

PICTURE THIS VIDEO
COMMON GROUND CMTE COLUMBIA
INTERVIEW WITH CHRIS WALLACE AND MAGGIE HABERMAN,
INTRODUCTIONS: BRUCE BOND, AND COLUMBIA
SPOKESPERSON
INTERVIEWER: LINDA FELDMAN
PRODUCER: FREDDIE DORN

MEDIA ID: CGC COLUMBIA 2020.MP3

* * *TRANSCRIBER'S NOTE: BACKGROUND NOISE FREQUENT, ONLY TRANSCRIBED WHEN PARTICULARLY INTRUSIVE.* * *

COLUMBIA SPOKESPERSON:

17:01:16;00

(IN PROGRESS) --of the *Columbia Journalism Review*. My job right now is super simple, which is simply to welcome you to Pulitzer Hall on behalf of the Columbia Journalism School and the *Columbia Journalism Review*. Since 1961, *CJR* has been-- both an advocate for a free press and a watchdog of journalism.

17:01:38;24

And we think both of those roles are more important now than maybe they've ever been in our existence. We've been, for the last four years or

so, obsessing about the coverage of politics in America both in general and as it relates to this presidency in particular.

17:01:56;00

We think there's a lot of lessons that need to be learned from the coverage of 2016 and are really interested to watch as-- as we-- as we now head into 2020, which what-- which is what makes this event so interesting. I'm really interested to hear what Chris and Maggie and Linda have to say. And again, thank you all for coming. (APPLAUSE)

DWIGHT EISENHOWER (RECORDING):

17:02:24;10

Our people expect their President and the Congress to find essential agreement on issues of great moment, the wise resolution of which will better shape the future of the nation.

MALE SPEAKER (RECORDING):

17:02:38;24

The Congress is so partisan, so divided, they refuse to even address this issue.

BILL CLINTON (RECORDING):

17:02:47;07

The political divisions we see in our country today, it is a counter model for how people ought

to make all kinds of decisions.

BARACK OBAMA (RECORDING):

17:02:56;02

We can decide to come together and make our country reflect the good inside us.

RONALD REAGAN (RECORDING):

17:03:02;24

But never better than in those times of great challenge, when we came together not as Democrats or Republicans, but as Americans, united in the common cause.

ANNOUNCER:

17:03:19;09

Now please welcome Bruce Bond, cofounder and CEO of Common Ground Committee. (APPLAUSE)

BRUCE BOND:

17:03:32;10

Thank you, and good evening, and welcome. We're delighted to have all of you with us tonight. I'd first like to thank the Columbia School of Journalism and-- particularly Julie Pozo-Cepeda and Stephanie Cohen. And, of course, Dean Sheila Coronel and Kyle Pope for being with us and hosting us tonight.

17:03:50;12

And on behalf of my colleagues, the Common Ground

Committee and our media partner, the *Christian Science Monitor*, thank you all for coming. I hope some of you were able to attend the m-- the seminar that was-- put on earlier this afternoon by the *Monitor*, by the editor, Mark Sappenfield, who happens to be in the back of the room at this moment. I heard great things about that.

17:04:10;12

Now, the video you just watched-- told you a little bit about our organization. We are a nonpartisan, nonprofit group focused on bringing light, not heat, to public discourse, and bringing the challenges, bringing healing to the challenges of incivility and polarization that threaten our country.

17:04:31;01

Now, this is the 12th public forum that we've held, and tonight's topic is Finding Common Ground on Facts, Fake News, and the Media. Now, a couple of housekeeping items, first-- please respect our request for no flash photos this evening. And second, we do encourage you to

tweet, and indeed, the hashtag is right here on the screen, you can see at the bottom. But please turn off your ringers, if you would.

17:04:57;24

So let's get right to it. So first, let's welcome our monitor-- our monitor, our (LAUGHTER) moderator. She is the Washington Bureau Chief and White House correspondent for the *Christian Science Monitor*, and she hosts one of Washington's premier journalistic forums, The Monitor Breakfasts. Please welcome Linda Feldman. (APPLAUSE)

LINDA FELDMAN:

17:05:22;09

Thank you. Thank you.

BRUCE BOND:

17:05:27;07

And now our panelists. He is the host of *Fox News Sunday* and is one of the country's most prominent political journalists. Over his decades-long career, he reported from the ABC news desk as a senior correspondent for *Primetime* and *20/20*, and as an anchor on NBC News *Meet the Press*. He has won every major broadcast news award, including

three Emmys. Please welcome Chris Wallace.

(APPLAUSE)

17:06:05;21

She is the White House correspondent (BACKGROUND VOICE) for the *New York Times*, a political analyst for CNN, and is one of the most respected and influencer-- influential voices in national affairs journalism today. In 2018, she and her team at the *New York Times* received the Pulitzer Prize for reporting on Donald Trump's advisors and their connections to Russia. Please welcome Maggie Haberman. (APPLAUSE) My thanks to all three of you. Linda, the floor is yours.

LINDA FELDMAN:

17:06:42;05

All right, thank you, Bruce. And welcome, everyone. Our topic, as Bruce said, our topic tonight is Finding Common Ground on Facts, Fake News, and the Media. Journalism has gone through an incredible upheaval in the past two decades. Advertising used to sustain print publications. Facebook, Twitter, and the iPhone didn't even exist, nor did instant shares and the ability to

spread fake news like wildfire.

17:07:08;14

And journalists believed that facts were universally accepted as pillars of truth. That notion is now being debated in newsrooms. And as information environments have grown more toxic, journalists feel frustrated. Many news organizations have moved beyond analysis to become opinionated and partisan. We're in an interesting political climate where journalists are under attack by government officials. Let's take a look at a recent exchange between NPR reporter Mary Louise Kelly and Secretary Mike Pompeo.

MARY LOUISE KELLY (RECORDING):

17:07:46;17

People who work for you in your department, people who have resigned from this department under your leadership, saying you should stand up--

MIKE POMPEO (RECORDING):

17:07:53;10

I-- I-- I don't know who--

MARY LOUISE KELLY (RECORDING):

17:07:54;00 --for the diplomats who work here.

MIKE POMPEO (RECORDING):

17:07:55;01 --I don't know who these unnamed sources are
 you're referring to. I can tell you this, when I--
 -

MARY LOUISE KELLY (RECORDING):

17:07:59;06 These are not unnamed sources--

MIKE POMPEO (RECORDING):

17:07:59;23 --when I talk to my team--

MARY LOUISE KELLY (RECORDING):

17:08:00;16 --this is your senior advisor, Michael McKinley,
 a career Foreign Service officer with four
 decades experience, who testified under oath that
 he resigned in part due to the failure of the
 State Department to offer support to Foreign
 Service employees caught up in the impeachment
 inquiry on Ukraine.

MIKE POMPEO (RECORDING):

17:08:15;07 Yeah, I-- I'm not gonna comment on things that
 (LAUGH) Mr. McKinley may have said. I'll say only
 this, I have defended every State Department

official. We've built a great team. The team that works here--

MARY LOUISE KELLY (RECORDING):

17:08:26;02 Sir, respectfully, where--

MIKE POMPEO (RECORDING):

17:08:27;04 --is doing amazing work around the world--

MARY LOUISE KELLY (RECORDING):

17:08:27;20 --have you defended Marie Yovanovitch?

MIKE POMPEO (RECORDING):

17:08:29;15 I-- I've defended every single person on this team. I've done what's right for every--

MARY LOUISE KELLY (RECORDING):

17:08:33;21 Can you point me toward--

MIKE POMPEO (RECORDING):

17:08:33;24 --single person on this team.

MARY LOUISE KELLY (RECORDING):

17:08:34;21 --your remarks where you have defended Marie Yovanovitch?

MIKE POMPEO (RECORDING):

17:08:36;24 I-- I've said all I'm going to say today. Thank you.

LINDA FELDMAN:

17:08:41;16 Now let's listen to what Mary Louise Kelly said happened after the interview was over.

MARY LOUISE KELLY (RECORDING):

17:08:52;04 I-- I was taken to the Secretary's private living room, where he was waiting, and where he shouted at me for about the same amount of time as the interview itself had lasted. He was not happy to have been questioned about Ukraine. He asked, "Do you think Americans care about Ukraine?"

17:09:07;13 He used the F-word in that sentence-- and many others. He asked if I could find Ukraine on a map. I said yes. He called out for his aids to bring him a map of the world with no writing, no countries marked. I pointed to Ukraine, he put the map away. He said, "People will hear about this."

LINDA FELDMAN:

17:09:29;09 Now let's listen to President Trump making comments after the incident.

DONALD TRUMP (RECORDING):

17:09:35;21

And, of course, our great Secretary of State, Mike Pompeo. Whoa. That's impressive. That was very impressive, Mike. That reporter couldn't have done too good a job on you yesterday, huh? I think you did a good job on her, actually. That's good, thank you, Mike. Great.

LINDA FELDMAN:

17:10:10;09

AG Sulzberger, the publisher of the *New York Times* penned an op-ed back in September in which he wrote, "The free press is foundational to a healthy democracy, and arguably the most important tool we have as citizens. It empowers the public by providing the information we need to elect leaders, and the continuing oversight to keep them honest. It gives voice to the disadvantaged and doggedly pursues the truth to expose wrongdoing and drive change."

17:10:43;02

We invited the two of you here today because you're leading journalists representing both broadcast and print media. We'd like to hear your

thoughts on all of these weighty issues facing journalism. But I'd like to start off by asking you if you'll share with us your secret sauce. How did the two of you reach the top of your field? So Maggie, let's start with you.

MAGGIE HABERMAN:

17:11:05;17

What if I reject the premise of the question?
(LAUGHTER)

LINDA FELDMAN:

17:11:08;14

Well, you're gonna have to accept it. You've been covering Donald Trump since his days as a real estate mogul, and I see your byline on so many stories, sometimes multiple times in a day. We have a room full of journalism students here, and they should know that you-- you live here in New York, but you're covering the White House. So-- so how do you do it? And-- and how do you get the access? And how do you-- how do you get people to open up to you?

MAGGIE HABERMAN:

17:11:33;20

Well, first of all, thank you for having us-- this is a terrific event. And there's-- it's an

honor to be on the same stage as Chris. I-- I-- it's with difficulty, right, I mean, covering the White House from a different city. But I have three kids, I couldn't relocate them.

17:11:50;20

I covered-- as you note, I covered Donald Trump for a long time. I really formed a relationship with him in 2011 when he was thinking of running for president the following year-- in that cycle, when Mitt Romney was also running. And he ultimately didn't, and he abandoned that campaign-- in the middle of sweeps week of *The Apprentice*, which I'm sure was a coincidence-- in 2011. But-- when he was thinking of running for president-- one of his aides called me-- Sam Nunberg, and said, it was May of 2015, and said, "Trump is gonna run for president, he's gonna declare on June 16th, and we want you to break it."

17:12:27;24

And I said, "No." And he said, "Why?" And I-- the very simple answer was I wasn't gonna do this

unless he actually-- I wasn't gonna write a word until he actually declared his candidacy, because Donald Trump had been floating running for president for many, many decades, just like another candidate in the race. Mike Bloomberg had spent a long time-- floating the idea of-- of a presidential run.

17:12:48;06

But I was-- I was c-- I knew a lot of the people around him. I had known a lot of the people around him for a long time, Michael Cohen-- his former lawyer, had run for city council-- a gazillion years ago when I was covering city hall, so I knew him.

17:13:02;21

So I was helped (MIC NOISE) by the fact that I was familiar with these players, and Roger Stone was a very familiar figure in New York politics. So-- it sorta began that way. And I covered the campaign-- his campaign in particular-- because nobody else was assigned to it. And at the time, frankly, people weren't taking him as seriously

as they should have.

LINDA FELDMAN:

17:13:25;06

So you're-- you get your access from just that you know these people and you've known them a long time?

MAGGIE HABERMAN:

17:13:30;02

Right. And I guess I-- I take a little issue with the word access, just to be clear, because I think people hear that word and A, they assume that it means-- A, it's a pejorative, and B, it means there's some kind of an exchange-- going on. People know me and they return my calls. That doesn't influence what I write. It doesn't influence how I write it.

17:13:46;15

And it often doesn't influence why I know something. More often than not, I know things that the White House would rather I didn't know. But I do think that when they came into office, he had such a small group of people around him, and he was so, you know, I mean, this-- (LAUGH) he's never run for city council before, he won

the presidency in his first campaign. It's jarring and it's disorienting.

