporters, he took to the campaign trail and, relegated to the "zoo plane" changed the course of American political journalism with *The Making of the President 1960.*

White's *Making of the President* editions for 1964 and 1972, and *America in Search of Itself* remain vital historical documents on campaigns and the press.

Before his death in 1986, Theodore White also served on the Kennedy School's Visiting Committee, where he was one of the early architects of what has become the Joan Shorenstein Barone Center on the Press, Politics and Public Policy. Blair Clark, former senior vice president of CBS who chaired the committee to establish this lectureship, asked, "Did Teddy White ever find the history he spent his life searching for? Well, of course no, he would have laughed at such pretension. But he came close, very close, didn't he? And he never quit the strenuous search for the elusive reality, and for its meaning in our lives."

WARREN B. RUDMAN, a respected member of the United States Senate, chose to retire from that body at the end of his second term. His 12 years as Republican senator from New Hampshire won him many compliments as one of the Senate's "best legislators," "more sensible men," and "rising stars." Rudman left the Senate disenchanted and frustrated, increasingly alarmed by a national deficit that continues to rise with no sign of abating.

In public service for nearly 25 years, Rudman served as legal counsel to Governor Walter Peterson and then as attorney general of New Hampshire for six years. Rudman was first elected to the Senate in 1980. He was one of two senators who did not receive any out-of-state PAC money. His service in the Senate was distinguished by his influential membership on the Senate Ethics Committee, the Senate Appropriations Committee, the Senate Intelligence Committee, and the Select Subcommittee on the Iran-Contra hearings among others. He also co-authored the historic Gramm-Rudman-Hollings Act of 1985 putting a cap on federal spending as a step toward balancing federal budgets.

In December, 1986, Rudman was appointed to serve as Vice Chairman of the Senate Select Committee investigating arms transfers to Iran and helped organize and direct the investigation of the Iran-Contra affair. The former senator has long been concerned with environmental issues such as toxic waste cleanup, advancement of acid rain control legislation and the preservation of thousands of acres of forest land in northern New England. He has also been an outspoken critic of complicated and expensive weapon systems.

Warren Rudman was known in the Senate as a man of principle, integrity, independence, fair-mindedness and candor. He left office with the knowledge that he had served without compromising those principles. His continuing crusade to reduce the federal deficit led him to support the "Lead ... or Leave" campaign to get members of Congress to sign a pact that they would address the deficit with a formal plan or leave office.

THEODORE H. WHITE LECTURE
NOVEMBER 19, 1992

Mr. Kalb: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen, and welcome to the annual Theodore H. White Lecture, which is sponsored by the Joan Shorenstein Barone Center on the Press, Politics and Public Policy. I'm Marvin Kalb, director of the Center.

I start with a quote, not from Teddy White's voluminous writings but from a speech on the floor of the United States Senate delivered on March 12, 1992. The quote, as reported in the *Congressional Record,* was: "The thing that has been really troubling me for the past three or four months, to try to determine whether to spend another six years of my life in this place with so many fine and wonderful people, is it worth it? Can you do anything? Can you accomplish anything? Can you make the country better? Are you part of a solution rather than part of the problem?"

The speaker then was our speaker tonight. The senator from the neighboring state of New Hampshire, whose first name according to his birth certificate is Warren, but for so many years now it seemed as if his first name was Gramm. (Laughter)

As in Gramm-Rudman, and his last name Hollings, as in Gramm-Rudman-Hollings, a truly extraordinary piece of budget-controlling legislation that elevated the name and the person of Warren Rudman into the forefront of Senate leadership. That was why so many eyebrows were raised back in March of this year when Senator Rudman, finishing his second term in office, first indicated that he'd had enough of life in the world's most deliberative body.

To Rudman it had become too deliberative; too hidebound by perks and privileges and politics to address the people's pressing business. But whereas many of his colleagues recognized that the budget deficit had become a hugely constraining force, they found ways, and sometimes even ingenious ways, of avoiding the challenge of reducing it. In Washington, "gridlock" became the description of choice. "Nothing can be done," became the acceptable, rhetorical escape.

Throughout the 1992 presidential campaign, all three candidates decried this state of gridlock. Change the Congress, the president shouted. Change the president, the Democratic challenger responded. Lift the hood and change the whole engine, came the populist cry from Texas.

Come January 20, 1993, there will surely be change. Like a "laser beam," the president-elect promised, he would focus on the economy. But will those changes affect the deficit? Given the best will in the world, the best plan macroeconomists can project, will the deficit have to go up before it can begin to go down? Will more taxes be required?

When he announced his intention last spring not to seek a third term, Senator Rudman provided one sort of an answer when he said that the American people wanted a "free lunch," and their elected representatives, both Democratic and Republican, were so frightened by political risk-taking that they refused to level with them about the economic dangers facing the country.

James Madison, writing in the Federalist Papers, Number 10, placed high hopes on the capacity of enlightened legislators "to refine ... the public views" and "to discern [the country's] true interest." These days, few legislators have the courage to be inspired by Madison's vision. So often, when it is time to "refine" and to "discern," in other words, to lead, they punt.

And what about the press, one of the central concerns of the Shorenstein Barone Center's mandate? Has it "refined" and "discerned" the issues this year? Has it led an intelligent and spirited discussion? Has it truly informed? Or, approaching the problem

from a totally different direction, let us assume for a moment that it is not the responsibility of a free press to "refine" and "lead" any discussion. The press is there simply to cover the story, and its responsibility ends with publication or broadcast of the news.

To many of these questions and issues, Senator Rudman has sounded a clarion call for action. With former Senator Paul Tsongas of Massachusetts, he has carried his battle to another battleground — to what they call the Concord Coalition — to push every lever to insure a lowering of the budget deficit. Rudman recently joined a law firm with strong credentials in public policy. One of his new law partners, Arthur Liman, who first met Rudman during the Senate's Iran-Contra hearings, said: "Warren is never going to retire ... I believe he will be a force in the struggle that is going on in the GOP; whether it will be a viable party or disintegrate into a fringe party."

Ladies and gentlemen, it is my pleasure to introduce the 1992 Theodore H. White Lecturer on Press and Politics, Senator Warren Rudman of New Hampshire. (Applause)

Senator Rudman: Marvin, I want to thank you so much for that generous introduction. We go back a long time and I'm delighted to have you introduce me this evening.

Let me also say that I am so honored and really humbled to be asked to give this lecture at this institution for a number of reasons. First, Joan Shorenstein Barone. I did not know her well, but I knew her well enough to know that she was a careful journalist who took pains with what she did. She cared about getting it right.

And for Theodore White, whose lecture series this is in his honor, I only met him once other than on the campaign trail in New Hampshire where I would sit and talk to him at the Sheraton Wayfarer, with all the other journalists who would be there, back into the '60s and the '70s. But I will never forget a memorable day in the Senate dining room, it had to be about 1983 or 1984 and my recollection may be imperfect, but I believe that Ted Kennedy, a good friend of mine, brought him into the dining room for lunch and what was to be a lunch for two became a lunch for many. And we sat and listened to Teddy White about politics, and he certainly was in the great tradition of modern journalism. For those two reasons Marvin, I thank you and your institution for the invitation.

America has a new president-elect who will take up the reins of government in January. The American people in their wisdom have voiced displeasure with the status quo. One of the many positive aspects of American democracy is that it affords us every four years a sense of renewal. It's a fresh slate. A chance to remake what we perceive to have gone awry. So there has been much Monday-morning quarterbacking and analysis, endless analysis, of what messages were sent by this year's voters. I think it's as simple as this. Voters were angry. They knew something was wrong and they wanted it fixed. The election is over and we have begun the peaceful transition to power. We hope to move from gridlock to control.

George Bush said the Democratic Congress blocked his programs, but the American people apparently found it easier to change the president than the Congress. Now what happens? What will the next four years hold for us? America has spoken out for change. We're going to get change whether we want it or not because the world is moving forward and we cannot ignore its transformation. The central question is: Will we have the foresight and courage to shape this change and preserve our heritage and the dream of America for generations to come?

For there is much to change. Those of you in the journalistic profession who travel America, who peer into the eyes of its citizens and discuss their dreams, must recognize this new impetus for change is rooted in distress and anxiety.

Overseas we proudly bask in the knowledge that the Cold War, which dominated so much of our American perspective during the past 40 years, has ended. But at home, we

stand as a nation often splintered and ripped apart by division and difference. We struggle to reconcile our traditions of self-reliance and individual freedom with our acknowledged social responsibilities and collective obligations.

It is odd and ironic that at a time of triumph for democracy, its greatest champion seems at times a nation in turmoil, desperately seeking to recover a lost sense of community and common purpose. The simple fact is, in this new era of change, our nation faces enormously difficult problems and there are no easy answers for these problems. The great tragedy is that at a time when we face these problems our political discourse is too often marred by prurient interests or trivialization of issues.

Candidates for public office shun discussion about the tough problems facing America out of fear of losing votes or possibly the election. Instead, they serve up platitudes or speak in symbols, thereby evading the politically onerous issues. We're not talking about issues anymore. We're talking about slogans. Partial blame for voter disgust can be attributed to the recent years of shrill finger pointing in Washington and our divided government, where Democrats control the Congress and Republicans the White House. Bipartisan cooperation was needed to achieve results. Yet, it was not cooperation but confrontation that too often won out. Democrats blamed Republicans. The Congress blamed the president and vice versa. The American people didn't know who to blame. They were frustrated by what they saw in Washington and this year they "just said no."

Regrettably, the media has also contributed to the problem. The press hasn't always painted a fair or accurate picture of our nation's leaders. One national magazine prints as a factual statement that in Washington "trading votes for money or pleasure is another day at the office." In a second magazine one reads, "the notion that public service might require some sacrifice has become a quaint relic. Working in government instead has come to be seen as a way to enrich oneself."

I believe that most in this room recognize both statements are dead wrong and quite unfair. Such claims and attacks on the integrity of individuals and our institutions, attacks often with little or no basis in reality, end up tarring the entire system. Our political system needs the trust of people to function properly, and if people believe that all of government is corrupt and for sale our democracy will suffer. Good people are in fact leaving government. The fact is Congress is populated by enormously talented people. There are a few scoundrels, but most are honest, ethical, hardworking members.

We must return the ethics debate to the real issue. Standards of behavior in government service. Let people retain their own private lives. Do not make scandals out of trivialities and avoid treating serious issues as if they were morality plays.

Candidates meanwhile found new ways to approach the voters. They eschewed many traditional political reporters, concentrating on the "Larry King" format of call-in and direct contact with the voters. To realize what a quirky, odd year it was, consider the following. The president-elect helped resuscitate his campaign by playing the saxophone on *Arsenio Hall.* One of the essential interview spots for candidates this year was MTV. George Bush, Bill Clinton and Al Gore all appeared on MTV. Ross Perot appeared on *Larry King Live* more often than he held a press conference, and Dan Quayle got into a feud with a fictional television character named Murphy Brown.

The candidates made few appearances on the former mainstream interview shows such as *Brinkley, Meet the Press* and *Face the Nation.* They gave way to the immediate direct contact with the voters afforded by call-in segments on *Good Morning America, Today* and the *CBS Morning News.* While many in the mainstream media rue this trend, it is not all bad. While it does bypass many reputable and knowledgeable reporters, it allows the American people at least a sense of direct access to the candidates. After all, turn-out this year was up significantly. People watched. They listened. They turned out

and they voted. And while they didn't get the detailed information sometimes secured when candidates are pressed by knowledgeable reporters, they did get a sense of the candidates' positions.

Besides, to some extent, traditional political reporters, in my view, deserve the end run they got this year. In past campaigns, they, to a great extent, controlled the agenda, deciding what was important or significant in the campaign. But in recent years, they became swept away, focusing on the private lives of the candidates and trying often to manufacture scandals — playing a game of "gotcha."

You gentlemen and women of the press, who Theodore Roosevelt once called "the men with the muck rakes," have a responsibility to do more than simply titillate. Americans have an insatiable appetite for information, yet they also demand immediate gratification. Stories grasp our attention. The questions they generate are answered and they fade.

Teddy White's highly stylized writing underscored that all too often *how* a story is told is as important as what it says. Once, television pictures complemented the written press. The broadcasts of men like Edward R. Murrow went hand-in-hand with the written reports from men like Theodore White. But today, for many Americans, television provides the sole source of news. As a result, coverage of important issues is often presented in a manner favorable to television.

There is a real sense, I believe, that television undervalues the magnitude or significance of a story. It seems as though what appears is of little consequence. As Bill Moyers once put it, "The printed page conveys information and commitment and requires active involvement. Television conveys emotion and experience, and it's very limited in what it can do logically. It's an existential experience — there and then gone." Or as Walter Cronkite said, "Everything is being compressed into tiny tablets. You take a little pill of news every day — 23 minutes — and that's supposed to be enough."

Television is good at telling you who's ahead, who's behind, who's succeeded and who's failed. Producers prefer a beginning and an end. According to Torn Brokaw, "It's all storytelling, you know. That's what journalism is all about."

Television, with few exceptions, has not been very successful at portraying the story of our economic problems. These stories are not visual. They don't film very well. When a story is done, it simply flashes across our TV screen for a few moments and it disappears. A few minutes later the sense of urgency dissolves into a feature on the rise of picante sauce as the nation's most popular seasoning.

In a speech this past April, the chairman of the FCC, Alfred Sikes, talked about this problem. He said: "Our public discourse is too often defined by pictures or by the incredible shrinking sound bite — down from an average of 42 seconds in '68 to an amazing 10 seconds in '88. And what news are we treated to? Infinite replays of Rodney King being beaten by police in Los Angeles; nightly images of grisly disaster and crime scenes; guaranteed evening news coverage of summit meetings in picturesque locations; or heated exchanges in Congress. Exchanges that are often only so much grandstanding and contain no substance."

He went on to say: "The lessons from these clips that escape today's version of the cutting-room floor are clear: Energy, motion, props, scenery and seemingly passionate conflict make 'news.'"

The quality of coverage on the deficit has been so poor that in five *ABC/Washington Post* polls, conducted in 1990 and 1991, voters said that an average of 46 cents of every tax dollar was wasted. With that level of cynicism and distrust produced mainly by the combined failures of politicians and the press, how can we expect as a nation to address such a tough issue?

