

November 1979

## Moral Prerequisites of Political Support: Business Reactions to the Watergate Scandal

Janet M. Clark

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.coastal.edu/jops>



Part of the [Political Science Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Clark, Janet M. (1979) "Moral Prerequisites of Political Support: Business Reactions to the Watergate Scandal," *Journal of Political Science*: Vol. 7 : No. 1 , Article 4.

Available at: <https://digitalcommons.coastal.edu/jops/vol7/iss1/4>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Politics at CCU Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Journal of Political Science by an authorized editor of CCU Digital Commons. For more information, please contact [commons@coastal.edu](mailto:commons@coastal.edu).

## Moral Prerequisites of Political Support: Business Reactions to the Watergate Scandal\*

JANET M. CLARK

*New Mexico State University*

Two basic components of support for political authorities have generally been distinguished. Easton argues that "specific support" is generated by direct benefits which individuals or groups perceive as coming to them from the political system while "diffuse support" involves a more deep-seated reserve of good will towards the polity.<sup>1</sup> One of the supposed bases for diffuse support is respect for the "rules of the game," defined by Truman as expectations so widely held in a society that they are taken for granted. They constitute the popular attitudes regarding the limits of authority and what the government should do and how it should do it.<sup>2</sup> Despite the general acceptance of Truman's theory regarding the importance of observing the "rules of the game" for maintaining political support, few empirical studies have been made concerning the actual impact upon support resulting from events affecting political norms which did not materially affect citizens.<sup>3</sup> In particular, there has been little examination of whether blatant political immorality can erode the support of a group for a particular incumbent who has supplied specific satisfactions and benefits to it in the past.

The effects of the Watergate scandal upon support for the Nixon Administration among business interests should provide an illustrative case study of this situation. In 1972, President Nixon was re-elected with one of the largest majorities in American history.<sup>4</sup> Although the American business community is not monolithic and is composed of individuals with political perspectives

\* A previous version of this paper was presented at the 1974 Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, Chicago, August 29-September 2. The author would like to thank Professor Cal Clark of New Mexico State University for his helpful comments on earlier drafts. He is not, however, responsible for the conclusions reached herein.

<sup>1</sup> David Easton, *A Systems Analysis of Political Life* (New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1965) pp. 273-275.

<sup>2</sup> David Truman, *The Governmental Process: Political Interests and Public Opinion* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1951) pp. 512-514.

<sup>3</sup> See Edward N. Muller, "Correlates and Consequences of Beliefs in the Legitimacy of Regime Structure," *Midwest Journal of Political Science* (August, 1970); and Edward N. Muller, "The Representation of Citizens by Political Authorities: Consequences for Regime Support," *American Political Science Review* (December, 1970).

<sup>4</sup> At the start of his second term, President Nixon's "actions" were approved by 67% of the American public, for example. *Gallup Opinion Index* (February, 1973) p. 3.

from both sides of the ideological spectrum, businessmen are generally conservative;<sup>5</sup> and spokesmen for business were generally favorable toward the first Nixon Administration which was perceived as being business oriented. Specific policies drew some criticisms, but for the most part, businessmen were satisfied with his actions and particularly anxious for his victory over Senator McGovern who appeared too radical for business tastes.<sup>6</sup> At the start of his second term of office, Mr. Nixon's actions were approved by 68% of the business and professional people.<sup>7</sup> Yet as Watergate and its associated scandals unfolded, support for the President eroded significantly. By the end of the year, the level of approval of his actions had dropped by 42 percentage points among the business and professional group.<sup>8</sup>

### METHODOLOGY AND HYPOTHESES

The purpose of this paper is to discover how moral issues can influence political support in the United States by showing how much the Watergate scandal detracted from President Nixon's support among one of his foremost constituencies, the business community, and how lasting these effects proved to be. To accomplish this, editorial statements and feature articles in the major business publications were analyzed for the period beginning in January, 1969, and ending with December, 1974.

This study includes all editorials concerning the Nixon Administration in five journals during this six year period. Three factors were considered in coding the editorials and feature articles: 1) the subject matter, 2) the attitudinal valence, and 3) the number of subjects or attitudes covered. Only those editorials or features that discussed President Nixon personally, his appointees, or Nixon Administration policy were included in the study. These were then separated into categories according to the subject matter discussed (see Appendices I and II for a list of these issue areas). They were also evaluated according to the valence of the attitudes expressed. Editorials and articles which used statements and adjectives which were complimentary towards the Nixon Administration were classified as positive, while those which used critical or unfavorable statements were classified as negative. Statements which raised questions, made recommendations, or offered explanations of Nixon policies without making explicit evaluations of current policy or personnel were included in the neutral category. In other words, the neutral category was used as a catchall for any statement that was not clearly suppor-

<sup>5</sup> Bruce M. Russett and Elizabeth C. Hanson, *Interest and Ideology: The Foreign Policy Beliefs of American Businessmen* (San Francisco: W. H. Freeman and Company, 1975) provide detailed data that belie many of the stereotypes about business attitudes.

<sup>6</sup> Janet M. Clark, "Interest Groups' Relations with the Presidency: Business Perceptions of the Nixon Administration," paper presented at the 1973 Conference of the Southwest Social Science Association, Dallas, Texas.

<sup>7</sup> *Gallup Opinion Index* (February, 1973) p. 3.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, (January, 1974) p. 4.

tive or critical. Many of the editorials and feature articles expressed a single evaluation of only one subject area; and these were recorded only once no matter how many adjectives or statements were used to reflect their opinion. There were some articles, though, which were more complex, covering more than one subject area or expressing varying attitudes toward the same subject or both. In these cases, each separate attitude was recorded under the appropriate subject category; so that there are more separate opinions recorded than there were editorials.

To assess the reliability of the coding scheme, a sample of 10 issues from each of the five journals was coded independently by a second judge. Because of more than one subject per editorial and some journals with more than one editorial per issue, 60 references were coded as to both their issue area and affective valence by the second judge. The reliability of the coding was fairly high as there were four errors in issue area coding and five in direction of evaluation for an overall percentage agreement score of 93%.<sup>9</sup> None of the coding disagreements, further, were momentous ones as all concerned a few "borderline" decisions that should not affect the primary thrust of this analysis.<sup>10</sup>

On the basis of the findings of Bauer, Pool, and Dexter, it was assumed not only that business publications tend to reflect the views of their readerships but also that they help to form the attitudes of their readers.<sup>11</sup> While editorial opinion may not be as efficient in detecting support for Nixon as more directly political activities by businessmen, the examination of journal editorials has the advantage of providing specific evaluations of Nixon's performance and of indicating the reasons for those evaluations. Emphasis was placed on editorial statements and feature materials because they tend to make evaluations more forthrightly than the subtle and ambiguous "slants" of news stories. The findings of the content analysis were then compared with poll data indicating opinions of businessmen at large.