17:14:09;04

And so I think he was overwhelmed by this new government that he had to lead, and I think that familiarity was helpful to him. And so that's-- that's how it started. And th-- this was initially supposed to be a short-term thing-- that I was gonna cover it for a little while, and that was three years ago. So--

LINDA FELDMAN:

17:14:26;20

Sure. And you're still at it.

MAGGIE HABERMAN:

17:14:27;22

--and so we'll see what happens in November--

LINDA FELDMAN:

17:14:29;10

Yeah. So Chris-- clips from your interviews are frequently played by your competition, because you are so good. And I'm-- I'm a huge fan. I'm a fan of both of yours, I should start by (LAUGH) saying. But you're so good at asking pointed questions and holding the guests' feet to the fire. So what-- what's your secret?

CHRIS WALLACE:

17:14:45;13

Well, let me just say, first of all, having-- and I had never actually heard the clip, I am so admiring and so jealous of Mary Louise that she got under Mike Pompeo's skin that way. (LAUGHTER) That is-- that is what we live for. You know, the answer is the-- that these officials come in, they are-- they have lots of talking points, they have lots of advisors.

17:15:07;22

They know what their line that they're trying to get out is. And my job is to try to get them off that line and to try to get them to think and to react in real-time. And the key to that is preparation. The key is that you really know your stuff. And there are a couple of-- points I'd make specifically about that.

17:15:28;24

I'm interviewing the Secretary of State. I obviously am not gonna know as much as the Secretary of State about foreign policy, but I know what I'm gonna be asking him. And I only h--

I only have to know as much as he does on those subjects. And the other thing is that-- that public officials, politicians-- administration officials, foreign leaders, have a tendency to say the same thing over and over again.

17:15:53;22

So if you kind of-- and one of the things that I do, I have a great researcher. I give her direction. You know, I wanted this. And I'll often say, "Give me what the pushback is on that subject." And I'll be lookin' at it. And, you know, it's not like we literally roleplay, "All right, when he says this, what do I say?" But I'm always thinking that-- that-- you know h-- he's likely if I ask him or her about this, to give this kind of an answer, then what's the pushback to that? And that--

LINDA FELDMAN:

17:16:20;10

What's your--

CHRIS WALLACE:

17:16:21;10

--once you get them on that, once they have-- you've given them the sense early on in an

interview they can't spin you, they can't just rely on their talking points, you're often able to get them to think and to react in real-time. And that's what you saw there.

LINDA FELDMAN:

17:16:34;05

Sure, exactly. So Fox News and the *New York Times* have both been accused of being slanted in their news coverage. Do you believe there is any truth to these perceptions? So Chris, I'll-- I'll start with you on this. There are programs on your network that are hosted by commentators with strong conservative opinions. How-- how do you feel about that, as-- as a news guy?

CHRIS WALLACE:

17:16:58;13

Well, this-- it's interesting, because, and I don't know whether Maggie gets asked this-- or not, my guess is you don't. But-- I get asked a lot, you know, d-- "What's goin'-- what goes on on primetime and how can you be a fair reporter?" And, you know, one of the things that I wanted to say today is that you-- nobody tends to ask people at the *New York Times*, "Well, how do you

cover your beat when you've got Paul Krugman who is expressing strong left-wing views, or Charles Blow expressing ch-- strong anti-Trump views?"

17:17:30;05

Just like there are people in my primetime who are very opinionated and generally pro-Trump. And the answer is they do what they do, I do what I do, there's a different piece of real estate, whether it's the op-ed page versus the New York t-- versus the front page. And in my case, whether it's the primetime versus what we're doin' all day long in straight news coverage or what I'm doing on-- on *Fox News Sunday*.

LINDA FELDMAN:

17:17:52;17

But there are clashes, right? I mean, Shepard Smith clashed with Hannity, and you yourself-- recently-- told Katie Pavlich, "Get your facts straight." So that--

CHRIS WALLACE:

17:18:03;16

Yeah, that-- that wasn't--

LINDA FELDMAN:

17:18:04;05

--those worlds--

CHRIS WALLACE:

17:18:04;20 --that wasn't my best moment--

LINDA FELDMAN:

17:18:04;24 --those worlds can collide.

CHRIS WALLACE:

17:18:05;24 I-- I-- (LAUGHTER) I don't regret saying it, but I-- the way in which I said it-- I had been up at f-- at 4:15 in the morning two days in a row, so if I'd had a little more sleep I probably woulda been a little more--

LINDA FELDMAN:

17:18:16;01 So maybe it's easier--

CHRIS WALLACE:

17:18:16;24 --decorous about it. But no, I mean-- there are clashes. But really there aren't, in the sense that I-- my marching orders from Fox News and the marching orders of Bret Baier at 6:00 and the marching orders of Bill Hemmer at 3:00 and the marching orders of Ed Henry and Sandra Smith at-- from 9:00 to 12:00 are to tell the news, to tell it straight, not to push an agenda, not to pull punches.

17:18:38;24

I have never, in 16 and a half years at Fox News been-- second-guessed on a question I asked, on a guest that I asked-- that that I-- I invited, and-- and so there-- there really isn't a clash. You know, they do their thing, I do my thing, and I have the full backing of my exec-- the-- my bosses at Fox News.

LINDA FELDMAN:

17:19:00;20

Okay. Maggie, how do you feel about the accusations that the *New York Times* has a liberal bias? Is-- is that a fair criticism?

MAGGIE HABERMAN:

17:19:07;05

I think the editorial page certainly does, and I think that Chris is absolutely right, that the answer is the same. I do think he's right that, he gets that question more often than-- than we do. I don't think that that's-- necessarily fair. I mean, the-- there-- there-- one of-- when you were talking just now, one of the reasons that you have so much credibility is you have always been able to say when you were wrong. And that is

one of the hallmarks of a good journalist.

17:19:27;21

I think it's one of the things that we try to do in the news pages, is-- is make clear when we are wrong and get it right as often as possible. I try to steer clear of the opinion section-- as much as possible. We do get asked about it, because it's-- it's got nothing to do with us.

LINDA FELDMAN:

17:19:43;22

Right, but what do you mean by steer clear? Like--

MAGGIE HABERMAN:

17:19:44;18

What I mean is when I get asked about Krugman or I get asked about--

LINDA FELDMAN:

17:19:47;03

Okay, like, what do you think of--

MAGGIE HABERMAN:

17:19:47;24

--a Charles Blow column.

LINDA FELDMAN:

17:19:47;24

--what someone says?

MAGGIE HABERMAN:

17:19:48;23

Right, h-- did you see this? Can you comment on

this? Sometimes it-- officials in the administration, and this has happened with almost every administration I've-- I've covered, they will conflate the opinion section and the news section. And I try to draw as bright a line as possible.

17:20:07;12

I-- I do think in the era of Twitter it has actually become more challenging for everybody. It's not just because of what people are saying on their own Twitter feeds, and god knows I have-- been accused of perhaps being intemperate at times. But-- it's that it's hard to discern what is opinion versus not, and sometimes people miss the label. And things look the same on Twitter.

LINDA FELDMAN:

17:20:27;12

Sure. So there are times, though, when the *New York Times* does things that make you go, "Hmm." Like-- (LAUGHTER)

MAGGIE HABERMAN:

17:20:33;19

Make who go, "Hmm?"

LINDA FELDMAN:

17:20:35;14

One-- one go, "Hmm." So recently, actually, there-- there was-- it was after the-- the dual shootings, we had the dual massacres, Dayton and then El Paso, the-- the initial headline in the times was, *Trump Urges Unity Vs. Racism*. That he had, when he was making those comments, and there was this huge blowback.

MAGGIE HABERMAN:

17:20:53;00

There was.

LINDA FELDMAN:

17:20:54;24

And then the h-- the new-- and then suddenly there was a new headline on that story that said, *Assailing Hate But Not Guns*. So how do you-- does that suggest any kind of--

MAGGIE HABERMAN:

17:21:08;23

I think it's--

LINDA FELDMAN:

17:21:08;24

--attitude toward Trump in--

MAGGIE HABERMAN:

17:21:10;19

See, I don't think so. I think that it actually, it-- it-- I was one of the people who-- who said,

"Hmm," about that initial headline, and I think a lotta people did. Not because it wasn't literally what he said in his remarks-- at the White House, it was. But it-- it omitted the totality of his day, which had been tweets and all sorts of other statements. And I do think that we have to strive, in this 24 hour news cycle, to give the fullest picture as possible, which is hard when we're-- a print publication. It's obviously less immediate.

LINDA FELDMAN:

17:21:39;18

So by changing a headline that-- was maybe less friendly toward the president, did that--

MAGGIE HABERMAN:

17:21:47;01

I don't think-- I don't s-- I guess I--

17:21:48;14

(LINDA FELDMAN UNINTEL)

MAGGIE HABERMAN:

17:21:48;24

--I don't see it in terms of whether it was friendly or not friendly, I thought one was incomplete and one was a more accurate picture.

LINDA FELDMAN:

17:21:54;08

And what about, sometimes I see in the *Times*,

characterizations that make me pause. For example, describing when the president will go on and on about something, describing that as a rant. Is that-- or do you have to be careful about characterizations in that way--

MAGGIE HABERMAN:

17:22:09;16

I-- I think we all do, and I think we all need to check ourselves. I think there's no question. I also think that-- because the president speaks so frequently and he has so many different-- means of communication, I think it becomes easier to be flip or quick, and I think that's on us to make sure that we are checking ourselves as often as possible--

LINDA FELDMAN:

17:22:26;24

Do-- do you have any comments on the *Times* and--

CHRIS WALLACE:

17:22:29;06

Let me just say, first of all, I am loving this event, when the *New York Times* (LAUGHTER) is getting criticized more for bias than--

LINDA FELDMAN:

17:22:34;24

Well--

CHRIS WALLACE:

17:22:34;24 --Fox News.

17:22:35;11 (LINDA FELDMAN UNINTEL)

CHRIS WALLACE:

17:22:36;24 This is great. Who knew that I'd come to Columbia
Journalism--

LINDA FELDMAN:

17:22:38;03 Okay, all right--

CHRIS WALLACE:

17:22:39;06 --and all of this would come out.

LINDA FELDMAN:

17:22:40;04 --let me roll up my sleeves.

CHRIS WALLACE:

17:22:41;15 Actually-- I do find-- and-- and look, I-- I-- I
love Maggie. I think she's a first-rate reporter.
I-- she knows how many times that I've asked her
to be on our panel.

MAGGIE HABERMAN:

17:22:53;18 That's true.

CHRIS WALLACE:

17:22:54;05 And she keeps saying no, because she has a
contract with CNN.

MAGGIE HABERMAN:

17:22:57;11 Also true.

CHRIS WALLACE:

17:22:58;02 I w-- I hope you'll come to the-- error of your ways at some point on that subject--

MAGGIE HABERMAN:

17:23:01;10 I appreciate that, Chris. Thank you.

CHRIS WALLACE:

17:23:03;15 But-- but I-- I do think that there are-- I-- I notice in news coverage, and it's not just the *Times*, I see it in the *Post*, I see it other places. And look, you can probably find it-- I'm sure you can find it in Fox News straight news coverage as well. I find there are adjectives, and rant is not an adjective, it's a noun, I know that. But like-- (LAUGH) like the--

17:23:22;16 (LINDA FELDMAN UNINTEL)

CHRIS WALLACE:

17:23:23;01 --Trump, I-- I find, like, rambling is often used when talking about--

LINDA FELDMAN:

17:23:25;05 Rambling.

CHRIS WALLACE:

17:23:26;07

--Trump. And I sometimes think, "Do they really need that adjective in there?" Because it's a very pejorative adjective. And, you know, people can make up their own minds. Rambling is very much an opinion of what you think. Somebody else might think it was coherent. That's-- that's an opinion.

17:23:40;08

I-- or rant, I-- we all do it. I guess, one of the reasons, and it's interesting, and I think, you know, that I-- I wanted to bring it up early and how-- and see how you reacted to it, that I'm fascinated at the idea that I would get asked much more at Fox primetime than Maggie, I think, would get asked about the *New York Times* editorial page.

17:23:59;23

And I'm now speaking to the media critics out there, and the reason I think it happens is because they agree with the *New York Times* editorial page or-- op-ed page, so they don't see

that as opinion, they see that as fact and right, and as opposed to Fox News primetime, which they see as very conservative and very right wing.

17:24:21;03

The fact is they're the same thing. One is on one side of the spectrum, one is on the other side of the spectrum. And they all sh-- both should be handled equally. And a reporter, as good a reporter as Maggie is for the *New York Times*, should be asked about it just like I should be asked about it in terms of Fox primetime.

