



THE GOLDSMITH AWARDS IN POLITICAL JOURNALISM

March 5, 2013

DEAN ELLWOOD: Welcome, everyone. It's my distinct honor to welcome you to one of the greatest events that the Kennedy School is so fortunate to host every year, the Goldsmith Awards that is led through the remarkable Shorenstein Center and Doug Shorenstein is here. There he is, sitting next to my wife, I ought to be able to find him. But Doug is truly a remarkable supporter and friend, but most importantly this is a critical moment, it seems to me, for the future of journalism, for the future of democracies and the like. We're here tonight to celebrate the kind of work that is most critical and, frankly, very much at risk if you are not very thoughtful and effective in terms of what we do for the future. We're also going to hear from one of the truly remarkable journalists of our era, Nick Kristof, who also happens to be on my visiting committee, so he is kind of my boss, so I'm like really high on him.

(Laughter)

DEAN ELLWOOD: And speaking of bosses, my real boss, Drew Faust, President Faust, has joined us here, along with her husband, Charles. So I'm really on best behavior. I'm going to be sitting up straight admiring everything. My only job here, other than to talk about how amazing and important this night is, is to briefly introduce Alex Jones. He's the Director of the Shorenstein Center and Lombard Lecturer in Press and Public Policy. He covered the press for the *New York Times* from 1983 to '92. He was awarded the Pulitzer Prize in 1987. His most recent book, *Losing the News: The Future of the News that Feeds Democracy*, was published in August, 2009, and the *New York Times* Sunday Book Review called Jones a bringer of light in the encircling doom. So I think

that's good. He also, in '91, co-authored along with Susan Tifft, *The Patriarch: The Rise and Fall of the Bingham Dynasty*, which *Business Week Magazine* called one of the best business books of the year. And on it goes.

He's been a Nieman Fellow. He often appears on the NPR's On the Media, is frequently called upon to comment on a variety of issues and indeed, was recently awarded the DeWitt Carter Reddick Award at University of Texas for career achievement and was elected the American Academy of Sciences. But most importantly to me he is the Director of the Shorenstein Center and it is my great honor now to turn the program over to Alex Jones. I should make one other point about Alex. Alex gives the best introductions of anyone here. Because I have to give a certain number of these I am thrilled he gives only one or two a year. Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. JONES: Thank you all and welcome. This is, as David said, always a very happy night for the Shorenstein Center. This year marks the 22nd anniversary of the Goldsmith Awards program and each year we look forward to this night as a high point for the Shorenstein Center. And if I may say so, immodestly, for American journalism. There is of course a story behind the Goldsmith Awards. Bob Greenfield, then a Philadelphia lawyer, had a client named Berta Marks Goldsmith, who had told him of her intent to leave him her entire estate. Bob declined to accept it and went searching for a good way to use the money for a purpose that Berta would have approved. She was passionately interested in good government, followed the news ardently and was particularly outraged about misconduct by people with a public responsibility.

Eventually Bob connected with Marvin Kalb, the Shorenstein Center's founding director, who I am glad to say is with us tonight. And the result was the Goldsmith Awards in Political Journalism, which include the Investigative Reporting Prize, book prizes, fellowships and a career award. Shortly before the new year and after an extraordinary life of achievement and many, many contributions to the common good, Bob Greenfield died at 97. We mourn him and miss him and tonight we honor him. I

believe that the creation and the support of the Goldsmith Awards was one of Bob's proudest accomplishments, a pride that his family shares. We are joined tonight by several members of the Greenfield Family, Mike Greenfield, who serves as a Goldsmith Prize judge, his wife, Elaine Uang and their daughter, Karina, who attended her first Goldsmith Prize ceremony last year at five months. Also here are the Greenfield Foundation's Chairman Bill Greenfield and his wife Joni, the Foundation's President Jill Feldman, her daughter Rachel and nephew Daniel, Charles and Barbara Kahn and Bill Epstein.

Without the Greenfield Foundation's continued support and good faith this night would not be possible. So please join me in showing our appreciation to the Greenfield Family and to those associated with the Greenfield Family.

(Applause)

MR. JONES: I would be remiss if I did not also take the opportunity to thank the Shorenstein Family for their generosity and support. Walter Shorenstein originally endowed the Shorenstein Center as a memorial to his daughter Joan, who was a distinguished journalist. His family continues its support of the Shorenstein Center and its engagement with all aspects of the media. His son, Doug, you've already been told is here tonight sitting by the Dean's wife. Please join me in expressing our thanks to the Shorenstein Family.

(Applause)

MR. JONES: Our Career Award winner this year goes to the indefatigable Nick Kristof of *The New York Times* and we shall be hearing from him later. But first the Goldsmith Prizes. The first Goldsmith Awards are the book prizes and making those presentations will be my colleague, Tom Patterson, the Bradlee Professor of Government and the Press at the Kennedy School.

