


# **Covering the United States Supreme Court in the Digital Age**

**Edited by Richard Davis**




**CAMBRIDGE**

# Covering the United States Supreme Court in the Digital Age

Edited by

**RICHARD DAVIS**

Brigham Young University



**CAMBRIDGE**  
UNIVERSITY PRESS

**CAMBRIDGE**  
**UNIVERSITY PRESS**

32 Avenue of the Americas, New York, NY 10013-2473, USA

Cambridge University Press is part of the University of Cambridge.

It furthers the University's mission by disseminating knowledge in the pursuit of education, learning, and research at the highest international levels of excellence.

[www.cambridge.org](http://www.cambridge.org)

Information on this title: [www.cambridge.org/9781107052451](http://www.cambridge.org/9781107052451)

© Richard Davis 2014

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements, no reproduction of any part may take place without the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 2014

Printed in the United States of America

*A catalog record for this publication is available from the British Library.*

*Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data*

Covering the United States Supreme Court in the digital age / edited by Richard Davis.

pages cm

ISBN 978-1-107-05245-1 (Hardback)

1. United States. Supreme Court—Press coverage. 2. Courts of last resort—Press coverage—United States. 3. Mass media—Law and legislation—United States.

I. Davis, Richard, editor of compilation.

KF8742.C679 2014

070.4'493477326—dc23 2014003454

ISBN 978-1-107-05245-1 Hardback

Cambridge University Press has no responsibility for the persistence or accuracy of URLs for external or third-party Internet Web sites referred to in this publication and does not guarantee that any content on such Web sites is, or will remain, accurate or appropriate.

## About the Contributors

**Bill Barnhart** is a Chicago-based journalist and former financial columnist for the *Chicago Tribune*. He is the coauthor of biographies of Justice John Paul Stevens and former Illinois Governor Otto Kerner.

**Rosalee A. Clawson** is a professor of political science at Purdue University. Her research focuses on public opinion, mass media, and the politics of race, class, and gender. Her work has been published in the *American Political Science Review*, *Journal of Black Studies*, *Judicature*, and *Public Opinion Quarterly*. She is the coauthor of *Legacy and Legitimacy: Black Americans and the Supreme Court* and *Public Opinion: Democratic Ideals, Democratic Practice*.

**Richard Davis** is a professor of political science at Brigham Young University. He is the author of *Decisions and Images: The Supreme Court and the Press*, *Electing Justice: Fixing the Supreme Court Nomination Process*, and *Justices and Journalists: The U.S. Supreme Court and the Media*.

**Valerie Hoekstra** is an associate professor of political science in the School of Politics and Global Studies at Arizona State University. Her research focuses on the Supreme Court and public opinion, judicial independence in state courts of last resort, judicial decision making, and the diversity of high courts globally.

**Tyler Johnson** is an assistant professor in the Department of Political Science at the University of Oklahoma. His research interests lie at the intersection of American political behavior and institutions, using elite activity and norms to explain media coverage and public opinion. His work has appeared in *Political Behavior*, *American Politics Research*, *Politics & Policy*, *Social Science Quarterly*, and the *Journal of Integrated Social Sciences*. He holds a PhD in political science from Texas A&M University.

**Nicholas LaRowe** received his PhD in 2010 from Arizona State University and is an assistant professor of political science at the University of Southern

Indiana. His research focuses on the interrelation of courts, legitimacy, and public opinion; he is currently looking at the impact of *Citizens United versus FEC* on judicial elections.

**Dahlia Lithwick** is a senior editor at *Slate*. Her work has appeared in the *New York Times*, *Harper's*, *The New Yorker*, *The Washington Post*, and *Commentary*, among other places. She won a 2013 National Magazine Award for her columns on the Affordable Care Act. She has received two Online Journalism Awards for her legal commentary. She also is the first online journalist invited to be on the Reporters Committee for the Freedom of the Press.