<sup>9</sup> For a good discussion of the percentage agreement score in content analysis see Richard L. Merritt, *Systematic Approaches to Comparative Politics* (Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1970) pp. 86-88. The formula for it is:

$$P_o = 2r_{ab}/(r_a + r_b)$$

where  $P_o$  is the percentage agreement score,  $r_a$  is the number of items recorded by judge A,  $r_b$  is the number of items recorded by judge B, and  $r_{ab}$  is the number of items coded similarly by the two judges.

<sup>10</sup> Regarding issue area, there was one disagreement between defense and foreign policy focus; two domestic policy codes by one judge were put in the style and staff categories by the other; and for one editorial, a second issue area was not coded by one of the judges. In addition to one noncoding, the other four valence errors were composed of neutral versus positive or negative evaluations.

<sup>11</sup> Raymond A. Bauer, Ithiel de Sola Pool, and Lewis A. Dexter, *American Business and Public Policy: The Politics of Foreign Trade* (New York: Atherton Press, 1963) p. 470. For a similar methodology for investigating business and military foreign policy beliefs through a content analysis of the business and military press, see Russett and Hanson, *op. cit.*, Chapters 6 and 7.

For this study, *Business Week*, *Forbes*, *Fortune*, *Nation's Business*, and *The Wall Street Journal* were used to gain a cross-section of the general views of the business world. These journals were selected since they are specifically directed toward businessmen and, furthermore, because they constitute the major general business publications in terms of readership and circulation.<sup>12</sup> As a result of the analysis of these journals' evaluations of Nixon's first four years in office, they were ranked according to their support for the President, principal areas of editorial concern, and general liberalism or conservatism. It was then possible to compare the reactions of the various journals to the Watergate scandal to test the following hypotheses:

- H1. Support for Nixon should drop substantially in all journals as the Watergate scandal became increasingly salient during 1973 because of both the political and economic crises occurring simultaneously.
- H2. Questions of administrative integrity should be raised earlier and stressed more throughout the period of scandal investigation by the more liberal journals.
- H3. The more conservative journals should react to the many unfavorable revelations primarily by confining their criticisms to the economic realm.
- H4. The more conservative journals should more quickly resume their previous levels of support for Nixon and argue that "the past should be forgotten" and that he should be allowed to remain in office.

#### EVALUATIONS OF THE FIRST FOUR YEARS

The business publications were generally supportive of President Nixon during his first term of office, and favorable comments regarding his policies far outnumbered the criticisms. Nevertheless, there were noticeable variations in the level of relative support given the President and in the types of policies preferred by the various spokesmen for business. Support also fluctuated within each publication over time. The more conservative journals exhibited greater enthusiasm at the beginning of the term but became more critical as time passed. The more cosmopolitan and liberal journals, however, were skeptical at the beginning but warmed toward Nixon's perceived achievements.<sup>13</sup> Table 1 summarizes the nature of the commentary about President Nixon in all five of the journals; and Table 2 shows what policy areas received the greatest amount of commentary and support.

<sup>12</sup> Edward C. Bursk, "New Dimensions in Top Executive Reading," *Harvard Business Review* (September-October, 1957) pp. 93-112. More recent circulation figures are available in the January, 1973, *Circulation Bulletin*, of *Nation's Business*.

<sup>13</sup> For a much more detailed analysis of Nixon's first term see Clark, *op. cit.*

**TABLE 1. Business Editorial Evaluations of the First Nixon Administration, 1969-1972**

	Positive		Negative		Neutral		Ratio
	N	%	N	%	N	%	Pos/Neg
<i>Forbes</i> . . . . .	75	78	9	9	12	13	8.7:1
<i>Business Week</i> . . . . .	105	53	55	28	39	19	1.9:1
<i>Wall Street Journal</i> . . . . .	69	46	37	25	44	29	1.8:1
<i>Nation's Business</i> . . . . .	57	51	32	29	22	20	1.8:1
<i>Fortune</i> . . . . .	39	53	25	34	10	13	1.6:1

**TABLE 2. Evaluations of Specific Aspects of the First Nixon Administration, 1969-1972**

	Total	Positive	Negative	Neutral
Economic . . . . .	194	99	48	47
Domestic Policy . . . . .	160	89	41	30
Foreign Policy . . . . .	92	69	12	11
Personal Attributes & Style . . . . .	54	19	15	20
Staff . . . . .	45	34	8	3
Budgetary Policy . . . . .	42	12	18	12
Executive Reorganization . . . . .	24	16	5	3
Defense Policy . . . . .	20	10	7	3

A major concern of all the journals was President Nixon's economic policies concerning inflation control, taxation, labor relations, international trade, and anti-trust suits, which directly affect business operations. Moreover, since the economy is the field of most immediate concern to businessmen, the most significant editorial differences occurred in this area. While all the journals expressed more approval than disapproval of Mr. Nixon's economic policies, the proportion of approval varied (see Appendix I for the individual journals' support by issue area). *Forbes* was by far the most supportive with positive evaluations occurring seven times more often than negative comments. *Fortune*, on the other hand, criticized Nixon's economic policies nearly as often as it praised them. It was particularly opposed to any obstacles to international free trade and to his anti-trust actions. *Nation's Business* and *Business Week's* evaluations were twice as likely to be favorable as negative, while the ratio was three-to-one favorable for the *Wall Street Journal*. Variations in support also

occurred regarding specific economic issues and between time periods for a single issue.<sup>14</sup>

Domestic programs regarding welfare reform, environmental protection, health insurance, revenue sharing, and mass transit were also important to the business spokesmen who were generally supportive of finding solutions for these troublesome problems; and President Nixon's policies in this field were approved by a more than two-to-one margin. All of the journals overwhelmingly supported President Nixon's foreign policy measures throughout his entire first term; and praise for his initiatives peaked in 1972 as a result of the Peking and Moscow trips. In general, the journals assumed a fairly "dovish" stance towards foreign policy and defense matters.<sup>15</sup> Critical comments outnumbered positive ones in only one major policy area. Most of the business press opposed Mr. Nixon's deficit budgets. Fiscal responsibility had been one of the campaign promises of the Republican Administration. Hence, the failure to balance the budget drew demands for cuts in federal spending from four of the journals and for an increase in taxes from *Forbes*.<sup>16</sup>

The business publications occasionally commented upon Mr. Nixon's personality, behavioral style, and staff during his first administration. While at first all of the journals overwhelmingly approved of his appointments, *The Wall Street Journal* gradually began expressing reservations about the abilities of the White House staff. It indicated that the men closest to the President were amateurs in politics and tended to be "yes" men who were not noted for their skills or initiative.<sup>17</sup> *The Journal* and *Business Week* particularly questioned the Nixon style. While his policies and actions were usually seen as praiseworthy, they found his rhetoric to be disappointing and inappropriate.<sup>18</sup>

<sup>14</sup> For example, reactions to President Nixon's efforts to control inflation fluctuated over time. Generally the business spokesmen held high expectations of his ability to stabilize the economy when he first took office, but confidence ebbed as time passed without any significant improvement. Criticism of his anti-inflation programs reached a peak in 1970 and early 1971. Then despite the fact that all of the journals opposed wage-price controls in principle, they accepted Nixon's institution of controls in 1971 and rallied to his support, suggesting that the unusual circumstances required drastic actions.