(Applause)

MR. PATTERSON: I've got all of Alex's notes up here. Alex, thank you. We award two Goldsmith Book Prizes each year. One for the best trade book in the field of press

and politics, the other for the best academic book. Each prize includes a \$5,000 cash award. Let me first thank this year's book award judges. Alex is one of the judges, Matt Baum, somewhere out there, Marion Just and I was also a voting member of the committee. I'll start with the Goldsmith Book Prize in the trade category. This year's winner is *Consent of the Networked* by Rebecca MacKinnon. Read it. The book will change how you think about the internet. We've heard countless stories in recent years about the transformative effects of the internet, nearly all of them positive, as in the case of the Arab Spring. But as Rebecca shows, the digital revolution is not unfolding in a straight line. Its liberating power is under threat by governments, China, for instance, but also by corporations, like Google, Facebook, Twitter, which Rebecca likens to sovereigns because of their degree of influence over our daily lives. Everything from knowing what we're looking at to knowing what we're buying. Our privacy, one of the strongest protections we have against the intrusive power of the state and the corporation is at risk.

Governments use the internet to spy on us. Private firms use it to exploit our preferences. As a result, says Rebecca, we need a Lockean type social contract to protect our rights as citizens of a networked world. Therein lies the book's title, *Consent of the Networked*. One review calls her book a sobering rebuttal of the heady rhetoric of what it means to be free online. Another review says Rebecca demonstrates that the ultimate effect of the digital revolution will depend not on technology itself, but rather on the resolve of citizens to shape the way in which it is used. Full disclosure requires that I say one more thing about this book. The author is a former Shorenstein Center Fellow. Rebecca was with us in the Spring of 2004 after having served as CNN Bureau Chief in Beijing and in Tokyo. For books written by former Shorenstein Center Fellows, the committee raises the bar for the award, from the simple majority vote to the unanimous vote. Rebecca MacKinnon, please step forward to receive the Goldsmith Trade Book Award for *Consent of the Networked*.

(Applause)

MR. PATTERSON: As I mentioned at the outset, we also award the Goldsmith Prize

Advance Services
Franklin, Massachusetts
(508) 520-2076

in the academic book category. This year's winner is Jonathan Ladd's *Why Americans Hate the Media and How It Matters*. Jon, who is on the faculty of Georgetown University is not a former Shorenstein Center Fellow. And we don't normally reveal the committee vote in such cases, but I thought he might like to know that, as with Rebecca's book, his was a unanimous choice. One of the most disturbing media trends of the past half century has been a sharp decline in the public's confidence in the news media. The media was once one of the nation's most trusted institutions. They are now one of the least trusted.

In most surveys they are either last or next to last, depending on how we're feeling at the moment about Congress. What explains the precipitous decline? Through surveys, experiments and other methods, Jon tests a number of hypotheses. One that panned out was the rise in infotainment. However attractive soft news is to the news audience, it has contributed to the undermining of the media's credibility. Nevertheless, the major factor behind the media's declining reputation has been a relentless effort by partisan elites, mostly from the right, to weaken the media's credibility. Under the guise that the news media are politically biased, partisan elites have raged the decades long assault on the media and have succeeded to an astonishing degree.

As Jon shows, it makes little difference whether the media are actually biased. As long as partisan elites say they are many people will believe it's so. Why does it matter? This is where Jon's analysis gets really interesting, but where it would take me too long to do justice to his findings. So let me give you just a quick teaser. When people distrust the press they tend to reject its factual claims, relying instead on partisan sources in deciding what's true and what's false. As a result Republicans and Democrats increasingly hold different views of reality. Their disagreement over the facts has reached the point where they can barely understand what the other side is saying. Jonathan Ladd, please step forward to received the Goldsmith Academic Book Award for *Why Americans Hate the Media and How It Matters*.

(Applause)

MR. JONES: It is now my honor to introduce each of the six finalists for the

Advance Services
Franklin, Massachusetts
(508) 520-2076

Goldsmith Prize for Investigative Reporting. This year's competition was extremely competitive and I'm very glad to say that. In these difficult times for journalism one might fear that the quality and ambition of investigative reporting would be in decline, but that was definitely not the case with this year's entries. In addition to Mike Greenfield, the judges for this year's competition were Steve Jarding, a recognized expert in political campaigns and a lecturer at the Kennedy School; Dan Kennedy, a media critic and member of the journalism faculty at Northeastern University; Chuck Lewis, founder of the International Consortium of Investigative Journalists and Professor of Journalism at American University; and Laura Sullivan, one of NPR's most decorated journalists and a Goldsmith finalist in 2011.

No judge is allowed to vote for any entry from his own organization or an affiliate of any kind. In January, after long deliberation, the judges select the six finalists and also the winner. We announce the finalists at once because part of the purpose of the Goldsmith Prize is to call attention to the excellent work that all the finalists have done and the other great investigative work that is being done which they represent. So it is with great pleasure that I describe the six finalists, each of which in its own way was regarded as extraordinary. They will be presented in alphabetical order by news organization.