LINDA FELDMAN:

17:24:37;04

All right, so Chris, another one for you, there are a number of ways that bias can sneak into reporting. So it can come in the form of which stories are covered, and what is determined to be a lead. Even omitting a story is a way that a news organization can reveal bias. And there's, of course, there's no way to eliminate all bias. But do you consciously scrutinize your scripts or stories? And this is c-- actually gonna be for both of you, but Chris, you first. Do you-- do

you really look hard at what you're saying to make sure that there's no unintentional bias?

CHRIS WALLACE:

17:25:06;22

Yeah. And do I succeed? I'm sure not. I'm-- you know, I am what I am, I'm a 72 year old white man who's come up through the world in a certain way. And-- I'm-- I'm sure that, you know, there are all kinds of biases. One of the first things I would say about bias, we all have it. I mean, it-- do I have an opinion of who I'd like to see be the Democratic nominee? Absolutely. Do I w-- want that in my reporting? No.

17:25:32;24

I mean, you know, this gets carried to extremes. (MIC NOISE) Len Downie, who was the editor of the wall-- of the *Washington Post* for a number of years literally wouldn't vote on election day, because he felt that that was expressing a bias. My reaction was that was the-- most damn fool thing I'd ever heard of. (LAUGHTER) If you-- if you can't separate your voting for somebody or you think that somehow that makes you pure--

purser that you v-- didn't vote, but that-- is gonna show you don't have any bias? Of course I do.

17:25:58;24

But I think you try, to the degree possible, to take-- to take that out. And-- and really, to me, what it is is that there was a famous-- Jerry Kramer was a lineman for the Green Bay Packers one time, and somebody asked him about Vince Lombardi, who was the coach of the Packers. And they said, "Well, does he discriminate? Does he, you know, treat the stars differently than the offensive linemen?" And he said, "No, he treats us all like dogs." (LAUGHTER) And-- and that's my view, is treat 'em all like dogs.

17:26:31;02

And-- and, (LAUGHTER) you know, I wanna treat-- I wanna treat the-- the-- Republican member of the Trump administration like a dog, and I wanna treat the Democratic candidate-- I w-- and-- and if I feel like I've been just as tough on both, then I've done my job.

LINDA FELDMAN:

17:26:44;03

So let me throw one more out to Maggie, and then we're gonna go to the next segment. So I wanna know if this blurring in the public mind of news and opinion is, in some ways, damaging public trust? Because as you know, public trust in the media has been in decline.

MAGGIE HABERMAN:

17:27:01;02

And public trust has been, in the media-- has been in decline for a very long time, right? I mean, it certainly predates this era, and a lot of it the media brought on itself. Trump is not novel to saying, I mean, fake-- saying, "Fake news," as a president, is novel. But his-- questioning the media is not. He's just thrown accelerant on it.

17:27:19;15

I guess I don't know how much of it-- some of it is, I think, the blurring of-- of opinion analysis and then straight news. I think some of it is we are in this moment in time where the public, and I was thinking about this actually,

about-- after your last question, I feel like there are a lot of readers who don't actually understand what reporters are supposed to do--

LINDA FELDMAN:

17:27:37;10

Exactly.

MAGGIE HABERMAN:

17:27:38;24

--as opposed to-- what opinion columnists do, or what-- people who are supposed to have voice do. We are not supposed to give you the reality you want, we are giving you the reality as it is, hopefully. Where you can see that playing out a lot is on Twitter, where a lot of these-- fights and-- and uproars about *New York Times* headlines or *New York Times* stories play out, including the one you mentioned. Although in that case, the *Unity v. Race* one, I-- I thought it was the right decision to change the headline.

17:28:07;15

But a lot of it is that people are just upset about the version of events that they're reading. And-- sometimes these things are just fact sets. And they're gonna-- I think that people,

particularly readers on-- on the political left, expect that the *New York Times* is somehow supposed to be dictating how people should feel about events. And therefore they think we are not doing that enough, because they're not getting the desired result that they want.

17:28:34;02

To your question of bias, you know, I would argue there's two-- there's two genres of coverage that I think reflect on that. So one is-- a genre of coverage of Donald Trump that I find fairly useless, and I've talked about this publicly before, which is-- the "Trump fumes" variety. Like, every story describing him as fuming over something. And sometimes he is and sometimes he isn't. And he tends to yell, and then it kinda moves on quickly, like a lot of other people who can blow a fuse.

17:29:02;24

And I think that the Mike Bloomberg presidential candidacy has exposed-- I would say cosmopolitan bias in the media. He gets an enormous amount of

coverage for somebody who has yet to win a delegate-- and yet to actually have any votes cast for him. So I think the way we think about bias-- sometimes should be a little different.

LINDA FELDMAN:

17:29:22;14

Sure, okay. Well, let's move on to-- a new topic, fake news in the media. (LAUGH) According to Pew Research, news coverage of President Trump's first 60 days delivered a greater share of negative assessments than coverage of any previous presidents, going back to Bill Clinton. Now, let's watch a short video of President Trump talking about the media.

DONALD TRUMP (RECORDING):

17:29:49;24

The media has lost so much credibility in this country. Our media has become the laughing stock of the world. When you look at what they did to Justice Kavanaugh and so many other things last week, I think this is one of the worst weeks in the history of the fake news media. You have been wrong on so many things. And this one will be, I wouldn't say it will top the list because I think

you can't do worse than some of the stories you missed over the last week or two. But the media of-- of our country is laughed at all over the world now. You're a joke. (LAUGHTER)

LINDA FELDMAN:

17:30:24;18

The *Washington Post* has an-- (THROAT CLEAR) excuse me, an ongoing database of the false or misleading claims made by President Trump since assuming office. As of January 19th, their numbers say that in 1,095 days, President Trump has made 16,241 false or misleading statements. Maggie, I quoted something you tweeted about Mr. Trump in a story I wrote in June of 2018.

17:30:52;17

You wrote, and I don't usually quote other reporters, but this was such a great quote, you wrote, "The reality is that what he does can be hard to label, because as anyone who has worked for him will tell you in candor, he often thinks whatever he says is what's real." I thought that was an interesting take. Do you think that the media are doing a good job of holding him to

account? Or are they-- are they being too tough on him?

MAGGIE HABERMAN:

17:31:19;20

That's a difficult question to answer. I-- I think that-- I think that there is too much repetitive focus on the same type of thing with him. I-- my issue with the-- the-- the lie counters is that w-- how one person is qualifying a lie is not the same as how somebody else is qualifying it. So Daniel Dale at CNN will have a different count, say, than-- than Glenn Kessler at the *Washington Post*.

17:31:42;13

I think that the-- I think that the circumstances under which the media is working in-- in-- during an administration where the president repeatedly says we're writing things that it's not just that they're not true, but fake-- and has said any number of things to try to accelerate public distrust of the media, I think that creates a unique circumstance.

LINDA FELDMAN:

17:32:05;11 I'm sorry, a what circumstance--

MAGGIE HABERMAN:

17:32:06;03 That creates a unique circumstance.

LINDA FELDMAN:

17:32:07;17 Unique.

MAGGIE HABERMAN:

17:32:07;24 I think in general, I actually think the media is doing a pretty good job. I-- I think that I-- and I've said this before, I wish there was good coverage all around and over the last three years of what's happening at the agencies, and what's actually happening inside the administration, as opposed to just the Mueller investigation or just extensive focus on EPA. But in general, I think the-- the media is-- is doing better than its reputation.

LINDA FELDMAN:

17:32:34;04 Uh-huh (AFFIRM). And Chris, (THROAT CLEAR) you can't fact check a live speech in real-time, and often, not all falsehoods in live interviews are addressed in real-time. Do you worry about the

amount of false claims being made by political leaders? And what can be done differently?

CHRIS WALLACE:

17:32:50;06 Well, yeah, sure, sure I do. I'm gonna answer a different question, (LAUGHTER) excuse me.

LINDA FELDMAN:

17:32:55;22 Okay, well.

CHRIS WALLACE:

17:32:56;24 Well-- because-- what I wanna say is that I think that d-- d-- Donald Trump, and I was just struck by watching-- that, when he was calling out the press to the press's face, as they sat there silently in the Oval Office-- and I think back particularly to February of-- of 2017 when he sent the infamous tweet about, you know, "The lying *New York Times*, *Washington Post*, CBS, CNN, ABC is not my enemy, it's the American of the American people."

17:33:25;02 Donald Trump is engaged and has been engaged in the most concerted attempt to delegitimize our media in-- the media in our history. And I-- I

said that in a speech, and somebody wrote me and said, "Well, wait a minute, what about John Adams and the Sedition Act?" And I said, (LAUGHTER) "Well, okay." You know, let me just say in the last 200 years that it's the most concerted attempt to-- delegitimize the media.

17:33:52;10

And look, there's-- there's-- a very clear pattern to what he's doing, and that is by building up, and there's no question, as Maggie's quite right, there has been a lot of distrust about the media for a long period of time. You know, we're usually, when they're ranking-- a p-- approval of various groups, somewhere around use car salesmen. But-- but he, obviously, has added to that-- as Maggie put it, put an accelerant on that-- and-- and has a bully pulpit and 100 million people who listen to his various social media platforms.

17:34:26;08

What concerns me, and-- and this is the main point I would-- I wanna make tonight, is we can't

control the president's behavior. We shouldn't try to control the president's behavior. What we can do is control our (MIC NOISE) behavior. And I worry that-- that the president's attacks-- have-- have given too many straight news reporters, not talking about the opinion page or primetime-- an excuse or-- or license to cross the line themselves and to become-- players on the field.

17:35:01;09

And I think that is a huge mistake. It's not our role. We're not-- we're-- our role is to be observers, umpires-- fact checkers-- investigators. It's not to be advocates. It's not to be opponents. There was-- an event today, I didn't see it but I've been reading about it, that there was a news conference in India. And-- Jim Acosta of CNN--

LINDA FELDMAN:

17:35:26;01

Went after--

CHRIS WALLACE:

17:35:26;03

--asked a question of the president, and the president proceeded to attack CNN. And Acosta

then said, "Our record at telling the truth is a lot better than yours, Mr. President." I was horrified by that. I covered the Reagan White House for six years with Sam Donaldson and Lesley Stahl, none of us receding personalities.

17:35:46;04

None of us would have ever dreamt of saying that to a president of the United States, and Acosta shouldn't have. It is-- it's not our job to get in fights with presidents. It's not our job to one-up presidents. It's our job to report on presidents. And-- and-- to the degree-- and, you know, I'm not saying it's all his fault and it's therefore we're-- we're-- it's-- that's our excuse. But to the degree that we have responded to his attacks on us with attacks or advocacy in kind is a huge mistake, and I think adds to people questioning the credibility of the media.

MAGGIE HABERMAN:

17:36:21;14

Yeah, yeah. I agree with Chris.

LINDA FELDMAN:

17:36:23;11

In-- yeah, in some ways--

CHRIS WALLACE:

17:36:24;02 Well, I'm glad-- now I know the sound of one hand clapping-- (LAUGHTER)

MAGGIE HABERMAN:

17:36:25;22 And one person does-- two hands (UNINTEL).

LINDA FELDMAN:

17:36:31;04 No, and I-- I actually, I have to say that when I talk to young people, I say, you know, "Watch the way Chris Wallace interviews people, not Jim Acosta." I'm just gonna-- I think you're the-- you're the model.

MAGGIE HABERMAN:

17:36:41;06 Thank you.

LINDA FELDMAN:

17:36:42;20 In some ways, President Trump acts as his own press secretary and has a love/hate relationship with the press. You've both been called out directly by the president on stories, both in-- in positive and negative ways. Sometimes he says nice things about you guys, sometimes he says terrible things. And we have some of the negative tweets you've both received--

CHRIS WALLACE:

17:37:02;11 Oh really, we're gonna have to--

MAGGIE HABERMAN:

17:37:02;23 Oh great--

LINDA FELDMAN:

17:37:03;01 --and we'll put them up on the screen--

MAGGIE HABERMAN:

17:37:05;02 Wonderful.

LINDA FELDMAN:

17:37:11;24 So. Anyway, as-- as those are going up--

CHRIS WALLACE:

17:37:17;06 Can I say one thing about the first one? So he c-
- he called me nasty and obnoxious, and about two
hours later, my 44 year old son called me up and
he said, "Dad, I just want you to no, nasty? No.
Obnoxious? Well, (LAUGHTER) maybe."

