



1

A Right To Know

The development of a news culture is closely allied to the development of democratic societies. If democracy is, in Abraham Lincoln's words, "Government of the people, by the people, for the people" then journalism at its best exhibits a similar pluralist propensity. Indeed, journalism and democracy can claim a longer marriage than that between journalism and the commercial imperative of media for profit. Yet it is the latter which seems to have taken precedence in the twenty-first century. In the past, the presentation of "diverse" stories and information was useful to the workings of democracy, but by last century's end editors, whether by inclination or circumstance, were increasingly defining news within a business context in order to maintain or increase revenues. News had become commercialized.¹ The process by which this happened is examined in more detail in Part II, but in Part I we examine the implications for democracy.

Who's Right and Who Knows?

"I shall resign the presidency effective at noon tomorrow. Vice President Ford will be sworn in as President at that hour in this office." These words were spoken on August 8, 1974 and brought to an end one of the most bizarre series of events in American history as President Nixon became the only president ever to resign from office. The Watergate scandal, as it became known, was an example of the finest journalism pursued from the highest of motives by men of unquestioned integrity. Richard Nixon, of course, didn't agree.

But how important were the two *Washington Post* journalists, Bob Woodward and Carl Bernstein, in the whole saga of the Watergate break-ins? How significant was journalism in the Watergate story? History is a movable feast, but after 35 years history may already be giving its verdict. To take one example: the internet Wikipedia page, *Watergate Scandal*, is some 7,500 words long. Woodward and Bernstein are referred to only briefly in the main text despite the celebrity status accorded them in the immediate aftermath of the scandal itself. So are we right to assume uncritically that this was a shining example of journalism taking the moral high ground and coming to the rescue of a democracy treated with contempt by a president and a people treated with disdain by the ruling elite? Is it inevitable that our affirmation of one is always at the expense of our faith in the other?

Twenty years later, on October 20, 1994, the UK *Guardian* newspaper published a front-page article by its Westminster correspondent which alleged that a lobbying company, Ian Greer Associates, had paid two Conservative MPs £2,000 a time to ask parliamentary questions on behalf of Mohamed Al-Fayed, the owner of Harrods department store in Knightsbridge, London. This was the first time the names of MPs Tim Smith and more notably Neil Hamilton had entered the public consciousness. Junior Northern Ireland minister Smith resigned immediately, fueling speculation that the allegations were indeed true. But Hamilton and Greer served the *Guardian* with libel writs. Subsequent events led to Neil Hamilton, a junior minister at the Department of Trade and Industry, losing his safe seat at Tatton in Cheshire to journalist Martin Bell. Many political commentators believed the “cash for questions” affair, as it became known, was instrumental in the fall not only of Neil Hamilton but also of John Major’s Conservative government and the subsequent election of Tony Blair and New Labour in 1997.

The British media’s coverage tended to follow the *Guardian* line. But Neil Hamilton always denied the allegations contained in the *Guardian* article and subsequent newspaper stories. There was an official investigation by Sir Gordon Downey, the Parliamentary Commissioner for Standards, which vindicated the *Guardian*’s version of events. Downey found the evidence “compelling” that Neil Hamilton had indeed been paid large amounts of “cash in envelopes.” There the matter might have rested but for the diligent research and enquiring minds of two freelance journalists, Jonathan Boyd Hunt and Malcolm Keith-Hill. Hunt was a former reporter on the regional TV news program *Granada Tonight* and Keith-Hill was an experienced investigative journalist. They had already joined forces to produce a TV documentary (never aired) on the “cash for questions” affair provisionally entitled “From Ritz to Writs.”

The conclusions of the Downey Report, at complete variance with the results of their own research for the documentary, led them to pursue the issue with renewed vigor. It was their contention that the whole story was a fabrication, that there never was any “cash” and that Tim Smith, Neil Hamilton, and Ian Greer were innocent of all charges. Hunt and Keith-Hill alleged further that the *Guardian* framed Neil Hamilton with Mohamed Al-Fayed’s cooperation and that “when the lobbyist and one of the MPs sued the *Guardian* for libel, for which the *Guardian* was uninsured, its editors, journalists, and lawyers enacted a cynical cover-up.”²

Yet Hunt and Keith-Hill were unable to get their story published in the press or anywhere else. To combat this, Hunt wrote a book on the affair, *Trial by Conspiracy*, and set up the website www.guardianlies.com as a way of publicizing his and Keith-Hill’s investigative work. The world wide web thus became a bona fide outlet for a piece of investigative journalism that might otherwise not have seen the light of day. As the two journalists stated, “This website is undoubtedly the first of its kind in the world. It was constructed to overcome a news blackout enacted by the British media of the two freelances’ investigation.”³