Our first finalist is *The Atlanta Journal-Constitution's* series, "Cheating Our Children." In 2011, *The Atlanta Journal-Constitution* exposed widespread cheating in the Atlanta school system. It was a blockbuster story, got a huge amount of attention. It also left a nagging question, could Atlanta be alone in manipulating the test scores that largely determine whether schools met the federal standard known as Adequate Yearly Progress. For five months a team of *Journal-Constitution* reporters and database specialists engaged in an unprecedented effort to collect standardized test scores from every classroom in the United States. They went after every one. Eventually the team was able to analyze scores in 69,000 schools in almost 15,000 districts in 49 states.

Even after knowing what had happened within the Atlanta Schools, what they found astounded them. Test scores in hundreds of cities across the nation followed a pattern of

suddenly much higher test scores that, in Atlanta, indicated cheating in multiple schools. In nine large school districts the odds that scores in some classrooms could change so dramatically from year to year were less than one in ten billion. The analysis alone did not tell the story, however. Team reporters traveled around the country, to Baltimore, to Boston, Milwaukee, St. Louis, Mobile, Washington, other cities, to interview parents and educators and to examine public documents on suspicious test taking.

In almost every city they found a haphazard approach to investigating possible cheating with allegations often treated as nothing but aberrations and best handled in isolation. Gathering the necessary data and documents turned into a legal and logistical challenge. While a few states had posted online all the data that was needed and many others provided the material requested within a few days or weeks, several states sought to thwart the reporting by withholding information. And not only of test scores, but reports of their own investigations of suspicious tests. Nevada, for example, dismissed the request for information as “an annoyance.” When a *Journal-Constitution* reporter told the Nevada Assistant Attorney General that his state was virtually the last to provide data, he responded with what could -- you could think of it as the Shorenstein response. He said, yada, yada, yada.

The team repeatedly consulted with academic experts and published a detailed explanation of the methodology behind their analysis and of course some attacked the messenger. But the overwhelming reaction overall was that school districts, large and small, saw the series as what it was intended to be, a wake up call about the dark side of the high pressure testing required by the No Child Left Behind Act. As one superintendent, a large school district, wrote to his colleagues when he sent them the articles, ignore this at your peril. The thing that separates the Goldsmith Awards from others is the express intent that the journalism be aimed at improving how government works, including of course public education.

And these awards also are closely attentive to the impact of journalism. Did it make a difference? The impact of *The Journal-Constitution* series was that numerous large school

districts reevaluated their test scores, then through self-investigation led to the firing of the principal of one school, this school touted at one time for its sky rocketing test scores. Others are facing criminal charges. Officials in several states are devising testing systems that they hope will deter cheating. And organizations that are developing the common curricula for American schools on which the tests are based are increasingly addressing this test integrity issue.

Of course it is probably fanciful to think that test scores and test score cheating can be eliminated altogether, especially as long as educators are judged by the test scores and the results that they produce. But what is unquestioned is that *The Atlanta Journal-Constitution's* reporting and analysis on a national scale has laid groundwork for a deep and broad national conversation about test integrity. Please join me in saluting the work of Alan Judd, Heather Vogell, John Perry and M.B. Pell of *The Atlanta Journal-Constitution* for "Cheating Our Children." Would you please stand?

(Applause)

MR. JONES: Our next finalist is the work of a consortium of nonprofit journalism organizations. The Center for Public Integrity, Global Integrity and Public Radio International in cooperation with the investigative news network. They call their project the "State Integrity Investigation." And it started over coffee. Nathaniel Heller, Director of Global Integrity, was telling Bill Buzenberg, the Director of the Center for Public Integrity, about some new research in which Global Integrity had delved into government practices in 22 provinces of Argentina that had led to some real reform there by shining light on breakdowns through a combination of social science metrics and journalistic reporting. Global Integrity is international in its focus. But the Center for Public Integrity scrutinizes the United States. Could the same thing be done in all 50 states in this country?

The media were filled with stories about corruption in statehouses, but no one seemed, it seemed, had bothered to assess the accountability gaps facilitating the endless cycle of pay to play scandals and influence peddling in state capitols. Might the groups

join forces to apply what they had done in Argentina toward analyzing corruption risks in the United States. Much later, with the addition of Public Radio International to the team, the state integrity investigation was born. The first six months were spent hiring reporters of veteran and respected statehouse journalists in all 50 states.

The team had to establish what exactly they were looking for and what were to be the criteria for measuring something as elusive as integrity. The team interviewed close to a hundred state level organizations, good government groups, think tanks and academics. And through that process came up with 330 integrity indicators across 14 categories of state government. Then, in each state, the designated journalists spent some six months reporting. Then the writing and editing process for the 50 state overview pieces consumed another half year. All told the team conducted 1,200 interviews, reviewed approximately 5,000 documents and scoring a total 16,500 indicators and producing 125,000 words of copy, copy that had to be readable and insightful and engaging.

What it amounted to was an unprecedented data driven analysis of transparency and accountability in all 50 states, which resulted in a ranking of all 50 states, accompanied by both a letter grade and a numerical score. Not a single state, not one earned an A grade from the probe. And eight states got F's. The reaction was massive. *The New York Times* weighed in with an editorial and the project was featured in such outlets as *The Washington Post*, *Chicago Tribune*, *Huffington Post*, NPR. That is another aspect of this nonprofit consortium. All that they gathered was available to every news organization in the country. So news organizations everywhere were able to use the team's reporting to spark their own integrity inquiry into the state government in which they lived.