The unpleasant fact is the press has missed the story. The country is at war. Not a traditional war but an economic war. I do not believe that is an overstatement, and I do not believe that I am being an alarmist. Our nation's wealth is being drained drop by drop. Indeed, our most urgent task is to address our staggering national debt and put this nation on a sound fiscal footing.

Unless we face up to our obligations, decrease deficit spending and lower the level of debt, there will be no money, no resources that are needed to address this nation's critical needs.

This year we will borrow 25 cents of every federal dollar we spend. The interest we must pay on the debt this year is $200 billion or nearly 14 percent of the federal budget. This money is paid to those who hold United States securities, many of them wealthy foreign investors, who finance our debt. In my mind, it is money totally wasted. It is not going to feed a hungry child, house the homeless, improve the quality of education or combat the scourge of drugs in America.

The numbers don't lie. This year 47 cents of every federal dollar will go to direct benefit payment for individuals, 22 cents for defense, 14 cents for interest, 12 cents to states and localities and six cents for all remaining federal programs. Our budget deficit this year was a staggering $290 billion, not the $490 billion, however, that was estimated. And thus, using the new Washington math we saved $110 billion. (Laughter)

And just to put it into some context, if we were to eliminate all nondefense discretionary programs of the government — that's everything you think of when you normally think of government, the FBI, the DEA, the EPA, student aid, the FDA and the VA among others — we would still have a deficit this year of approximately $190 billion.

We must end the conspiracy of silence characterizing our budget debate and be honest with the American people. I simply cannot overstate the enormous threat that our mountain of debt represents to America's future. For the past seven years, the primary economic issue confronting America has been our important attempts to achieve deficit reduction, but this is not an easy story to cover, especially for broadcast news. Up until recently, it has not received the attention commensurate with its threat to the future.

Going back to FCC Chairman Sikes, he contends that a series of "blind spots" prevents television news from adequately covering economic news. Returning to his insights of this past April, he said, "Responsible economists of every single stripe agree that this debt burden threatens our children and our grandchildren and their standard of living. Yet ... television news has left our citizens poorly informed to respond in a way equal to the challenge we now face. The result? On such complex issues our primary news source leaves our democracy disabled. For without understanding, there is little hope that those who ultimately hold power in our representative government — the people — can exercise all-important tasks of disciplining our representatives."

A 1985 Media Institute study of network news coverage of the 1985 budget debate, the greatest budget debate since I was there, concluded that: "The coverage was sadly lacking in comprehensiveness and in balance." The report went on to note, "At a time when the broadcast networks are losing audience share, it seems unlikely that they will move away from the sensationalism and superficiality that have characterized their news programs, especially in recent years. Nor are they likely to abandon the entertainment values that have come to shape their news productions. Thus, the prospects for better network news coverage appear dim, at least for now."

I think it's safe to say that the blame for the gridlock we all despair rests in varying degrees with three groups: the people, the politicians and the press.

Based on my 22 years of public life, allow me the indulgence of offering a few observations in how to deal with this problem. The first point I would make is that breaking the gridlock and raising the level of political discourse in this country will not

be achieved through new government regulations or requirements purportedly on the press. There are obvious constitutional problems with that.

Nor will it be achieved through complicated revised professional codes. You simply can't fine-tune the flow of information in a democracy in that way. The real solution is that the people who enjoy journalistic or political power must also accept the responsibility that comes with the power. Individual actions will make the difference. "Freedom," as Clemenceau said, "is nothing in the world but the opportunity for self-discipline."

And so what I am asking for here today, on the part of the public, the politicians and the press is more maturity and self-discipline in the discussion of public policy. To the American people I would say, as I've said before, it's time to start looking beyond your own self-interest. This means an acknowledgement that some small, short-term sacrifice will be necessary if we are to solve the difficult problems that we face.

It means an understanding that government cannot provide all the weeks or months. Political candidates and elected officials must summon the courage to reject the temptations of focus groups and polls as well as the pressures of the constituents. They must come to the realization that doing what is politically popular is not always right and doing what is right is not always politically popular.

I speak from some experience. For 12 years I've had the privilege, the special privilege, of representing the people of New Hampshire in the United States Senate. They returned me for a second Senate term with a strong majority in 1986. At the time of my retirement announcement this past March, my relationship with my constituents was in good standing. But during my tenure in the Senate, I voted against weapons programs that cost jobs in New Hampshire, refused to fight the closing of the Homestead Air Force base, which should have been closed, co-authored a deficit reduction bill opponents warned would decimate the government, and supported means testing of popular entitlement programs.

How is it that I was able to say all of this and retain the respect and, more importantly, the votes of my constituency? I believe it is because when you know what you stand for, and you tell the truth and it is perceived as the truth, no matter how unpopular, the American people will listen and they will understand. I took great pains to answer truthfully the questions posed to me by the New Hampshire and the national press. Through them, through you, I was able to communicate to my constituents the positions I took and why I felt they were in the national interest and thus in their interest.

The English statesman, Edmund Burke, put it much better. He said, in his famous speech in Bristol in 1774: "Your representative owes you, not his industry only, but his judgment; and he betrays, instead of serving you, if he sacrifices it to your opinion."

The success of political truth-telling can be found, not only in my experience, but more recently in the experiences this year of Paul Tsongas. You could see the relief in the affirming faces of his supporters when Paul Tsongas stood there and said, "No more lies. It's time for the truth. The American people are tough enough and smart enough to take it."

In addition to leveling with the people, I would advise public officials to treat the press with respect and dignity, acknowledge their constitutionally recognized role in the functioning of this democracy. The old gimmick of using the press as a tool to advance the image drawn by your pollster is wearing so thin that the American people, I believe, are finally seeing through it.

And finally, allow me to turn to the central focus of this event, the role of the press in public policy. I recognize that what I will call the mainstream press are in a very difficult position. As forms of entertainment, and news programs and newspapers are just that —

"entertainment," — albeit, enlightened entertainment — you must capture the attention of the viewer or the reader.

At the same time, the business end of news gathering has changed. Management is cutting back on resources. Bureaus are closing. Newspapers are bought, sold or closed and the domination of the networks is no more. Therein lies the rub, the "Catch-22."

We have entered into a great new era of communications competition. New technologies have opened doors and increased competition. Cable has broken the network's stranglehold on television news. Today, satellites, videotape and computer technology are fast transforming news gathering and delivery services. This new competition will increase pressure on traditional news outlets to conform. But with respect, I would say that the *CBS Evening News* should not become *Hard Copy.*

Traditional news outlets must not shun their responsibility to "strip the sheen" off the façade and look beneath the carefully honed image. Beyond that they should not forsake their obligation to enlighten the public. Much like my call on public officials to reject the tyranny of the Beltway pollster and consultant, I call on responsible journalists to reject the oppression of the news consultant, the newspaper doctor, the ratings game and the pressure to compete.

In 1960, in a remarkable speech to the Women's National Press Club, Clare Booth Luce observed that while people aren't as interested in issues as they should be, unfortunately, neither are journalists. She accused American journalism of engaging in a "debasement of popular taste." She went on, "the desire of the American public for more thrills in their news does not exonerate the press because it is delivering those thrills."

She asked her audience, "Can the American press seek to be excused from responsibility for public lack of information, as TV and radio often do, on the grounds that, after all, "we have to give the people what they want or we will go out of business"? And she went on, "No. Not without abdicating its own American birthright. It cannot. The responsibility is fixed on the American press. Falling directly and clearly on publisher and editor, this responsibility is inbuilt into the freedom of the press itself."

The freedom guaranteed by the Constitution, under the First Amendment, carries this responsibility, however burdensome, with it. It's incumbent on American journalism to help break the cycle of gridlock and cynicism. It is your responsibility to use creativity and explain the serious issues of our time, like the deficit, no matter how boring your consultant says they are. You must corral the great energy that is found in American journalism to go beyond the limits of your medium and educate the public about the challenges we face. In short, fulfill the true role our Founding Fathers intended you to play.

The same year that Clare Booth Luce was reminding journalists of their responsibilities, Edward R. Murrow delivered an address on television and politics at the Guildhall in London. As he looked to the future of journalism in the electronic age, he asked "if democracy will be able to develop the competence to deal with those complexities. If so, it must be through a broadening of education and use of communications not yet realized or perhaps even conceived." How prophetic.

As a television democracy, are we mature enough to exercise proper judgment and restraint? Journalists, both print and electronic, would not help the United States solve problems like the deficit by using newfound capacities and technologies to do more stories about what goes on in a politician's bedroom. I'm asking reporters to strive for a higher ideal than simple competition at all costs.

At a recent reception marking his 75th birthday, veteran CBS and NPR correspondent Daniel Schorr, who is with us this evening, confessed to having withheld a story in 1957 about the secret immigration of Jews from the Soviet Union to Israel through Poland. Schorr reminisced that his actions at the time summoned him to

"membership in some other group beyond just being a reporter." He observed that, "the older I get, the more I begin to realize that life isn't that simplicity of the young reporters saying, 'Out of my way, Bud, I want that story, and if I get that story, there it goes.' I have a greater and greater sense of complications."

The serious problems facing this nation are not simple. They are not easy. They are not always exciting. They do not lend themselves to easy broadcast coverage, but they are important. They are essential. And while these issues are complicated and difficult to explain, they demand attention. It will take all of the creative powers of television, the broadcast and print media to tell this story. It's frequently said that topics like the deficit are too boring. Well, it can't be too tough. Ross Perot attracted millions of viewers with his simple infomercials, a half-hour of talking head and rather crude homemade graphs.

Some say the public isn't interested. I don't believe you've really tried.

Thank you. (Applause)

Mr. Kalb: Thank you very much, Senator Rudman. This is a time for questions. Let me just start by asking you a question concerning the cost of television in a campaign and the effect that the raising of the money, the cost of television, has upon politics and the quality of politics in America today, and then we'll go right to the questions here. Thank you, Senator.

Mr. Rudman: I believe that any reading of statistics of the last few years will indicate that somewhere between 70 and 80 percent of all campaign dollars are spent on television or related to the production of television commercials. I have always felt with all the talk of campaign reform that the real scandal wasn't how much we had to raise, it's how we had to spend it.

I recall as a candidate in New Hampshire paying $18,000 once for a 30-second commercial on a Boston television station. I thought that was rather outrageous but that's nothing compared to what some have to spend.

I believe that either we totally change the way we allocate money and let the federal government do it, which I personally oppose. Or, quite frankly, to truly lower the cost of campaigning and thus the influence of special-interest groups, I have long been an advocate of the award of a certain number of free minutes of advertising time to candidates every two years. Without it we'll continue going on.

No matter what we do, there is two-and-one-half times more money raised by the presidential candidates from private sources than from the public source, all through very neatly carved-out loopholes. The only way to do it is to reduce the cost of television time which is where most of our dollars are going.

Mr. Guston: My name is Dave Guston. I am a fellow at the Center for Science and International Affairs here at the Kennedy School.

My question, Senator Rudman, has to do with your condemnation of the press for submitting to the degradation of competition. In effect, of degrading its product based on the competition. And I wonder about that because, after all, the press does compete in a constitutionally free market and to condemn them, particularly in an era when one of the few media enterprises that is somewhat insulated from market pressures, public broadcasting, is under attack from the federal government for being a biased presenter of news, of culture and so forth. Is your condemnation of the competitive, private media really on target?

Senator Rudman: Well, of course, I do not accept your premise whatsoever. I don't think any reading of that speech is a condemnation of the press. That speech says, in my view in a line that these are difficult issues to cover. They must be covered and you must be more creative in how you cover them. I understand the competitive pressures and thought I referred to them.

My belief is that public television and public radio obviously have clear advantages. No question about that. They may be attacked by some. Hardly by me. I would make the observation that, in recent months, the television networks have done a rather remarkable turnabout on the very issue I am talking about tonight.

One of the examples was on the CBS Sunday Morning program with Charles Kuralt on the deficit. ABC, on one of its featured programs about a month ago, did the same thing. If you are creative about it, you can do it. I am simply saying that the press has not done it as they could do it because they have been frightened off by the fact that it's a dull story. I don't think it's a dull story at all that a young man like you is going to pay 25 percent of your gross pay in FICA taxes by the time you are 35. That is a very exciting story.

Mr. Goffman: Hello, Senator. My name is Mark Goffman. I am a first-year student here at the Kennedy School.

After some frustration and even alienation from both the Republican and Democratic parties, I found myself working side by side with many of them and Independents in the United We Stand party, as you might call it. I was pretty satisfied with how we did. Very satisfied both in Massachusetts and nationwide, and now we are officially a lobbying organization. I want to ask you to please comment on that and where you see us going and how that might relate to the Concord Coalition.

Senator Rudman: Let me say very frankly that, and I've said this publicly before, that I think Ross Perot had the right message, but he was probably the wrong messenger. I believe that someone with more political skills than Mr. Perot, delivering that same message, might have done extraordinarily well, beyond anyone's expectations. Although I suppose I would have to admit that he would also have to have Mr. Perot's balance sheet.

I think that that movement has proven what I've always believed, that the American people will fundamentally listen to reason. Now there are large groups who won't, but all you need is 51 percent. And what I am concerned about and what Paul Tsongas is concerned about in this Concord Coalition is a coming generational war when people like you are going to say, "Wait a minute. I'm not about to have 25 percent of my pay withheld for FICA." There will be a march on Washington. The Concord Coalition is trying to organize across this country, young and old, to recognize this issue, and you would be pleased to know that we have received literally thousands of inquiries from people who are active in the Perot movement. We have a number of former Perot chairpersons around the country who are working on this issue with us.

Ms. Sybil: Good evening, Senator Rudman. My name is Katherine Sybil. I am the Eastern Region Political Director for the Republicans for Choice PAC, Alexandria, Virginia.

On Sunday morning's *Eyewitness News Conference,* you mentioned that you're getting involved with the coalition of moderate Republicans, including Governor Weld—

Senator Rudman: It's hard to find these days, but we're working on it.