<sup>15</sup> The journals generally agreed with his Vietnamization strategy of slowly withdrawing American troops while negotiating a settlement with North Viet Nam. Criticisms, however, were voiced during the Cambodian crisis when it appeared that American involvement was deepening. Many of the publications supported Nixon's relative reductions in the defense share of the national budget and urged him to abandon controversial defense programs such as the ABM's. For more detailed data indicating the fairly dovish positions of a significant portion of the American business community see Russett and Hanson, *op. cit.*

<sup>16</sup> *Nation's Business* (May, 1972) p. 80; *Business Week* (June 24, 1972) p. 124; *The Wall Street Journal* (January 28, 1972), p. 10; and *Forbes* (June 1, 1972) p. 15.

<sup>17</sup> *The Wall Street Journal* (February 11, 1972) p. 8, (September 11, 1972) p. 20, (October 23, 1972) p. 8, and (December 20, 1972) p. 14.

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*, (October 29, 1971) p. 8, and (February 6, 1971) p. 94.

"Watergate"<sup>19</sup> received only scant attention from these five publications during 1972. *Business Week*, *Fortune*, and *Forbes* were the only ones to comment on any of the interrelated scandals, and they limited their editorial opinions to the ITT question. The three expressed the belief that the settlement had been typical and far from overly advantageous to ITT. Nevertheless, *Business Week* and *Fortune* were critical of the way in which the agreement had been reached saying that it had aroused needless suspicion.<sup>20</sup>

There were significant differences in the amounts of attention given to the various issues by the journals. Table 3 shows the proportion of each journal's Nixon editorials devoted to the major issue areas. *Fortune*, *Business Week*, and *Nation's Business* had a much greater relative emphasis on economic and budgetary affairs than the other two publications. *The Wall Street Journal* and *Forbes*, on the other hand, placed more emphasis on foreign affairs and defense issues. In addition to attracting a readership more interested in international business matters, the wider interests of *The Wall Street Journal* probably derived from its role as a newspaper, while *Forbes'* editorial policy primarily reflected the interests of editor Malcolm Forbes, a moderate-to-liberal Republican.

TABLE 3. Relative Attention Given to Policy Area By Business Journals, 1969-1972

	<i>Fortune</i>	<i>Bus. Week</i>	<i>Nat. Bus.</i>	<i>Forbes</i>	<i>Wall St. J.</i>
Economic-Budgetary .	50%	49%	43%	24%	18%
Domestic . . . . .	27	25	27	18	21
Foreign-Defense . . . .	12	13	8	31	20

The five journals cover the full ideological spectrum. *Nation's Business*, the official magazine of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, expressed the most traditional and conservative views. It devoted a considerable number of its editorials to attacks upon Nixon's domestic programs, taking the position that federal expenditures had to be reduced to prevent further damage to the economy through rising inflation. *The Wall Street Journal* and *Business Week* represented mildly conservative to moderate interests. The *Journal* also wanted to reduce the role of the federal government in American life and to have a balanced budget but supported Nixon's welfare and health programs as practical solutions to major domestic problems. *Business Week* held views

<sup>19</sup> In this paper, the term "Watergate" is used to refer to all of the matters that the U. S. House of Representatives' Judiciary Committee had under investigation for impeachment.

<sup>20</sup> *Forbes* (April 15, 1972) p. 21; *Business Week* (March 4, 1972) p. 140, and (June 24, 1972) p. 124; and *Fortune* (May, 1972) pp. 151-152.



TABLE 4. Rankings of the Business Journals Over the First Nixon Administration

Most Positive	Support for Nixon	Emphasis on	Liberalism
	Least Negative	Economic Issues	
<i>Forbes</i>	<i>Forbes</i>	<i>Fortune</i>	<i>Forbes</i>
<i>Bus. Week</i>	<i>W.S. Journal</i>	<i>Business Week</i>	<i>Fortune</i>
<i>Fortune</i>	<i>Business Week</i>	<i>Nation's Business</i>	<i>Bus. Week</i>
<i>Nat. Bus.</i>	<i>Nat. Business</i>	<i>Forbes</i>	<i>W.S. Journal</i>
<i>W.S. Journal</i>	<i>Fortune</i>	<i>W.S. Journal</i>	<i>Nat. Business</i>

similar to those of the *Journal* on domestic and budgetary issues but seemed more willing to accept government intervention in the economy to smooth out business cycles. *Fortune* and *Forbes* expressed more liberal ideas. A prime emphasis of *Fortune* was upon the need to restore domestic tranquility with the President taking the lead in achieving social equality. Yet, *Fortune* still adhered to some classical economic theories with regard to free trade and monopolies. *Forbes'* editorials supported a dynamic presidency and government programs for domestic improvement. Even income redistribution through higher income taxes was not an anathema to *Forbes*.<sup>21</sup>

The differing ideological orientations of these journals might be explained in part by the interests, attitudes, and geographic distribution of their subscribers. *Nation's Business'* conservatism may reflect the facts that 67% of its professional subscribers came from small businesses and industries and that it has the highest southern circulation of the five journals.<sup>22</sup> Small businessmen have long been considered the most conservative segment of the business community,<sup>23</sup> and the South is the most conservative region of the country. The more liberal emphasis of *Fortune* and *Forbes* might result from the more cosmopolitan viewpoint of their subscribers since they have the highest proportion of board chairmen readers to total circulation.<sup>24</sup>

It is possible then to distinguish between the editorial positions of the five journals at the end of President Nixon's first term. Table 4 ranks them according to support for the President, attention to economic issues, and ideology. *Forbes* gave by far the most positive evaluations of the President, and *The Wall Steeet Journal* the least. Yet, the *Journal* was not actually as critical as some of the other publications. It was second only to *Forbes* in the

<sup>21</sup> *Forbes* (June 1, 1972) p. 15. Clark, *op. cit.*, discusses these ideological differences in much more detail.

<sup>22</sup> *Nation's Business, Subscriber Analysis* (May, 1972) p. 5.

<sup>23</sup> Truman, *op. cit.*, p. 183.

<sup>24</sup> *Nation's Business, Subscriber Analysis* (May, 1972) p. 5.

low proportion of critical comments, while *Fortune* had the highest proportion of criticism. It also devoted the highest proportion of its Nixon editorials to economic issues as opposed to the *Journal*, a newspaper with the most diverse readership among the five journals, which had the least emphasis on economic matters.

### THE AFTERMATH OF WATERGATE

During the early months of 1973, most of the journals continued to be highly supportive of President Nixon; but in the second half of the year, when the enormity of Watergate became apparent, his popularity tumbled greatly. This section of the paper will examine the overall effect of Watergate revelations upon presidential support showing the slippage over time and will compare the relative amount of editorial attention given to the scandal by the various publications. In particular, business perspectives on Watergate and economic matters will be contrasted. The findings will then be compared with poll data concerning the attitudes toward Nixon among business and professional people. Finally, the four hypotheses outlined at the beginning of this study will serve to summarize the analysis.