Since the report was published, the "State Integrity Investigation" has been quoted, praised, assailed and otherwise cited by literally hundreds of news outlets. And the investigation prompted or accelerated reform in an ever growing number of states since the project was released a year ago. For instance, Delaware, Iowa and Maine have passed laws that improve access to open records and increased disclosure requirements for lobbyists and government officials. Five additional states, California, Michigan, Ohio,

South Carolina and North Dakota have proposed laws that would increase transparency in government and good government groups in many more states have launched their own reform campaigns, bolstered by the work of the “State Integrity Investigation.” The consortium team is represented tonight by Nathaniel Heller, Executive Director of Global Integrity; Gordon Witkin, Central Managing Editor for the Center for Public Integrity; Adam Hochberg, Editorial Project Director of the State Integrity Investigation and Caitlin Ginley, former Center for Public Integrity editor and now with Media Matters for America, may I ask them to stand.

(Applause)

MR. JONES: Our third finalist is the *Chicago Tribune* and I think that the best possible way to explain their powerful series “Playing With Fire” is to read from the lead of the first article in a series that began last May. “Dr. David Heimbach knows how to tell a story,” the article began. Before California law makers last year, the noted burn surgeon drew gasps from the crowd as he described a seven week old baby girl, who was burned in a fire started by a candle while she lay on a pillow that lacked flame retardant chemicals. Half of her body was severely burned. She ultimately died after about three weeks of pain and misery in the hospital. Heimbach’s passionate testimony about the baby’s death made the long term health concerns about flame retardants voiced by doctors, environmentalists and even fire fighters sound abstract and petty.

But there was a problem with his testimony. It wasn’t true. Records show there was no dangerous pillow or candle fire. The baby described didn’t exist. Neither did the nine week old patient who Heimbach told California legislators died in a candle fire in 2009, nor did the six week old patient he told Alaska law makers was fatally burned in her crib in 2010. Heimbach is not just a prominent burn doctor. He is a star witness for the manufacturers of flame retardants. His testimony, the *Tribune* found, is part of a decades long campaign of deception that has loaded the furniture and electronics in American homes with pounds of toxic chemicals linked to cancer, neurological deficits, developmental problems and impaired fertility.

And as a sort of coup de grâce later in the article, the *Tribune* team revealed the ultimate irony. The retardants don't work. The fire just laughs at it, said the researcher whose work is usually cited by the industry and he says grossly distorted by them. Sort of takes your breath away. The "Playing With Fire" series represented more than a year of shoe leather reporting and meticulous digging involving thousands of documents. The reporters had to master complex material frequently buried in seldom read documents. To reveal the surprising role of big tobacco in the build up of toxic chemicals in American homes, they sifted through 13 million records cigarette companies made public after settling lawsuits.

Reluctant to alter the cigarettes that were starting fatal house blazes, tobacco companies created a new scapegoat, the furniture catching fire. Internal memos, minutes of meetings and strategic plans showed how big tobacco planted its lobbyists inside the National Association of State Fire Marshals and used that organization to promote flame retardant furniture. The series also exposed how chemical makers twisted science to promote products. The reporters dissected numerous studies and drilled into underlying data. It was often highly technical and arcane and in many cases distorted by the chemical industry. Dr. Heimbach, the industry's favorite burn doctor, was sponsored by an organization calling itself Citizens for Fire Safety Institute and claiming to be a coalition of ordinary people dedicated to protecting families. The *Tribune* combed IRS records, corporate franchise tax reports and lobbying disclosure forms to prove that the coalition was a front for the three largest manufacturers of flame retardants.

When the *Tribune* confronted Dr. Heimbach about his testimony, his response was that he had not been under oath. When the first stories ran worried parents asked if the fire retardant chemicals were in mattresses, especially crib mattresses. The industry front organization said they were not. But when the *Tribune* tested three popular brands of mattresses it found significant amounts of the same flame retardant that had been removed from children's pajamas over cancer concerns. The impact of the series has been huge. Historic state and federal government reform on the works and the debate over

toxic chemicals has been reshaped. Hearings have already taken place in the Senate and in the California Statehouse, the EPA and the Consumer Product Safety Commission have moved to increase safeguards. And on a more direct level, retailers have started to take note as consumers have become more aware.

And the potential impact is far reaching as the word circulates as to what the fire retardant industry has done. One California State Senator, after reading aloud from sections of the *Tribune's* series at a legislative hearing told the industry lobbyist present, this industry has been dishonored, disgraced and discredited. I would say in fact it has been exposed thanks to the *Chicago Tribune*. Please join me in expressing admiration to the *Chicago Tribune's* Patricia Callahan, Same Roe and Michael Hawthorne, reporters for "Playing With Fire", George Papajohn, Assistant Managing Editor and Kaarin Tisue, Deputy Editor.