**Phil Marcin** is a college lecturer at the University of Akron. He is pursuing his PhD from the University of Georgia. His research focuses on judicial selection methods and media attention to the Supreme Court.

**Laura Moyer** is an assistant professor of political science at the University of Louisville. She graduated summa cum laude from Emory University and earned her Master of Public Administration and PhD in political science from the University of Georgia. Her research examines judicial behavior and identity politics and has appeared in numerous political science journals.

**David G. Savage** has covered the Supreme Court for the *Los Angeles Times* since 1986. He also writes about national legal issues and reports for the *Chicago Tribune*, the *Baltimore Sun*, and the other Tribune papers. He is the author of *Turning Right: The Making of the Rehnquist Supreme Court*, which describes the increasingly conservative court in the early 1990s. More recently, he revised and rewrote the two-volume *Guide to the U.S. Supreme Court*.

**Rorie Spill Solberg** is an associate professor in the School of Public Policy at Oregon State University. She is widely published in journals such as *Political Research Quarterly*, *Social Science Quarterly*, *Policy Studies Quarterly*, and the *Journal of Empirical Legal Studies*. In 2011, she was selected to edit *Judicature*, the journal of the American Judicature Society. She received her PhD in American politics from The Ohio State University in 1997.

**Seth Stern** is coauthor, with Stephen Wermiel, of *Justice Brennan: Liberal Champion*, a biography of Justice William J. Brennan Jr. published in 2010. He is an editor at Bloomberg BNA and previously was a reporter for Bloomberg News, the *Christian Science Monitor*, and *Congressional Quarterly*. He is a graduate of Harvard Law School, the Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University, and Cornell University.

**Vincent James Strickler** lives in Valdosta, Georgia, with his wife and seven children. He is an assistant professor of political science at Valdosta State University. He earned a PhD from Stanford University and a JD from the J. Reuben Clark Law School at Brigham Young University. His work has

appeared in the edited volumes *Freedom and the Rule of Law* and *Media Power, Media Politics*, in the *Georgia Law Review*, and in the *International Journal of Press/Politics*.

**Matthew Thornton** is an assistant professor of convergence media and chair of the Division of Media and Communication at Louisiana College. His research focuses on political communication and campaigns. Dr. Thornton has authored or coauthored numerous conference papers. Additionally, his work has been published in the *Journal of Politics*.

**Terri L. Towner** received her PhD from Purdue University and is an associate professor in the Department of Political Science at Oakland University in Michigan. Towner's research focuses on American politics, public opinion, media coverage of elections and political institutions, and the politics of race and class. Her research has been published as chapters and journal articles in outlets such as the *Journal of Political Marketing*, *Social Science Computer Review*, and *New Media & Society*.

**Joseph Daniel Ura** is an associate professor of political science at Texas A&M University. His research addresses the dynamic interactions between the United States Supreme Court and public opinion as well as other issues of macropolitical responsiveness and representation. He teaches courses on American national government, judicial politics, and constitutional law.

**Richard L. Vining, Jr.**, received his PhD from Emory University in 2008. He is an associate professor of political science in the School of Public and International Affairs at the University of Georgia. His research interests include judicial selection and departures, judicial decision making, interbranch politics, and media coverage of American courts. His work has appeared in academic journals including the *Journal of Politics*, *Political Research Quarterly*, *American Politics Research*, and *Social Science Quarterly*.

**Eric N. Waltenburg** is an associate professor of political science at Purdue University. He is the author or coauthor of three books on judicial politics and the United States Supreme Court.