#### *An Overview of Declining Support*

By the end of his administration, President Nixon's support had suffered tremendously in all of the journals except the conservative *Nation's Business* where it remained about the same. Table 5 compares the average evaluations of the journals for Nixon's first term with those for his shortened second one. *Nation's Business* had become progressively more critical of Nixon during his first term, but his efforts to reduce federal spending had improved his image during the early part of the second term. While Watergate was deplored, it had no overwhelming effects on *Nation's Business'* evaluations of the President. *The Wall Street Journal*, however, devoted considerable attention to the scandal, and its level of criticism rose sharply over that of the previous four years.<sup>25</sup> *Business Week's* growing criticism of Nixon was accelerated by the revelations of the scandal. It feared that his ability to govern was being completely undermined by the credibility gap. Certainly he was no longer able to cope as stringently with the economic problems of the nation. *Fortune* and *Forbes* shared this view, feeling that Nixon was so distracted by Watergate that he had let the economy and energy crisis go beyond control because he was afraid to make unpopular decisions.<sup>26</sup> Thus, the chief concern of these

<sup>25</sup> The *Journal* could not fathom Nixon's handling of the crisis. While he was considered very astute in handling foreign affairs and most domestic issues, he seemed surprisingly inept at reducing this "second-rate burglary" to its true level of importance. (*The Wall Street Journal* (March 21, 1973) p. 20). Until August, 1974, it never assumed Nixon himself to be guilty but repeatedly berated his nonprofessional staff.

<sup>26</sup> *Business Week* (May 21, 1973) p. 204, and (June 9, 1973) p. 110; *Fortune* (January, 1974) p. 65; and *Forbes* (August 1, 1973) p. 13.

publications over the scandal revolved around its impact on Nixon's economic policies. While none of them condoned the breach of ethics and the attack on democratic principles, they tended to focus attention on its damaging effects on what was to them more pertinent policy areas.

TABLE 5. The Effect of Watergate on Evaluations of Nixon's Policies by Business Publications

	Positive		Negative		Neutral	
	1969-1972	1973-1974	1969-1972	1973-1974	1969-1972	1973-1974
<i>Nation's Business</i> . . . . .	51%	55%	29%	31%	20%	14%
<i>W. S. Journal</i> . . . . .	46	42	25	43	29	15
<i>Business Week</i> . . . . .	53	36	28	44	19	20
<i>Fortune</i> . . . . .	55	42	34	52	13	6
<i>Forbes</i> . . . . .	78	51	9	33	20	16

In addition to the decline in overall support during 1973-1974 as opposed to Nixon's first term, significant temporal variations occurred within this latter time period as well. The strongest impact of Watergate was felt during the second half of 1973. Table 6 shows the variations in the level of support for Nixon within the approximately twenty months of his second term. During the first half of 1973, all of the journals except *Business Week*, which was unhappy with the ending of economic controls under Phase III, retained very positive images of the Nixon Presidency, approximately maintaining their level of support from the first term. A dramatic reversal occurred during the second half of the year. The overall editorial tone dropped to a substantially critical one in *Forbes*, *Fortune*, and *The Wall Street Journal*. *Business Week* continued a slightly negative evaluation, and even the support of *Nation's Business* fell noticeably. The sharpest drop in support occurred in the two more liberal journals, *Forbes* and *Fortune*, whose proportion of favorable editorials fell from the middle 60%'s to the middle 20%'s.

TABLE 6. The Effect of Watergate Revelations Over Time

	Jan.-June 1973		July-Dec. 1973		Jan.-June 1974		July-Dec. 1974	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<i>Nation's Business</i>								
Positive .....	7	78	4	50	5	56	0	0
Negative .....	1	11	4	50	3	33	1	33
Neutral .....	1	11	0	0	1	11	2	67
<i>W. S. Journal</i>								
Positive .....	58	52	38	36	35	43	7	27
Negative .....	42	38	58	54	29	35	11	42
Neutral .....	12	11	11	10	18	22	8	31
<i>Business Week</i>								
Positive .....	20	38	15	39	4	20	4	44
Negative .....	22	42	17	45	9	45	5	56
Neutral .....	11	21	6	16	7	35	0	0
<i>Fortune</i>								
Positive .....	13	62	4	24	3	38	1	25
Negative .....	6	28	13	76	5	63	2	50
Neutral .....	20	10	0	0	0	0	1	25
<i>Forbes</i>								
Positive .....	12	67	6	28	7	54	4	80
Negative .....	3	17	12	57	3	23	1	20
Neutral .....	3	17	3	14	3	23	0	0

Yet, by early 1974, Nixon's support started to recover slightly. The proportion of favorable to negative comments increased in all the publications but *Business Week* and was especially pronounced in *Forbes*. This recovery, however, was accompanied by a significant decrease in the amount of attention given to the Nixon Administration. The number of *Journal* editorials fell from 107 to 82 from the second half of 1973 to the first six months of 1974; and this drop was much sharper in *Business Week*, *Fortune*, and *Forbes* whose combined total of editorials fell from 76 to 41. To some extent, then, silence may have been substituted for direct criticism as the journals waited to see how Nixon's political and economic trials would end. This silence continued into the second half of 1974 when the number of Nixon editorials dropped to nearly nothing. Although this reduced attention can be partly explained by the fact that the President resigned in August, there certainly were numerous events in July, August, and September that should have invited critical

comment. The increased negative tone of the editorials reflects the journals' relief that Nixon did resign.<sup>27</sup> The Nixon pardon in September brought additional comment with some division of opinion concerning its propriety.<sup>28</sup>

Watergate, of course, was not the only issue in which the journals were interested during Nixon's second term. President Nixon was simultaneously faced with the energy crisis, runaway inflation, and the Middle East War, not to mention Vice President Agnew's problems. The journals gave considerable attention to those areas as well. Table 7 shows the level of interest in and evaluations of these other policy issues (see Appendix II for a journal-by-journal breakdown).

TABLE 7. Evaluations of Specific Aspects of the Nixon Administration, 1973-1975

	Total	Positive	Negative	Neutral
Watergate . . . . .	157	28	94	35
Economic Policy . . . . .	95	40	36	19
Staff . . . . .	63	29	30	4
Energy Crisis . . . . .	49	22	20	7
Budgetary Policy . . . . .	47	36	8	3
Foreign Policy . . . . .	46	35	6	5
Domestic Policy . . . . .	44	30	9	5
Personal Attributes and Style . . . . .	33	6	23	4
Nixon Pardon . . . . .	13	4	5	4
Executive Reorganization . . . . .	11	2	6	3
Defense Policy . . . . .	7	4	2	1
Agnew Scandal . . . . .	7	4	2	1
Press Relations . . . . .	6	2	4	0
Ford Nomination . . . . .	5	3	2	0

Many of the areas where President Nixon received high levels of criticism were related to the scandal, such as comments upon his poorly qualified staff, his relations with the press, and his personality and style of operation. How-

<sup>27</sup> *The Wall Street Journal* considered resignation his only reasonable alternative in the face of the overwhelming evidence which had come out against him. *Forbes* felt "euphoria" after his resignation, and *Fortune* expressed relief. *The Wall Street Journal* (August 9, 1974) p. 8; *Forbes* (September 1, 1974) p. 21; and *Fortune* (September, 1974) p. 109.