(Applause)

MR. JONES: Our next finalist is the *Los Angeles Times* for its series, "The Shame of the Boy Scouts." The Boy Scouts are much in the news today. Their policy regarding gay scouts garners front page attention. And along with that is the disquieting knowledge that all has not been as it should have been in this revered and iconic American institution. And I speak as a former Boy Scout. Two years ago the *Los Angeles Times* set out to determine whether the Boy Scouts of America, one of the nation's most venerable youth organizations, had protected the young people in its charge. The first step of the two reporters was to verify the existence of what was known within the most guarded chambers of the Boy Scout organization.

It was known within that organization as the Perversion File, a confidential blacklist dating to 1919 of men suspected of molesting boys in their care. Next the team obtained copies of thousands of the long hidden files. With months of painstaking work they redacted the names of victims, created a searchable database of the file, linked each file to the appropriate geographic location in the United States and posted the database and the associated map on the *Times* website. Within days of disclosure of this long suppressed

archive more than a hundred thousand people had poured over the newspapers online database and 5,000 abuse files in case summaries. Some had been molested and sought to learn whether their molester had ever been caught or punished or had been allowed to abuse other boys.

Some sought to confirm long held suspicions about a troop leader's behavior. In some cases those perpetrating the abuse were finally forced to face consequences for their actions. For instance, a Milwaukee pediatrician was forced to surrender his medical license after the state examining board learned from the *Times* that he had admitting molesting two scouts. What was disclosed above all was how sexual abuse had permeated the Boy Scouts and how the secret had been kept for so very long. The reporters disclosed that for decades the Boy Scouts had adhered to a policy of allowing suspected molesters to leave the organization quietly, assured that the allegations against them would not be made public or reported to police. That was bad enough. But the team also disclosed the so-called blacklist had proved outrageously ineffective. Its purpose was to enable the Scouts to keep out anyone who had been credibly accused of sexual abuse, but the men exiled from scouting often managed to find their way back in.

Slipshod registration process, clerical errors, computer glitches and most damning, eagerness of the Boy Scouts of America to look the other way exposed an unknowable number of scouts to sexual predators. The *Times* pieced together its database from files released over years through litigation and court order. The *Times* found more than 125 cases across the country in which men continued to molest after the Boy Scouts had learned of previous abusive behavior. A Scout leader in Minnesota, for example, returned to his old troop after completing a prison term for child abuse.

The files also revealed that the Scouts had been informed of abuse directly by boys, parents and staff members at least 500 times over the years and failed to contact police in 400 of those cases. Even when the Scouts did cooperate with police, the *Times* discovered that the organization often sought to hide what had happened from parents and the public, primarily to protect the reputation of the Boy Scouts. Not until 2010 did the Boy

Scouts require all suspected abuse to be reported to law enforcement. To protect the organization from legal liability the Scouts had deliberately chosen not to study and learn from its own archive, this Perversion File, which was one of the largest databases ever assembled on the sexual abuse of children. The *Times* did the analysis that the Scouts could have done years earlier and found simple and clear red flags that could have been used to screen volunteers and keep likely abusers out.

The main impact of the *Los Angeles Times* investigation, aside from giving former Scouts an invaluable body of knowledge, has been the move by the Boy Scouts of America to launch a comprehensive review of the files and to promise to report to law enforcement any cases that had not previously been disclosed. Please join me in recognizing the excellent work of reporters Jason Felch, Kim Christensen and Editor Julie Marquis of the *Los Angeles Times* for "The Shame of the Boy Scouts."

(Applause)

MR. JONES: Our last two finalists are the work of *The New York Times*, but on different investigative missions. The first is "Wal-Mart Abroad," a careful and detailed account of how Wal-Mart, the world's largest private employer with more than two million workers conquered the Mexican market using corruption. And the investigation further revealed that Wal-Mart's top most executives in Bentonville, Arkansas, knew about it, feared exposure and tried to sweep the truth under the rug, but were thwarted in that effort. *The Times* faced two huge challenges. First, it had to penetrate the secret precincts at the top of Wal-Mart to discover and recreate what had happened. And there was no hope of cooperation from anyone inside Wal-Mart. In Mexico the challenge was to demonstrate that bribes had been paid, even though no one would admit to receiving them.

The investigation began, as so many do, with a tip. David Barstow, *The Times* reporter, learned that a former Wal-Mart Mexico lawyer had contacted the company executives in Arkansas and told them how for years he and his bosses had used systematic bribery to obtain zoning rulings and construction permits that allowed Wal-Mart to win domination in every corner of Mexico. There were hundreds of suspect

payments, in total more than \$24 million. Wal-Mart began its own investigation. But within months when the inquiry began to bear fruit, the company's leaders shut it down. No doubt they believed the matter would quietly end there. And it would have, but for David Barstow.

The Times obtained hundreds of highly confidential Wal-Mart documents, an amazing trove of memos and e-mails. Barstow interviewed the key players, here and in Mexico. Before he was through he knew more about how Wal-Mart dealt with this episode than Wal-Mart did. He was able to piece together the hidden corporate drama with all its machinations and power players of an internal investigation Wal-Mart's leaders feared could cripple it as it expanded through Latin America and around the world. And he then found the smoking gun. He turned up Wal-Mart memos documenting that its investigators, its own investigators had in fact found powerful evidence that the whistle blowing lawyer was right.