Ms. Sybil: I know. Yesterday, David Gergen, speaking at the BU School of Communication, thought it would be better to find common ground with the religious right than to start an all-out war with them. Would you like to comment on that? Do you think there is common ground, and how will the press play a role in the battle that you intend to get involved in with the religious—

Senator Rudman: Well, I like David Gergen. He is a friend of mine, but I will tell you that I do not agree with that. I do not think that there is any— (Applause)

I do not believe there is any community of purpose between my perception and many of my friends' perceptions of a political party and that of those who are attempting to take over the party and who, in fact, did at the convention. My colleague, Jack

Danforth, had a great line I thought. He said that "The Republican convention was all-inclusive. It was a very inclusive convention, all the way from Buchanan to Robertson." (Laughter)

So my answer is no, I don't think we'll do that. I believe that the mainstream Republican party believes in more centralist positions on social issues and traditional conservative positions on fiscal and foreign policy issues, and I believe that is a party that has viability. I think a party that puts the social issues first and foremost, well to the right of center, is destined for obscurity. Thank you. (Applause)

Mr. Reyneri: Good evening, Senator. My name is Nelson Reyneri. I am a second-year Master's in Public Administration student here.

I'd like to know if you could please expand a little bit on two aspects of the deficit cutting. One would be the having to raise taxes and the second part would be the entitlement. Obviously, they take up a lot and they are very politically difficult to do. If you could expand on, one, what kind of impact they could make as you see it, and secondly, what kind of advice you would give to the president-elect on both those two measures?

Senator Rudman: The solution to the deficit does not require the resources of a think tank. It's already been laid out many times in many resolutions before the Senate and House Budget Committees. As a matter of fact, John White's plan that he put together for Ross Perot, and, by the way, Mr. White is now working with us in our Concord Coalition, John White's plan is an excellent blueprint for it. You might want to disagree with parts of it. You might want to fine-tune other parts, but essentially, to get deficit reduction down to approximately the percentage we want of the GNP, you need to do several things.

One, you have to means-test the entitlement programs for upper-middle-income retired people. You must do that. You must tax social security of those that can afford to have it taxed. You must have higher initial costs for medical care for wealthier retired Americans. You must, from a fairness point of view, if not from a fiscal point of view, but from a fairness point of view, raise taxes on the wealthiest of Americans. You must do what Governor Clinton is talking about, about investment, tax credits, capital gains. Those are all important. You must take the federal discretionary budget and essentially let it grow only by inflation, which is about what Gramm-Rudman has let it do anyway, and allow defense to continue to decline.

Now, if you could get 51 people to vote for that in the Senate and more than half in the House, you would see the long-term interest rates around the world plummet, which is really what is holding back this economy. What many don't seem to understand is that President-elect Clinton could have the most extraordinary economy in his third and particularly fourth year if he did the hard things early on.

What this country needs is not more pump priming. What it needs is a signal to the world financial community that we are willing to start the deficit on a downward trend. Not immediately. Not next year. Not four years from now. Say seven years from now, but at least start it on a certain track now. You do that and you'll get real growth in America, real jobs in America. You won't get it with government tinkering with the mechanism. It won't work.

Mr. Shriver: Good evening Senator. I'm Randy Shriver. First-year student here at the Kennedy School. First of all, I want to thank you for 12 outstanding years of service in the Senate.

The question I'd like to ask is regarding one of the popular ways to deal with the gridlock situation right now and that's term limits. If you could offer your ideas on that.

Senator Rudman: Well, of course, I have never been a great fan of term limits. I self-impose term limits. It's another gimmick. It's very anti-democratic in my view. I think if

the people of the state want to elect a particular person over and over again, they should and, you know, if people don't do very well then they normally get thrown out. I could give you a whole list over the last 10 or 12 years. Many this year in the House.

I don't see term limitations as being a particular solution. Unless, of course, you adopt what I call the Rudman Plan, which I have, tongue-in-cheek, proposed on the floor of the Senate. What is term limits all about? Well, I know what it's all about. It's all about trying to get people not to be there for a long time so they become wedded to their jobs, concerned about re-election. Fine, I've got the plan. One six-year term for everybody. Every member of the House, all 100 senators and the president.

Now, there is a problem with that. Jefferson would have had a problem with that. It takes all the accountability out. You go in there and you can do anything you want to do because you never face the voters again. So I don't think either of those plans is very sensible. I think what we have now is very sensible.

When I came into the United States Senate in 1980, two-thirds of the people serving in the Senate were serving on either their first or their second term. So things are changing.

Mr. Gross: My name is Gregg Gross and I am an alumnus of Harvard and a writer and also former president of the Harvard Republican Club in the mid-1980's.

Senator Rudman: I didn't realize they had such a club here. (Laughter)

Mr. Gross: We actually had the largest membership of any political organization on campus at the time and we were very proud of that.

But, anyway, what my question is, now that the Republicans are a minority party in every sense of the word in Washington, what should the Republican party, the Republican members of Congress, the Senate and the House, do in their relationship with the Clinton administration and the Democratic leadership, and how can the Republican party once again distinguish itself from the Democrats? How can it set itself up as an alternative, given that the Democrats have quite successfully presented themselves as the party of the middle?

Senator Rudman: Well, let me say first and foremost that I happen to believe that we all have an enormous stake in the success of a Clinton presidency. We have a stake in it because the country truly is on the edge of serious economic problems. There isn't a reasonable economist who will disagree with that. And so I do not believe that being obstructionist in this atmosphere is something that anyone should do. And certainly not my party. I don't expect them to.

What I do expect Republicans to do is to keep the administration focused on fiscal responsibility, which we've heard things during the campaign.

There were a lot of promises made. Reminds me of Tom Foley's marvelous line, which many in this room have heard, but for those who haven't I'll repeat it. Tom Foley, one of my favorite people in Washington, says that "the two biggest mistakes a politician can make is first, to make a campaign promise. The second is to keep it." (Laughter)

So, I believe that the Republicans ought to work with the new president, and if they can help shape legislation through compromise, because after all there are, at last count, 42 Republican members of the Senate, that is enough to block legislation that is totally against what the prevailing philosophy of this party is, then I think they ought to work for compromise. If that ends up with a great success for this administration, then the Republican party may not win the White House again in 1996. But I will tell you quite frankly, that is less important than getting this country growing economically again, in my view. (Applause)

Mr. Quinn: Good evening, Senator Rudman. My name is Jim Quinn.

In the 1960's, we saw three presidents come from the U.S. Senate. We saw Kennedy, Johnson and Nixon. The more recent presidents have all come from the governor's

mansion, Carter, Reagan and now Governor Clinton and their vice-presidents have come from the Senate, Mondale, Quayle and so forth, Senator Gore.

Senator Rudman: So forth is Gore, right. (Laughter)

Mr. Quinn: Do you think that this trend is going to continue, and do you think that this is also the result of the media and probably the complex issues that these people are facing in Washington that we're going to people outside the realm of Washington? And if not, is this why you left the Senate?

Senator Rudman: Well, let me simply say that I believe there are several reasons for it. I think first and foremost, is probably the reason that you captured in your question, but I think that one of the reasons is that governors generally are doing a much better job at their job than senators have been doing at their jobs. That's what I think. Look around this country, look right in this Commonwealth. Whether you agree or disagree, Bill Weld has said that he would do things, and he has done them, and he has restored some things that people wanted restored.

Look south to Connecticut and look at Lowell Weicker, an incredible story of political courage in my view. I believe he just received the Profile in Courage Award from the Kennedy family or whatever foundation gives that award.

Governors have confronted the problem. You know, they can run but they can't hide. In the Senate, you can run and you can hide. I mean, I think one of the most remarkable things is the United States Senate. Those political reporters, there are some sitting right in the front row here, and one with me here, who have watched this little vignette. It's really wonderful to watch, and I always get a kick out of it because, you know, you really run because you want to do something and you want to vote for things that you believe in. You want to vote against things that you don't believe in. And that roll-call vote is called and if you watch it on C-SPAN, you'll notice that senators come down the aisle and we all go down, Democrats on the left, Republicans on the right, and there is a table. There is a yellow legal pad there and on that pad is written the precise amendment or the bill or whatever it is and to hear the agony about casting a vote. I mean this vote, you know, you hear the agony, what's this going to do to me back in, I won't use this state, back in X? They know what the right vote is, but it's a tough vote.

Governors don't get that opportunity. Governors can't let their states sink. They are a single person up there and people look at them. They get more prominence and, frankly, I think they are probably better at solving problems than most members of the Senate. That's my view. Because of their training and what they've done, which is why I've never wanted to run for governor by the way. (Laughter)

Mr. Quinn: Is that why Lyndon Johnson and Kennedy contributed a lot in their tenure in the White House, because they had so much legislative experience?

Senator Rudman: Times have changed enormously. The United States Senate of Lyndon Johnson and John Kennedy's day is a far different Senate than today for a whole variety of reasons which, frankly, we don't have time to go into today. It is a different era. There was party discipline. There were things that were done. There were philosophies that were followed. It was a different place.

Ms. Geis: Penny Geis, recent graduate of this School.

You have had a long interest in bipartisan work and breaking gridlock and you've expressed some of that this evening. Are there things other than the public and the press, things that could be done within the process and within procedures that would help to break both partisan gridlock in the legislative branch and between the legislative and the executive?

Senator Rudman: Yes, if there is some way to institute a form of enlightened dictatorship amongst the leadership of both bodies, it would help a great deal. The best way I know of doing that is to shut down the radio/television studio upstairs for a year.

The trouble with the Congress today is that everyone is an independent contractor. I've heard George Mitchell lament on the floor: "I really don't have any power. I mean I'm only one senator. I can't get that guy to take his hold off this bill." I mean it's a different place. A hundred people, all equal.

Now, granted, the leadership is more equal than everyone else, but still they don't have the power to get it done. The problem we have right now is a breakdown of party discipline. I mean, I really believe that we were better off when parties had some discipline. The parties gave the money to run. Today, you don't go to the party to get money to run. You do it yourself. They help a little. You look at Lyndon Johnson's life and how he did things, many in this room know more about that than I do. He had a lot of control over a lot of people and that's not all bad. That may give you an inner view of my philosophy. (Laughter)

Mr. Cagnus: Senator, I'm Joe Cagnus, concerned citizen.

I've got a couple of questions here. The first one is when Gramm-Rudman-Hollings Bill was passed, that was supposed to get us on the road to solving our deficit problem. What happened to that? Was it a failure and to whom do you lay the blame for that failure?

All right. The second—

Senator Rudman: That's quite a question itself. You really want two, I mean— (Laughter)

Mr. Cagnus: Well, this one is a fun one.

The Paul Tsongas message in many ways was the Perot message and vice versa. If Perot had come to Paul Tsongas when Paul dropped out of the race and offered him financial support, do you think the results would see a Paul Tsongas presidency today?

Senator Rudman: Well, I have an easy answer for the second question. I've told Paul this. I don't think he should have dropped out of the race. I think he dropped out too early. I'm absolutely convinced that one of the great things the media does is give a lot of time, absolutely free, to somebody who has a message, who's interesting, who says different things, and I just thought he dropped out too soon. I've told him that. He may think that also. Obviously, if he'd had that kind of money it would have helped.

I'll tell you a little anecdote about that. We have to have a little fun tonight, Marvin.

Little inside stories. About four weeks before the election, would have been in early October — I'm trying to consume enough time, I don't have to answer the first part of this question— (Laughter)

But I will answer it. I got a call from Ross Perot. I had had a number of calls from Ross Perot during the fall, and he said, "I want to make you an offer. I'm making the same offer to Paul Tsongas. I'm calling him now and also to Paul Volcker. I want to buy an hour of time for you on all three networks. I want you and Tsongas to go on and tell the American people what the problems are." I was waiting for the other shoe to drop. (Laughter)

And I said, "Well, Ross, sounds interesting. What do you want?" "1 don't want anything. I just want it shown at the end that I paid for it." Let me tell you something— (Laughter)

For someone in public life for 12 years, who feels about the deficit like I think Billy Graham feels about the Bible, that was a hard one to turn down. An hour on ABC, CBS and NBC. We decided not to because we felt that no matter what the disclaimer — by the way, in fairness to Mr. Perot, "You can have any disclaimer you want on that. You don't support me. You don't agree with me. Anything you want to say, but I would just like it known that this was an educational grant by Perot." But we didn't do it.

First part of your question, and neither did Paul Volcker, by the way, which is probably wise. Gramm-Rudman-Hollings didn't fail. It failed in reaching its targets

because we had always assumed there would be an entitlement package following it. Gramm-Rudman-Hollings never touched the entitlement programs. The Congress won't agree to that.

I would say in fairness to Republicans and Democrats there was no agreement to cover entitlements. But the rate of government spending in discretionary areas was going up at anywhere from 12 to 14 percent a year up until 1985 when that bill passed. It has flattened out. It is going up only at the rate of inflation. And as a matter of fact, if you want to know the real reason that the defense budget fell, it was because of GRH as much as any other reason. The defense budget in real dollars from '86 on started downward.

So GRH did work, but then in 1990 they started to play some real games, even trying to get around in what it could do in the discretionary part of the budget. Time will tell. I feel comfortable that it has saved untold tens of billions of dollars. And considering my salary for 12 years, I think it's a fair return on investment. (Laughter)

Mr. Mecklin: Hi, I'm John Mecklin. I'm a journalist.

I was just curious. You've sort of put a challenge to journalists in your speech. Talk about the complicated issues. I was wondering what public officials ought to be doing to make it easier for journalists to cover the deficit? I mean, you said you just turned an hour down free. All you had to do was say, "I'm not really with Ross, but he paid for it," and you said no. I mean, is that legit when you view—

Senator Rudman: Well, sure it's legit. It was legitimate because as you know I supported President Bush for re-election. Paul Tsongas supported Bill Clinton and both of us felt that it could be totally confusing to people, and Paul and I agreed together that we should not do that. I would have loved to have done it, and in fact, I expect to go back to Mr. Perot and ask him if he'd like to do it this year. (Laughter)

I think public officials should speak the truth and many do. I can name a few on both sides of the aisle. No need to tonight, but there are a number who speak the truth in their own election cycle. Not enough, but the numbers are increasing. But I believe there's some great examples of what can be done on this story. NPR has done some stories on the deficit that were remarkable. ABC did one I spoke about. Kuralt did one on *Sunday Morning* about eight weeks ago. Very graphic, very interesting, got excellent response. So I think there is a lot you can do.

Now, as far as print journalism is concerned, you know, you have to use charts and graphs and things that jump out at people, but it can be done, I believe.

Mr. Whiteside: Good evening, Senator. Former constituent of yours and student at BC Law School now. My name is Taylor Whiteside.