Can we assume from this story that the internet is now a respected and trusted media outlet in its own right rather than just the last resort of cyber-stalkers, ax-grinders, whistle-blowers, or the merely insane? Should we accept it as a legitimate forum for investigative journalism and one that offers a potential corrective to the vast power of a modern media conglomerate? There is no doubt that the internet has become increasingly important to media organizations. The BBC, for example, employs more staff on its website than on its news programming. However, if the internet is to be trusted, it must be possible to distinguish between the legitimate website and the disingenuous. This isn’t a problem with the websites of well-known media organizations but for the independent site or newcomer blog issues about trust and truth loom large. For the journalist who has a story to tell and nowhere else to tell it, the internet may well be a boon, but he or she still has to overcome people’s natural cynicism when presented with startling “revelations” that have not found a home in a mainstream media outlet.

So, why is it that one of these stories resulted in the two journalists concerned being feted, writing a book, *All The President’s Men*, and having a film made of their exploits, while the two journalists telling the other story were only able to publish it on the internet? What does this say about the state of our democracy or, for that matter, the state of our journalism? This chapter will attempt to put these issues into a perspective that takes account of both historical factuality and changing journalistic imperatives.

The motivation behind such stories, however, is always the same: the journalists' sense that the public has a "right to know," that the story is in the public interest and not just of interest to the public. But even more than this perhaps is the broader principle that journalists actually have a duty towards the public. According to the Italian Charter of Duties of Journalists, for example, "A journalist's responsibility towards people always prevails over any other thing."⁴ That responsibility includes alerting people to issues, events, situations, and individuals that deserve attention as well as providing them with the information needed to make valid judgments about their rights and responsibilities as citizens. Journalists inform public opinion by reporting, interpreting, and providing background information and context. Journalists serve democracy by pointing out "what, if anything is being done elsewhere, what options exist, what the admitted likely consequences of various actions might be, what choices their (the public's) political leaders are considering."⁵

It was not, of course, preordained that journalists should be the ones to provide such political news and editorial comment. The earliest newspapers, known as *corantos* or *courants* (news books), contained little news. However, the development of the newsbook and the news sheet in seventeenth-century Britain was accompanied by an upsurge in political and foreign "intelligence," or news. This was produced by men who were paid for their labor and it became known as journalism, after the journal or daily newspaper that published their writings. The word journalist entered the language for the first time toward the end of the seventeenth century. Thus the historical role of journalism as supporter of democracy is based on those continuities that the profession has struggled to achieve over the last three hundred years. There are three traditionally linked responsibilities:

- 1 The presentation of a diversity of informed views on matters of the day including political issues and their interpretation;
- 2 Watchdog of the public interest, as a guard against politicians and officials who may act in their own interest or threaten democracy rather than serve the public – the notion of the press as a Fourth Estate;
- 3 An ability to expose untruths and support truth wherever power is wielded arbitrarily, because journalists are, at least in principle, independent from the control of others.

Obviously, by definition, mass communications always relay messages to more people than have a specific need for them. In addition, there have

always been (and always will be) journalists and media practitioners who endeavor to contribute to the various forums where public life is scrutinized, for as Walter Lippmann noted, “There can be no liberty for a community which lacks the information by which to detect lies.”⁶ But as deregulation advances and commercialism becomes more widespread, there has been a marked increase since the end of the nineteenth century in personal “affairs” journalism epitomized by the human interest story. Whether in the arena of sport, business, or entertainment, such stories provide information for people to make sense of their own personal “world” and lifestyle as opposed to their responsibilities as public entities.

Sometimes described as the commodification of culture, where the “consumer is king,” this trend has come to symbolize what cultural critics describe as an obsession with the acquisition of personal goods and an equal passion for media-generated entertainment. Fewer people, it seems, are willing to devote time and effort toward the achievement of a common, collective good. Public affairs journalism on matters of national, regional, and local government, whether aimed at the welfare of entire communities, collective private interests, or wider society has in consequence suffered. This democratic “deficit” has left many commentators wondering about the future, in particular how journalism’s unique mission can be protected and what the prospects are for any remaining relationship between journalism and democracy.