<sup>28</sup> *Business Week* was outraged at the inequity of the pardon, while *Forbes*, *Fortune*, and *Nation's Business* were concerned with the future political implications and the effect upon Republican fortunes in the upcoming elections. The *Journal* was alone in supporting the pardon, saying that it would allow a faster healing of the Watergate wounds. *Business Week* (September 14, 1974) p. 188; *Forbes* (October 1, 1974) p. 17; *Fortune* (October, 1974) p. 140; *Nation's Business* (December, 1974) p. 13; and *The Wall Street Journal* (September 10, 1974) p. 20, and (October 18, 1974) p. 14.

ever, the journals were also unhappy with many of the Administration's economic policies. Although Phase III had failed to hold down inflation, none but *Business Week* approved of the price freeze and creation of Phase IV; and all were relieved when the controls ended altogether in the spring of 1974. In regard to the energy crisis, the journals felt that President Nixon had ignored critical shortages too long before the embargo began. They believed that actions should have been taken earlier and more urgently. Nevertheless, they did support Nixon's basically voluntary approach to cutbacks in energy use.

On the positive side, the publications favored Nixon's budget cuts and urged Congress to hold the line on federal spending. Domestic programs in the fields of housing, busing, and the abolition of the OEO were supported. The journals liked his foreign policies as much as ever. The new Arab rapprochement was particularly welcomed. Even the Agnew affair won President Nixon support as *The Wall Street Journal* stated that his neutral stand on the charges was the only intelligent position that he could possibly have taken.<sup>29</sup>

#### *The Relative Impact of Economic Deterioration and Watergate*

It is difficult to isolate Watergate as the most important factor in the decline in support for President Nixon because so many other issues of vital concern to businessmen were going sour at the same time. In absolute terms, the Watergate scandal stands out as the lightning rod for business criticism of the Nixon Administration during 1973-1974. There were twice as many critical comments as positive ones, 156 to 69, concerning Watergate and the related issues of Presidential staff, personal attributes and style, pardon, and relations with the press, while the minor area of executive reorganization was the only other one in which negative comments outnumbered positive ones. Despite the continued enthusiasm for Nixon's foreign policy and gains in the popularity of his domestic programs and budgetary initiatives, there was a substantial deterioration in the evaluations of his economic policies. In contrast to the over two-to-one ratio of favorable to unfavorable comments during the first term, the ratio for the second term was only slightly positive for economic policy and the closely related energy field, indicating considerable business concern over their "bread-and-butter" issues. Moreover, the growing economic problems may well have caused the business spokesmen to regard Nixon's Watergate problems more critically than they would have had they been more satisfied with his economic performance. As noted above, much of the business criticism of Watergate focused more on its economic effects than on questions of political morality.

The six most important issue areas for the first Nixon Administration, which constitute six of the eight most important ones for 1973-1974 (Watergate and

<sup>29</sup> *The Wall Street Journal* (October 5, 1973) p. 8.

energy were the two new major issues), are compared between the two time periods in Table 8 to give a more precise idea of the relative impact of Watergate and economic considerations upon the deterioration of business support for Nixon. The first column in Table 8 presents the proportion of the total number of editorial comments (positive, neutral, and negative) on each issue area of the 1973-1974 period to the 1969-1972 one. Variations among these ratios indicate which issues were given more editorial emphasis during the Watergate period relative to the first Administration. The second column gives an ordinal measure of association — gamma — for relating the relative favorableness of the comments on each area between the two time periods.<sup>30</sup> Positive gammas show that Nixon's position on an issue was more favorably viewed during 1973-1974 than during his first term, and negative gammas indicate that his position was evaluated less favorably in the 1973-1974 period.

TABLE 8. Comparison of First and Second Term Editorials by Issue Area

<i>Issue Area</i>	<i>Proportion 2nd/1st term references</i>	<i>Gamma*</i>
Personality and Style . . .	.61	-.66
Staff . . . . .	1.40	-.63
Economic Policy . . . . .	.49	-.30
Foreign Policy . . . . .	.50	.01
Domestic Policy . . . . .	.28	.21
Budget . . . . .	1.12	.74

\* Positive gamma denotes proportionately more support during second term.

The data in Table 8 suggest that Watergate, whatever its interconnections with economic evaluations, played a substantial independent role in the falling popularity of President Nixon. Evaluations were more negative during the second term for only three of the six issues indicating that the deterioration of support for the President was confined to specific policy areas. Nixon's more conservative budgetary policies were particularly remarkable in this regard as editorial evaluations changed from a 2:3 negative ratio to a 4½:1 positive one; and, to a lesser extent, a similar trend can also be discerned regarding domestic policy. The two areas of staff and personality, which were directly related to President Nixon's Watergate troubles, form perhaps the most striking feature of Table 8. They rank first and third in relative emphasis during 1973-1974. For example, although Nixon's second term was only half as

<sup>30</sup> For each of the six issue areas, a four-fold table was constructed with the two columns being the first term and the second term and the two rows being positive and negative evaluations (note the exclusion of the neutral comments here). Gammas were then computed from the numbers of editorials falling into these four cells. For the computation formula, see Hubert M. Blalock, Jr., *Social Statistics* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1972) p. 424.

long as his first, there were 40% more comments on staff during it than for 1969-1972. A tremendous negative swing in the editorial perceptions of these two issue areas also occurred as both had gammas of less than  $-.6$ . The aforementioned decline in support for Nixon's economic policies, in contrast, only resulted in a gamma of  $-.3$ . In sum, the two Watergate-related areas stand out for their increase in relative salience and pronounced negative shift in tone of editorial comment; and the effects of Watergate did not prevent the business community from applauding a favored shift in budgetary policy.

The five journals did not grant equal attention to the scandal. Table 9 shows the percentage of Nixon editorials and features devoted to Watergate. *The Wall Street Journal* stands out as exactly half of its Nixon editorials concerned Watergate. *Forbes* and *Business Week*, on the other hand, paid relatively little attention to it. Although *Nation's Business* gave relatively more commentary on the topic, it was not as critical of Watergate as the other journals, seeing it as just another political scandal among many in American history.<sup>31</sup> Except for *The Journal*, the publications paid nearly twice as much attention to issues affecting the economy as to Watergate.

TABLE 9. Relative Attention Given to Watergate by Business Journals

	W. S. Journal	Nat. Bus.	Fortune	Forbes	Bus. Week
Watergate . . . . .	50%	28%	22%	19%	13%
Economic-Budgetary .	14	38	32	30	44
Energy . . . . .	5	10	14	9	16
Domestic . . . . .	8	10	8	2	9
Foreign-Defense . . . .	11	0	8	16	4

\* The Watergate category includes comments regarding personality and style, the pardon, and press relations that were connected with the scandal.