There was, the company's own investigators told their superiors, reasonable suspicion to believe that Mexican and U.S. laws had been violated. But Wal-Mart never notified law enforcement officials in either country, as they were required to do. *The Times* also did the shoe leather reporting that Wal-Mart could have done, should have done, but elected not to do. Barstow traveled through Mexico with a Mexican reporter, Alejandra Xanic von Bertrab, tunneling into databases and filing cabinets of local bureaucracies that governed construction permits and zoning issues. They discovered how, in city after city, Wal-Mart had paid bribes to win approvals that the law would not allow.

Perhaps the most blatant exposure of corruption was when Wal-Mart bribed its way around regulation after regulation to build a supermarket in the shadow of the ancient pyramids, one of the most venerated places in Mexico. There it was, the bribe for a crucial last minute change in the zoning map, the payment for a traffic permit, the payment for the blessing of the Institute for Archeology and History, the organization that is the official guardian of Mexico's cultural treasures. And finally the bribes to the mayor for

the all important construction permit. The store opened on schedule, in time for Christmas shopping.

As a direct result of the series, the Justice Department and the Securities Exchange Commission are investigating Wal-Mart for violations of the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act. The revelations brought an abrupt halt to a growing movement to ease up on the Act's anti-bribery enforcement. Mexican authorities are also investigating Wal-Mart, Mexico's largest private employer, for violation of anti-corruption laws. When Wal-Mart got wind of what *The Times* was doing the company hurriedly reopened its own investigation and in November Wal-Mart disclosed that it was examining possible violations of the anti-bribery law in China, India and Brazil, three of its primary markets overseas. A number of key Wal-Mart players have left the company and more may follow. The company has also radically overhauled its compliance and investigative protocols. *The Times* work, in other words, has had impact. Please join me in recognizing Reporter David Barstow and Editor Larry Ingrassia of *The New York Times* for "Wal-Mart Abroad."

(Applause)

MR. JONES: I just looked at my former colleagues at *The New York Times* and I think we got the editors mixed up. Did we? Paul, please stand.

(Applause)

MR. JONES: Our sixth finalist, also *The New York Times*, was an investigation of a very different sort. It is called "the iEconomy." The series began with a simple question. Why doesn't America make cell phones, any cell phones? The most ubiquitous consumer product of our time. And what does that omission say about how technology companies, and especially Apple, conduct business. To answer those questions *The Times* had to overcome a huge obstacle. It had to penetrate a company so obsessively secret that it refused to give *Times* reporters any interviews or access to any of the company's operations. That secrecy is strictly enforced. Apple employees know that speaking to a reporter without permission is grounds for termination.

Nevertheless, *The Times* reporters managed to unearth more than six dozen Apple insiders willing to speak. To find them *The Times* built a database of hundreds of current and former Apple executives and contacted each of them. Though many immediately hung up enough were persuaded to talk that a detailed portrait of how Apple operates could be drawn. *The Times* assigned a dozen reporters in six nations, led by Charles Duhigg in the United States and Keith Bradsher and David Barboza in China. Assisted by multi-media reporters and producers and more than a dozen translators the team visited the Chinese laborers who make cell phones near the factories where they worked and at their homes.

Times reporters collected tax documents from four continents and tracked down former executives who helped create convoluted tax avoidance plans, like one dubbed Double Irish with a Dutch Sandwich. I cannot possibly tell you what that is. They cultivated sources at the White House and Singaporean ministries, the Caribbean bureaucracies and at schools and municipal agencies in Apple's home town. And what they revealed with all this digging was the harsh and at times deadly conditions under which Chinese workers assembling iPhones and iPads live and work. They disclosed the low pay, high turnover at Apple's fabled retail store. And they showed the dubious lengths to which Apple, America's most profitable company, went to reduce its tax bill and the short sightedness of its conclusion that Apple products couldn't be manufactured in America.

Apple, Inc. with its enormous profits, messianic founder and wildly popular products, many no doubt in pockets and purses in this room tonight, had become a company with an image so above reproach as to not be accountable. It took the persistence of a dozen *New York Times* business reporters to rip the veil on America's wonder company and discover the troubling underside of the elegantly designed device we hold in our hands. As a result of this more than a million workers at the Chinese factories that make Apple iPhones and iPads got a 25 percent raise. Their working conditions vastly improved after Apple's supplier plants were opened to outside

inspections for the first time.

Apple tripled its corporate social responsibility staff and reached out to advocacy groups that it had once rebuffed. It publicly identified its suppliers for the first time. Some 30,000 employees at Apple got raises of up to 20 percent and Apple announced it would invest a hundred million dollars to manufacture some computers in the United States. Other computer companies, such as Hewlett Packard and Intel began to rethink how they deal with overseas suppliers. And Congress opened an investigation into the dubious tactics that Apple and other technology companies used to reduce their tax bills.