Résumé Walter Lippmann

Walter Lippmann was one of the most influential journalists and cultural commentators of the twentieth century. He believed journalists were a link between the governors and the governed and as such had an almost sacred duty to the truth and objectivity, although he understood that all truth was necessarily subjective. He was an elitist and promoted the idea that a “governing class” of experts, specialists, and bureaucrats was needed to safeguard democracy because the notion of a public competent to direct public affairs was a “false ideal.”

Lippmann was born in New York in 1889. He studied philosophy and languages at Harvard and graduated in 1909. In May 1910 he wrote to Lincoln Steffens, the “muckraking” investigative journalist, asking for a position on *Everybody’s Magazine* “because there is no kind of work that appeals to me as much as yours does.”⁷ Lippmann

soon became one of its editors and Theodore Roosevelt described him as the most brilliant man of his age in all the United States.⁸

He established a political weekly, the *New Republic*, in 1914 and was a member of the US delegation to the Paris Peace Conference of 1919. He also helped to draw up the covenant of the new League of Nations. By then he was a “personality,” became an informal adviser to many presidents and wrote a number of significant books on journalism and politics. In 1931 he joined the New York *Herald Tribune* and won the Pulitzer Prize in 1958 and 1962 for his syndicated newspaper column “Today and Tomorrow.” He popularized the term “the Cold War” when he published a book of the same name in 1947, and his now famous phrase, the “Manufacture of Consent,” was adapted by Edward S. Herman and Noam Chomsky for the title of their 1988 groundbreaking book on the political economy of the mass media, *Manufacturing Consent*. Lippmann died in 1974 in New York.

This relationship is traditionally reflected in the kind of democracy a country enjoys. The North American continent, colonized in the seventeenth century, was in itself a democratic undertaking. Yet the development of the press, mainly because of the sheer size of the continent, has always remained a largely regional affair in the same way that politics at state level can be a more potent force in a citizen’s life than federal politics. Similarly a strong state legislature was reflected in a strong regional press clustered around individual states, towns, and cities. Iconic titles of the American press, for example, the *New York Times*, the *Washington Post*, the *Los Angeles Times*, the *Chicago Tribune*, are all named for the cities in which they operate.

These practical continental problems were acknowledged by Founding Fathers James Madison and Alexander Hamilton in the *Federalist Papers* (1787) where they argued that transport engineering and newspapers would unite the nation.⁹ Cultural historian James Carey expanded on this simple dictum: “The United States was ... the product of literacy, cheap paper, rapid and inexpensive transportation, and the mechanical reproduction of words – the capacity, in short, to transport not only people but a complex culture and civilization from one place to another, indeed between places that were radically dissimilar in geography, social conditions, economy, and very often climate.”¹⁰ Carey’s acknowledgement of the “radically dissimilar”

in the United States has not precluded a vibrant print community, even though transport engineering did little to promote a national press.

Magazines, on the other hand, were more likely to flourish because they operated with more flexible deadlines, weekly or monthly, and broader news agendas which allowed for the vagaries of early transport systems. A good example is *The Nation*, a weekly magazine known as “the flagship of the left,” which was first published in 1865 and flourishes to this day. Its early remit was to secure full rights for freed slaves and it still campaigns for traditionally “left-wing” causes. Eventually, modern distribution systems enabled proprietors like Henry Luce to produce magazines that appealed to the broadest possible readerships. His *Time* magazine began publication in 1923 and now boasts a *Time Europe* edition published in London and *Time Asia* based in Hong Kong. Its direct competitor, *Newsweek*, was first published in 1933 but has always trailed *Time* in circulation and advertising revenue. Today it is published in four English language editions and 12 global editions written in the language of the circulation region.

In Britain, the first modern newspapers emerged in the eighteenth century, followed by the concept of “public opinion” and accompanied by ideas about free speech and a free press. Crucially, the beginning of the nineteenth century saw the emergence of a viable national press aided by the early development of mechanized printing presses, the railways, and a national postal service. As a much smaller country distribution was never the issue it was in the USA. And its smaller population encouraged a national press as the main route to profitability.

Magazines similarly were profuse from the early years of the nineteenth century, benefiting from advantageous postage rates and speedy distribution. Today, for example, the UK can boast the largest publishing industry in Europe, with around 3,000 more firms than Germany, the next largest European market. According to Frontier Economics’ “Comparative Analysis of the UK’s Creative Industries,” a report to the Department for Culture, Media and Sport published in 2006, the worldwide journals market, based on data from The Publishers Association, is estimated at £5–7bn and involves around 17,500 publishers and 35,000 journals. Frontier Economics also estimate that the UK has around 25–30 percent of the world market, with a total turnover of £1.5–2bn. Exports account for 60–75 percent of sales for most journals, and for some, the figure will be as high as 85 percent. There are almost 1,300 regional newspapers in the UK. According to the Newspaper Society, they are read by 84 percent of the adult population, compared with the 70 percent who read national newspapers.