An examination of the journals' specific criticisms during the second half of 1973 when the dissatisfaction with the Nixon Administration was expressed reinforces this conclusion. In Table 10, *The Wall Street Journal* is again spotlighted by its concern with Watergate as 78% of its critical comments during this key period were directed at Watergate-related matters. *Forbes* and *Fortune* were next with approximately half of their criticisms related to the scandal. *Business Week* and *Nation's Business*, however, were more critical of Nixon's economic and domestic policies than of Watergate; and *Fortune's* concern with these two areas equaled that with Watergate. Thus, the impression from Table 8 that Watergate dominated business criticism of

<sup>31</sup> *Nation's Business* (December, 1973) p. 4, and (February, 1974) pp. 11-12.



the second Nixon Administration appears to be primarily an artifact of *The Wall Street Journal's* editorial policy and its relatively large number of editorials. Even at the height of the Watergate fallout, three of the five journals devoted as much or more criticism to economic and domestic matters as to the scandal. For them, the reduced support for President Nixon may well have been substantially influenced by his failure to solve the economic problems.

TABLE 10. Areas of Criticism, July-December, 1973

	<i>W. S. Journal</i>	<i>Forbes</i>	<i>Fortune</i>	<i>Bus. Week</i>	<i>Nat. Bus.</i>
Watergate . . . . .	45	6	6	6	1
Economy-Energy-Budget	8	3	4	7	1
Domestic . . . . .	1	0	2	2	2
Foreign-Defense . . . .	2	2	0	0	0
Executive Reorg. . . . .	0	0	0	2	0
Agnew . . . . .	0	1	1	0	0
Ford Nomination . . . .	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Total . . . . .	58	12	13	17	4

These conclusions are strengthened by the summary of the five journals' overall evaluations for the entire 1973-1974 period contained in Table 11. The first column is the total number of negative references to Watergate and related matters (staff, personal attributes and style, and press relations). The second takes negative Watergate comments as a percentage of the negative evaluations from all issue areas to show the relative importance of Watergate in each journal's overall criticism of the Nixon Administration; and the third is the percentage that these negative comments form of all positive and negative editorials on Watergate (neutral remarks are not included here) which indicates the relative level of criticism by each journal of Nixon's Watergate activities. The proportions of negative to negative plus positive comments for major internal (economic, energy, domestic, and budgetary) policies and for just economic and energy policies together (since Table 8 showed that their aggregate approval ratings were much less than for the domestic and budgetary areas) compose columns four and five respectively. They can be compared with Table 8 to show the level of Watergate criticism relative to other areas of more direct professional concern to the business community.

TABLE 11. Differences in the Journals' Evaluations of Watergate, 1973-1974

	Num Neg Watergate Comments	Neg Watergate/ All Negative Comments	Neg/Pos + Neg Watergate Comments	Neg/Pos + Neg Internal Comments*	Neg/Neg + Pos Economic-Energy Comments
W.S.J. . . . .	103	75%	70%	31%	52%
Fortune . . .	13	54	87	43	53
Forbes . . . .	9	47	47	22	33
Nat. Bus. . .	4	44	67	25	17
Bus. Week	20	38	80	45	47

\* Includes economic, energy, domestic and budgetary issue areas.

Table 11 quite definitely confirms the leading role of *The Wall Street Journal* in the Watergate criticism as 69% of all negative comments came from the *Journal*. The *Journal* is also exceptional in that Watergate constituted three-fourths of its critical comments during the second term, while for the other four journals nonWatergate criticism formed about 50% or more of their negative evaluations (note that these percentages do not depart drastically from the ones in Table 10 for the July-December, 1973 subperiod alone). Among the other four journals there is a slight tendency for *Nation's Business* and *Business Week*, the pair that is more conservative, to devote relatively less of their criticism to Watergate than *Fortune* and *Forbes*. In the specific evaluations that were made about Watergate, however, the *W.S.J.* was not so negative as *Fortune* and *Business Week* and approximated the percentage of *Nation's Business* which, as observed above, gave President Nixon the most support during his second term. The surprisingly low negative percentage for the liberal *Forbes* resulted from positive comments on Nixon's staff (8 to 3) which offset negative ones on Watergate itself (1 to 6).<sup>32</sup> Finally, comparing Watergate to editorial perceptions of other internal policies demonstrates that the Watergate actions were much more harshly evaluated than Nixon's endeavors in other fields in all five journals, liberal and conservative alike, even when the relatively often criticized economic and energy policies are considered by themselves.

Assessing the relative impact of Watergate and economic factors upon the decline of business support for President Nixon, hence, produces some ambiguous evidence. On the one hand, much of the Watergate criticism was phrased in terms of Watergate's implications for economic policy-making; general support for the Administration in the realms of economic and energy policy declined significantly; and all the publications except *The Wall Street*

<sup>32</sup> Most of this praise was bestowed upon Henry Kissinger. George Schultz, William Simon, William Rogers, and Ambassador Annenburg also received favorable comments.

*Journal* devoted substantial amounts of criticism to areas other than Watergate. On the other hand, Watergate drew proportionately much greater criticism compared both to issue positions during the President's first term and to other issues during the second term; and these trends existed in both liberal and conservative publications. In sum, while Watergate criticism was undoubtedly intertwined to some degree with other increasingly negative business perceptions of Nixon, a significant amount of disillusionment with the Watergate actions *per se* also occurred. Despite this sharp criticism of Watergate, however, the editorials did not strongly emphasize moral issues; and there were few, if any, calls for Nixon's removal as punishment for "breaking the rules of the political game."

#### *Editorial Evaluations and Indicators of Public Opinion*

The levels of approval and disapproval of President Nixon's policies expressed by the five business journals were very consistent with those stated by samples of business and professional people. The Gallup organization conducts regular polls about popular approval of the way in which the President handles his job, and the respondents are classified according to occupation.<sup>33</sup> Although the business and professional category includes more than businessmen, it should generally indicate the feelings of members within that group. Table 12 compares the average level of approval and disapproval expressed by the professional respondents with the average evaluations of the five journals. Although the editorials generally had a higher proportion of neutral comments, the level of support for President Nixon given by the sample and the editorials was very close with only a few percentage points separating them for most of the first three years.

During the latter part of 1971, the business and professional sample began to take a more positive stance toward the President than the journals' editorial pages did. This gap widened in the first half of 1972 and remained pronounced through the first six months of 1973. Perhaps, individual businessmen had anticipated more beneficial effects from the Administration's wage-price controls than the journals did. There was a greater decline in Nixon's popularity among the business and professional respondents than in the editorial columns during the latter part of 1973 so that the two rates of approval were again almost precisely the same.

<sup>33</sup> *Gallup Opinion Index* (January, 1969 - October, 1974).