I wonder if you have any thoughts on the practice in some democracies of restraining the publication of polls for a period of time before an election?

Senator Rudman: You know, it's a great idea, in principle it's a wonderful idea, but I have terrible problems anytime government, under the guise of anything, starts restraining anything that isn't absolutely going to inhibit the national security. That's just the way I feel. Just against it. I mean it just starts to be a further encroachment. I mean if it's there, then I think responsible journalists will do what they wish with it. Television will do what it wishes. I thought this year was interesting with the sensitivity with which it was done, but I don't want to see legislation getting into that area. That is nothing the government ought to be regulating.

Mr. Best: My name is Peter Best. I'm a Cambridge citizen.

We examined a number of things this evening. The combination of the public and the press in something you might call mass adult education across the country. The politicians are facing the economy with somewhat like a terror and government, as distinct from politics, is facing, in trends of supernationalism this equivocal long-distance

nationalism and a growth of multinational corporations and also organized crime that are larger, in many cases, economically than governments. Now, in terms of—

Senator Rudman: Multinational corporations are larger than government?

Mr. Best: Economically speaking.

Senator Rudman: I don't know of anyone that is, but that's all right. Go ahead.

Mr. Best: What do you think about a RICO Amendment for economic crime? Do you think this involves the Republicans and perhaps the Democrats policing themselves?

Senator Rudman: Well, for those who aren't familiar, RICO is a statute that was designed for the purpose of closing down organized crime racketeering and things of that sort. It has now been used in a number of other ways as a tool of lawyers in various kinds of lawsuits. I think that people ought to be charged with crimes when they commit crimes in a traditional way, and people ought to be subject to civil lawsuits, including antitrust, when they do those kinds of things and the two shouldn't be mixed. That's my answer.

Mr. Einberg: Good evening, Senator. Lt. Carl Einberg, United States Navy. I'm not a student here.

You said that the press, the politicians and the people all bear responsibilities for the debt and deficit problem and in turn the debt and deficit solution. What level should we hold as people, hold our representatives to reducing the deficit over the next few years?

Senator Rudman: My own view is that if the deficit isn't on a truly downward trend, and I mean truly, not due to some little events that happened, like not having to spend money on certain things that you thought you had to. But I mean, structurally changed so we know it's going down, the system is changed. By 1995, 1996, I think, by the way, that the accountability will come in a far different way, there will be a third party and God only knows who will be leading it, and who knows what else they will stand for. And that's my concern.

Mr. Kalb: I want to thank you, but first I wanted to ask you one final question.

Senator Rudman: Final question, all right. This is going to be a beauty. (Laughter)

Mr. Kalb: Now, in your speech you spoke with great affection about most of the people in the Senate. Spoke of them as fine, thoughtful and intelligent.

Senator Rudman: Most are.

Mr. Kalb: And you said there were scoundrels among them.

Senator Rudman: Right.

Mr. Kalb: So now that you are a free man and you can speak your mind— (Laughter)

Senator Rudman: My book will be coming out in about a year. (Laughter)

Mr. Kalb: Thank you Senator. (Applause)

Let me just say that my brother has always said that his autobiography is going to be called *Corridors I Have Known* and the Senator's book is obviously going to be called *Scoundrels I Have Known*. But we are all here at the Kennedy School and at the Shorenstein Barone Center extremely delighted, proud and honored that you have been our speaker here tonight, and I think all of us, by our applause, have indicated that kind of an agreement.

Thank you again very, very much.

THEODORE H. WHITE SEMINAR
NOVEMBER 20, 1992

Mr. Kalb: Good morning everyone, and welcome to the second half of the Theodore H. White Lecture for 1992.

Last night we were privileged to hear Senator Warren Rudman of New Hampshire deliver his talk, and this morning we will continue with an analysis and a discussion of the Senator's comments. We are joined this morning by, to my left, Stephen Hess, who is a senior fellow in governmental studies at the Brookings Institution and is known to most of the United States and the world as the sound-bite meister, one of the best that Washington, D.C., has produced. He is an author and scholar, and his work on the press, which goes on and on and on, is all trail blazing and we are all indebted to him.

Linda Wertheimer, to my immediate left, is the anchor of *All Things Considered,* which is by all reckoning one of the finest news and commentary analysis programs in American journalism. It is on National Public Radio. She is a member of our senior advisory board and we are very pleased that she is with us this morning.

Senator Rudman, we all met last night, and to his right is Haynes Johnson, who is a Pulitzer Prize–winning columnist for *The Washington Post* and who has been spending most of this year looking into the nature of that people called the American people and his work in progress, on all that research, is tentatively called *Who Are We as Americans.* His book, *Sleepwalking Through History,* was on the bestseller list of *The New York Times* for many weeks and was a rather extraordinary analysis of the Reagan years.

I would like to start with Linda Wertheimer.

Ms. Wertheimer: Thank you. Last night Senator Rudman took the press to task for the way in which we covered the campaign, and he sort of began at the beginning by suggesting that we are more concerned with scandal and titillation than we are with the issues and with the more important aspects of the campaign and that we shouldn't keep digging for the dirt and should start paying attention to what elected officials may do in office.

I have to agree that we are guilty in some respect in that we do dish dirt and we are susceptible to the notion that a story, whether it is confirmed or not, whether it can be confirmed or not, if it has been reported by somebody and is said to be out there, is fair game.

I would like to say that my own organization in the case of the infamous Gennifer Flowers debacle — during the course of the New Hampshire primary — my own organization, under the leadership of a young woman who is a whole lot younger than I am and a whole lot littler than I am, but she's tough as nails. She said "out there" doesn't mean "in here," and we didn't cover the story until the Clintons themselves spoke out on it.

So I think that there were all kinds of efforts this year in which news organizations tried very hard to stay on the issues, to offer both analysis and, in some cases, to stand out of the way of the relationship between candidates and voters and allow it to be more direct.

National Public Radio had call-in programs. We stole from *The New York Times* and *The Washington Post* the notion of broadcasting large sections of stump speeches which were uncommented upon, just stuck into the program seven or eight minutes at a time so that our listeners would have the same opportunities, or at least something like the same opportunities, that people who lived in towns where the campaigns passed through to hear what the candidates were saying.

I think, though, that Senator Rudman's point that we should stop considering issues as morality plays, which he said last night, is not well taken because I think consideration

of issues *does* become a morality play. The Senator illustrated it very well in his own speech when he said, "You walk down to the front and you look to see what the amendment is, the precise vote you're going to cast that day and you know what the right vote is and you know what your constituents are going to say if you cast it."

He did not say, but I will say, that you also know what your contributors are going to say if you cast that vote. And that seems to me to be a perfect example of a morality play and I think it's useful to present it in that fashion.

Political reporters do deserve, as Senator Rudman pointed out, to have something of the end run that has happened to us this year as *Larry King Live* has taken over for other kinds of programs. To the extent that we have spent too much time on strategies and mistakes and polls, I think we do deserve to have some of that kind of thing happen to us. Although I must say that with the president of the United States sitting at the table, you know, when Larry King turns to the number two camera and says: "Tomorrow at this time, Cher will be—" and the president is in the shot, kind of back out of focus, and you think, is this really the right thing to be doing here?

Now, I'd like to make a very simple, almost stupid point but which I think is very important in any conversation about the responsibilities of the press in shaping and framing the debate and in keeping the debate on a serious track. Our responsibility, as Senator Rudman pointed out, is to do more than titillate but, unless we own the paper or the radio station, unless we have the nerve of, say, the family that owns the *Union Leader*, we do not — I mean, it is not accepted, admirable practice in the United States for newspapers and television stations and so on to organize the kind of steady drumbeat that is really necessary to hammer an idea home.

We can't preach in that way. We write a story. We do a series on it. We do a big analytical take-out on it. We write features that illustrate it and then we just wait until we get the next hook and then we start again. But we are not in a position to write that story every single day and that is really what has to happen, that sort of drilling that has to happen if people are to become as concerned, for example, about the deficit as Senator Rudman would have us be.

Politicians whose words we take down in print and broadcast, it seems to me, win no prizes for making this exchange more responsible. I would say that, if the country is at war on the economy and on the deficit, as Senator Rudman has said, let's not lose sight of who it is that ordered the Light Brigade to charge.

I think the American people have a strong sense, as Senator Rudman said, that their tax dollars are wasted. But who was it that said that waste, fraud and abuse were the principal problems causing the deficit and the principal solutions to it?

Our reporting that the then 60 billion dollar deficit, we're talking 1980 here of course, was not going to be cured by handling waste, fraud and abuse, was certainly not sufficient to back the candidate off that theme. Nor was it sufficient to back off the Republican members of the House and Senate who fell right into line. Party discipline seemed to me to be working fairly well at that point.

The notion that taxes could be cut, military spending could be increased and the deficit would go down was a notion that George Bush said was nonsense on its face and many people agreed with him and many reporters wrote that story, but then the Congress fell right in line behind the president. George Bush changed his position and survived the attacks for it. The resulting ballooning deficits we all know about.

And I think it is not at all sufficient to say, as the administration has repeatedly said, that concomitant budget cuts did not happen and so, therefore, the deficits. I don't know anyone who actually thought that the Congress was going to do it, and a reality check would have told us all that it was not going to happen.

The administration, in fact, never actually proposed budget cuts which would be equal to the task of offsetting the drops in revenue and coping with the deficit. And without that kind of presidential leadership the Congress really cannot do it on its own and did not do it on its own.

Another notion that the American people have had hammered into their heads is that taxes are high. We all believe that our taxes are high. Compared to every other industrial democracy our taxes are not high but we think they are and, I daresay, that one of the reasons we think they are, one of the reasons why the American people believe they're right is that they don't see much of a return on their taxes. I think that those are a series of ideas that were raised in campaigns, repeated constantly from the various bully pulpits, written down and recorded by people like me and put on the air and, when we said "yes but," "not likely," "I don't think so," our voices are just not as loud. They're just not as effective.

For all of the credit we get, you know, we don't have that kind of voice and I would say that we have a partnership problem here. If this is going to be solved in some way with our cooperation, we will not lead in that effort. It's not our role.

Mr. Kalb: Thank you very much, Linda. I want to add, in the sense *post facto* to my introduction, that if you wanted to get a sense of what this country was thinking about, thinking about itself, thinking about its leaders, its place in the world in the post–Cold War environment, you could have not done better than listen to some of the pieces that Linda had on the air from different parts of the United States. I still remember one, she reminded me this morning of the name of the small town in Oklahoma — Ada, Oklahoma — where she simply went into this community and allowed it to speak. And it was one of the best pieces of radio reporting I have ever heard since I've been in the business and she did that time and time again and that was an indication of the way in which the reporting of politics in 1992 had changed. There was much more sensitivity to what people actually thought and what they felt.

Haynes Johnson, please.

Mr. Johnson: I was in a strange position last night listening to Senator Rudman and I found myself agreeing with almost everything he said, which doesn't make for a very vigorous dissenting debate and colloquium here this morning. As I understand what his basic message was, it was quite simple, that the country feels it's facing a crisis, that the election was about anger and distress, which is undeniably true, that neither the political system nor the press nor the people have responded to that and that if changes aren't made or something doesn't happen in this interim period, that we're going to be in a very dangerous condition. I thought the most riveting thing he said last night was the specter of down the road more Perots, more fragmentation, more division, not consistency and not unity which is a challenge for the whole system and I believe that that's correct.

As far as the press goes, it comes down to what Joe Liebling used to say, A.J. Liebling, "the power of the press comes down to the guy who owns one." It does make a difference if you own one and what you can do with it, to be sure, but I would be more critical even than Warren Rudman about the press.

I think with the exceptions that Marvin has properly made there was more attempt to be sensitive. We did things better, but we're always like generals fighting the last war in the press. And I think this was a year in which really and truly we missed the story of what was boiling in the country.

It shouldn't have been so hard to figure out, just as we missed four years previously what was happening in the debacle of the savings and loan crisis. We didn't report on it. We didn't talk about it. We didn't prepare the country for what was happening in the financial system, nor four years before that did we really examine the workings of the economy on Wall Street in the early '80s when things were going on.

I once went back to *The Post* computer files after Milken was about to be indicted and I pulled up where we had written about this guy. I don't think there was a single entry on Michael Milken. Who was he? Boesky, similarly, hardly at all, I mean, and I just think in that sense I'm generalizing here. I see Warren Phillips over here. There are institutions that did some fine work and I'm not saying we all were amiss, but basically, in those kinds of institutional stories that really affect the nature of the society, we didn't do a very good job. That's not what we do best.

I think we this year, again, were driven by polls, by focus groups. Again, we talked too much to each other. Again, we were enraptured by the strategy, the tacticians of the campaign, rather than what was happening.

And, again, I think most fundamentally, we missed the story of or the significance or symbolism of Ross Perot. I think Perot will be seen as the great lesson of this year for the press and for the public and maybe for the country — and the great danger.

We should be fortunate that he was so ill-suited to be president and proved it, because by temperament he demonstrated exactly why he shouldn't be president. But, despite all of the evident difficulties with the kind of personality and the way he would operate and the choices that he might have made, he still got an extraordinary result on election day.

I still find it hard to realize 30 percent of the vote in Maine, 27 percent of the vote in Kansas and in 31 states he got over 20 percent of the electorate, and these were not states like Utah where they have people roaming the woods looking for a terrorist with their guns to shoot. This was across the board. This was the American electorate with a great signal. And I think that's where we are now.

Listening to Warren talk about the politicians, now I want to turn the lens a little bit. I agree with what you say, that the political process does not tell the truth. When Paul Tsongas says we're tired of lies, that struck a great chord in the country. No question about that. Similarly, Perot did the same thing. We're not saying whether they had the solutions to it but it struck a great chord and the public instinctively understands that that's correct and you said so last night.

Only a few people really dare to tell the truth. Why is that? It's not good enough just to say that that condition exists. What is the reason for that and what do you do about it? I mean, where does this chicken and egg — where does it stop? You're certainly correct in what you say but why is that so?

For instance, I think it's very easy to sit back in these postmortems of every election. We do it again and again. And we'll say the following things: We rely on polls too much. We rely on focus groups too much. We rely on tacticians too much. We do it every four years. We don't know about what's happening, boiling in the country too much. We spend too much money. The primaries go on too long. Money drives the process.