The emergence of broadcast media raised fresh concerns in the press and governments on both sides of the Atlantic. In the United States, the Communications Act of 1934 established the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) which ensured that broadcasters acted in “the public interest” in exchange for permission to lease the airwaves. When government exercised some control over broadcast content, there was a substantial amount of news transmitted. But by the time Ronald Reagan became president in the 1980s, news coverage was already dwindling and Reaganomics, as it became known, began the era of deregulation which inevitably accelerated the whole process of decline – in quantity if not quality. In Europe, the survival of public service broadcasting has ensured the tenuous existence of factual programming in the “public interest” – a safety net of sorts for serious journalism.¹¹ In Britain the BBC was set up, in part, to frustrate the commercial tendencies apparent in American radio. Its acceptance by most people as a “monopoly,” indeed its very legitimacy, was in large part a result of its national character. It wasn’t until 1967, for example, that the first local radio station, Radio Leicester, began broadcasting. However, in our search for a way forward, we need to go further back in history than the twentieth century to find inspiration.

Magna Carta and Journalism Today

Magna Carta is the birth certificate of liberty. This great charter enshrines the rights of the individual against the state. When disaffected English barons forced King John to sign it in a field after the battle of Runnymede in 1215, they did not realize that this was a document that would enshrine enduring principles. About a third of the world’s population is governed according to the principles laid down in Magna Carta: that no person is above the law; that no person may be persecuted by power or imprisoned without fair trial. This latter right – the writ of habeas corpus allowing appeal against unlawful imprisonment – is included within the American constitution. The Fifth Amendment simply rephrased Clause 39 of Magna Carta: “No person shall ... be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process.” Founding Father Alexander Hamilton considered habeas corpus to be the “bulwark” of individual liberty, and condemned secret imprisonment as the most “dangerous engine of arbitrary government.”¹² Today, the American Bar Association periodically gathers at Runnymede in Surrey in the UK to rededicate itself to the principles first established there.

Résumés

The Founding Fathers

The Founding Fathers of the United States are generally agreed to be the political leaders who signed the Declaration of Independence in 1776 or those who took part in the American Revolution (War of Independence). American historian Richard B. Morris named seven men as the key Founding Fathers: John Adams, Benjamin Franklin, Alexander Hamilton, John Jay, Thomas Jefferson, James Madison, and George Washington. The following three men are relevant to the present chapter.

Benjamin Franklin

Benjamin Franklin was born in Boston, Massachusetts in 1706. His formal schooling ended at the age of 10 and he was apprenticed to his brother James, a printer. A self-taught polymath, he was a true Renaissance man and became a leading writer, scientist, politician, statesman, and satirist. He is credited with inventing the lightning rod, bifocal glasses, public lending libraries, and the first fire department in America.

As a Founding Father and a diplomat he favored the creation of an American nation and was instrumental in securing the treaty with France and Britain that paved the way for an independent American state. He was Postmaster General in 1775–6 and Minister of Finance in 1778–85. Franklin died in 1790 and his funeral was reputedly attended by 20,000 people.

Alexander Hamilton

Alexander Hamilton was born on the island of Nevis in the British West Indies in 1755. In the American Revolution he joined the New York militia and became aide-de-camp to General George Washington. He was elected to Congress in 1782 but resigned and later founded the Bank of New York. A constitutional lawyer, he became the first United States Secretary of the Treasury and cowrote the *Federalist Papers* with James Madison. In 1802 his rivalry with Vice President Burr resulted in a duel. Hamilton was mortally wounded and died the next day.

James Madison

James Madison was born in Port Conway, Virginia in 1751. He studied at Princeton (then the College of New Jersey) and graduated in two years. He served as the fourth President of the United States, 1809–17, and was responsible for writing most of the *Federalist Papers*, a series of 85 articles that provided a commentary on and interpretation in favor of the Constitution. He is now considered to be the “Father of the Constitution” and was also the author of the United States Bill of Rights. Although always in delicate health, he was the last of the Founding Fathers to die, in 1836.