# Contents

<i>About the Contributors</i>	page ix
<b>Introduction</b>	1
<b>1. The Symbiotic Relationship Between the U.S. Supreme Court and the Press</b>	4
<i>Richard Davis</i>	
<b>2. How and Why the Supreme Court Remains Undercovered</b>	23
<i>Tyler Johnson</i>	
<b>3. News Coverage of the Supreme Court Docket</b>	42
<i>Terri L. Towner and Rosalee A. Clawson</i>	
<b>4. The Supreme Court and New Media Technologies</b>	61
<i>Vincent James Strickler</i>	
<b>5. Explaining Intermedia Coverage of Supreme Court Decisions</b>	89
<i>Richard L. Vining, Jr., and Phil Marcin</i>	
<b>6. Constructing Harry Blackmun</b>	109
<i>Rorie Spill Solberg and Eric N. Waltenburg</i>	
<b>7. On and Off the Supreme Court Beat: Differences in Newspaper Coverage of the Supreme Court and the Implications for Public Support</b>	126
<i>Nicholas LaRowe and Valerie Hoekstra</i>	
<b>8. The Placement of Conflict: The Supreme Court and Issue Attention in the National Media</b>	153
<i>Joseph Daniel Ura</i>	

9.	<b>How Traditional Journalists Cover the Court in the New Media Age</b>	173
	<i>David G. Savage</i>	
10.	<b>The Supreme Court and New Media</b>	187
	<i>Dahlia Lithwick</i>	
11.	<b>What the Justices Think of the Press</b>	198
	<i>Laura Moyer and Matthew Thornton</i>	
12.	<b>Justice Brennan and the Press</b>	221
	<i>Seth Stern</i>	
13.	<b>Justice John Paul Stevens and the Press: Extra! Extra! Read All About It!</b>	238
	<i>Bill Barnhart</i>	
	<b>Index</b>	257

## Introduction

The U.S. Supreme Court is one of the most secretive and yet one of the most public institutions in American government. It is remarkably effective in shielding its decision-making process from the public's view, while its products, the opinions themselves, are lengthy tomes filled with detail about the justices' decisions and the rationales behind them. Ironically, the justices are the most verbose of public officials, while also acting as the most sheltered from public attention.

In recent years, however, that tightrope act of publicizing the product but masking the decision-making process behind it has become more difficult for the Court. The justices have become objects of press attention from their role in deciding a presidential election to their decision regarding a president's signature legislative reform. Their own actions have contributed to this higher profile. Unlike their predecessors, most justices give news media interviews. Moreover, these interviews appear not only in legal publications. For example, Justice Ginsburg has given interviews to *USA Today*, *Oprah* magazine, and the *New York Times*. Justice Scalia has been interviewed by *CBS Evening News*, the *Laura Ingraham Show*, and BBC radio. In addition, Justice Breyer has appeared on many media outlets, including *Larry King Live*, the *NBC Nightly News*, and *FOX News*.

At the same time, the Court has not altered the secrecy of its decision-making process. A press report in 2012 that Chief Justice John Roberts may have switched his vote in the case of *National Federation of Independent Business et al v. Sebelius* may suggest the shroud around decision making is being lifted. However, such breaches of the Court's secrecy have occurred in the past, albeit rarely. Indeed, it is the rarity of such disclosures, even in the face of extensive media coverage of high profile cases and enhanced coverage of the Court and justices generally, that suggests the Court remains

successful in its media strategy of directing the public's attention to its product and not to its decision-making process.

How does the Court achieve its press goals, particularly in an age of increased transparency, 24-hour cable news coverage, and the plethora of Internet news and information? What are the routines of press reporting on the Court in the Internet age? As justices have become more visible, has press coverage focused more on individual justices? How has the Court's role in high profile social issues affected its press coverage and public image? How is new communication technology affecting the Court?

These are all questions that political science, communication, and legal scholars seek to answer. Scholars have addressed these questions in various formats such as law reviews, as well as political science and communications journals. This volume brings together scholarly and journalistic perspectives on these questions. The purpose of this book is to illuminate the relationship between the Court and the press by examining the nature of press coverage of the Court and its effects on public opinion, the functioning of the Court, and the Court's interaction with its various public constituencies. It accomplishes that purpose by organizing aspects of the relationship between the Court and the press and then presenting new research by academics describing and explaining those aspects. Additionally, it offers journalistic perspectives, primarily from current members of the U.S. Supreme Court press corps, on the job of covering the Court.

