

Citation metadata

Author: EVAN CORNOG
Date: Jan. 2001
From: Columbia Journalism Review(Vol. 39, Issue 5)
Publisher: Columbia University, Graduate School of Journalism
Document Type: Article
Length: 1,904 words

Main content

Article Preview :

To imagine how historians will view the press coverage of the 2000 presidential race, consider the images you might use to illustrate a history of the subject. I would suggest five: Al Gore kissing Tipper at the Democratic convention; George W. Bush kissing Oprah; Bush and Dick Cheney talking out of the sides of their mouths about Adam Clymer of The New York Times; Bush's DUI arrest record from Kennebunkport; and the Palm Beach County butterfly ballot. Others may have other choices, but these are mine (for now) and not one of them has any relation to serious issues facing the United States.

What they do have to do with is "character," a term used by the press to confer dignity upon the current obsession with personality. This concern with "character" has dominated coverage of the presidential race and other campaigns this year, largely because of the Clinton/Lewinsky scandal, which made presidential "character" a central issue in the race. And although the public seemed to be far less engrossed with the Lewinsky matter than Republican leaders and journalists were, and Bill Clinton seems destined to leave office with extraordinarily high approval ratings, the concern with character and the focus on personality endures. This, of course, was a great advantage for George W. Bush, whom most Americans seem to find a much more likable person than Al Gore. One of the Bush campaign's goals was to keep public attention focused on personality, where he was perceived to have an edge, rather than on policy, where Gore's greater command of the issues gave him the advantage. Historians are likely to judge this obsession with personality one of the weaker aspects of the press coverage of the 2000 campaign.

Another likely target will be the nearly total omission of foreign-policy issues. The effect of this was, again, to favor George W. Bush, whose experience in foreign affairs is so much more limited than the vice president's. When Bush, during a debate, said he would remove American troops from Kosovo, it was a big story in Europe, but a fairly small one here (The New York Times did give it serious attention). The larger issues involved in the Atlantic alliance and the state of U.S.-European relations were left aside. The ravages of HIV/AIDS in sub-Saharan Africa -- a demographic catastrophe that the U.S. government and American pharmaceutical companies could certainly do more to contain -- remained outside the orbit of campaign coverage.

The hardest part of the race to cover was the post-Election Day carnival of recounts and court cases. Here, again, the assumptions under which the game proceeded worked in favor of George W. Bush. In spite of the substantial national popular-vote margin for Gore, and the evidence that there were serious shortcomings in the way the Florida vote was counted, the pressure on Gore to withdraw was...

[Access from your library](#)

This is a preview. Get the full text through your school or public library.

Source Citation

Source Citation

CORNOG, EVAN. "Character vs. Policy." *Columbia Journalism Review*, vol. 39, no. 5, 2001, p. 54. Accessed 27 Nov. 2020.

Gale Document Number: GALE|A70495758

Explore

This is a preview. Get the full text through your school or public library.

[Access from your library](#)

Footer

- [About](#)
- [Contact Us](#)
- [Terms of Use](#)
- [Privacy Policy](#)
- [Accessibility](#)

Yet Americans are learning far more about Donald Trump's sex life and Hillary Clinton's emails than about their respective policy agendas. The candidates are partly to blame. Character Vs. Policy In The 2016 Presidential Election. Howard Gleckman Former Contributor. Business in the Beltway. Not only is it difficult to judge your personality, but your character as well. People can initially only make assumptions about your personality, or even your character. Your character is objective, and personality, on the contrary, is subjective. Character is something that comes from within and shows how much a person of value you are. Wherever you go, your character goes with you. Personality is how you present yourself, and thus, can change at certain stages in life. Home › Forums › Decaffeinated Coffee › character vs policy Which is more important? This topic has 75 replies, 25 voices, and was last updated 6 hours, 14 minutes ago by Health. Viewing 50 posts - 1 through 50 (of 76 total). Whenever i hear democrats-and even never trump conservatives bash trump, its always attacks on his character (with exception for the few delusional ones who wanna somehow blame trump for covid). This baffles me. Yes, attacking his character is certainly warranted to a certain degree. Content: Personality Vs Character. Comparison Chart. Definition. By the term character, we mean an enduring and distinguishing mental and moral characteristics in an individual. It is the only factor which determines our reaction or response to the given event or situation. It defines a person's behaviour pattern, thinking style, controls feelings. It is based on the environment that surrounds us, mental ability, moral principles and similar other factors. Policy iteration includes: policy evaluation + policy improvement, and the two are repeated iteratively until policy converges. Value iteration includes: finding optimal value function + one policy extraction. There is no repeat of the two because once the value function is optimal, then the policy out of it should also be optimal (i.e. converged). Finding optimal value function can also