LINDA FELDMAN:

17:37:32;20 Well, and I remember--

MAGGIE HABERMAN:

17:37:32;24 That's a good fact check. That's great--

LINDA FELDMAN:

17:37:33;24 --the other day--

CHRIS WALLACE:

17:37:34;14 Yeah.

LINDA FELDMAN:

17:37:34;15 --(UNINTEL) he said nice things about you.

CHRIS WALLACE:

17:37:36;08 Pardon?

LINDA FELDMAN:

17:37:36;23 Did you--

CHRIS WALLACE:

17:37:37;02 The president.

LINDA FELDMAN:

17:37:37;20 Yeah.

CHRIS WALLACE:

17:37:37;24 Yes, I know. I was shocked.

LINDA FELDMAN:

17:37:38;24 So you-- yes. (LAUGH) Okay. And I've heard him say nice things about Maggie too. So I-- I get responses from-- from the public to moderate breakfasts that I moderate, usually complimentary, sometimes nasty. So for both of you, how does it feel to have the president of the United States attacking you publicly by name?

Is-- I mean, is it intimidating? Does it influence you in any way on how you report on him? Maggie--

MAGGIE HABERMAN:

17:38:02;10 No, it can't. But I mean, but it is designed to--

LINDA FELDMAN:

17:38:04;10 Yeah, but you're--

MAGGIE HABERMAN:

17:38:04;20 --get a rise out of you.

LINDA FELDMAN:

17:38:05;03 --but you're human. You're a human being--

MAGGIE HABERMAN:

17:38:06;15 Sure, it-- it is designed to get a rise, and I-- I think that I would be lying if I didn't have a moment of, "Ooh," when I'm looking at the-- at the phone. I actually forgot about that-- that one about-- (LAUGH) Michael Cohen, which made its way into the Mueller's rep-- the Mueller Report. But-- as one of the examples of obstruction of that he was considering.

17:38:23;13 That one was-- I only remember when it was

because it was the morning of my daughter's birthday-- which was April 21st of 2018. And since you asked a question, and we're not supposed to be people, but this is a people question, it was a week before my mother-in-law died. And-- I woke up and I reached for my phone, and there was a text from my colleague, Mike Schmidt, that said, "Don't worry about the tweet." And I'm like-- (LAUGHTER)

LINDA FELDMAN:

17:38:47;21

Uh oh, what tweet?

MAGGIE HABERMAN:

17:38:48;17

--"What?" And so I-- went-- I hadn't seen the tweet. And I went and looked at it, and it was-- you know, it's-- I would've preferred not spending the morning of my daughter's birthday dealing with how the paper was responding-- to it, but it is what it is. It-- it is designed to provoke.

17:39:05;24

It is designed to set a tone, because the way the president oper-- this president operates is he

tries to set the-- the terms of engagement on-- on almost every conversation. And you can't meet him back that way, but I have. And I regret it every time I have. I-- there have been times I've tweeted back at him.

17:39:23;03

I've regretted it the second I do, as I do almost every tweet that I have sent that has become a problem. Any-- anything-- I agree with Chris, it is not our job-- we're not-- this isn't a jousting match and we're not political opponents--

LINDA FELDMAN:

17:39:36;20

So have you--

MAGGIE HABERMAN:

17:39:36;24

--but-- but this is unusual, and I wish that we could all do a better job of explaining to the public why having a president personally attacking people is-- actually is-- a departure from the norm.

LINDA FELDMAN:

17:39:48;17

Right, right. I mean, have an-- have either of

you received any personal threats as a result of the president's attacks?

CHRIS WALLACE:

17:39:55;13 Only from my son. (LAUGHTER) No, I haven't--

LINDA FELDMAN:

17:39:58;05 So--

CHRIS WALLACE:

17:39:58;11 --I haven't received-- no. But, you know, it-- I mean, Maggie's exactly right. I-- I-- when I do the show, I have to get up at 5:15 on Sundays. I like to take a nap after I have-- you know, lunch. And you know, you wake up and you're sort of, "Well, I think I'll catch up." And I've gotten one of the, "Don't pay attention to the tweet."

17:40:16;11 And I-- you know, I don't-- I-- look, I've been in this business 50 years. I have been-- and-- and I'm sure this is true of Maggie, what, for, you know, from city hall to the state house to the Congress to the White House to world leaders, you know, you work your way up the-- I've been

insulted by all of them. I've been attacked by all of them.

17:40:36;15

And you know, to get a tweet that says-- "Nasty and obnoxious Chris Wallace"-- it doesn't make you feel good, no. I mean, you-- you just assume that-- that it wasn't there-- it-- it-- it kinda hurts your feelings. On the other hand, do I take it seriously? No. And-- one of the other ones which you have there, and this is one where actually-- see, I'm different than you, because I'm meaner, because I responded to one and I'm really happy with my response, (LAUGHTER) which is one of his favorite things he likes to say is, "The great Mike Wallace, and Chris Wallace will never be Mike Wallace," to which I've said, "One of us has daddy issues and it's not me."

LINDA FELDMAN:

17:41:11;10

Oh right, (LAUGHTER) that was a very good response, (UNINTEL).

CHRIS WALLACE:

17:41:13;17

It was fine. I like that response.

LINDA FELDMAN:

17:41:15;19

That was good. That was good. All right, so speaking of social media, now we're gonna talk about the impact of social media, and in particular, Twitter, on how the press covers President Trump and politics. According to the Pew Research Center, only 22% of the adult US population is on Twitter, which still translates to approximately 11.2 million adults.

17:41:39;14

And yet there's this media obsession with chasing the president's tweets. Some-- some worry that other issues important to Americans are getting lost 'cause of it. So let's take a listen to what technology journalist Kara Swisher said recently about the impact of social media.

KARA SWISHER (RECORDING):

17:41:58;21

Balkanization has been around forever, and-- and early, you know, you look at George Washington, and all those days, that was-- that was very partisan crowds on every-- every bit of media. The issue is when you get it into the social

media space, it becomes three things. It becomes weaponized, it becomes amplified, and it becomes anonymous. And then you can repeat lies and then they take a virality and create engagement that leads to enragement. And then it-- you know-- you know, do it again. Lather, rinse, repeat. And that's what goes on.

LINDA FELDMAN:

17:42:26;24

So Maggie, you have a very large presence on Twitter, and I'd like you to respond to what Kara said, because I think-- I think maybe you can relate. I remember-- you wrote a piece in 2018 saying that you were taking a break from Twitter.

MAGGIE HABERMAN:

17:42:38;24

I wish I hadn't ever written (LAUGH) the piece.

LINDA FELDMAN:

17:42:40;15

That's the problem with the internet, it--

MAGGIE HABERMAN:

17:42:41;24

It is, it stays--

LINDA FELDMAN:

17:42:42;13

--it just-- it just never--

MAGGIE HABERMAN:

17:42:43;09 --lasts forever.

LINDA FELDMAN:

17:42:43;24 --goes away.

MAGGIE HABERMAN:

17:42:44;02 It's very unfortunate.

LINDA FELDMAN:

17:42:44;16 So you wrote that you were gonna take a break because it had become so toxic and partisan, but you're obviously still on Twitter. So did you change your approach? I mean, did that--

MAGGIE HABERMAN:

17:42:54;00 So a couple of things--

LINDA FELDMAN:

17:42:54;15 --what happened there?

MAGGIE HABERMAN:

17:42:55;13 It wasn't that it was partisan, it was actually that it had become, I think my line in that piece was-- the anger video game. I feel like people get on Twitter so that they can get in these kinds of fights that Kara's talking about, and so that they can make something take off, and people

s-- it's like some sheen is left, and you don't really remember what somebody originally said in the first place.

17:43:12;24

I was off it for a while. And then I discovered that when it's the main way that the person you cover speaks to people, it's really hard to not be on it. And then once you're on it, then you are tweeting your own work and tweeting reporting. I still find it to be very useful for tweeting out reporting either that got-- you know, cut from a story or, you know, to lay down a marker on breaking news, which I've done a bunch of times. That has been very valuable. You know, as long as you use it that way and you are not getting into back and forths with people, which-- are unwise, no matter how often I do it-- is-- I think that's where the danger comes.

17:43:57;09

And I do think the danger comes, in terms of Chris's point about sort of people responding to the president, and Chris's excellent tweet

clapback about-- about daddy issues aside-- I-- I think the problem with Twitter and the fact that the president exists on Twitter so frequently, the pr-- it's-- we-- we I think didn't understand in the campaign, and to some extent still don't, how much the Twitter feed made people feel like they had a direct connection to the president.

17:44:19;04

And so that has-- why it's been so valuable for him. But because, as I said earlier, everything on Twitter looks flat and the same-- a tweet from the president of the United States looks exactly the same as a tweet from-- from me or you or Chris or whomever. And that's where it's not good to get into these back and forths. I don't think the speed at which Twitter moves is healthy. I think Kara's summation of the anonymity it provides people to say all kinds of things is-- is among my main problems with it.

17:44:48;08

It is still clearly going to it's a driver of news and of news cycles in this presidential

campaign, and that-- that-- 2016 was the first one where that was really the case. It was sort of that way in 2012, but not to the extent it became or it is now. But-- but there are enormous problems with it.

LINDA FELDMAN:

17:45:04;18 Uh-huh (AFFIRM). Yeah, and Chris.

CHRIS WALLACE:

17:45:05;24 You're gonna talk about my Twitter presence--

LINDA FELDMAN:

17:45:07;22 Well, you know, I mean, (LAUGH) I wanna ask you about Twitter, because I don't think you have an account, right?

CHRIS WALLACE:

17:45:11;24 That's right.

LINDA FELDMAN:

17:45:12;09 So how did you clapback at the president? If you--
- just through--

CHRIS WALLACE:

17:45:15;18 I-- I--

LINDA FELDMAN:

17:45:15;24 --through *Fox News Sunday*, or--

CHRIS WALLACE:

17:45:17;11 No, I was at an event and--

LINDA FELDMAN:

17:45:19;05 Oh, so you just verbally--

CHRIS WALLACE:

17:45:20;00 --I-- I--

LINDA FELDMAN:

17:45:20;05 --the old-fashioned way--

CHRIS WALLACE:

17:45:20;23 --yes, I used my words--

LINDA FELDMAN:

17:45:21;08 --you used your mouth--

CHRIS WALLACE:

17:45:21;22 --and (LAUGHTER) I said them.

LINDA FELDMAN:

17:45:22;24 So you--

CHRIS WALLACE:

17:45:24;22 So-- so first of all, I'm an old guy, and I--
this Twitter thing, I don't know. I-- I guess
it's gonna-- I guess it's gonna catch on, but I--
but--

LINDA FELDMAN:

17:45:31;20 Trump is older than you--

CHRIS WALLACE:

17:45:32;03 --and-- and secondly, there are certainly times when I'm seated at-- a desk and we're, you know, we're watching the-- a primary or we were watching coverage of the impeachment trial, and Brit Hume, who's an older guy, or Bret Baier, they're sitting there and they're following Twitter, and they know-- they find out things I don't know. But the vast majority of the time, the-- I mean, like, 98% of the time, what-- I-- I feel like the crap that they're reading and the-- and the stuff they're responding to I'm so happy not to have in my head.

LINDA FELDMAN:

17:46:01;10 So you're not-- you're not a lurker? You don't--

CHRIS WALLACE:

17:46:03;24 No.

LINDA FELDMAN:

17:46:04;03 You don't have an (LAUGHTER) account-- you don't-

-

CHRIS WALLACE:

17:46:04;24 I'm not-- I'm not--

LINDA FELDMAN:

17:46:05;12 --you don't read Twitter?

CHRIS WALLACE:

17:46:06;01 No.

LINDA FELDMAN:

17:46:07;06 But you have to follow the president's tweets. Or
do you not even--

CHRIS WALLACE:

17:46:08;18 Yeah, but you-- they come out other places--

LINDA FELDMAN:

17:46:10;15 So you just--

CHRIS WALLACE:

17:46:10;24 You know, you can go to Google and you can hear--
see the president's tweets.

LINDA FELDMAN:

17:46:14;00 So you--

CHRIS WALLACE:

17:46:14;13 No, I-- I-- I don't. And I will say one other
thing just about social media. So in 2016, I was
asked to be the moderator of a presidential-- a

general election presidential debate. And I did the third debate between Clinton and Trump. And first of all, it was an enormously stressful thing.