Well, why doesn't it change? Whose responsibility is that for making a change? The political parties draft the rules upon which the game is played. They decide where the primaries will occur and at what length and what number of them. In 1960 I think there were 13 presidential primaries, when Kennedy began, and that was the modern era.

Now they begin and they run for really an entire year. It is a very simple fact that you could change that system if you wished to. You could have five regional primaries in five weeks, have 30 days off, have a convention, have an election, have free time given on the public airwaves that we own and say what you suggested last night.

Why doesn't it happen? That's what I'm trying to get at. Isn't there a responsibility? I put on a hairshirt. I love to lash myself as a member of the press and say how terrible we are and how we booted X and Y but what's the matter with political process?

Mr. Kalb: Steve Hess.

Mr. Hess: Well, knowing that Warren Rudman would be delivering a lecture on Thursday entitled "Government in Gridlock" and knowing that I would be discussing that lecture on Friday, I spent odd moments of Monday through Wednesday wondering what gridlock Warren would focus on. So, for me, I'll remember this week as the search for the elusive gridlock.

It struck me, logically, that since Warren had spent 12 years in Washington during which at no time did one party control both houses of Congress and the presidency and given the prominence of the divided government issue in the recent presidential campaign, that Senator Rudman would focus on political gridlock and, if he did, I would probably take a somewhat contrarian view, feeling that this has been exaggerated.

I would certainly have referred you to the work of David Mayhew, a quite remarkable book that Yale University Press put out in 1991 called *Divided We Govern.* If you have learned political science as a foreign language, I recommend it to you, but what Mayhew of Yale did was to look at the period post–World War II, 1946 to 1990, 44 years, and divide that period into such time as we had unified government and divided government.

He then looked first at major legislation during that period, everything from the Marshall Plan to the Clean Air Act of 1990 and, lo and behold, he discovered that there was no difference, that as much major legislation had been passed during periods of divided government as during periods of unified government. Next he looked at important Congressional investigations of the executive branch, everything from McCarthy/Army to Iran-Contra and, lo and behold, he discovered that there was no difference, that there were as many major investigations of the executive by the Congress in periods of divided government as there were in periods of unified government. So this was not a predictor. Much better as a predictor, he found, was presidential leadership and the mood of the people.

But then I thought next, no, no, Warren is coming to Harvard and surely he is going to focus on philosophical gridlock. Everybody who comes to Harvard focuses on the philosophy. You know that.

And so I started to think about the Madisonian model of government and he would surely ask us if this applied in the 21st century and would we want to change this delicate balance with things like line-item veto and so forth. And I thought a little more about whether James Madison and his buddies should be still as revered and venerated as we still do and concluded yes. I certainly wouldn't want to change this remarkable system of checks and balances and interlocking gears of government that require consensus of many groups and leaders in order for us to have action.

But then I thought no, no, no. Warren is not a philosopher; he is a man of action. So surely the gridlock he is going to talk to us about is programmatic gridlock. He will show how he will end gridlock by enacting his program, and I think in effect the first half of his remarks last night did that. But for my purposes, I went back to his platform, the Concord Coalition, and looked through it and said yes, but it also looks familiar.

It looks an awful lot like the program that Paul Tsongas used when he ran for president, which also means, when I looked at the Democratic platform, that it's about 80 percent of the Democratic platform on which Bill Clinton was elected.

So, basically, I concluded that the Concord Coalition will be a lobby on predominantly economic issues that will apply pressure on Clinton and the Democratic Congress from the Democratic right or, if you will, the Republican left, although I don't know, beside the two of us, who's left in it. (Laughter)

And then we moved on in his speech last night, as you know, to what he called the central focus and that was the role of the press.

And here he had just told us, of course, programmatically, the importance of the economy and what was happening there, and then the absence of serious economic news. I thoroughly agree with that analysis. He felt, I think, that the cause of this, or at least the cause that he had time to discuss last night, resulted from the oppression of news consultants and so forth.

In other words, from misreading the American public, the media's consumers, and feeling that they would be bored by serious economic news with some exceptions. He thought that was wrong. I tend to agree with him.

Let me say that I think that there's another reason that I wanted to mention slightly because it's figured in some of my own research and that is who writes news about the economy, the journalists. And with the exception, of course, of people like Warren Phillips' group whose job is to understand the economy, it became clear to me as I studied Washington journalists that they don't cover the economy if they can help it because they're bored by the economy, simply bored by it.

You look at their background and you see how few of them studied economics or certainly majored in economics when they were in school. I did, for example, a listing of the beats, the major 13 beats in Washington, by prestige. Worked out various measurements on how you could figure out who was where and clearly there was a seniority system unspoken. The longer you were around, the more prestigious you were, the more likely you were to get the beat that you wanted.

Out of 13 beats, economics at that time — this book came out in 1981 — was 11th out of 13. There were only two beats that were lower in the pecking order. One was what I call Class B general assignments which was if Ralph Nader was having a press conference, what young reporter do you send out to cover it. And lowest of all was the regional reporter, the lowest person in the bureau who covered the Massachusetts congressional delegation.

By the way, not only was economics number 11 but number 10 was the other economics beat, which was regulatory agencies.

Why was this? In part, I found, that reporters kept away from any beat that required documents research. To be a reporter was, if possible, to talk to interesting people. Most of the work was done by interview. The idea of having to mess around in the docket room of the SEC or something was not why they became journalists. If they wanted to do that, they would have become scholars. Clearly, you know.

When they were asked, 84 percent of them thought that regulatory agencies are not sufficiently covered and 51 percent of them thought that it was a serious problem. Yet there was no evidence to suggest that these reporters were prevented from doing this work.

In other words, one reporter for a major regional paper, which shall be nameless since we're in Boston, said, "It's drudgery. When we hire four or five people to cover regulatory agencies, they switch to another beat as soon as one becomes available."

So this is what's happening and I think it is something that is easier than systemically dealing with how to create a new consumer to deal at least in part with this question. There are obligations in the university, particularly in that 80 percent of entry-level journalists now have majored in journalism. Our journalism schools must be aware that the major news is economics and that their products better understand that or have some sense of knowing where to look when they leave.

There is mid-career training in economics, importantly, for institutions such as this and I think we don't do a very good job. They are still operating like ma-and-pa stores where the Sulzbergers and the Chandlers and the Grahams live over the store.

They must invest money in mid-career operations. The only time you get any money possibly is from the Nieman program because it is indeed a prestige program. They must

do more on that score. The foundations that have made their money initially from news. Gannett, now called Freedom Forum, does a pretty good job. Others tend, if you look at how they spend their money, it is a disgrace. They spend their money for goodwill in their communities.

They spend their money the way other corporations do under public relations. It is a rich industry even though, if you go to a convention of publishers, you would think you were at a buggy whip convention in 1920. They should do more. They have to do more and the place that they must do more is in economics.

Mr. Kalb: Thank you very much, Steve. Two quick points. I know a journalist who arrived in Washington from abroad in 1966 to cover the regulatory agencies for CBS News, named Dan Schorr, who took that beat and transformed it into one of the great beats of Washington, D.C. And, to pick up your point about the large newspaper and network conglomerates and their willingness to commit resources to help train people, they are among the least generous institutions in the entire country.

Now, Senator Rudman, a number of comments have been made about your talk and some themes have been raised and it's your opportunity now to respond.

Senator Rudman: Well, I want to first respond to something that Linda said so that we have no misunderstanding.

I do not believe that it is the primary role of the press to bring this problem to the fore. Obviously, if you wanted to debate the other side of what I said last night, I could have easily written a speech doing that. Although I don't believe it, I could have written that speech.

I could say that the role of the press is to report what is happening, period. I'm talking about the news columns and the networks and that they don't have a responsibility beyond that.

Now, I believe that you're absolutely right that one of the reasons, that we haven't had the kind of serious economic reporting that is required to address this enormous problem, which is now not around the corner, it's here, is the simple fact that politicians have not been addressing it in a serious manner.

I gave a speech a couple of weeks ago, about a week ago, talking about these two campaigns and, quite frankly, although it is true that President Bush in his Detroit economic message laid out some interesting markets in terms of entitlement reform, he kind of whispered those remarks and you never heard about them after that because politically they are hot buttons.

So, unquestionably, I agree with you that politicians ought to take a more vigorous role is discussing the issue and then of course you will have more to report on. That's, of course, what the Concord Coalition is really all about. We are going to try to get more dialogue going on this because we want to get the people interested. If Steve is right and journalists are relatively unskilled in the ways of economics, let's take it a step beyond that or below that to the average citizen who really don't understand the issues.

Let me make just one other point, though, on what several people talked about the difficulty of reporting. I am not a television watcher so I hope I have it right, but the ABC program that has Hugh Downs and Barbara Walters is that called *20/20*? All right.

Approximately six weeks ago one of their field reporters did a story on middle-class entitlement programs. I commend it to any journalist who wants to see how to take that issue and make it exciting and interesting and very worrisome. They did an extraordinary job.

By the same token, Charles Kurah, *CBS Sunday Morning*, about seven or eight weeks ago, invited Paul and I to go on board and talk a bit and then they went out in the field and did a lot more. That is an extraordinary, well-done story.

All I am saying is that, when I said last night that I think you've missed a very important story, granted, if nobody is talking about the story, it's pretty hard to report on it. I understand that, but it seems to me that, particularly in the year we're about to start, you're going to have a great opportunity for really educating the public about this issue because here's the conflict.

You've got the Clinton platform and it almost has a conflict within it. On the one hand, Clinton says the people have to come first and, secondly, he says but the deficit's important long-range. And there's a group of economic advisors that are all over the place as to what the deficit really means.

Now, you've got the Republicans, led by Bob Dole, who are not going to let go of this issue because it's a very important issue. So, if President-elect Clinton moves forward and truly addresses the deficit in a meaningful, statutory way where we get, for the first time, everyone together on the issue, and certainly have the Republicans with them on that issue, that's one thing.

But if he doesn't, then you're going to have one heck of a story of the kind of conflict that's going to exist between some Democrats, most Republicans and the president. That will be a very interesting story to report and my point is that, if it's reported in a way that that young couple sitting out there in Lynn that night watching Channel 4 in Boston, watching the NBC Evening News, see graphics indicating that unless what these people are talking about is done their FICA deduction is going to go from 7 to 12 to 15 to 20 percent, that no longer is a boring story.

Mr. Kalb: But, Senator, doesn't that assume that the Republicans will lead the charge on the issue of the deficit in 1993? And on the basis of the record of the last 12 years, why should anybody believe that that's going to be the case?

Senator Rudman: Obviously they will because when Ronald Reagan and George Bush were in the White House, Republicans didn't want to get involved in leading that charge because you couldn't get the White House to go along with you. They were the champions of deficit spending.

Mr. Kalb: So that is your policy?

Senator Rudman: It is now certainly. Now with Clinton—

Mr. Kalb: No, but it was then, too.

Senator Rudman: Now that Clinton has responsibility, the Republicans are certainly going to be in a position to do it. Now the Democrats, to their credit, when Reagan proposed his program in February and March of 1981, people like Carl Levin in Michigan and others who I will show you gave speeches on the Senate floor and predicted what would happen and how it would happen. So there was responsible opposition.

But there was a difference between 1981 and 1992.

Mr. Kalb: Because of the dimension of the problem.

Senator Rudman: Exactly. I was going to say the difference is around three trillion dollars.

Mr. Johnson: Well, why doesn't the political process tell the truth and lead? I mean, it may seem so simple and simple-minded, but doesn't that come down to some sort of essence of where we are?

Senator Rudman: Oh, of course. You raised the question. I agreed with you and, you know, you were obviously preaching to the converted. I mean, I agree with that and the reason which I referred to I guess somewhat obliquely last night is the Disraeli school of politics. I think his most famous quote during a contested time, during his prime ministership is when he said, "If one wishes to become a statesman, first one must get elected," and the whole issue of middle-class entitlements, you just have been unable to talk about until now.

People are starting to talk about them and I am encouraged by that, although I will say, being from New Hampshire and being in New Hampshire during that primary last year, it was fascinating to watch what happened when Paul Tsongas went from his "no more lies" to specifics and talked about the middle-class entitlement programs.

It didn't take Bill Clinton's organization more than 48 hours, talk about the SWAT team, to come up with commercials and responses essentially preaching, you know, Ronald Reagan's old line, "They're trying to take away your Social Security."

So, you know, it's not easy, and the reason is that people aren't willing to plunge themselves into that kind of political risk. I think it's changing and I'll tell you what changed a great deal of it. Ross Perot changed a great deal of it. I really believe that.

Mr. Hess: Let me just say something because I don't think it's as simple for this reason and I use this not on economics but on all issues.

CNN, early in the campaign; because they got a grant from the Markle Foundation, did a big program called the "Voters' Agenda." They were so proud of it that they even sent me the transcript and I sent a very impassioned letter to Tom Johnson saying, "Look, if there was a voters' agenda, you could be sure that politicians would be on it. The problem is that there are voters' agendas, all sorts of agendas," and even on this issue there are lots of agendas and not everybody even agrees with Warren.

The point is that eventually, and I think we're coming close, we'll reach consensus on this one, just as it seems to me quite clear, starting in the Pennsylvania Senate election of 1990, that we're starting to reach consensus on health care. We at least moved it up to the scale where now everybody believes that we have to do something about it. I don't think they're going to do it in a hundred days but I think in the 103rd Congress they will do that. Haynes, as you well know, I don't have to lecture you on this, there isn't just one truth and, you know, if we had Herb Stein sitting here, he might argue quite otherwise on the question even of deficits and he's one of our leading economists.

Ms. Wertheimer: I'm interested in something you just said, and something you said last night, Senator Rudman.

You said last night that if the Republicans in the Senate were to do what Senator Dole suggested — I mean he appeared to be saying that he was going to stand in the way of a lot of the things that Bill Clinton wants to do — and you said that is not what the American people want. They want the thing to work.

But what you just said was that the Republicans in the Senate and House could not speak out because there was no support from the White House. Why is that a reason not to speak out?

Senator Rudman: Well, it wasn't a reason for me but it was a reason for many. You'll have to ask them. I would point out to you that in 1985, when Phil Gramm and I went down to the White House to talk to the president and Jim Baker about Gramm-Rudman, you would not believe a transcript of that meeting which I have. It's not a transcript but it's pretty darn good. It's in my diary.