**TABLE 12. Comparisons of Business Journal Evaluations With Business and Professional Opinion**

	Percentage of Journal Comments											
	1969		1970		1971		1972		1973		1974	
	1st ½	2nd ½	1st ½	2nd ½	1st ½	2nd ½	1st ½	2nd ½	1st ½	2nd ½	1st ½	2nd ½
Positive . . .	71%	60%	59%	59%	50%	53%	45%	50%	52%	35%	41%	34%
Negative . . .	11	17	31	23	25	27	31	29	34	54	37	43
Neutral . . .	18	23	10	18	25	20	24	21	14	11	21	23
	Percentage of Business and Professional Opinion											
Approve . . .	68%	65%	64%	59%	54%	60%	62%	66%	63%	35%	28%	29%
Disapprove	9	22	28	32	38	32	31	27	30	56	63	64
No Opinion	23	13	8	9	8	8	7	7	7	9	9	7

SOURCE: For public opinion data, *Gallup Opinion Index* (January, 1969-October, 1974).

In early 1974, however, the sample's evaluation of Nixon continued to fall in contrast to the recovery that he made in the journals, reversing the direction of the previous gap between individual and journal evaluations. The journals may have been mollified by the relatively successful handling of the oil embargo and hoping that the President would be able to come to grips with inflation once the economic controls were ended. In the final months of his administration, the journals virtually ignored Mr. Nixon. On the other hand, individual businessmen appeared to be much more forthright in expressing skepticism about Nixon's remaining effectiveness as President.<sup>34</sup>

The business and professional respondents tended to assume President Nixon to be guilty in the Watergate affair fairly early in the unfolding scandal but apparently did not consider it repulsive enough to warrant his ouster from office.<sup>35</sup> *The Wall Street Journal*, the only one of the five business publications to give in-depth analysis of the scandal, in contrast, took a more neutral

<sup>34</sup> For example, in a *New York Times* survey of 167 chief executives of major corporations taken during the summer of 1974, 80% stated that Watergate had "seriously affected the President's ability to handle the nation's economic affairs." By August, 48% of Gallup's business and professional sample preferred that Ford complete the term of office, while only 35% preferred Nixon. Creed C. Black, "Leadership is the Question in the Fight Against Inflation," *The Philadelphia Inquirer* (July 14, 1974) p. 7-D; and *Gallup Opinion Index* (September, 1974).

<sup>35</sup> As early as April, 1973, 50% of the business and professional respondents believed that Nixon knew about Watergate in advance; and in July, a vast majority of the sample was not satisfied with Nixon's handling of the scandal and wanted him to release all of the evidence and make a clean explanation. Yet, the majority did not consider it a serious matter but "just politics." By April, 1974, the majority of the sample believed that there was enough evidence for impeachment, but 50% still did not want him removed from office. *Gallup Opinion Index* (May, 1973) pp. 6-7, (August, 1973) pp. 5-12, and (May, 1974) p. 5.

position waiting for all the evidence to materialize.<sup>36</sup> After the release of additional tapes in August, 1974, both the majority of the business and professional sample and the *Journal* conceded Nixon's guilt, and the *Journal* called for his resignation.<sup>37</sup> In regard to the Nixon pardon, the sample shared the views of most of the business publications as 58% felt that Nixon should be brought to trial and 50% opposed his being pardoned if convicted.<sup>38</sup>

This comparison of editorial comment and public opinion, then, lends more validity to the content analysis by showing a generally close correspondence between these two indicators of business perspectives. The journal strategy of withdrawal and silence is also highlighted by the increasing divergence in the support percentages between the journal editorials and opinions of the business and professional people in 1974. While these data do not directly address the question of whether economic or Watergate problems were more important in the erosion of President Nixon's popularity, the fact that wide-spread perceptions of presidential culpability for Watergate were not coupled with a clamor for his ouster, at least until the summer of 1974, demonstrates that for the business elite breaking the political rules of the game is not a mortal sin.

#### IMPLICATIONS

Perhaps the best way to summarize these findings is to review the hypotheses stated earlier in the paper. They receive only partial confirmation at best from the data presented here. Although it was expected that after the eruption of the Watergate scandal the level of support for President Nixon would radically decline in all of the journals from the average levels during his first term of office, it did not clearly do so. Editorial evaluations did move sharply in the expected direction in *Forbes*, *Fortune*, and *The Wall Street Journal* by the second half of 1973; and increasing criticism was especially notable in Watergate related fields. *Business Week* and *Nation's Business*, on the other hand, displayed a wholly different pattern of change. The ratio of criticism to support in *Business Week* had been growing progressively after 1971 because of dissatisfaction with Nixonian economics, and this trend was not greatly

<sup>36</sup> The *Journal* also wanted the impeachment hearing to proceed with a full investigation of the charges, not because it presumed Nixon to be guilty but because it wanted to clear the air. The release of the first White House transcripts placed the *Journal* in an ambivalent position. It was glad that the President had finally placed the evidence before the people. Its interpretation of the taped conversations tended to exonerate Nixon of guilt in the break-ins and cover-up. However, it was repulsed by his moral tone and pettiness which robbed him of public confidence. The *Journal* was extremely concerned that the affair not be allowed to upset national stability and further divide the American people. At first it opposed resignation stating that if President Nixon had to go, he should be given a fair and open hearing to assure the people that the impeachment and conviction were just and not political. *The Wall Street Journal* (May 2, 1974) p. 12, (May 3, 1974) p. 10, (May 7, 1974) p. 22, (May 9, 1974) p. 16, and (May 21, 1974) p. 24.

<sup>37</sup> *Ibid.*, (August 7, 1974) p. 10; and *Gallup Opinion Index* (September, 1974).

<sup>38</sup> *Gallup Opinion Index* (October, 1974).

altered by the Watergate revelations.<sup>39</sup> In *Nation's Business*, the ratio of support went up during the second administration despite the scandal, perhaps in response to the President's shift to more conservative policies following the 1972 election.

In addition, the shift in editorial positions during the later part of 1973 appears only partially attributable to Watergate. All of the journals were much more concerned with the economic impact of the scandal than with its implications for political morality, and only *The Wall Street Journal* really directed extensive editorial comments to the Watergate issues. Further, from the substantial decrease in the number of comments about the Administration in most of the journals by early 1974, it appears that Watergate caused them to withdraw from Nixon as a controversial topic too hot to handle.

The second hypothesis that the more liberal journals would raise the question of moral integrity earlier and stress it more frequently may be rejected outright. Although there was a significant increase in the number of critical comments in *Forbes* and *Fortune*, the most serious consideration of Watergate was not presented in either of them but in the moderately conservative *Wall Street Journal*. This fact is probably explained by the *Journal's* daily newspaper format. It has more space to devote to noneconomic matters, and its editorials could give more timely analysis as each phase of the scandal broke. Of the more liberal journals, *Fortune* had more in-depth coverage of Watergate through feature articles, while *Forbes* gave only short references to it in editorials. Moreover, the conservative *Nation's Business* gave proportionately more attention to the scandal through editorials and James Kilpatrick's articles than the most liberal *Forbes* did.

The hypothesis that the more conservative journals would react primarily by confining their criticisms to the economic issues appears partially valid. Most of the publications confined their observations primarily to economic rather than political issues. The principal exception was *The Wall Street Journal*, a relatively conservative journal with half of its evaluations of Nixon related to Watergate issues. Thus, the relative emphasis on economic as opposed to Watergate matters seems less tied to a liberal-conservative dimension than to the journals' normal coverage and editorial interest. The three journals having the highest proportion of their criticisms related to economic and domestic, as opposed to Watergate, issues — *Fortune*, *Business Week*, and *Nation's Business* — were the three most economically-oriented ones during Mr. Nixon's first term.