17:46:32;17

I've done almost everything in the business, but I had never done that. And I-- there were-- more than anything I've ever done, there were moments when I thought, "I don't know if increase an handle this." And the other thing that happened is it just unleashed a storm-- I guess on Twitter, although I don't get it, but on social media about a Fox News person doing a debate, and me, and all this stuff. And I decided the only way I was gonna get through, because I was-- unfortunately, although I was asked in early September, I was doing the last debate, which was in mid-October, so there were six weeks, is I went radio silent.

17:47:06;19

I-- I stayed off any social media of any sort and didn't pay attention. And it was the best-- it

was really delightful. (LAUGHTER) And, you know, if it's important enough, it seeps through into the old-- old guy news. I find-- I find out about it--

LINDA FELDMAN:

17:47:22;01 Yeah. So-- so can journalists fight the algorithms on social media that are amplifying fake news and/or propaganda?

CHRIS WALLACE:

17:47:29;12 You better ask her that, I-- we--

MAGGIE HABERMAN:

17:47:31;06 I was gonna say--

CHRIS WALLACE:

17:47:31;05 --you lost me at algorithm.

MAGGIE HABERMAN:

17:47:31;23 --I (LAUGHTER) was gonna say, I-- I feel like-- I feel like I'm not gonna get a partner here on this answer. Look, it's hard, right? I mean, I think the only way to fight it is to follow, and this is what I tell journalism students, is just f-- follow verified accounts, but not just any random verified account. Follow the-- the-- the

account--

LINDA FELDMAN:

17:47:46;00

Right, the ones that have the blue checkmark.

MAGGIE HABERMAN:

17:47:48;17

And-- and even narrower, follow the account of, you know, CBS or Fox or-- NBC or CNN or the *New York Times*, but follow the accounts that-- that belong to major outlets. And then you can follow a couplea people whose reporting you trust. But otherwise, it-- it is what Chris says. It really is just noise. And it fills your head, and it-- it's not-- it's not real.

17:48:11;03

It's-- it's a facsimile of actual life. And so if you-- if-- it's-- it is still, I think, for a lot of people it has be-- replaced the AP Wire. I am certainly one of them. But-- and I was in-- a religious AP Wire user back in-- at the *New York Post* 1,000 years ago. But-- but it is-- it is, generally speaking, it is a lotta clutter.

LINDA FELDMAN:

17:48:33;24

Yeah. And what about the responsibility of

citizens-- you know, to kind of look at what's in the-- in these tweets and discern what's-- do they-- do citizens need to do fact checking? Because all this-- all this junk--

MAGGIE HABERMAN:

17:48:48;06 Citizens need--

LINDA FELDMAN:

17:48:48;24 --(UNINTEL) out.

MAGGIE HABERMAN:

17:48:49;01 --to be more responsible news consumers. And I've been having this conversation actually a lot recently. I was on a panel in Nevada-- with-- Jon Ralston, who is a journalist out there, very well-known-- and very respected. And he has an independent nonprofit organization now-- that is thriving and doing great journalism.

17:49:06;12 And one of the questions that came up the other day from-- an attendee was, you know, what can newsrooms be doing to get more people engaged and reading and so forth? And at the end of the day, the answer is people have to wanna-- (LAUGH)

wanna read. We have done alternate story forms and we've done all kinds of things. But at the end of the day, people have to it's-- improve their own news literacy-- because there is such a proliferation of partisan websites-- and on the left and the right. People get to sort of choose your own adventure with news now, and if you wanna actually know that you're getting something that's real and that's quality, that's on you to find it.

* * *TRANSCRIBER'S NOTE: WALLACE'S MIC GOES ON AND OFF IN THIS SECTION.* *

CHRIS WALLACE:

17:49:42;24 And let-- can-- let me pick up on that. Because not just social media, but old fashioned--

MAGGIE HABERMAN:

17:49:47;06 Absolutely.

CHRIS WALLACE:

17:49:47;15 --news media too, I-- I say to people, every day consume, whether you're watching it, whether you're reading it, whether you're listening to it, some news source that you-- you disagree with. Something that challenges your views--

MAGGIE HABERMAN:

17:50:01;22 Yes, definitely.

CHRIS WALLACE:

17:50:02;12 I mean, they-- there have been studies that show, even in an op edge-- op-ed page of a newspaper, that people-- if you're a liberal, you overwhelmingly read the liberal columnists and you ignore the conservative columnists. I go, you know, if you're-- if you-- you know, love the front page of the *New York Times*, read the editorial page of the *Wall Street Journal*. If you love Fox News, watch an evening newscast.

17:50:25;14 I-- you know, I-- I almost feel like it's like triangulation, that somewhere in there if you're-- if you're seeing something that you-- you agree with and something that challenges your views, or maybe you disagree with, that you're able to come up with your own version of reality, and it isn't just that you're surfing in the wake of somebody that you agree with.

* * *TRANSCRIBER'S NOTE: END OF MIC PROBLEMS.* * *

LINDA FELDMAN:

17:50:43;19

Right, exactly. No, I agree. Okay, so our final section's gonna be short, maybe eight or ten minutes, and then we're-- and then we're gonna get to questions, so everybody think of some questions and I'll-- we'll have you start lining up at the end of this next section.

17:50:59;24

So we're gonna talk about the bottom line and how TV ratings and online clicks affect what news the public sees. People are drawn to sources of information, as-- as you said, that confirm their preexisting point of view. Are your organizations, whether it be Fox News channel or the *New York Times* and CNN, are they targeting their audiences just as the president is? Would they be covering other news that is pertinent to a broader audience or more important to the public's lives if it weren't for ratings and revenue? So we just--

CHRIS WALLACE:

17:51:33;21

Well, I-- I mean, to me, one of the classic

examples of this was 2016. And it actually had nothing to do with ideology, it totally did have to do with audience though. And that was the over-coverage of Donald Trump during the 2016 campaign. (THROAT CLEAR) And-- and-- and Jeff Zucker at CNN, which is not a particularly pro-Trump network, has apologized for it.

17:51:52;24

But they were, I think, one of the-- one of the worst-- purveyors of this, which is that every Trump rally, they would-- not only would they cover it live, but they would-- you know, they would have the empty podium ahead of time, "Trump rally coming soon." So-- and the whole point of that was, and it was true in 2016, that Trump was such a phenomenon that if your network wasn't covering, I'm talking about cable news, wasn't covering the Trump rally, people would go to the other network that was covering the Trump rally.

17:52:23;11

And, you know, it was-- it-- that was-- had nothing to do with ideology, it had to do with

eyeballs. People wanted the eyeballs, so you covered Donald Trump. Was that fair to the other candidates? No. Was it responsible? Not especially. But-- you know, it's the news business. And-- and that's what people wanted to see.

LINDA FELDMAN:

17:52:41;24

So-- so Maggie, is President Trump good for the news business as a business? In other words, are more people watching or reading because of him? And if so, does the extra revenue lead to even more coverage of the president?

MAGGIE HABERMAN:

17:52:54;21

It's-- it's an excellent question. Look, I mean, the president often says, you know, Trump is good-- he says-- describing himself in the third person, that Trump is good for business. And he's right, that Trump is good for business. I mean, our subscriptions are up massively. I attribute some of that to just the-- the quality of the journalism.

17:53:08;16

But the-- the subject matter is clearly a big piece of it. Is it-- a, you know, self-fueling cycle? To some extent, right? I mean, I-- I think that it remains to be seen how we and how networks are going to cover the coming campaign, when there is a Democratic nominee, whenever that may be.

17:53:26;24

I do think there are a lot of lessons from 2016, and one is certainly that the constant broadcasting of the rallies-- ev-- if you just take away the actual content of what he was saying, which was often very controversial, and not necessarily helpful to him, frankly, with-- a lot of voters. But just the buildup of them, to Chris's point, that, you know, he'll be on TV soon, and then he's going away, and then we're gonna dissect what he-- what he did.

17:53:50;01

It's different now because he's the president. So I don't quite know how to balance those equities of you are talking about an incumbent president,

and as much as a lot of people do not wanna acknowledge that, we are going to cover the president. This is-- this is who he is.

17:54:06;19

I don't know how to balance the equities of that, and s-- and a president who, at least in my experience, is the first n-- maybe-- maybe ever in-- in the modern media age, who is so focused on keeping himself in the news. I don't know what that's gonna look like for the next eight months.

LINDA FELDMAN:

17:54:22;20

Yeah. So I wanna talk briefly about local news, because local news outlets are in crisis. Many local papers have shut down because of digital media. The Nieman Lab at Harvard put out a sobering statistic, so take a look at this. The number of newspaper journalists in America has shrunk to fewer than 20,000, down from just about 57,000-- in 1990 when the country had 77 million fewer people. This has to hurt both of you to your core. And both of you have journalism in your blood-- as we, you know, we already have

talked about Chris and his famous father, Mike Wallace, from *60 Minutes*, and-- and Maggie is the daughter of Clyde Haberman, who's had-- a storied career at the *New York Times*. So Chris, you first. How-- how do you see the crisis in local news affecting the role of the media overall, and its function in keeping our democracy healthy?

CHRIS WALLACE:

17:55:16;24

Well, look, this is where people live. My first job in journalism was-- at the *Boston Globe* covering city hall. And-- and I loved it, and I-- and-- and, you know, I learned so much there. But this was-- in the end, yes, people enjoy the tr-- the Trump show. But it doesn't generally-- affect-- I mean, obviously in some macro ways it does, it doesn't affect a lot of what goes on in their daily life.

17:55:41;15

So to have-- you know, an-- an attrition, an atrophy-- a dis-- a disintegration of lo-- of aggressive, investigative local news coverage of-- of-- of the cities and the government and big

industries in-- in a city, and environmental policy in a city, I mean, that's what really tends to affect your daily life, far more than what's going on and who's up and who's down in Washington.

17:56:07;08

So-- it's-- it's terribly depressing. And it, you know, let me just say, nothin' good gets done-- when people aren't watching. You know, so when people aren't watching-- there's a much greater-- likelihood of wrongdoing or corruption or self-dealing. So it's bad.

LINDA FELDMAN:

17:56:26;22

So-- so Maggie, are-- do-- is there a role for reporters from national outlets in keeping local papers afloat? Is there-- and do citizens bear any responsibility here?

MAGGIE HABERMAN:

17:56:40;24

I mean, I think that with the advent of the internet, you have seen people not wanna have to pay for their news. And so I think we're having to balance those concerns. I do think that there

are models that have works-- worked, the *Texas Tribune*-- is one example, right, of-- of a nontraditional-- news outlet.

17:56:56;15

There have been upstart-- startups that have worked very well, ProPublica is one. I do think national outlets that have-- particularly those that have thrived in this era, do have an obligation to try to help-- local outlets, to the extent they can, it might not be feasible, either in partnerships or in content shares or possibly distribution, if there's a way, right, to-- or-- or special sections. Or there-- there are a number of different-- ways to go about it. The way you don't go about it I think is hedge funds buying local news-- which has tended to disintegrate local news.

17:57:30;21

And if anyone needs to look at the importance of-- of holding the powerful accountable, and that it's-- it's not just major national outlets doing it, look at Jeffrey Epstein. I mean, that was

local reporting-- you know, to-- a terrific, intense degree. And when I look at, you know, what happened with McClatchy recently-- filing for bankruptcy, it is heartbreaking.

LINDA FELDMAN:

17:57:51;24

Yeah. So I think we are now ready for questions. But we need the microphones, I think, to be one there, and one there. So maybe if somebody could-- and anybody with any questions, please line up. If you'd like to ask our distinguished guests a question, start lining up, and we'll take as many questions as we can. And I would ask that you keep your questions brief, and please, no multipart questions. And our guests will also help us out by being brief, and try to get to as many of you as possible. Let's see, I think you were here first, so why don't you go for it?

CHRIS WALLACE:

17:58:37;13

Let me just say, there's one guy there and there are five there--

LINDA FELDMAN:

17:58:39;08

Well, but you--

CHRIS WALLACE:

17:58:39;14 --so you can-- (LAUGHTER) you should go over there. You'll get your question.

LINDA FELDMAN:

17:58:43;24 So there we go. There you go--

MAGGIE HABERMAN:

17:58:46;15 Nicely done.

CHRIS WALLACE:

17:58:46;13 Yeah, I thought that was well-done. That's what I would've done.

LINDA FELDMAN:

17:58:49;09 Yes. Good job, thank you. Yeah, go ahead.

QUESTION:

17:58:53;14 I was just wondering--

MAGGIE HABERMAN:

17:58:53;24 It's not only.