The volume begins with a brief overview of the historical relationship between the Court and the press while also emphasizing developments in national politics, the Court, and the press occurring in the twentieth century that heightened the relationship. Next, we turn to the nature of media coverage of the institution. Tyler Johnson discusses the type of media coverage devoted to the Supreme Court today and addresses the causes of the Court's media portrayal.

News coverage of the docket is the subject of the following three chapters. Terri Towner and Rosalee Clawson discuss which cases receive more attention from the press and specifically focus on one type of case – civil rights – to analyze media framing of these cases. Vincent James Strickler compares coverage of two cases two decades apart to show the changes in press coverage of the Court caused by the Internet. He also speculates on how these developments will affect the future of news media coverage and what they mean for how citizens will acquire news about the Court. Richard Vining and Phil Marcin investigate intermedia coverage of decisions to determine the factors that affect a wide array of media coverage despite audience fragmentation.

Then, Eric N. Waltenburg and Rorie Spill Solberg focus on media coverage of one particular justice, Harry Blackmun. Through their extensive analysis of *New York Times* coverage of Blackmun, they offer insights into how a medium reports on the various facets of a justice's public work – from Blackmun's role in oral arguments to his opinions to his personal life.

Two chapters shift to the Court, news media, and public opinion and examine the Court from two different perspectives in that relationship. Nicholas LaRowe and Valerie Hoekstra examine the role of media coverage in shaping diffuse support for the Court as well as public opinion towards specific Court actions. Joseph Ura examines how the Court has shaped the issue attention of national media outlets through its decisions. He demonstrates how *Brown v. Board of Education* served as a catalyst to public discussion of desegregation.

Then we move to the view from the pressroom. *Los Angeles Times* reporter David Savage, a twenty-eight-year veteran of the Supreme Court press corps, explains how new media such as the Internet and blogs have affected reporter routines. Then, Dahlia Lithwick, former Supreme Court reporter for *Slate*, describes the Court's struggles to adapt to or resist new media changes, as well as the difficulties of new media reporters in covering an institution wedded to traditionalism.

Finally, we get the justices' perspectives on their relationship with the press. Laura Moyer and Matthew Thornton review justices' public statements about the press corps that reveal their attitudes about press coverage while expressing their willingness to engage the press. Additionally, two biographers of justices relate views about the press as gleaned from personal interviews with the justices while they served on the Court. Seth Stern recounts Justice William Brennan's ambivalence toward a press he championed in opinions, but whom he derided personally due to his negative experiences with some reporters. John Paul Stevens' biographer Bill Barnhart describes Stevens' distance from, but not complete disinterest, in the press – both in terms of the cases Stevens handled as well as his personal interactions with reporters. Both chapters provide readers with an inside look at justices' views about the press corps that covered them.

## The Symbiotic Relationship Between the U.S. Supreme Court and the Press

RICHARD DAVIS

### INTRODUCTION

Soon after the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that the Affordable Care Act passed by Congress in 2010 was constitutional, CBS News reporter Jan Crawford aired a story claiming that Chief Justice John Roberts had switched his vote. Crawford reported that Roberts had changed while he was writing an opinion for the majority of conservative justices, and that Justice Anthony Kennedy led the effort to redeem Roberts' vote with the conservatives. The story was unusual because Crawford cited "two sources with specific knowledge" about the incident. That suggested the justices themselves might have been sources. While one of the references was to an unidentified source the other was explicitly, although perhaps indirectly, attributed to a justice: "And so the conservatives handed him their own message which, as one justice put it, essentially translated into, 'You're on your own.'" CBS News anchor Scott Pelly termed the story a "rare insight."<sup>1</sup>

Indeed, such a story is rare. As scholars of the Court know, inside information about the process of decision making for a specific case does not reach the public, except in unusual circumstances. Typically, the Court's norm has been to maintain the secrecy of the decision-making process.