I mean, here was a conservative Republican administration and the last thing it wanted was this piece of legislation which you will recall from having reported it, we were holding the country hostage. We said we won't let you raise the debt ceiling until this amendment is at least considered.

Now the fact is that some of us did that but a great number of Republicans — and I'm going to say in this administration — a great many Democrats tend to put party loyalty ahead of almost everything else when their party's in the White House.

George Mitchell has a number of deeply held positions which are diametrically opposed to those that Bill Clinton's talking about — middle-class tax cuts for one, it seems. Now I watched Bob Dole in that position. I watched Bob Dole squirm and shift and finally do what he felt that he had to do. That was to be the loyal carrier of spears for

George Bush, a man for whom he obviously had no great affection, considering what happened to us in the New Hampshire primary, and I say "us" because I was running his campaign.

Now what is George Mitchell going to do, to answer your question? Is he going to speak out against President Clinton? I seriously doubt it and let me give you just one justification for that that is not purely political.

There is a strong argument to be made that the president has the bully pulpit. He is elected by all the people. He is the head of his party and, if he decides or if there is something that he wishes to do and there is some support for, then the leadership has some obligation to follow. That's the best answer I can give you.

Ms. Wertheimer: Yes, but what I'm wondering about is why does it make it right now for the Republican Party to stand in the way of things that the Republican Party should have been standing for, which as I take it is what you were saying?

Senator Rudman: No, I think you misunderstood me. No. In fact, watching Bob Dole last night I thought what he said last night was just right. I don't know if you saw the late news last evening but they had a meeting yesterday in Washington and talked to some people. Bob, as a matter of fact, early this morning.

It is apparent to me that the Republicans will not stand in Bill Clinton's way on things that Republicans feel are very important, for instance, deficit reduction. By the way, tax cuts, I expect you'd find a lot of the people, Republicans in the Senate, who would be for that, as they always have been and it's kind of curious because politically, it seems to me, that is a very dangerous thing to do.

But be that as it may, I believe that Bob Dole and Republicans in the Senate will cooperate with Bill Clinton on a number of issues but if he stops to do some things that we believe are — for instance, hypothetically, huge amounts of infrastructure spending, pump priming, things of that sort — I think Republicans will attempt to stand in his way and I think with some success.

Ms. Wertheimer: Well, I'm making a kind of complete command of the obvious point. One of the reasons that I think voters are viewing this whole process with alarm is that Republicans would be more committed to deficit reduction when a Democratic president is in the White House.

Senator Rudman: They would be less committed with a Republican president in the White House.

Ms. Wertheimer: I think the American voters could be forgiven for thinking that this — there's something stinky in —

Senator Rudman: Oh, they don't have to be forgiven. They don't have to be forgiven. They're right. But with all due respect, that, unfortunately, is a reality in the American political system and I would point in fairness to some things that George Bush tried to do which he was totally stopped from doing by a very obstinate Democratic Congress.

I'll give you just one — a capital gains tax in the form that Bill Clinton is now proposing which they're all now for. George Bush has tried to do that for three years. He was willing to compromise. I sat in rooms where he wished to compromise, any kind of capital gains tax to reduce the cost of capital and he was fought right down the line on the base the only way we're going to do that is X, Y and Z.

Well, you know, with all due respect, I mean, both political parties are guilty of the same thing.

Ms. Wertheimer: I rest my case.

Mr. Johnson: Well, I would like to go back to the point — I did ask you something else about the notion of political reform and why is it that the parties are resistant in changing the structure, like the primary length, like the money for campaigns?

You, yourself, raised last night the public airwaves. I think that's a very excellent idea. There ought to be free time and use of the public airway. We license the air to people to operate to make profits from.

Why doesn't that happen?

Senator Rudman: Well, in the case of the latter point, Haynes, on the two occasions I tried to do that — and for those who were not there last evening, my proposal is simply that the airwaves, the license of these television and radio stations are owned by the American people, they are worth a great deal of money, people make a great deal of money using them. Some small amount of time should be made available to all candidates every two years who qualify properly, a certain number of gross rating points, in return for which they would limit what they spent and that would solve the whole problem of campaign financing. It would solve it overnight because roughly 80 percent of our money is spent on that.

Haynes, the simple answer is that the National Association of Broadcasters have been such a powerful lobby that they have truly thwarted any attempt that several of us made to build any consensus for that reform.

On the primary issue, it tends to be very interesting that the individual states, through their own elected representatives such as in my state, seem to have the upper hand over the parties as a whole in making those kinds of determinations and to try to put together, to broker some sort of national legislation that would, in fact, accomplish what up to now has been virtually impossible. I would think that the Democrats would probably have an easier time of it than we would.

Mr. Hess: Can I ask Senator Rudman a question? You know, the Constitution says that anybody can become a United States Senator if they are a citizen and 30 years or over. There's nothing in the Constitution that says you have to remain a United States Senator. I understand that but after listening to you last night and again this morning, seeing that you're in good health, sir, seeing that you still have an awful lot of fire in your belly and passion for these issues, seeing or believing that, let's say, unlike Tim Wirth who would have had a tough time getting re-elected, you would not have had a tough time getting reelected. Why is it that you felt that you could be more effective outside the United States Senate than inside the United States Senate?

Senator Rudman: Well, Steve, let me first say that I don't necessarily feel that I can be. I think there's a chance that I may be and people I respect a lot have said to me they thought this was a remarkable coalescing of two people who have credibility on these issues, Paul and I, but let me simply say that, if — well, I'll use Haynes; it's much easier because he is a journalist.

If Haynes Johnson wrote a column, as he used to and he's been depriving us since he's been on his new career, but if he wrote a column twice a week for the next year and it came back rejected from the editor saying it's just not the kind of thing we want and he labored hard for a year and didn't get one published, I think he'd probably decide to pump gas or something or do something else at least.

Frankly, my personal level of frustration had reached its zenith. That may be very hard for people to understand. You're right. I was unopposed for re-election when I made my announcement. The Democrats said they would not run anyone against me in New Hampshire even in this year and that was a nice feeling but I had to say to myself, did I want six more years of coming home at night angry, and I was angry because I truly believe that we are literally fiddling while Rome burns, and I feel it very deeply, and I know people like Herb Stein may disagree but he's in the minority. Most people that I've talked to agree, including many at the place that you work.

I just felt that you ought not to do this job of United States Senator unless you have every ounce of your intellect and your energy dedicated to doing it and feeling good

about it, and I, frankly, didn't feel very good about it anymore. That's the best answer I can give you.

Ms. Wertheimer: Did you quit too soon? I mean, considering the ways things have shaken out?

Senator Rudman: Oh, I don't think so. I don't think I quit too soon. I believe that Paul Tsongas and I are going to have an absolute terrific time in turning up the heat on people. I'm going to really enjoy that.

Mr. Johnson: Warren, do you subscribe to the idea, then, from what you're saying and all the conditions you're talking about — the gridlock and the rest — that we have to have a train wreck figuratively speaking before anything changes. I mean, is that where we are? Just smash it up and then start over afresh? I'm serious.

Senator Rudman: I refer you to a couple of speeches on the floor in which I said exactly that. It may well be that the only way you break the gridlock — and by the way the gridlock that I've always talked about is really not a gridlock so much with divided government, although I've referred to that. It is really the gridlock in the economic issues. The lack of understanding of those issues and the inability of the Congress to have the political courage to do what they ought to do for obvious reasons.

No, I really believe that, unless Governor Clinton is successful in putting together a long-range program of investment which will lead to deficit reduction, job creation over the next several years, that we will have a train wreck.

The train wreck will probably take the form of interest rates jumping markedly and when you jump those interest rates and our national debt right now at four trillion, you jump it from, I've seen estimates as high as three hundred billion in interest for fiscal '95. You get to that point, my friends, you don't have a train wreck; you have the bridge fall, the tunnels collapse and the train goes off the track.

Then people say, "Oh, what happened? We have to do something." Then what you have to do gets even more difficult than what it is now and that's why I urgently hope that Clinton recognizes that he could truly be a remarkably successful president, a great president, by taking some early-on risks, getting some constituencies angry at him. But, boy, by the time you got to '96 this economy would be moving, moving better than anything else they can do with tinkering and fine-tuning, with building bridges in Chelsea. It's just not going to do it.

Mr. Kalb: Well, this has been a year when the people have spoken and so this is your opportunity to comment, participate, to raise questions and we do have the microphone and, if you wish to go to the microphone, please do so and, if not, stay at your seat and speak up. But I see a hand first of Blair Clark.

Mr. Clark: Marvin, I actually wrote out something which is not on the Rudman special. It's on Perot. I'm giving it the Texas pronunciation. This is really a sort of broadcast attack on the way the media handled the Perot phenomenon because I think that the press and the media were generally suckered by Perot and my question is, was it a distortion to pay that much attention to Perot and my answer is, yes, and the reason is that the media fell like a ton of bricks for the mere celebrity of Perot.

Reporters are bored like any writer or observer with the humdrum of ordinary politics. They hate to go on repeating the same stories over and over again so they look for novelty and eccentricity and they found a mother lode in Perot.

Why, a billionaire was going to spend a bundle, up to a hundred million dollars to run for president. That immediately translated into more than either of the two parties' candidates would spend, more or less. Instant celebrity was the result, as soon as Perot told Larry King that's what he'd do.

In the U.S. there are a couple of kinds of instant celebrity — growth crime, major sex, Donald Trump, Madonna, and above all, wealth, that unholy grail. Perot stood for the latter.

So the media reported the phenomenon with their tongues only half in their cheeks. It was so unusual. They reported with straight faces his incredible claim that his supporters were grass-roots people, that he was responding only to you, that he was their servant; the reality being that he was buying their support and paying for the whole, quote, volunteer effort.

The press almost never raised the question of how he would govern outside the parties. That was never raised that I heard. They hardly looked into the phony paid structure of the volunteers. They were dazzled and charmed by the sheer nuttiness of his operation. Gatsby was running, no longer ambivalent about power but they reported it straight as if he might win and the phoniness of the polls that in the spring had him briefly leading Clinton and Bush was swallowed whole. The wrong questions being asked by the pollsters.

Why wasn't the Libertarian Party's Mr. Marrou on the ballot in all 50 states taken as seriously? Answer: Because he didn't have a chance and that was because he had no money and could, thus, easily be consigned to the customary ghetto of neglect for third parties.

So I say the media enthusiastically launched into a celebration of celebrity, H. Ross Perot. And it was totally misleading about the realities of the campaign of '92. End of my kindly remarks about the media. Thank you.

Mr. Kalb: Well, from the applause, obviously you've got some supporters there. Would anyone like to make a comment on that?

Mr. Johnson: Yes, please print it, Blair, on the Gatsby analogy and the green light of 1992. I think you're right about us generally, that we like two-headed monsters running and we love celebrities and we love all that sort of thing and I think that there wasn't enough examination of how Perot would have governed and the structure and so forth. However, I think you're wrong in one fundamental way.

I think that at least in my experience, what I did this last year, what I was hearing from people, they were looking for someone like Perot before he emerged. They were looking for someone that seemed to say what he said, that the system's broken, the famous analogy as you said last night, "lift up the hood, take out the engine and let's put a new engine in together" and they really responded to that.

They responded first to Paul Tsongas saying similarly up here in New England and I think they really did have the sense that we were in a different period and that's when Perot began to come in.

When he got out — well, let me just put it this way. I will tell you, Blair, in 30 years of covering this country I have never seen what I saw in the early spring about Perot. In one night I would meet a CEO who told me that Nixon was his favorite president, he had never voted Democratic in his life, always voted for a Republican, loved Barry Goldwater and he was going to vote for Ross Perot.

Two days later in the South I ran into a priest who was down there, who had marched with King and Bobby and so forth and, by God, I've never voted for a Republican in my life and so forth and so on. I'm going to vote for Ross Perot.

I heard people coming out of graduate schools and law school students, number one in their class at Duke, this was in the spring. They were going to vote for Perot because it seemed perhaps that he was promising something different, a real breakthrough.

And I agree with your criticism about the press but I think fundamentally what people were looking for was something deeper. I think it still exists, too, by the way, beyond Perot.

Mr. Turner: Bob Turner. Let me, I think, follow up on that question. Senator Rudman, last night you talked about the potential for a third party movement in the future and made an interesting remark about its being, perhaps, concentrated on deficit reduction but not on what else it might include.

What do you see happening along these lines and, particularly with reference to what seemed to me to be three groups, now — the Perot campaign, the Concord Coalition and the Lowell Weicker-Condon Moore-John Anderson group, the Independent's party, I guess. And I'm sure there are other people on the fringes — but it seems at the moment at least three distinct third party or independent efforts.

Will there be cooperation, competition? Are they for, in any way, the same thing, that they can get together on? How will it work?

Senator Rudman: First, lest the counsel to the Concord Coalition have a stroke when he hears the nature of your question without hearing my answer, the Concord Coalition is a 501(c)3 corporation. And Paul Tsongas and Warren Rudman talk individually on political subjects as much as they would like but as a coalition we are educational in nature, we are not, you know, involved in getting activity as such going. We are trying to build the kind of educated chapters around this country of hopefully hundreds of thousands of people — and we're doing rather well, by the way, in terms of attracting membership — that will in fact become informed on the issue and then be a responsible lobby, if you will, on their own as individual citizens. That's what we're trying to do.

Now the fact is that many of the Perot people are most interested in what we're doing and have joined the coalition, others want to take leadership roles and probably will. As far as the other independent groups are concerned, I'm working with a group of Republicans to try to bring this party back to the center as I said last night.

But, you see, what I am concerned about and it really is a concern that comes from a study of history. Haynes talked about a train wreck. We've just been through and are still in, here in this region, a recession that has done some things to middle class Americans they never even dreamed possible.

Educated couples that I know, working for computer companies and other high-tech companies with a nice home in Amherst, New Hampshire and a couple of kids and all of sudden both laid off and losing their cars and their homes and wondering whether or not they're going to be part of the homeless they watched on television last night. And I'm talking about serious business.

This recession has cut into the middle class like no other recession ever has and that's one of the reasons for the anger because these are people who tend to be politically active as well.