LINDA FELDMAN:

17:58:56;11 Oops.

QUESTION:

17:59:01;24 Okay, thank you. When the president gives a major address like the State of the Union, and-- or other major speeches, do you think it might be a

good idea to put him on tape delay on some TV stations? Because often the next day you'll see in the *Washington Post* or the *Times* the fact checkers. And by then I think it's too late.

CHRIS WALLACE:

17:59:24;10 So what are you suggesting--

QUESTION:

17:59:25;02 So-- so I'm saying, let's say he's speaking at 9:00, put him on at 10:00 and have somebody fact checking that in the-- in the hour. Or is it--

MAGGIE HABERMAN:

17:59:34;11 That feels like opinion seeping into news
(UNINTEL)--

CHRIS WALLACE:

17:59:36;18 I think CNN should do it, very much so.
(LAUGHTER) I think it would be very good over there. We'll carry it at 9:00, they'll carry it at 10:00, the annotated-- version. No, I think it's a terrible idea.

QUESTION:

17:59:46;06 All right.

LINDA FELDMAN:

17:59:48;08 Okay. All right--

CHRIS WALLACE:

17:59:49;02 I mean, let me just say, look, he's the president. And, you know--

MAGGIE HABERMAN:

17:59:52;04 Exactly.

CHRIS WALLACE:

17:59:53;19 --you-- you-- you don't-- maybe you don't like him. There are a lot of-- there are millions of people, I keep saying this, there are millions of people who do like this president. And, you know, we're not supposed to pick sides, 'cause guess what? There's gonna be another president someday, and maybe you'll hate that pres-- or th-- or you'll like that president and somebody else will hate him. You got-- you cover it straight. There's plenty of time to do fact checking afterwards. And you-- I mean, you find out in the end what he said that was right and what he said that was just not right, you know, I mean, not factual.

LINDA FELDMAN:

18:00:23;11 All right. All right. All right, go ahead.

QUESTION:

18:00:25;22 Hello. First, thanks for having a very interesting conversation today. And-- my question-- my question today is m-- has to do with, like, the future of journalism. So, you know, in terms of newspapers-- readership is going down. Literacy rates are down. So there-- there's a problem there.

18:00:43;24 And then in terms of broadcasting, like, all the major networks are competing with new platforms, like-- YouTube or podcasts, and-- and other kind of newer outlets. So where do you see-- a viable path for journalism to grow in the future-- with all this competition, like-- coming into the space?

MAGGIE HABERMAN:

18:01:04;07 Boy, smarter people than I am have failed to answer the question of what journalism is gonna look like-- two years out-- let alone long-term.

I think that you are gonna continue to see a proliferation of different kinds of platforms-- until people arrive at a model that actually provides some profit or sustainability, or that advertisers wanna get behind.

18:01:25;01

Podcasts seem to actually be one of them, but-- I don't know how sustainable that is. I go back to something I said before, and I know I'm gonna sound a bit like a broken record, but readership is down. That is on-- on readers. They-- they have to be more interested and be willing to pay for their news. And a lot of readers, when so much content, even if it's of lesser quality, is free on the internet, just don't want to.

18:01:51;09

So my hope is that schools will start to do more-- at the grade school level in terms of news literacy-- and that people can get, who are not just interested in journalism, will get more interested in the concept of journalism. But I-- I-- I couldn't begin to tell you what it's gonna

look like. Do you have a smarter answer than I have?

CHRIS WALLACE:

18:02:06;24

I have a different answer, just because I'll-- I'm gonna take it from the broadcast journalism side, or the, you know, the electronic journalism. Business is good. And-- and, you know, the people have talked for years about the death of the evening newscasts. It's certainly down from the heyday of Cronkite and-- and-- and-- *Huntley-Brinkley*. But-- I saw the other day that 22 million people watch the three evening-- I mean, what could be more archaic than a 6:30 evening newscast when people have been getting news all day?

18:02:34;14

But 22 million people wanted to watch one of the three broadcast networks. At Fox News, our ratings have never been bigger. Interestingly enough, the Democratic primaries, there's no Republican race at all, the Democratic primaries, Fox had the number one ratings for Nevada, for

New Hampshire, for Iowa.

18:02:53;12

So you-- I-- people are very engaged. And I'm-- I'm not-- I'm not threatened by the proliferation of sources. I-- I actually welcome it. I think that, you know, it's let 1,000 flowers bloom, and competition is good, and fact checking is good, and sometimes we get things wrong, and-- and responsible blogs find out things we-- we don't. And that's all-- all to the good. I-- I find, generally speaking, people are pretty darn engaged in what's goin' on.

LINDA FELDMAN:

18:03:22;19

All right, over here?

QUESTION:

18:03:25;00

Hi. Thank you both for coming. I really am a fan of the work you both do, despite the question I'm about to ask. (LAUGHTER)

MAGGIE HABERMAN:

18:03:33;03

Uh oh.

QUESTION:

18:03:34;03

So going back to the very first question-- you

both really separated yourselves from the opinion or primetime people at your-- at the *Times* and at Fox News. It, and this question is more for Chris, it feels a bit disingenuous, in that, like, you share branding. You share a channel. And frankly, your viewers don't really separate. Do you ever worry that they're using the quality of your work to sort of truth-wash primetime?

CHRIS WALLACE:

18:04:04;24

I f-- again, I find it interesting that people would say that about Fox but they wouldn't say that about the *New York Times*. Because guess what? They share a same section of a newspaper, and one could argue the same about them.

QUESTION:

18:04:15;15

It's called primetime--

CHRIS WALLACE:

18:04:16;02

No, I-- I-- let me just finish. I-- I think that you're underselling the intelligence of the viewer. I think the viewer knows that what goes on in primetime is opinion, and I think, you know, man, if somebody thinks that what I do when

I rake-- a Trump administration official over the coals, somehow they're mixing that up with what's going on in primetime, I-- I--

QUESTION:

18:04:39;11 It legitimizes it.

CHRIS WALLACE:

18:04:40;03 --I find that very hard to believe they'd do that more than once--

QUESTION:

18:04:41;10 It-- it legitimizes what they're doing in primetime, the quality (UNINTEL)--

CHRIS WALLACE:

18:04:44;11 I-- you know, they-- they do what-- no, I don't think it legitimizes it. The fact is, it doesn't need to be legitimized. There are millions of people who wanna hear it. It's not like, "Well, we think we're getting Chris Wallace and now we're getting something else." They-- they-- people wanna watch that.

18:04:57;20 And they're entitled to watch it, just like they're entitled to watch Rachel Maddow, just

like they're entitled to watch Chris Cuomo. And-- and, you know, honestly, I don't find any of it particularly interesting. I'd just as soon not have people shouting at me in-- at-- at primetime, I wanna go to bed. But-- (LAUGHTER) but millions of people wanna watch that stuff, so god bless 'em.

LINDA FELDMAN:

18:05:20;00 So you don't watch any of the evening opinion shows?

CHRIS WALLACE:

18:05:24;04 As-- on a regular basis?

LINDA FELDMAN:

18:05:25;18 Yeah.

CHRIS WALLACE:

18:05:25;15 No.

LINDA FELDMAN:

18:05:26;13 Okay. All right. Over here?

QUESTION:

18:05:29;24 Hi. I was think-- wondering about how you both sort of think about your respective audiences, and how-- how you-- sort of-- do you see some

sort of role or responsibility to-- introduce people and-- and ideas that sort of challenge any dominant narratives in the-- in the audiences that you sort of-- that circle around your respective organizations and-- and personally as well?

MAGGIE HABERMAN:

18:06:02;24

Can you give me an example of what you mean?

QUESTION:

18:06:06;24

Like, I mean, Chris, you said something about-- if you're not reading journalism, if you're not reading ideas that you disagree with, you're-- there's-- there's something very important about doing that. And so I'm sort of just wondering if-- if-- if you see yourself having any role in making that easy for the people who read your work.

MAGGIE HABERMAN:

18:06:31;11

Ideally, no. Because I think that if Chris and I are both doing our jobs, we're basically just presenting information. I mean, I think Chris is one of the best interviewers in the business--

and one of the toughest. And I would love to never be interviewed by you, (LAUGHTER) because it's terrible. But--

CHRIS WALLACE:

18:06:44;07 So that's why you won't come on my panel--

LINDA FELDMAN:

18:06:45;24 (UNINTEL) she's afraid of you--

MAGGIE HABERMAN:

18:06:46;24 I've been found out. But-- but no, I mean, I actually-- I see our-- I see our role-- presenting different opinions, what Chris was talking about, was if you have a certain, fixed point of view, reading the opinion page of the *Wall Street Journal*, or if you are, you know, if you're-- if you're a *Times* reader or if you're a Fox News primetime viewer, you know, reading the *Times* op-ed page.

18:07:08;19 But that's different. I don't see either of our roles, and maybe cr-- Chris can speak for himself. But for me, I don't see our role as being to challenge the v-- reader to think

differently, I think in the way you mean it. If anything, I, frankly, wish that readers would understand, as I think I mentioned earlier, that-- we can't control the facts that exist.

18:07:29;20

The question that was asked just before about-- of Chris about you're legitimizing these other views, I mean, to Chris's point, people-- there are people who consider that point of view legitimate. So it doesn't matter whether we do it or not. I think one thing that we haven't touched on on this stage that I think has-- come up a lot in the last couple of years is the media, as it has traditionally been seen is as some kind of a referee or umpire, right, of either government or politics or of our electoral systems. It's not really the case anymore.

18:08:02;04

And so I think that people get frustrated that, you know, we-- we write things, or in Chris's case, he does interviews, and they don't provide some change in-- in what's happening. And I

don't-- I don't really think that's our role. So I guess I-- I dispute the premise a little bit.

CHRIS WALLACE:

18:08:18;24

Yeah, I would just pick up, I-- I-- I completely agree with everything Maggie said. I don't think about an audience. I don't think about sort of-- a prevailing view that I'm either trying to enforce or-- reinforce or-- or to argue against. In this, particularly with this president and Washington today, I'm just trying to get the story straight.

MAGGIE HABERMAN:

18:08:39;06

Exactly, exactly--

CHRIS WALLACE:

18:08:39;24

I'm just tryin' to-- to unders-- you know, one of the interesting things doing, primarily-- I do a lot of commentary during the week, but doing primarily-- a weekly show-- is, and this goes back to something that Linda asked at the very beginning about-- I-- I bias, you could call it. You could call it editorial judgment.

18:08:57;18

It used to often be when I was-- when-- when I-- I started out in 2003 as-- on *Fox News Sunday* covering Bush and then Obama and now Trump that it was, "What are we gonna focus on this week?" You know, and I'm tryin' to think on Sunday, what are we gonna focus on? Now it's, "What are we not gonna focus on?"

LINDA FELDMAN:

18:09:17;03

That's right.

CHRIS WALLACE:

18:09:17;22

Because there is so much news, and I'm sure Maggie has this all the time as somebody who's really on the front lines for the White House-- you-- there's so much that happens in the course of a week that something that seems just mind-blowing on Monday or Tuesday, by Friday you don't-- you're-- "Did that happen this week or not?" So I'm just trying to think, what is the-- I've got an hour and I wanna add value to your experience.

18:09:41;05

So what can I do in that hour, looking forward,

not looking back, I'm not doing a week in review, I'm looking-- always looking forward, that is gonna be most useful to you-- as you approach the week going forward? The last thing I'm thinking about is, "What's the audience take on this and how do I fit into that?"

LINDA FELDMAN:

18:09:59;19

All right. Over here.

QUESTION:

18:10:03;20

Thank you very much, it was a great talk. My question, it's a little bit two part. First, Chris, do you think Fox, under the new leadership, is moving towards the middle and leaving room for a new, more conservative outlet to come up? And second, would you moderate a Bernie/President Trump debate?

CHRIS WALLACE:

18:10:20;11

Would I moderate a Bernie/Trump debate? Oh, you betcha. (LAUGHTER) But I gotta be asked. That's-- that-- you know, that-- I bet-- whoever it was, I'd interview-- I-- I would moderate any presidential debate. It-- it's a huge--

challenge, and it's a huge honor, and it's enormously gratifying if this is what you do for a living.

18:10:41;16

You know-- the president likes to-- argue that line that Fox is moving more to the center, and you know, that what's happened to the-- what-- what happened to old Fox, it didn't used to be that way. And I think Maggie would agree with this, he is a genius at working the ops.