Nevertheless, there are indications that such stories may become more common. U.S. Supreme Court justices have become public in a way that would have been unimaginable even thirty years ago. Moreover, the press has undergone an evolution in its approach to the Court. Reporters have become less willing to view the justices as above political scrutiny, personalize Court

<sup>1</sup> Jan Crawford, "Roberts Switched Views to Uphold Health Care Law," *CBS News*, July 1, 2012, at [www.cbsnews.com/8301-3460\\_162-57464549/roberts-switched-views-to-uphold-health-care-law/](http://www.cbsnews.com/8301-3460_162-57464549/roberts-switched-views-to-uphold-health-care-law/).

coverage, and cover the Court with less formality than in the past. What has led to this change in the relationship between justices and the press?

The thesis of this chapter is that the justices and the press operate within a symbiotic relationship that is marked by public tension, but also by frequent accommodation of each other. That relationship is defined and examples of accommodation on the part of the press towards the Court and the Court towards the press are described. Finally, three recent developments affecting the relationship are discussed. These are more extensive interaction between justices and journalists, increasing scrutiny by the press, and greater judicial acceptance of press norms.

### SYMBIOSIS

With the possible exception of the federal bureaucracy, the conventional wisdom is that there is no national institution needing the press less than the Supreme Court. The justices serve life terms, do not stand for re-election, and often issue decisions that are blatantly countermajoritarian. Similarly, the press should be disinterested in the Court because the justices fail to abide by press norms, such as routinely making themselves available for interviews, speaking on the record, holding press conferences, or writing brief decisions stripped of legalese (perhaps in the form of press releases).

It is true that the justices are the least visible of national policymakers and the Court as an institution is the least covered of the three branches of government, which would suggest the absence of much of a relationship between justices and journalists. Nevertheless, the institution possesses certain incentives to interact with the press that Alexander Hamilton realized when he predicted that the Court would lack the power of enforcement: "It may truly be said to have neither Force nor will, but merely judgment."<sup>2</sup> The power of that judgment would depend on the acceptance by other political players – the executive, Congress, and the public. Another power the Court lacked was a mechanism to communicate to those players in order to gain deference to the Court. The Court's ability to communicate that judgment, and therefore build respect for it, also would be dependent upon other players, particularly the press. The Court, then, possessed a strong incentive to utilize the press to convey certain images that reinforced the significance of its role in the minds of others with power over the Court's role.

<sup>2</sup> Federalist no. 78.

Many individual justices also have reason to pursue press relations. These include influencing their colleagues, shaping public attitudes about legal issues, or writing their own historical records. In addition to autobiographies, biographies (some written by journalists), and, of course, their own written opinions, some justices use interviews with reporters to achieve their own individual aims.

In addition, the press itself has powerful incentives to forge a relationship with the Court. The Court is an influential decision maker in public policy with the capability to shape the agendas, attitudes, and behavior of the president, the Congress, the bureaucracy, interest groups, and the public. Moreover, the Court occasionally addresses high profile issues that reporters cover and the public thinks and talks about. Decisions about controversial issues such as health care reform, gay marriage, gun control, and abortion affect ordinary Americans, but also correspond to existing media and public agendas.

Publicly, the symbiotic relationship between the Court and the press is marked by tension. Justices often describe their distance from the press and occasionally criticize press coverage as shallow and incapable of reporting effectively on Court action. Simultaneously, journalists complain about that distance and their inability to cover the Court as they do other beats. The press often describes the justices as inflexible and unwilling to satisfy press demands for greater transparency and accessibility. In reality, the relationship is marked by accommodation on both sides.