The series drew praise from some unlikely sources. Ari Fleischer, President George W. Bush's press spokesman who said frankly that he doesn't like *The New York Times*, said publicly this article about why Apple doesn't hire Americans for manufacturing is a must read. And in a case that almost stupendously, unlikely agreement, both Jon Stewart and Rush Limbaugh had good things to say. Please join me in recognizing the outstanding work of reporters Charles Duhigg, Keith Bradsher, David Barboza and Editor Larry Ingrassia.

(Applause)

MR. JONES: It's now time to announce the winner of this year's Goldsmith Prize for Investigative Reporting. The prize comes with a \$25,000 cash award for the winner and \$10,000 awards for the finalists, thanks to the generosity of the Greenfield Foundation. One of the things that seemed evident in this year's group of finalists is the increasing importance of database reporting, which many of the investigations relied upon and the importance of creation of databases that can be used by the public to explore the investigations' findings. That will surely only increase. What is also the lesson of these awards to me is how important this kind of reporting is and how much by influence we don't know. The Goldsmith Awards are intended to inspire and encourage others to do the same. And this year's finalists are certainly inspiring. May I ask all the finalists to stand for one more salute for outstanding work.

(Applause)

MR. JONES: And now the winner. This year's Goldsmith Prize for Investigative Reporting goes to Patricia Callahan, Sam Roe and Michael Hawthorne of the *Chicago Tribune* for "Playing with Fire."

(Applause)

MR. JONES: When I speak to people about the Kennedy School, if you aren't familiar with it, when I try to explain it to people, I often say that the thing that makes it such an inspiring, interesting, fascinating, good place is that the people who come here want to change the world. Changing the world, of course, is a tall order. I would say that the journalist in our time who had done more of that than any other, done more to change the world than any other is Nicholas Kristof. How to make a difference in the world, in fact, he has told me just before we came out here is the topic of his new book, how very appropriate. Bill Clinton credits him with having done more to really communicate how poor people live throughout the world than anyone in journalism. He's worked on child mortality in the developing world, is credited by the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation as being instrumental in helping direct that remarkable couple toward global health as their philanthropic focus.

Half the Sky, a book co-written with his wife, Sheryl WuDunn, is being compared to Rachel Carson's *Silent Spring*. It is a path breaking call to arms on the subject of sex trafficking, forced prostitution, contemporary slavery, gender based violence, rape as a weapon of war and the multitude of ways women are oppressed and violated in the world. By the way, yesterday Nick and Sheryl launched the Half the Sky game, which if you play it on Facebook raises money to help victims like the ones they wrote about.

Nick was early to seize upon the web's potential, he blogs, he tweets and so forth. Now he games. Archbishop Desmond Tutu has bestowed on him the title Honorary African for shining the spotlight on neglected issues in Africa. Jeffrey Toobin of CNN and *The New Yorker* was a Harvard classmate of Nick's. As he put it, I'm not surprised to see him emerge as the moral conscience of our generation of journalists. I am surprised to see him as the Indiana Jones of our generation of journalists. He has reported from more than

150 countries, including most of the worst places in the world as measured by their level of danger and distress. He has inspired not only his colleagues, but a new generation of journalists with his Win a Trip with Nick competitions, in which college students who are journalists vie to join him on reporting missions.

Since starting the competition in 2007 he has taken his young partners to Rwanda, Eastern Congo, Sierra Leone, Liberia, Niger and many other places. And my guess is that Mali may be next. Even the producer of the 2013 Oscar for best picture of the year took notice. Ben Affleck said Nick was a cross between Mother Theresa and the James Wood character in the movie *Salvador*. I was going to explain that to you, but Nancy said no.

So who is this guy? His father was a Polish American immigrant who came to this country after World War II and married a girl named McWilliams. His parents were long time professors at Portland State University in Portland, Oregon, and grew up on a sheep and cherry farm that the family also owned. He arrived at Harvard in 1978, having never seen it, a self-described country hick. But one already passionate about journalism from high school. He put in many hours at the *Crimson*, is Phi Beta Kappa, graduated in three years, won a Rhodes scholarship to Oxford and then took a first in law at Magdalen College. He went to work for *The New York Times* in 1984 where his work has earned him two Pulitzer Prizes, one with his wife for international reporting and one for commentary. He is probably not, surprisingly, not only David's boss, but after a fashion Drew's as well. He's on the Board of Overseers of Harvard.

What has made his career so very extraordinary is that the things he has chosen to explore have almost always been the ones that have great human suffering at their core. Nick Kristof is a moral journalist. He sometimes shames us. He always inspires us. And I am proud to introduce the 2013 winner of the Goldsmith Career Award, Nicholas Kristof.

(Applause)

MR. KRISTOF: Thanks very much. I'm delighted to be here and I'm truly honored to be here with so many incredible finalists for the investigative prize, really blew me away. It's a privilege to count myself a journalist alongside you. You really do this purely

incredible work. And I should also say that it's always a pleasure to come to the Kennedy School. I know so many people here, so many great friends. Although I must say every four years I have to make new ones because you kind of flush out a group to go to Washington to run the country. But I also have to confess that frankly this place is also one of my more traumatic memories, along with being arrested by war lords in various countries.