MAGGIE HABERMAN:

18:10:58;05

No question--

CHRIS WALLACE:

18:10:58;24

And-- and you know, it's like-- and I don't know-- I-- I have a feeling you're not a huge baseball fan, hearing your-- are you?

QUESTION:

18:11:05;20

No--

CHRIS WALLACE:

18:11:05;24

No, I didn't think so. So but-- you know, in-- in baseball, managers come out after a play, a controversial play, and they argue. They're not

gonna get that play reversed, but they're hoping to get the next play that's a close play that, "Well, I-- you know, he made such a pain of the ass of himself, I'm gonna-- I'll-- I'll call it his way." So when he's sitting there, knocking Fox News and-- and he's-- he's hopin' to get better coverage.

MAGGIE HABERMAN:

18:11:29;14

Yes, and it's the same with the times. And-- and if you-- if-- as Chris just used the word genius to describe what he does at that, that's absolutely right. But unlike Chris, if I call him a genius, you're gonna have people freaking out and tweeting at me. (LAUGHTER) So-- but that is-- or at least a genius in that regard.

18:11:43;07

But he's-- there is-- there is-- an intent to what he is doing, and there is a certain skill about being able to do it the way he does. Do I like the undermining of the press? No. Do I like the constant attacks on the press? No. Is he the first elected official in history to do things

like this? I mean, Rudy Giuliani used to scream at us at city hall when he was the mayor 20 years ago. So I mean, he's not the-- he's not the first person to not like his coverage. He's just different in how he's vocal about it.

QUESTION:

18:12:09;24 Okay, can I ask, do you think Bernie will help him win?

MAGGIE HABERMAN:

18:12:13;20 That's not really for us to-- (LAUGHTER) yeah, I think you got the wrong panel.

QUESTION:

18:12:19;02 Thank you.

CHRIS WALLACE:

18:12:20;17 And let me just say, don't jump on the Bernie train and think that he is now the nominee. I mean, this is something--

MAGGIE HABERMAN:

18:12:25;06 Correct.

CHRIS WALLACE:

18:12:25;09 That we do-- and I mean we, the media, that we-- that's, like, he's done well in three primaries,

d-- I don't know, it's, like, 1% or 2% of--

LINDA FELDMAN:

18:12:33;20 Of the delegates.

CHRIS WALLACE:

18:12:34;01 --all the delegates have been-- have been appointed. He's not the nominee yet. Let's wait and see. Let-- just-- just-- you don't-- wait and see what the story is--

MAGGIE HABERMAN:

18:12:40;22 It's okay to not know yet, but it's gonna be a while before you know, most likely.

CHRIS WALLACE:

18:12:43;19 Yeah.

QUESTION:

18:12:45;03 Thank you.

LINDA FELDMAN:

18:12:46;18 All right. Okay, over here?

QUESTION:

18:12:49;02 Thank you, thank you both for being here. I'd be curious to hear how you would each describe the president's opinion of your news organizations. Maggie, the *New York Times* many (LAUGH) call

Trump's hometown paper, even though he coined the unflattering "failing *New York Times* moniker," he obviously cares a lot about how he's covered in your pages.

18:13:06;21

And Chris, needless to say, Trump watches a lotta Fox. I'd just be curious how each of you would characterize the president's relationship with your news organization. Quick second question-- frequently officials-- give interviews in the hopes of the president actually hearing what they have to say. Is that a new phenomenon, where-- officials have such a hard time getting through to the president that they have to go on television so that the audience of one will see them? I'm just curious if that's unique. Thank you--

MAGGIE HABERMAN:

18:13:36;15

Do you want to go first, or do you want me to?

CHRIS WALLACE:

18:13:37;18

You go first.

MAGGIE HABERMAN:

18:13:38;10

Okay. I don't remember a time where people have taken to TV knowing that the president-- th-- this president watches a lotta television. And he watches a lotta television, and-- and he doesn't watch it the way that people think. He's not sitting there like this all the time. It's on most of the time, either in the little dining room off the Oval Office or when he's in the residence-- at least as it's been described to us-- on the latter.

18:14:02;02

But-- I-- I have n-- I have no familiarity with another administration where people were trying quite so hard to catch the ear of the president. But it's not 'cause they can't get through to him, it's just that they know that that's the best way to get his attention-- and he tends to be very reactive to TV.

18:14:15;08

In terms of the *Times* and him-- I would ask people to listen to an episode of *The Daily*. I

hope that all of you or many of you are *Daily* listeners-- from-- god, I w-- I think it was a year, maybe two-- it was-- everything feels like a blur. It was within the last two years, and it was an interview that my colleague, Peter Baker, and I did with the president-- that our publisher, AG Sulzberger, was there for.

18:14:39;14

And the reason that the interview happened was the president tried having AG Sulzberger to the White House residence for a dinner, an off the record dinner, which AG, to his immense credit, would not do. And he said, "I will come see you if my reporters can interview you." But it ended up with this 25 minute back and forth between AG and the president about the *Times*. And the president literally said, "I think I'm entitled to a good story from my paper."

18:15:04;24

And, you know, I think to-- to the president, who he's now a Floridian, but he's a very New York figure-- the *New York Times* symbolized to him

elites who he felt did not take him seriously over the course of a very long-- career. And I think that he-- I know he feels like he's in the White House and he's still not taken seriously.

18:15:25;24

And so I think that his relationship with the *Times* is one of looking for acceptance. But I also just think that he h-- his understanding of what certainly print media does is not typical of what most elected officials' understanding of it is, because he never was one before. He had a pretty transactional relationship with newspapers in New York, and he doesn't understand that there's a standing White House press corps that's gonna cover whoever the president is, they're not covering Donald Trump, per say, so.

CHRIS WALLACE:

18:15:52;03

That must come as a great disappointment to him, that they're not-- they're just--

MAGGIE HABERMAN:

18:15:54;15

I-- I-- I think-- I think-- (LAUGH) I don't think he's accepted that (UNINTEL) yet, but right--

CHRIS WALLACE:

18:15:57;13

Yes. I, to the two issues, I-- I don't really know, I mean, the president sometimes acts in his tweets as if he thinks that we're there for him. And I don't know whether it's that he's-- just wants to sorta put that out there as-- to troll us, or whether he really believes it. It totally-- I mean, I've got-- been criticized, often, for putting Democrats on, and-- and Fox has been criticized for covering the Democratic presidential campaign.

18:16:28;22

I-- you know, I don't-- on some level he's gotta know that we're n-- we're covering both sides of this race. On some level I-- so I don't know how serious he is in what he says, what he says. But it certainly doesn't affect us at Fox. We cover the news. And obviously right now, particularly, the big story is the Democratic race, because we know who the Republican nominee is gonna be.

18:16:50;24

As far as-- interviews, I-- I have no question in

my mind at all that there are times when people come on *Fox News Sunday* and they are speaking to an audience of one. And sometimes-- it-- you-- the-- I think they say things that are even more outrageous or even more-- partisan or are-- because they know that it will please him, sitting in the-- in the-- in the residence, or Mar-a-Lago, or wherever he is. And-- you know, I-- you-- it's just part of doing business. But-- yes, do I know that they're-- that they're playing to him, absolutely.

LINDA FELDMAN:

18:17:31;23

You. All right, over here?

QUESTION:

18:17:33;01

Hi, thanks for coming, it's-- it's a huge pleasure to see you both. (THROAT CLEAR) So Chris, in the beginning of this-- and Maggie, you as well, both said that, you know, this is primetime, we leave this over there, we do our jobs. This is-- the opinion pages.

18:17:46;22

But we are seeing under this administration, we

just touched upon this, active participation-- by the president. You know, whether it's giving interviews to Hannity and Tucker Carlson (UNINTEL) before the Super Bowl, and-- or whether the network, I'm thinking of the John Bolton recently spoke at Duke University, talking about wanting to write his book.

18:18:07;22

And that very evening he was being hit-- (THROAT CLEAR) time and time again by-- by primetime anchors the day of. So I-- my question is can we really separate them nowadays? Because when you think back under the Obama administration, I-- I'm struggling to remember Paul Krugman unpacking the stimulus packet for-- r-- readers, or-- or even David Brooks, when he wrote a really, you know, helping us through these times that we're seeing now.

18:18:34;24

And I guess a second part to that question, you know, you-- you're often saying this is-- on the job of the readers to kind of separate these two,

but we're seeing this blurring of the lines now, whether it's in activist journalism or this participation. So I'm wondering if these are-- whether it's print or broadcast, has a duty to listeners or-- or readers to separate them more clearly.

CHRIS WALLACE:

18:19:00;12

I-- I-- you know, all I can say is I do what I do, opinion does what its-- it does. I think people understand the difference. We at Fox-- frankly, as opposed to some of the other-- networks have always had a firewall between the news side and the opinion side, particularly when it comes to breaking new events, when it's-- a presidential debate, when it's an election night, when it's a convention.

18:19:25;19

We have always had the anchors of that be news people. First it was Brit Hume, now it's Bret and Martha and me, and if-- if the primetime people come on, they come on solely and only as-- as opinion people-- to offer analysis and commentar-

- I mean, really, commentary and opinion. They don't come on as news people. And you-- that's not true at CNN, where you'll see Anderson Cooper, or-- or Chris Cuomo on their news coverage of events.

18:19:59;15

And it's certainly not true with Chris Matthews and-- and Rachel Maddow-- at-- at s-- MSNBC. And, you know, so I-- I-- you know, I-- (LAUGH) I-- I kind of laugh at this, because we get-- I-- obviously I get asked this a lot. And yet you all know the difference. I mean, are you really-- do you really not-- do you not see a difference between I-- I should never ask a question 'cause I'm gonna get an answer I don't like. (LAUGHTER) But I-- I'll b-- b-- I'm not gonna ask you the question, so don't-- you're not getting a chance to answer. I'm just saying I don't think many people would mistake me for the primetime opinion people. I think they know the difference.

LINDA FELDMAN:

18:20:39;14

Maggie, do you have any thoughts?

MAGGIE HABERMAN:

18:20:41;03

Not-- not much. I mean, I-- A, I understand Chris's frustration, frankly, that I think that people tend to treat Fox as if it's the only outlet with a viewpoint-- because it isn't-- number one. And number two-- or at least with-- with anchors who have-- have viewpoints. But number two-- I guess we should be trying to do more to-- reassure people that there's no bleeding between the opinion page and the newsroom.

18:21:05;00

But I, candidly, don't know how else to do that other than to let people review my emails and see that I don't know who anonymous is, and I don't know-- you know what I mean? And on and on and on. I-- I would hope that people know. I would hope that people don't think that Maureen Dowd and I are writing the same pieces. I mean-- but I-- I-- and if they are confusing us, (LAUGH) then I think we have-- we have-- a bigger problem.

18:21:26;03

I do think people actually do understand the difference. And I think if anything, sometimes-- I'm not saying you're doing this, so please just don't hear it that way at all. But I do think sometimes when I get that question, it's people who, frankly, want the news to be more opinionated, and are upset that it isn't. So.

CHRIS WALLACE:

18:21:42;16

Or I usually get it that they want the opinion to be less opinionated, but that's the same thing.

(LAUGH)

MAGGIE HABERMAN:

18:21:48;04

Same-- same-- that's-- (UNINTEL) different sides--

CHRIS WALLACE:

18:21:49;06

Yes, right. And-- and again, I get-- I think we get l-- a lot more-- I get (MIC NOISE) asked this a lot more about Fox News because you like the opinion that you hear on MSNBC. You like the opinion you hear in the *New York Times*, so you're not as offended by it. You don't-- you-- the

reason you're offended by the news, and-- and when I say this about Fox News, is because you don't like the opinion of Fox News. I'm not saying necessarily about you, I'm saying it generally.

LINDA FELDMAN:

18:22:13;24

Okay. All right, over here.

QUESTION:

18:22:15;05

Yes. Thank you all for your time and your comments. Maggie you mentioned with Twitter the, sort of the flattening I think was the word, that-- a person who may be very legitimate and expert in something is right next to someone else who is just spouting off and has no credentials for that.

18:22:34;24

And I'm wondering, as far as media is concerned, what can the-- you've spoken about your fact checkers, and you-- your-- the work that you go into it. And yet your website is just as easy or-- you know, there's-- someone else is just spouting anything that they're making up in their

head just as easy to have access to that. What can the legitimate news outlets do to show how much work that they've put into their-- the editor-- editorialize-- or excuse me, the editing that goes on, and the-- the amazing amount of work and investigation that goes on as opposed to the other sources to help combat the accusations of being fake news?