What has Magna Carta to do with journalism? Quite simply, journalists over the years have had to remind governments of the basic liberties enshrined in its Latin text. For example, Magna Carta states in Clause 29: “To none will we deny or delay right or justice.” When Texan millionaire and former presidential candidate Ross Perot put his copy of the charter up for sale in 2007, it was a UK journalist – Ben Macintyre – who, writing in *The Times* of London, called for it to go back on display, and for it to be read again.¹³ He argued that this should be done in the light of what was officially referred to as “enhanced interrogation” of prisoners at Guantanamo Bay, the American detention camp in Cuba set up after the destruction of the World Trade Centre in 2001, and also in the light of British legislation that extended the length of the time terrorist suspects could be detained without trial. Clearly today’s journalism can learn from history about the preservation and enhancement of democracy. Indeed, the journalism of opposition has always gained much of its legitimacy from the principles enshrined in the Magna Carta.

John Milton’s Areopagitica

“Let truth and falsehood grapple” said John Milton in *Areopagitica*, his classic seventeenth-century polemic against censorship. Published in 1644 in the midst of the English Civil War, *Areopagitica* is a passionate defense of free expression, unlicensed printing, and freedom of the press. Milton was

prompted to pen this pioneer essay after the outrageously hostile reaction he had faced from extremist Puritans who, as the fundamentalist Protestants of their day, had demanded that Parliament reinforce the censorship laws and have Milton's recent pamphlet on the subject of divorce burned. Despite the country's engagement in a civil war, Milton denounced Parliament and demanded the repeal of all censorship. He called his essay "A speech of Mr. John Milton for the liberty of unlicensed printing, to the Parliament of England," and the reference in his main title was to the Aereopagus, the ancient Greek meeting place where Athenian citizens gathered to discuss issues of the day.

For Milton, effective self-government required that people receive information from a diversity of sources, in order that the truth could emerge. English common law at the time considered that truth could be potentially libelous – and thus a dangerous commodity – until in 1720 two London newspaper writers, John Trenchard and William Gordon, using the pen name "Cato," argued that the concept should be reversed: namely, that truth should be a defense *against* an accusation of libel. The impact of this discourse reverberated in the American colonies, where printers, including Benjamin Franklin, republished the work of Cato. In Britain in 1792 the Whig politician Charles James Fox introduced legislation designed to restore to juries the right to decide what was libel and whether a defendant was guilty, rather than leaving it solely to the judge. It is still in force today.

In *Milton's Vision*, historian Theo Hobson describes Milton as the "theorist-in-chief" of liberal Puritanism, but Milton's legacy embraced both moderate and more radical Puritans who "argued there should be no official state religion; they invented the separation of church and state the Americans put into practice in the next century."¹⁴ Thus the First Amendment to the US Constitution specifically prohibits the Congress from making laws both "respecting an establishment of religion" and "abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press." The wording amounted to a blunt way of saying that no law can be passed that allied the state to any religious observance – unlike Henry VIII's legacy in Britain where senior bishops of the Church of England are members of the House of Lords. Similarly, in America no law can be passed to curb press freedom and the media's rights to determine content are unlimited and unfettered by any prior restraint to publication. As Gore Vidal commented, "Milton would have said it more eloquently, but he would have made the same points."¹⁵

FactFile

The Development of Rights and Liberties

The Putney Debates – 1647

The English Civil War resulted in the defeat of King Charles I at the hands of Oliver Cromwell and his New Model Army. In the immediate aftermath there was a rift between Cromwell, his officers, and the rank and file soldiers of his army over how to deal with the King and how the constitution should operate in the future. Radical elements in the army produced a document, *Agreement of the People*, which called for “one man one vote,” religious freedom, equality for all under the law, and ultimate authority to be vested in the House of Commons rather than the House of Lords.

Cromwell invited the disaffected New Agents, as they became known, to debate their proposals before the General Council of the Army. The debates took place in November 1647 at St Mary’s Church in Putney, at that time a village on the Thames near London. Much of the debate was about the right to vote. Both sides eventually agreed on a compromise enshrined in a new document, the *Heads of Proposals*. This gave the vote to soldiers who had fought for Parliament in the war but excluded servants and alms-takers (i.e., the poor). The “Putney Debates” provided a platform for the “ordinary man” to make his voice heard and were instrumental in widening the electorate and paving the way for many of the civil liberties taken for granted in democratic societies today.