The evidence concerning the final hypothesis that the more conservative journals would more quickly raise their levels of support and argue that the

<sup>39</sup> See Clark, *op cit.*, Table 1. From the beginning of 1969 until June, 1971, *Business Week* was an enthusiastic supporter of the Nixon Administration with a 72/28 positive-to-negative ratio in its editorial comments. This fell to 10/7 in the second half of 1971 and 23/20 during 1972 before assuming the slightly negative tone for 1973 and 1974 reported in Tables 5 and 6.

past be forgotten and oppose Nixon's removal from office is difficult to assess. Many of the journals, liberal and conservative alike, dropped the topic as if afraid to be involved. None, however, argued that the past be forgotten and Mr. Nixon forgiven. Except for the *Journal*, they just seemed to be waiting to see what was going to happen, with *Forbes* only hinting that Nixon might not complete his term of office.<sup>40</sup> Thus, both liberal and conservative journals passed through a stage of passive tolerance of the Nixon Administration where they openly advocated neither support nor opposition. All but *Nation's Business* expressed relief at his resignation, and only the *Journal* had a good word for the pardon.

This case study of the impact of Watergate on political support indicates a strong interrelationship between diffuse and specific support. President Nixon's inability to cope adequately with either the problem of his loss of general public respect or with the specific demands for economic stability caused the business interests of the nation to withdraw significant levels of political support from him. Without sufficient diffuse support because of the scandal, President Nixon was without a solid political base for taking the desired stringent actions for improving the economy. It is difficult to determine whether his perceived violations of the American "rules of the game" or his economic setbacks helped to place him on the brink of impeachment. But with regard to the spokesmen for business, it appears that his economic failures rather than his moral shortcomings were of primary concern. Therefore, this study tends to confirm Easton's theory that diffuse support is essential under conditions of stress when specific demands are difficult to meet, but does not confirm Truman's suggestion that leaders' violations of the "rules of the game" by themselves bring about loss of support from interest groups.

<sup>40</sup> In a passing comment, Malcolm Forbes predicted that Edward Kennedy would be elected President in 1976 but that he might *not* be the *next* President of the United States. *Forbes* (May 15, 1974) p. 41.

**APPENDIX I**  
**Evaluations of Specific Aspects of the First**  
**Nixon Administration by Business Publication**

	<i>Nat. Bus.</i>	<i>W. S. Journal</i>	<i>Bus. Week</i>	<i>Fortune</i>	<i>Forbes</i>
<b>Economic Policy</b>					
Positive . . . . .	17	6	44	17	15
Negative . . . . .	8	3	21	14	2
Neutral . . . . .	10	8	25	1	3
<b>Domestic Policy</b>					
Positive . . . . .	13	21	29	10	16
Negative . . . . .	15	5	14	7	0
Neutral . . . . .	4	13	7	4	2
<b>Foreign Policy</b>					
Positive . . . . .	7	29	14	5	14
Negative . . . . .	0	2	5	1	4
Neutral . . . . .	1	5	1	2	2
<b>Personal Attributes and Style</b>					
Positive . . . . .	4	8	0	1	6
Negative . . . . .	1	12	1	1	0
Neutral . . . . .	3	13	1	0	3
<b>Staff</b>					
Positive . . . . .	9	4	7	2	12
Negative . . . . .	0	4	4	0	0
Neutral . . . . .	0	3	0	0	0
<b>Budgetary Policy</b>					
Positive . . . . .	2	1	3	3	3
Negative . . . . .	8	5	4	1	0
Neutral . . . . .	4	4	1	2	1
<b>Executive Reorganization</b>					
Positive . . . . .	5	1	6	2	2
Negative . . . . .	0	2	3	0	0
Neutral . . . . .	0	1	2	0	0
<b>Defense Policy</b>					
Positive . . . . .	1	0	2	0	7
Negative . . . . .	0	0	4	0	3
Neutral . . . . .	0	0	2	0	1



**APPENDIX II**  
**Evaluations of Specific Aspects of the Nixon**  
**Administration 1973-1974 by Business Publications**

	<i>Nat. Bus.</i>	<i>W. S. Journal</i>	<i>Bus. Week</i>	<i>Fortune</i>	<i>Forbes</i>
<b>Watergate</b>					
Positive . . . . .	1	24	2	0	1
Negative . . . . .	3	68	11	4	6
Neutral . . . . .	1	32	0	0	2
<b>Economic Policy</b>					
Positive . . . . .	2	12	15	5	6
Negative . . . . .	1	13	13	5	4
Neutral . . . . .	1	3	11	2	2
<b>Staff</b>					
Positive . . . . .	1	15	3	2	8
Negative . . . . .	0	17	7	3	3
Neutral . . . . .	0	2	1	0	1
<b>Energy Crisis</b>					
Positive . . . . .	3	7	8	2	2
Negative . . . . .	0	8	7	5	0
Neutral . . . . .	0	0	4	0	3
<b>Budgetary Policy</b>					
Positive . . . . .	6	14	7	4	5
Negative . . . . .	1	1	6	0	0
Neutral . . . . .	0	2	1	0	0
<b>Foreign Policy</b>					
Positive . . . . .	0	23	3	4	5
Negative . . . . .	0	4	1	0	1
Neutral . . . . .	0	4	1	0	0
<b>Domestic Policy</b>					
Positive . . . . .	1	22	4	2	1
Negative . . . . .	2	3	2	2	0
Neutral . . . . .	0	0	5	0	0
<b>Personal Attributes and Style</b>					
Positive . . . . .	0	5	0	0	1
Negative . . . . .	1	16	0	6	0
Neutral . . . . .	0	4	0	0	0

## APPENDIX II (Continued)

	<i>Nat. Bus.</i>	<i>W. S. Journal</i>	<i>Bus. Week</i>	<i>Fortune</i>	<i>Forbes</i>
Nixon Pardon					
Positive . . . . .	0	4	0	0	0
Negative . . . . .	1	2	1	0	1
Neutral . . . . .	1	2	0	1	0
Executive Reorganization					
Positive . . . . .	0	0	0	2	0
Negative . . . . .	0	2	3	0	1
Neutral . . . . .	1	2	0	0	0
Defense Policy					
Positive . . . . .	0	4	0	0	0
Negative . . . . .	0	0	0	0	2
Neutral . . . . .	0	0	0	0	1
Agnew Scandal					
Positive . . . . .	0	4	0	0	0
Negative . . . . .	0	0	0	1	1
Neutral . . . . .	0	0	1	0	0
Press Relations					
Positive . . . . .	0	2	0	0	0
Negative . . . . .	0	2	2	0	0
Neutral . . . . .	0	0	0	0	0
Ford Nomination					
Positive . . . . .	2	0	1	0	0
Negative . . . . .	0	2	0	0	0
Neutral . . . . .	0	0	0	0	0