MAGGIE HABERMAN:

18:23:21;18

It's a great-- each great question, and it is actually one that we've-- I think we've struggled with a lot. Because one of the things that we've discovered after the 2016 campaign was things that I think we really foolishly took for granted was that-- was that a lotta people-- whether these are people who read newspapers all the time or people who only occasionally interact with them, and I-- I can only speak to the-- the print side here, Chris can talk about broadcast. But we thought people understood journalism process, and people don't. And--

18:23:49;15

(QUESTION UNINTEL)

MAGGIE HABERMAN:

18:23:51;03

--I-- that's-- so I mean, I think that we all still have a ways to go in terms of informing readers. And we have tried doing things at least just at the *Times* on, "Here's how this story was reported. Here's how this came about." One example, that this is not in the pages of *The Times*, but my colleagues-- Jodi Kantor and Megan Twohey, who broke the Harvey Weinstein story, did a whole book about how they broke that story.

18:24:13;09

And I thought-- it-- and it is a riveting book that I hope everyone reads-- especially after the conviction this week. But-- but I think that the more we can show people how we did it, the better off we are. The w-- one of the worst parts about this era is-- you know, the president likes to say, "Anonymous sources aren't real. These are all made up."

18:24:34;07

His administration almost never wants to talk on the record-- in-- including his press office. And

it is really on us to-- to force people more to go on the record-- because I-- it just makes it easy to-- to just point to that and have people not have confidence in what's being said.

18:24:53;24

But it's hard, because we are dealing with an administration where people are afraid of speaking on the record, and we need to get information that's real information. I'm not talking about, you know, somebody offering a blind quote that's just attacking somebody else. Those are the kinds of challenges we're still dealing with. And-- do we get it right all the time? Absolutely not. I think we're certainly better than we were three years ago. I think industry-wide we are.

LINDA FELDMAN:

18:25:15;16

All right--

MAGGIE HABERMAN:

18:25:15;22

I hope that-- I hope that answers your question--

QUESTION:

18:25:16;24

Yup, thank you--

LINDA FELDMAN:

18:25:17;09 Okay, I think time for one more question. And my apologies to all the others who have lined up.

QUESTION:

18:25:23;08 Hi-- I'm coming from Japanese broadcaster-- NHK. And-- I have a question-- to both of you. You talked about, I was surprised when Chris said that you don't care-- you don't care much about audience, sorry-- and then--

CHRIS WALLACE:

18:25:38;15 I-- I don't care much about what?

QUESTION:

18:25:40;10 Much about what--

MAGGIE HABERMAN:

18:25:39;24 Audience--

QUESTION:

18:25:40;19 --what audiences--

CHRIS WALLACE:

18:25:40;24 Yeah, got it.

QUESTION:

18:25:41;07 --are thinking. And I was in both, like, reporting and audience engagement team. And-- I

wonder w-- if you could share with us, like, what kind of frustration you have against audience engagement team. Because *New York Times* treats (?) their reporters well. And I think, you know, in these days, straight news doesn't really, like-- be presented as straight news.

18:26:01;24

But it's gonna be, like, you know, you can have, like-- like, Instagram news, Facebook, and you know, it's gonna be, like, in different, like, containers, and-- with different l-- labors. So you know, your straight news doesn't really, like, you know, become, like-- one thing. So--

LINDA FELDMAN:

18:26:18;14

Okay, can you--

QUESTION:

18:26:19;23

Yeah, so if you have any, like-- comment on-- not-- frustration with aud-- audience engagement team, what would you want to change with the-- the structure?

MAGGIE HABERMAN:

18:26:29;24

I don't have-- my stories post, I tweet the link,

I tweet quotes that I think are important from it. And that's really the-- the-- the most that I-- I view it. I think that we have at times at *The Time--* at the *New York Times* had trouble with-- social media teams and tweets.

18:26:44;02

And I think that we are still struggling to try to make sure that tweets are accurately capturing the tone of a story. But we're also dealing with a 280 character limit. But in general, I-- I d-- it's not actually something that I think about that much.

LINDA FELDMAN:

18:26:57;07

Do you have anything to add, Chris?

CHRIS WALLACE:

18:26:58;16

No.

LINDA FELDMAN:

18:26:59;22

Okay. Well--

QUESTION:

18:27:00;09

I-- I do think it's-- it's--

CHRIS WALLACE:

18:27:00;20

This tw-- this Twitter thing, though, it's

definitely gonna--

MAGGIE HABERMAN:

18:27:03;00 It's gonna take off.

CHRIS WALLACE:

18:27:04;00 It's gonna take off.

QUESTION:

18:27:06;01 Wait. Sorry.

LINDA FELDMAN:

18:27:07;09 So I-- we-- we need to wrap up.

QUESTION:

18:27:09;07 Yeah, I just wanted to comment, like, you know-- if you could have a joint venture and people will gain trust on both sides, I guess, is there a possibility, and can you think about that?

MAGGIE HABERMAN:

18:27:21;13 I would definitely do a show with Chris on some to-be-named-- platform.

LINDA FELDMAN:

18:27:25;24 Well, there you go. (LAUGHTER)

MAGGIE HABERMAN:

18:27:27;04 Thank you--

CHRIS WALLACE:

18:27:27;04 There you go. Thank you.

LINDA FELDMAN:

18:27:28;11 All right. (APPLAUSE) So.

CHRIS WALLACE:

18:27:30;01 Well, (UNINTEL) all right--

18:27:30;13 (OVERTALK)

LINDA FELDMAN:

18:27:31;24 All right.

CHRIS WALLACE:

18:27:33;14 I like that.

LINDA FELDMAN:

18:27:35;19 So now I want to-- I'm sorry--

QUESTION:

18:27:36;05 Could I just ask a question about--

LINDA FELDMAN:

18:27:37;22 No, I'm sorry--

QUESTION:

18:27:38;15 No, when-- when Hadas Gold, when she was at
Politico, received a tweet with a bullet hole in
the middle of her forehead, no one took
responsibility to say, "Why is this happening?"

And to challenge those who create the atmosphere for when a young woman, a young journalist who is respected by many, gets this kind of a meme. Where's the responsibility for the protection of the young and of the older journalists, and who needs to take that position?

LINDA FELDMAN:

18:28:09;16 All right, do-- do you have anything to say? I don't know--

MAGGIE HABERMAN:

18:28:11;23 Hadas is a wonderful reporter who I worked with at Politico, and no journalist should ever have to face the kind of thing that she faced. But beyond that, I think it's really something for the proper authorities to deal with, and for social media platforms not to allow that kind of speech. I-- other than that I don't think it's something that applies to either one of us.

LINDA FELDMAN:

18:28:27;19 Okay--

MAGGIE HABERMAN:

18:28:28;07 Thank you for coming.

LINDA FELDMAN:

18:28:29;23 And on that note-- I wanna give each of you-- two minutes to sum things up, two minutes each. We've established common journalistic ground, but please leave us with some words of hope (LAUGHTER) and inspiration after that question. What would you like journalism students and citizens to take away from this discussion, and are you-- are you optimistic about--

CHRIS WALLACE:

18:28:52;22 All right, I'm gonna focus first, because--

MAGGIE HABERMAN:

18:28:54;05 Please, go first--

CHRIS WALLACE:

18:28:54;13 --I'm gonna-- I'm gonna give--

LINDA FELDMAN:

18:28:56;08 Give us something hopeful--

CHRIS WALLACE:

18:28:56;22 --you-- you'll give a better answer--

LINDA FELDMAN:

18:28:58;13 --that g-- to grab onto--

CHRIS WALLACE:

18:28:55;24

--so I want to leave them to you. First of all, I've been asked-- I've been-- asked if I-- I-- if I could do this, so I'm gonna tell you about my book. (LAUGHTER) I have a book coming out on June 9th called *Countdown 1945*. Now, people say, "All right, he's writing a book, he's gonna write about Trump, he's gonna write about his career."

18:29:15;09

It is a history book, and it's called *Countdown 1945: The 116 Days That Changed the World*. It's-- about April 12th, 1945, when Harry Truman finds out that he's the president of the United States, also discovers about the Manhattan Project, which he doesn't know exists, and 116 days later drops the bomb on Hiroshima. And it goes from the White House to Los Alamos and the scientists and to-- the-- the Tibbets crew, flight crew out on Tinian Island.

18:29:46;14

It's a great book. (LAUGHTER) Preorder it. Any-- or-- I've now f-- found out that all preorders

go-- count against the first week-- so it's my best chance of making the bestseller list, so please. Now, here's what I wanna say to all the journalism students out there.

18:30:02;17

I have been doing this for 50 years, and it has afforded me the most exciting, most satisfying life you can imagine. I have gone around the world, I've been an eyewitness to history, I've covered fascinating stories, I've-- I've learned so much. I remember when I was covering the Reagan White House for six years, you know, you'd be-- one day you'd be covering the Middle East, the next day you'd be covering the budget, the next day you'd be covering arms control. It was the most wonderful forced education.

18:30:35;08

So you know-- I know that it's always a question about, you know, what's the business gonna look like? And when I got into it, it was-- looked pretty stable. There were about three or four major national newspapers, there were three

networks, you had-- worked from local stations to move up to the networks. It was pretty simple. It isn't gonna be, but don't let that scare you off. It is the best way to make a living that ever existed. I can't tell you how many times, at my age, I still think to myself, "And I can't believe they're paying me to cover this."

(LAUGHTER)

LINDA FELDMAN:

18:31:05;24 All right--

MAGGIE HABERMAN:

18:31:06;00 I-- I can't top that--

LINDA FELDMAN:

18:31:06;10 --Maggie--

MAGGIE HABERMAN:

18:31:06;24 --what are you--

CHRIS WALLACE:

18:31:07;05 Yes you can.

MAGGIE HABERMAN:

18:31:08;02 But buy his book. I-- I-- I agree completely with Chris. I mean, j-- I didn't wanna be a journalist-- when I was-- a little younger than

you. I fell into this by accident because no one would hire me when I got outta college and I ended up at a clerkship at the *New York Post*-- and I instantly fell in love with the newsroom-- almost instantly. Pretty-- pretty s-- pretty close after.

18:31:31;15

Journalism gave me a life, literally. I met my husband at the *New York Post*. I have gotten to witness events I never would've otherwise. I cannot believe that I get paid to do this every day. It is-- it is punishing and exhausting, and I spent many hours on stakeouts, and I door-knocked, you know, the-- the families of crime victims, and I did everything I was ever asked to do. So I guess that my only parting wisdom is, no matter how unpleasant the assignment seems, you know, unless it is amoral-- do it. Because you will learn something doing it. And somebody else has done it too. Thank you for being here--

LINDA FELDMAN:

18:32:08;24

All right. (APPLAUSE)

CHRIS WALLACE:

18:32:10;19 Thank you.

LINDA FELDMAN:

18:32:12;03 Well, so it's-- so--

18:32:12;24 (OVERTALK)

LINDA FELDMAN:

18:32:14;24 So this has been a fantastic discussion, and I hope it lived up to the Common Ground Committee's motto of bringing light, not heat, to the public discourse. Now, before we end the evening, let's bring back Bruce Bond, CEO of Common Ground Committee, for some closing thoughts.

BRUCE BOND:

18:32:33;06 Before we thank our amazing guests-- just a couple things. First of all-- I do think it lived up to our motto of brining light, not heat, to public discourse. And I would like to encourage all of you to consider what happened tonight, and we had two people from different perspectives engage in a serious conversation.

18:32:51;04 They were civil. They were productive. And they

looked to f-- find common ground. And if we wanna heal the problems of incivility and polarization in our country, we all need to do this in our own daily walk of life with our friends, our families, and our colleagues. So I would encourage you to take a page out of our panelists'-- (THROAT CLEAR) our panelists' books tonight.

18:33:12;07

And-- I'd like to thank the Columbia School of Journalism for hosting us tonight. They did a terrific job. On behalf of all of us at Common Ground Committee, we appreciate all of you being here and all of you that are on Facebook Live. Thank you so much for tuning in.

18:33:28;22

And-- also, we have a couple cameras in the back here. Those of you who would like to take a moment and give us your reaction to tonight's event and get it caught on camera, please stop by on your way out. And with that, I cannot thank our guests enough. Linda, Chris, and Maggie, you

have enlightened us. You have given us hope.
We've had a lotta fun. Can't wait to do it the
next time. Thank you for being here. (APPLAUSE)

LINDA FELDMAN:

18:33:53;23

Thank you.

18:33:58;00

(OFF-MIC CONVERSATION)

* * *END OF TRANSCRIPT* * *