Now, let me simply say, what I'm leading up to. You see, my concern and I've talked about this a lot in the last few years, has never been that, if the deficit gets bad enough and the economy collapses, we're all going to be poor and our standard of living is going to plummet. Yeah, that worries me but not nearly as much as the other side of it.

What really worries me is what usually accompanies that kind of economic collapse. What accompanies it is a loss of freedom. What accompanied it in Germany was anti-Semitism, anti-establishment, anti-anything you want. Demagogues with easy, easy-sounding solutions. That is really my deep concern. My concern, if you want to know the plain unvarnished truth, has always been more social than economic, but the two are tied.

Let me tell you, I went to a dinner in Manchester, New Hampshire the other night put on by the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith honoring a wonderful former governor of our state, Walter Peterson, for what he's done to promote understanding in our state, and I learned of a statistic that night that absolutely floored me but it is a solid statistic and anybody who's interested ought to talk to the people over at the ADL.

Right now in this country there's a hardcore anti-Semitism of close to 30 million people and the anti-Black sentiment in this country is even higher. There is latent hatred in this country amongst some parts of our population.

You get into very serious economic times and that hatred coalesces into political organizations. That's my concern. I alluded to it only briefly last evening but that is my concern.

Mr. Hess: Could I just say a word in response to Bob Turner's question? I think now that we have the exit polls and we have some really hard data after the election on who voted for Ross Perot and why, it would be in my judgment almost impossible for the Perot movement as it is now constituted to turn itself into a serious third party.

If Perot had not run, we now know, half of his voters would have voted for Bush and half of his voters would have voted for Clinton. There was nothing holding that group together except frustration and Ross Perot. If they had to come together in a national convention to write a platform, they couldn't.

One 62-year-old charismatic billionaire is not sufficient in our system to create, in what is basically and has always been a two-party government, a viable third party. So I think that they will move on to from whence they came, particularly if Ross Perot eventually loses interest or is tired of paying the bills.

Mr. Johnson: Yeah, but, Steve, I don't think it's Perot at all. I don't think — we're not talking about Perot. We're talking about what happens if there's a failure here, and I agree with what Senator Rudman just said that that's the consequence. If the next four years don't produce some kind of change, then there is this discontent that begins there. That goes somewhere else. I don't know where it goes. It won't be for Perot. I don't think Perot's the leader of the future. I fear worse.

Ms. Wertheimer: You hear the sort of tremulous beginnings of it in everybody unthinkingly assenting to some of the majoritarian notions that Perot raises, that we should have town meetings on television, that sort of thing. I would freely translate that to while the majority of this country is still white and Christian, let's take control again.

Mr. Johnson: Well, let's look at the term limits vote. I mean, it passed in every single state in which it ran and that's hardly the idea the founders had in mind.

Ms. Wertheimer: I also think direct election of a president is an idea whose time has not come quite yet.

Mr. Kalb: We have a number of people to be recognized. Fedor Burlatsky?

Mr. Burlatsky: Senator Rudman, I was surprised very much during the election campaign. The international question had no such important basis in the discussion. It seems to me that the relation between United States and the CIS countries, Russia, the Eastern European countries, the relations with Japan and with Europe is not less important for United States even from an economical point of view. I don't say about the security problem and especially that Russia disappeared during the election campaign and yesterday I read a very interesting letter in *The New York Times* by former President Richard Nixon.

He mentioned some important points about the relations with Russia and gave some advice to the new administration to cut in the military budget, very big, about 30, 60 billion dollars to invest into Russia and the other countries in this area about three hundred billion dollars and what is strange for me even in this article that usually the Americans explain this situation from one point of view. What can be done for Russia; what kinds of help can come from United States for Russia and for other countries?

But the main problem is not this problem for new administration and Congress from my point of view. What are the interests of United States in this region? Security interests, economical interests and social interests. And from this point of view I think that former President Richard Nixon is right. The interest of security may move United

States to this way and the investments are important, not just for Russia, but for United States to open the door to this market, a potential great market which can give maybe more possible for the United States give to Japan.

I would like to ask you this question. What is your personal view about the explanation by Richard Nixon? What is the usual thinking in the Senate and in Congress about this question?

Senator Rudman: Let me see if I understand your question. I don't think your question elicits my view on the need for more activity of the United States in other western countries in terms of our own mutual interests and self interests with the former Soviet Union and others. I think your question, if I understood it correctly, was why is it that during this campaign just concluded, we don't seem to have more attention paid to these issues. Am I correct or did you want both? Both. All right.

The first question I think is relatively easy. I run into very few people, Republicans, Democrats in the Congress, conservatives or liberals who would reject the notion that it is in the self-interest of the United States to do all we can to assist in the economic rehabilitation of the former Soviet Union and that that is worth major investment on the part of this country. I don't think there's any argument about that.

As a matter of fact, a very interesting bipartisan group a few months ago, after Nixon did his first piece in *The Times* and really sent a wake-up call to George Bush and to others — You may recall that George Mitchell and Bob Dole, I believe Dick Lugar and Claiborne Pell, put forth the first aid package as such and everybody recognized we're not doing that because we're humanitarians, because we suddenly love the former Soviet Union. We are doing it because it is for the reasons you speak of. We have it in our own interest, period.

The second part of the question is more difficult to express but I will. I don't mean difficult to articulate but difficult really to talk about in a public forum but I will.

One of the great disappointments of my representation of my state is the general lack of interest in things foreign on the part of most of the American people, particularly when economic times are not well.

How many times have I heard in the last 18 months, since I sit on the Foreign Operations Committee of the Senate Appropriations Committee that appropriates that money, have I heard from angry constituents who say, before you send one more dime overseas why not spend it here in New Hampshire or in Maine or in Massachusetts or wherever.

The American people have been historically anti-foreign aid. As a matter of fact, it is an interesting, interesting political question that is posed by it. The United States Congress, the United States presidents for the past 45 years, have uniformly defied the overwhelming current public opinion of the country vis-à-vis foreign aid.

The American people are absolutely against foreign aid and we routinely vote for it and usually don't have much trouble in passing it. The fact is, putting it fairly bluntly, American people are far more interested in what happens in their own backyards than in your former backyard. The only way I can express it.

Mr. Hess: I find that fascinating, Warren. I mean, it flies in the face of your basic argument both last night and this morning. I mean, here's something where you can say collectively Washington, the Senate, the House, the president are acting—

Senator Rudman: Because it's three-quarters of one percent of the federal budget. That's why. Get it up to seven or eight percent and I'll show you a little bit of a different attitude.

Political courage is directly proportionate to the amount of money you're asked to spend.

Mr. Bator: Professor Bator. I want to make a comment, Marvin. What I'd really like to do is take Senator Rudman, take him down to a classroom with a blackboard, lock the door and have him there for an hour.

I should say that I think you deserve a medal for what you're doing and I agree with 90 percent of what you said yesterday but I wanted to make a comment about the 10 percent.

I think the budget problem, both the politics and the economics, is much harder than you put it — than is implicit in the conversation. It's harder to explain and it will be harder to solve. It's harder to explain because it is not a simple let's-match-income-to-outgo problem. It's not as of the first instance a problem of government finance. The crucial question about the budget is what it does and will do to the economy, to output, employment, to inflation, consumption versus investment and explaining those interconnections is really very hard.

We, the economists, have done an absolutely lousy job at it. I mean, it's really disgraceful, there are reasons for that and I could talk about that but it would take too long.

I think, Steve, you're dead right about economic journalists. The journalists in general and the economic journalists I'm afraid are very few — there are some honorable exceptions — but very few of the economic journalists know enough economics to explain the budget problem, not as an income and outgo problem, a sort of *Poor Richard's Almanac* problem, but the connections between the budget deficit and monetary policy on one hand and the consequences for the economy on the other.

It'll be harder to *solve* because we have two problems. We have a long-run problem of very sluggish productivity growth that goes back to 1973 and that problem intersects with the fact that during the 1980's we had an enormous shift in the allocation of resources away from investment and net exports: the wealth-creating components, towards, broadly speaking, consumption — a direct consequence of the budget deficits of '84 through '89.

To solve that problem once we are back close to full employment, it'll be necessary, I believe, not merely to swing the federal budget's current account budget to zero, not merely to eliminate the deficit. To recover the national saving and investment rates that we had between 1950 and 1979 by the end of this decade will mean that by the end of the decade, absent a fortuitous jump in private saving which mayor may not happen, we will have to swing the federal current account structural budget from a deficit currently of about 3 percent of GNP measured at full employment to a very substantial *surplus.* We will need to supplement private saving by very large positive federal saving. If, that is, we care about the future now as much as we cared in the '50s and the '60s and the '70s.

Now, take that proposition and superimpose it on the other one, which is that we have *two* problems. The current problem, the immediate problem is, as you say, the recession problem. That problem is a problem of insufficient spending relative to potential output. The cure for this sort of stagnation-the current gap between inflation-safe potential output and actual output is about three percent of GNP or about $300 billion.

The cure for that may be to do nothing. There's a 50/50 chance that by next spring, if you look at the mainline forecast, you can get an expansion going in and of itself. But that means, I think, that there's a 50/50 chance that that won't happen and the most reliable thing you can do for that is temporarily, for '93 and '94, to make the federal budget deficit larger and substantially larger, $40, $50 billion for a year.

Now, things can go wrong two ways — and I entirely agree with the point you made about the real nightmare is the politics four years from now or three years from now. If we don't get a decent recovery during the next two or three years, I think the Clinton

administration is going to be in very bad trouble and then I think the prospect of a kind of Perot-like populist politics getting out of hand is very serious. And that means I find it difficult to say, well, concentrate on the long-run problem, don't do anything about the short-term problem because politically it's too difficult, first, to step on the gas and then to step on the brakes. It's too difficult to make it a two-part problem.

But I think there's a real danger if we don't do that and, therefore, 90 percent of the time when I listen to you and Tsongas I say hurray, you deserve a medal but given the current problem, I worry a little about overdoing the deficit reduction problem-too hard, too soon and too large numbers.

One footnote and then I'll stop talking. The proposition that if you do budget tightening starting in late '94, '95, '96, '97, that in itself will cause enough of a reduction in long-term interest rates to get a recovery going. That proposition may be entirely true. This is not physics. But I would not bet a lot of money on it, not at even odds. There's nothing in the empirical evidence that you can get a recovery going merely by that kind of process. End of speech.

Senator Rudman: You know, you may be surprised that I agree with you. That is Paul Tsongas and I both agree, Pete Petersen. We put our material together. We're developing a plan now with John White and obviously what you say is true.

Let me tell you the problem as an economist laying out that scenario. Nobody really — macroeconomics would have to buy into that because it is empirically provable and I've had it proven to me. The problem is that with the Congress changing every two years, with the political dynamics of Washington to put a plan into place, let me cite Gramm-Rudman and hope to have, as the markers are reached, to do the things you're talking about is a very difficult process. Not to say it can't be done but I think that what everybody worries about is hearing we're going to get the economy moving and then we'll take care of the deficit.

Unless there is a very unique way to make sure that that happens, then unfortunately we put what you suggest into place. We do that. We get things moving. We don't do the second half of the equation and then we really are in a fix because now were at a higher level of deficit.

So that is one of the things that, frankly, I've been talking to a lot of my friends about who will be players in this. There has to be a way.

And this is where I think Republicans could really playa major role in working with this administration to design such a thing. The point I made earlier was that, if all of a sudden we get, you know, simply lip service to the deficit with a "we'll take care of it later" kind of a commitment, that's not going to be good enough and I think you would agree with that.

Mr. Bessie: Mike Bessie. During the last few years of his life, Teddy White had some favorite questions he used to address especially to young audiences like this. Teddy would say at the end of his speech, "I'd like to ask you a question. What do you think is the greatest change that has been taking place in the United States currently and for some time?" And every once in awhile there will be a bright young person who would say, "I think I know what you mean but I don't know how to say it. I think you're talking about our population."

Teddy believed, and I must say a number of others with him, that there's almost a conspiracy of silence about what is happening to the population of this country and I will not make a speech on that subject but I will assert that there is considerable evidence that there are changes taking place in the kind and numbers.

For example, you said nothing about, I hate to include women in the diversity area because that seems to me a cop-out phrase, but the fact that women not only in numbers but in their activities have had an important effect on this recent election everybody is

conscious of the fact that women not only in numbers but in their activities have had an important effect on this recent election.

I will turn your attention, those of you especially like Linda and Haynes who have done the country. What do you think about the long-range political effects of what I assert to be an enormous change, a growing, an accelerating change in the population of this country? Where it comes from, what its culture is, what its aims and needs are.

Mr. Kalb: Thank you, Mike. Mike Bessie's latest production, by the way, is right here, a new Teddy White book, *Teddy White at Large,* but the question was directed to Linda and to Haynes.

Ms. Wertheimer: Well, let me say that there is no question that the increasing diversity in our population as we see it in the coastal states particularly, in California most particularly, has a lot of possibilities for dangerous things happening as we saw in the riots in Los Angeles. And I think that I would have to agree with Senator Rudman that this kind of population can really only be supported by a strong economy. And absent a strong economy then we may lose the very thing that draws so many people to our shores which is the social order that generally prevails, the sort of general air of civility in which we conduct our public and private business here.

We are about to witness what I regard as the civic miracle of the century and that is one president gets into a car with another man and drives down to the capitol and the other takes an oath and drives back the president and nobody shoots anybody and nobody expects to die for it.

I mean, I agree with Senator Rudman that if things get really hair-raising that, we could be looking at some very ugly times.

Mr. Bessie: Well, there's another very important question on that. You dropped the phrase a little while back about the attempt on the part of what considers itself the dominant group in this country to do something about establishing or re-establishing its power before and you finished it under your breath.

Ms. Wertheimer: I was hoping that their impulses toward majority rule which I would regard as pernicious the notion that you could just get on television and have a big call-in and make some decisions and go right around the notion of representative government. I think it's a very bad idea and it is Ross Perot's idea and what I said was that what I believe is that there is a sub text, which I doubt Mr. Perot would admit, that I believe is there that well, the majority is what the majority is — let's take care of business, let's get control back.

Mr. Johnson: I'd like to make it very brief but I think this may well be the most unreported story that we face and much like the S&L was before, what's happening and just to be very personal about it. I've spent the last nine months traveling the country from Maine and I wound up in October on the Mexican border in Tijuana. Deliberately.