### *Press Accommodation to the Court*

The approach to the Court by the press is dissimilar from the press's treatment of other beats because the justices themselves are unique among national governmental players in their norms, practices, and traditions. In order to cover the Court, news organizations must recognize and adapt to the Court's institutional peculiarities. That is what they have done, even though these norms fly in the face of traditional newsgathering approaches.

One example of accommodation is adherence to the unique rules of the Court. One of those is press access to the decision makers – the justices who possess information reporters want. Unlike other institutions, the Court severely limits press access to those individuals – the justices – who, in another setting, such as Congress, would have frequent interaction with reporters.

Limitations on press access are not unique to the Court. For example, White House reporters understand where they can and cannot go in the White House. Journalists covering Congress are not allowed on the floor of the House or Senate or in congressional cloakrooms.

However, Supreme Court rules are more restrictive. Even physical proximity to the justices is more limited than for other institutions. Reporters covering Congress move freely among congressional offices and committee rooms. White House reporters see the president at photo-ops and press briefings where they can ask questions, and usually are able to walk around in the White House Press Secretary's office. But at the Supreme Court, reporters are not allowed to visit the floors where the justices work, unless they have an appointment with a specific justice, and their only regular contact with the justices is in the courtroom, where they obviously cannot ask questions.

In addition, the White House press corps has potential sources both in and out of the White House to obtain information about White House activities and processes. Moreover, leaks are common and even officially sanctioned. None of that is true for the Court. There is no sanctioned leak process. Most interactions with the press are off the record, not even on background. Moreover, justices' clerks are prohibited from releasing information and could well lose their jobs if they did so.

Reporters rarely chafe against the rules of the Court. They typically do not seek to violate those rules to uncover scoops about the Court. Rather, they rely on the official information provided by the Public Information Office and on what they observe in the courtroom. For example, when Tim O'Brien, an ABC News reporter, picked up a piece of paper from the ashes of the fireplace in the conference room during a photo shoot there, the justices discussed in a subsequent conference what action to take against O'Brien. One wanted O'Brien banned from the building. However, Justice John Paul Stevens suggested that O'Brien would not use any material he had obtained because he "will decide that the news value of what he may have seen is not worth the loss of our good will. . ."<sup>3</sup>

Stevens was right. O'Brien did not use the material, whatever it was. The good will of the justices is a carrot that encourages accommodation, rather than journalistic entrepreneurship, by reporters who might be inclined to follow their journalistic instincts to get a good story.

Breaking the rules is uncommon because members of the Supreme Court press corps generally have accepted the Court's practice of concentrating attention on the opinions of the justices rather than the justices themselves or the processes by which they reach those decisions. Adherence to the Court's norms may have diminished somewhat in the wake of the Thomas nomination, but reporters still are careful about shifting their focus to the

<sup>3</sup> Quoted in Davis, *Justices and Journalists*, p. 136.

individual justice, even when it is an attractive story. For example, one broadcast reporter confidentially related to the author that his producers had asked him to investigate the sexual life of one of the justices because of rumors about homosexuality. This request came in the wake of the Bork and Thomas nominations when judicial nominees' private lives became part of the public record. The reporter replied that he was uncomfortable doing so because he felt he should not report on the justices' private lives. His producers backed off when he expressed his reluctance to pursue such a story.

Reporters who cover the Court also accommodate to the Court by changing basic journalistic routines. Since on-record interviews are rarely available, reporters rely on documents to write stories. Stories about cases and decisions are typically about the legal principles of the case more than the personalities of the parties. That may be changing, particularly on television, but reporters covering the Court must adapt to their inability to use the standard journalistic tools of interviewing and observation of decision-making processes to understand and explain what the Court is doing. Instead, they must be willing to pore over stacks of legal documents in the form of writs, oral argument transcripts, and written opinions.