Bill of Rights – 1689

The Bill was an act of parliament which set out the rights that English citizens and permanent residents were entitled to under a constitutional monarchy. These rights were laid down for all time and still stand today. Some of the main provisions included the following:

- The crown could not usurp the power of parliament by executing laws without its consent
- Freedom of speech in parliament
- Freedom from fine and forfeiture without a trial
- Freedom from cruel and unusual punishment.

The Bill of Rights is still in use on a day-to-day basis throughout the British Commonwealth as well as forming the basis for the American

Bill of Rights and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. For example, freedom from cruel and unusual punishment is enshrined in Article 5 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and Article 3 of the European Convention on Human Rights.

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights – 1948

The Universal Declaration was adopted by the United Nations General Assembly in 1948. It is considered to be the first document that enshrined human rights as universal and applicable to all human beings. Of particular relevance here are Articles 18 and 19:

Article 18: Everyone has the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion ...

Article 19: Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression ...

The European Convention on Human Rights – 1950

The European Convention was adopted in 1950 by the countries of Europe to protect human rights and freedoms. The European Court of Human Rights was established by the convention and it is unique because it translates rights enshrined in a treaty into a high degree of individual protection. Articles 8 and 10 relate particularly to privacy and freedom of expression:

Article 8: Everyone has the right to respect for his private and family life, his home and his correspondence ...

Article 10: Everyone has the right to freedom of expression. This right shall include freedom to hold opinions and to receive and impart information and ideas without interference by public authority and regardless of frontiers ...

The ideas enshrined in Magna Carta and Milton's *Areopagitica* became the basis for later defenses of the press and the media in general against censorship and similar attempts to curtail the right to publish. The development of the press as a Fourth Estate of the realm in early nineteenth-century Britain was in many respects an attempt to enshrine these ideas of freedom and impartiality in such a way as to appear to serve rather than oppose the emerging democratic state. According to historian Thomas

Carlyle (1795–1881), it was British politician Edmund Burke who said there were three estates in Parliament – the Lords Spiritual (the clergy), the Lords Temporal (the nobles), and the House of Commons (the commoners) but in the reporters’ gallery sat a Fourth Estate which Burke considered more important than the other three.¹⁶ The next chapter examines how the freedom of the press as the Fourth Estate became both *cause célèbre* in the fight for more general freedoms and an excuse for the unscrupulous to pursue personal and political vendettas.

Notes

- 1 Gerald J. Baldasty, *The Commercialization of News in the Nineteenth Century* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1992), p. 4.
- 2 www.guardianlies.com, Rough guide to this website, p. 1.
- 3 www.guardianlies.com, Website main index, p. 2; See also Jonathan Boyd Hunt, *Trial by Conspiracy* (Exeter, UK: Greenzone Publishing, 1998).
- 4 Charter of Duties of Journalists, adopted by the National Federation of the Italian Press and National Council Order of Journalists, July 1993. Available online at http://ethicnet.uta.fi/italy/charter_of_duties_of_journalists, accessed on August 10, 2010.
- 5 Warren G. Bovée, *Discovering Journalism* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1999), p. 139.
- 6 Walter Lippmann, *Liberty and the News* (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, 1995), p. 58.
- 7 Justin Kaplan, *Lincoln Steffens: A Biography* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1975), p. 176.
- 8 *Ibid.*, p. 177.
- 9 James Madison, Alexander Hamilton, and John Jay, *The Federalist Papers* (London: Penguin, 1987), Nos. 10, 14.
- 10 James W. Carey, *Communication as Culture* (Boston: Unwin Hyman, 1989), pp. 2–3.
- 11 Jane Chapman, *Comparative Media History: 1789 to the Present* (Cambridge, UK: Polity Press, 2005).
- 12 Madison, Hamilton, Jay, *The Federalist Papers*, Nos. 10, 14.
- 13 Ben Macintyre, “800 Years On, Still a Great Read,” *The Times*, December 14, 2007, p. 21.
- 14 Theo Hobson, “Oliver Cromwell – a Liberal?” *Sunday Times*, November 9, 2008, para. 4. Available online at http://entertainment.timesonline.co.uk/tol/arts_and_entertainment/tv_and_radio/article5088728.ece, accessed on September 3, 2010.

- 15 Katrina Borjesson (ed.), *Into the Buzzsaw: Leading Journalists Expose the Myth of a Free Press* (Amherst, NY: Prometheus Books, 2002), p. 6.
- 16 Thomas Carlyle, *On Heroes, Hero-Worship and the Heroic in History* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1966), p. 164.