One of the stops here in February of this year was in Lowell and I had not reported on Lowell, not because of Paul Tsongas but because, when I was last there in the early '80s, it was coming back up, it was a renaissance, it was the "how you can take these old mill towns and make them blossom and bloom" and, of course, that's not the case today. Wang Laboratories has gone down, et cetera, et cetera.

What struck me about Lowell and absolutely fascinated me, like another world, were the Cambodians. It was the second largest population center of Cambodians in the country and I spent a lot of time talking to these people. It was like going into another world. It was just, like, blooming up, amazing in a way and I asked how they got there. They came by way of San Diego to here and it's all word of mouth and they all moved, and relatives were brought here and it's an American story, a marvelous story.

And what struck me about that was they were all leaving. Where are you going to go next? The state of Washington. They had heard that was the place to go. Boom, they were

going because Wang is — I think is now almost out of business, is it not? I don't know about any of that.

The second one, the very end of the story, just to tell you after going through Los Angeles for a couple of weeks talking in the riot areas with the gang members and so forth.

Then I spent a week on the Mexican border with the Border Patrol watching, in broad daylight, hundreds of people coming across the border. I mean, it was just extraordinary sort of seeing the futility of it, the hopelessness of it and there it was just pouring forth.

I had interviewed someone in Los Angeles. He told me how he got from Central America through the process bribing all the way along with their coyotes. I don't want to but it's really quite a human saga, 10 novels of how you do this and get there and go to Tijuana and it winds up, there he is in Los Angeles and the flatbed trucks with lumber over them, they arrive there and the next day, he says, "I go down, they take me to a place and I paid my money and," he said, "now I'm a citizen. I have my Social Security card. I have my identi-card. I have my green card. I am American." And, of course, there were no jobs for him. That was the problem. We have something boiling in the country that I don't think we're paying attention to at all. I don't want to, but I agree with you.

Mr. Kalb: Professor Marion Just of Wellesley.

Ms. Just: I'd like to talk a little bit about the Perot phenomenon that Linda has mentioned and Haynes has mentioned and tie it back to a general theme here.

Linda, you said you were worried about the Perot phenomenon because of its majoritarian tendencies. In our research we've been finding that the Perot supporters are basically anti-politics. What they liked about Perot was that he wasn't a politician. That was the primary thing that they said about him and one of the reasons I think, Haynes, that people from all parts of the political spectrum were attracted to Perot was precisely because he didn't have a political persona and so they could project onto Perot anything they liked, as if he was an empty vessel. The less they knew about him, the better.

And, in fact, in July when his popularity was going down, it was because people were finding out things that they didn't want to know about him and as long as he controlled the communications about himself in the last couple of weeks of October they didn't find out anything that was really terribly distressing.

The anti-politics sentiment is very broad in this country and what I think is fascinating is that many elites share the same anti-political orientation. We've heard it here today. Linda said, "Oh, it's politics," and we are forced to look at politics as if it's original sin but democracy is nothing if it's not politics and the reason that it's so hard to do anything in a democracy is that politics is about real interests that people have conflicts about.

And to think that the Democratic Party and the Republican Party are simply collections of people of ambition, personal ambition, and do not represent real interests I think is a mistake. And it's the scariest mistake that I think we can make about somebody like Ross Perot because what he has to offer is "forget about politics; I will come in and manage and you won't have to do any politics at all" and that was the part of Ross Perot that most reminded me of the Weimar Republic and the threats to democracy at that time.

Ms. Wertheimer: And this is to raise something that hasn't been said here and I do this sort of hesitantly because of my relationship by marriage to a person who is always raising these kinds of points. There are a lot of people in this country who feel that they have no need of voting because their access to representation is something else, and it's cash, and that to go out and vote for one member of Congress or one United States Senator is an essentially foolish act. What they do instead is purchase a piece of a lot of

members of Congress. It's much more efficient and much more likely to produce the desired result and I do think that happens. I think that absolutely does happen.

Mr. Hess: Let me jump in here because I think the United States has always been a very apolitical country. Politics is not what was on our minds and really has never been. If you ask people to tick off what concerns them, they talk about their families and their jobs and their health and their religion and their leisure and so forth, they'd need about three hands to get to a good political issue.

If we read the press, we think that this is something new and we put on our hair shirt and we say, look, in 1960 and so forth and so on. First of all, if you looked at the whole history of the country, you would find that you don't even use the right figures. You use eligible voters.

Who were our eligible voters originally? White, male property owners. As we expanded the electorate, of course, voting went down so that we use, even recently, a figure of 1960 at 62 percent — 62 percent, as if that's so remarkable — and why was that? Because it was the first election in which there was a real chance of electing a Catholic and people were coming out to vote for or against that proposition.

If we had looked at 1948, we would see an election that had less than 50 percent. Okay. We have now gone up from 50-odd to maybe 55. We don't know quite yet, a modest rise in which we're all very excited and the press is telling us it's because of Ross Perot, it's because so forth and so on.

Look, we know when people are most likely to vote and least likely to vote. We are playing with a very large cohort working it's way through the electorate that we call baby boomers. They are at a point where they are most likely to vote now. If Ross Perot hadn't been in here, we still would have had a rise in the election.

Now we can do all sorts of things if we want to raise the voting percentages. We can change laws to some degree. We can have a proportional representation system. You know, we could have a multi-party system. If everybody has a party that agrees with them, you're going to get a larger voting percentage.

But we have to ask ourselves why are we so concerned about this? What does it mean to us? And what's so new and so frightening about it? Now there is something that we think is frightening and that is that where once people who tended not to vote were poorer and less well educated, now it's been pointed out they very often look like all the rest of us.

So there is a point in which the glue is coming out of the system and we've got to worry about it but I think the press really tends to exaggerate that historically and I think frankly I felt some of this on this panel this morning so I throw that in because I think that's a proper perspective.

Ms. Fanning: I'd like to take us back for a minute to the kinds of things that Haynes Johnson was talking about and what the press did and did not do in this past election.

I happen to be one of those who thinks that the press did better this time than it did in 1988 in certain areas, that it did take on the politicians in many areas, it did examine the truth or accuracy of advertising and of statements in debates but it does seem to me that there's a conspiracy of silence that occurs between both the press and the politicians and I would pose it that perhaps one area is that there are certain things that we simply don't talk about, that the press has failed in its mandate, I think, to provoke discourse across the board on all the possibilities.

And one thing I think we've fallen for is the conspiracy of silence where Bush said, "Read my lips, no new taxes." I did not perceive that in anything Senator Rudman said last night or today the idea has passed his lips of the possibility that we might need to raise, indeed, some taxes to produce the effect that you desire, which is a reduction of the deficit and such things as the possibility of raising a gas tax, for instance.

And I wonder why it is that the press continually fails to fill in the gaps of what the politicians do. We fail to go ahead and look at the fact that in this country today it's assumed that it's disaster and death if you mention the possibility of raising any tax and yet, indeed, we may have to, and where is the press on this issue?

Senator Rudman: You know, I have to come back to what Linda Wertheimer said earlier. I want to make it clear that I believe that the press really can create interests and good reporting on these kinds of issues without some political leadership taking that stance. That is quite different from other kinds of investigative reporting where the press can't initiate and do that sort of thing but not in what we're talking about.

I would say that I disagree that there's a conspiracy of silence particularly. I think there is certainly a conspiracy of silence between the two major political parties on this overwhelming issue. I think the press has tried but, as I said last night, I think the press can do much better.

But the fact is that as we head into what is going to be, in my view, a time of very interesting economic debate you will see the coverage of it increasing. I believe that the major coverage of the Clinton Administration, looking at the first six months, will not be whether or not he gives gays the right to serve in the military and not that he will overturn the fetal tissue ban and the gag rule ban on Planned Parenthood and things of that sort which are all very interesting and important to different groups of people in this country.

The American people are still interested in the economy and he's going to have to talk about it. If he doesn't, that very tough group of White House reporters is going to ask him about it and I think you're going to see a renaissance of economic news.

If I were a young reporter who had had the foresight to get a master's in economics before I went to work for *The Washington Post,* I would beg to have that beat for the next four years. I think it's going to be the most exciting beat in Washington for someone who knows how to do it.

Ms. Fanning: I don't think you've answered my question. I have not heard you say anything about the issue of whether or not there's going to be—

Senator Rudman: Oh, of course, I'm sorry you don't read the *Record* more but if you don't read the *Record,* you could have listened to me last night. I outlined a plan that I thought you ought to have in two components a plan that involves more taxes, high gasoline taxes and high taxes on the wealthy. Said so last night. It's in the transcript.

Mr. Hess: Senator Rudman, you talked last night about the free TV, which you mentioned this morning. I've seen a lot of TV ads and I've written some and I don't think a single one of them has contributed anything to the public discussion, public debate in any real positive way.

It seems to me that the proposal, as I see it, and correct me where I'm wrong, is that the proposal would make TV ads more important rather than less important. Is that what you had in mind and is that the direction that you want to go?

Senator Rudman: Well, I guess in that sense you wouldn't see more of it. You'd probably see about the same amount or less of it. All I am trying to say is that, if you truly want to reduce the campaign finance scandal, the way to do it in my view, the easiest way to do it is to go and look where the money is spent. It's spent on television and let legitimate candidates who qualify in a variety of ways have a certain number of gross rating points on those stations during the last two to three weeks of a campaign and limit what they can spend based on their acceptance of that free time mandated by the federal government. I mean, that will work. I mean, Jack Danforth and I had a very detailed plan to do that. Unfortunately we could not get the kind of support that we needed.

I'm not sure it would make it more important — wouldn't make it less important. Incidentally, we had a very interesting First Amendment problem within this legislation and we have essentially drafted it two ways so that, if one fails on the constitutional question, the other circuit breaker will cut in.

And that is this, we wanted this to be used for non-negative campaigning and you would get more time if you appeared yourself and you could not have a negative ad unless you appeared yourself and I think it's a very good proposal.

I think it would work, but let me tell you, even though the percentage of profit that is derived from political advertising is relatively small at the local and network level, I will simply say that the opposition has been overwhelming.

Mr. Schorr: Dan Schorr. Let me mention in passing, Warren, just because it's the last thing you've said, that I would go a lot further than you in what you propose. I would introduce the usual British or European system in which television stations and networks are obligated to make time available on an allocated basis during political campaigns and no money may be spent on television.

I thought it was a little dangerous at one point when Perot was able, by giving a lot of his money to ABC and then it turned out that he was getting better treatment at ABC than he was getting on other networks, questions were raised as to whether treatment was following where the money goes.

I think money, political money and television make a terrible lethal mix and if anything could be done to remind television stations and networks that the Communications Act provides that they will perform in the public interest, convenience and necessity and that in return for the gold mine which they are given in the form of these licenses, they should have to give time for political campaigning. I think there would be a serious reform.

But what I wanted to say — a lot of things I could say. I've heard many interesting things here this morning and I just want to synthesize a couple of them.

My friend, colleague, boss, Blair Clark — I prefer him in two of those capacities — made a point that is interesting in which he suggested that we gave too much time, too much exposure to Perot and in doing so helped to build the image that he was trying to build.

I think whenever we meet in meetings like this we meet on a different plane than the way we work every day. For people in government or recently in government they are looking for a high-minded way to approach government. For those of us who are in the press we tend to think in higher, more ethical terms about what we do than when we're actually doing them.

Most of the time we are not looking for truth or morality. We're looking for a story. And if that story comes along, the average discussion that you will hear, be it at *The Washington Post* or, indeed, even NPR, is what are the interesting stories today and, if Perot appears to be an interesting story, he's going to be an interesting story.

That doesn't concern me much anymore because I think that the whole business of press and that small group in the entertainment field called journalists sitting on a little corner of a vast entertainment stage trying to wave their fingers and say a lot of the things that you see on television we want to tell you it ain't so or shouldn't be so, become less important for reasons that have been suggested here.

We're really moving into an age when television is no longer a gatekeeper but becomes the arena in a struggle and the control of television is far from being in the hands of those who are in the journalistic part of it. The politicians have learned how to use television. We're entering a kind of publicitary era in which Perot has shown what you can do by simply getting on the medium in your own time and using your time,

either paid for or on various versions of entertainment television which aren't journalistic television.

I think that Governor Clinton has certain tendencies in that populist direction as well. I think that in all of this we're seeing an erosion of parties and political organizations and we're beginning to see this ability to command time and command the attention of people and sell whatever it is that you have to sell if you have a way of getting on television.

And then I connect that with the serious warning I thought you properly gave, Senator, when you said that, as we move into this era, if we are faced also with economic privation, the combination of a nation, large parts of which are angry and passionate and tend then to resort to ethnic and other hatreds, the combination of that and the man on a white horse able to command television, put that together and I think that is the great danger of the future.

Thank you.

Mr. Hess: May I ask a question in follow-up, Warren, follow-up to Jamie Hess's question? Why are you interested and why do you support giving candidates free television time but not free money. That is, you're against public financing. In other words, you're from a state like New Hampshire where to get on television you use Boston or Maine so you're reaching — it's very inefficient for you. Why can't you just assume that the candidate knows best how to reach his consumers, his voters? Why is it that one is good and the other is bad?

Senator Rudman: Well, I would say the candidate would have the absolute right to choose where he wished or she wished to use these free television minutes or whatever but I surely couldn't imagine giving them money, campaign public financing because that would come out of the Treasury of the American people.

I think it ought to come out of the people who own these gold mines, as Dan Schorr has put it, these radio and television stations. They're the ones who ought, to a very small extent, be required to subsidize this process because they are using public airwaves. That's my reason.

Mr. Kalb: I was going to do a brief wrap-up but I think Dan Schorr did it much better and so I will not even attempt a wrap-up.

Let me point out to everyone something very nice that Senator Rudman has done. He's not only come up here and written and discussed a very thoughtful concept of press/politics within the framework of the Teddy White Lectureship, but he also told me last night that the honorarium, which is $5,000 for the Teddy White speaker, should go to student activities at the Center. I think that's really terrific. (Applause)

In addition, he gets the following, this very nice certificate of appreciation from the Center, which honors Senator Rudman for his distinguished leadership in the United States Senate on the occasion of his delivering the Teddy White Lecture.

And for our three discussants who have come up, Linda Wertheimer, your certificate, Haynes Johnson, yours, and Stephen Hess, yours.

Thank you all very much for being with us.