*New York Times* reporter Linda Greenhouse once described the difference between her previous beat covering New York state government and the Supreme Court this way: "Compared with the frenzied drama of the New York Legislature, the quiet of the Supreme Court press room was the silence of the tomb. In place of the easy banter with politicians that had made the Albany beat so engaging, there was an almost suffocating paper flow."<sup>4</sup>

Still another type of accommodation is news organizations' reliance on specialists to cover the Court. For most of the Court's history, reporters who covered the Court had no specialized training beyond journalism. In the 1950s, Justice Felix Frankfurter urged the *New York Times* to hire reporters with legal training. Frankfurter reportedly told a *New York Times* editor that the *Times* would not consider assigning a reporter to cover a New York Yankees game with as little understanding of baseball as *Times* reporters had about the Court. As a result, *Times* executives sent Anthony Lewis to law school for a year and then assigned him to cover the Court.<sup>5</sup>

Today, such legal training or even a law degree is more common in the Supreme Court press corps. Recent or current Supreme Court correspondents

<sup>4</sup> Linda Greenhouse, "2,691 Decisions," *New York Times*, July 13, 2008, at [www.nytimes.com/2008/07/13/weekinreview/13linda.html?pagewanted=all&\\_r=0](http://www.nytimes.com/2008/07/13/weekinreview/13linda.html?pagewanted=all&_r=0).

<sup>5</sup> David L. Grey, *The Supreme Court and the Media*, Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, pp. 52-53.

with law degrees have included Adam Liptak (*New York Times*), Jess Bravin (*Wall Street Journal*), Dahlia Lithwick (*Slate*), Tim O'Brien (ABC News), Marcia Coyle (*Legal Times*), and Jan Crawford (CBS News).

Not all reporters approve of the trend. Some reporters believe a legal background has the potential of increasing deference to the Court. SCOTUS-blog reporter Lyle Denniston suggested, "If a reporter hangs around judges and lawyers too long he begins to smell like them. A journalist has his own smell and he should never trade that aroma for someone else's."<sup>6</sup> Nevertheless, journalists with legal training, such as Jan Crawford Greenburg, Adam Liptak, Dahlia Lithwick, and Jess Bravin, write critically of the justices.

The press has adapted its practices to align with the culture of the Court. It has done so in order to report on the Court's decisions more accurately and effectively. In the case of the use of legal specialists, it did so as a direct result of a justice's suggestion. In other cases, the press corps has accepted the Court's norms in order to maintain access to the Court as an institution and to the justices individually, but also due to a sense of protectiveness toward the Court in its constitutionally-assigned role. Regardless of the reason, the press has accommodated to the Court as well as the Court to the press.

Pressure to alter the press corps' approach to the Court has tested such accommodation. *Washington Post* reporter Bob Woodward urged the Supreme Court press corps to cover the "courts as a political institution" in line with a critical analysis approach to political institutions that emerged with "new journalism" in the 1960s.<sup>7</sup>

At first, coverage of the Supreme Court was unaffected by this analytical approach. Then, *The Brethren* appeared. An account of the court then headed by Chief Justice Warren Burger, *The Brethren* was an inside look at an institution that rarely received inside looks. The fact that the book's coauthor was Bob Woodward, an icon in American journalism who had uncovered Watergate, made it all the more compelling. The book, which appeared in 1979, followed the justices as they decided controversial cases from 1969 to 1974. Those years were pivotal in the Court's jurisprudence, as they decided cases regarding executive power, abortion, school busing, and freedom of the press.

*The Brethren* was not the first book-length attempt to humanize the justices. *The Nine Old Men*, a 1936 book by Drew Pearson and Robert Sharon Allen, treated the justices with a mix of humor and derision during

<sup>6</sup> Quoted in Mitchell J. Tropin, "What, Exactly, Is the Court Saying?" *The Barrister* (Winter 1984): 14.

<sup>7</sup> Quoted in David Shaw, *Media Watch*, New York: MacMillan, 1984, p. 120.