Because five years ago I came and I was giving the commencement address here. I brought my then ten year old daughter because I thought that she should see her dad in this -- I thought it might improve her view of her dad, frankly. And so we're walking down the street toward the Kennedy School and we see these hoards of people, not coming to the Kennedy School, but crossing the street heading to Harvard Yard. And I was kind of mystified why everybody should be heading away from where I'm about to give a speech. And we stopped somebody and asked why is everybody going over there? And there was a young woman, she said very excitedly, oh, didn't you hear? Bill Clinton is speaking in Harvard Yard in a few minutes.

Well, I was kind of concerned about that as we walked a little closer and finally I stopped and said, Caroline, I just want to tell you something, that I'm going to be speaking here at the Kennedy School, but Bill Clinton, President Bill Clinton is going to be speaking right across the way over there. And so you may be the only person in the audience. And she looked at me very sympathetically and then said, Dad, can I go hear Bill Clinton?

(Laughter)

MR. KRISTOF: So I'm still not recovered from that. But I'm also frankly a little intimidated because I sort of assumed that the notion here is that I provide some authoritative wisdom, the summation of this career. And one of the things you learn in journalism is to be exceptionally suspicious of anybody's received wisdom. It's one of the basic things you learned early in your career. And I think one of the ways that I learned that is when Sheryl and I were posted in Beijing for *The New York Times* and at that point

we had to live in an official *New York Times* residence in the Zheng Duan area in Beijing. And we knew the apartments were bugged. We actually had a friend who worked part time for state security transcribing our conversations.

But we weren't entirely sure where the bugs were and then somebody pointed to a little grate just as you went into our apartment and said the bugs were inside there, or some of the bugs were inside there. Well, I thought, I'm going to get to the bottom of this. I got a stepladder. I tried to peer through the gate. It was kind of a shoe box shaped little recess in there, didn't seem to serve any obvious purpose. I tried to shine a light through the grate, there was some electrical gadgetry in there. I just took a hammer and pounded down the grate. And I just spent a year studying Chinese. I was so proud because I recognized the Chinese characters on these gadgets. In translation they read electronic sound carrying device.

We'd found it. We got to the bottom of this. So Sheryl and I, we retreated to the bathroom and turned on the shower and the faucets and whispered into each other's ears. We were well prepared for this by reading Robert Ludlum novels. So we were trying to figure out how we should deal with this challenge. We essentially felt we had three options. One was that we are well behaved, we leave the bugs in place. Second option, we smash them. Third option, we leave them in place but use them as our private disinformation channel to state security. Actually, let me poll this incredibly wise audience. What would you have done? Leave them in place? Smash them or leave them in place but use them for disinformation?

How many of you would have been the well behaved option and just left them in place? Oh, boy, okay. How many of you would have smashed them? I'm just going to take down a couple of names for the Chinese Government, they pay well for that.

(Laughter)

MR. KRISTOF: How many of you would have left them in place but used them for disinformation? Great minds think alike. That was exactly what Sheryl and I had agreed to do. And just at that moment a friend arrived at the front door and we found out what

an electronic sound carrying device is in Chinese. It's the doorbell buzzer.

(Laughter)

MR. KRISTOF: Boy, we felt deflated. But I always remember that experience any time I'm on a reporting trip and I kind of feel, wow, I've got it. I've nailed it. Because as you learn, that whenever you kind of think you've really kind of got it down, then that's the moment to really be wary of that wisdom that you think you've just inhaled. And given the insights that I just demonstrated, electronic sound carrying devices, I likewise advise you to be somewhat suspicious of my own reflections.

I wanted to offer some kind of ad hoc thoughts about three challenges that we face in journalism to try to inspire some conversation afterward. And the first challenge is a pretty basic one that is in part of the conversation already. It's that our business model, frankly, seems to be evaporating for an awful lot of news organizations. We're kind of groping for a new business model. And one of the things that troubles me is that if you think about past technologies and paradigms and industry, that typically it has not been the previous one that has mastered the new technology. It wasn't horse and buggies that mastered the automotive industry. It wasn't train company railroads that turned into airlines. It wasn't computer companies that became internet companies and internet companies do not become social media companies. I think that there tends to be, in any successful industry, a tendency to feel that you are doing really serious important work that tends to make you a little more careful about taking risks. You're protecting your friend, you're protecting your flank, and that makes you a little more cautious about experimenting and rushing into new areas. And I think that at the end of the day can end up hurting one. I think we probably do need to be more experimental, more willing to take risks if we want to dominate the new landscape ahead. I think it's an open question about what kinds of news organizations will.

I think it's so important that the kind who have demonstrated this incredible work are still very, very present, which means we have to figure out how to make money and I think we have to do a better job collectively in moving into new platforms as we go

along, be more willing to take risks.

A second challenge that worries me because so many of my interests are international is that frankly I think the U.S. is trying to retreat a little bit from the rest of the world. U.S. has historically been fairly inward looking, fairly insular. And then after 9/11 we became somewhat unusually very global. We were attacked by foreign powers and that made us look globally. Now I think the combination of the economic downturn and just a weariness with Iraq, with Afghanistan, is leading us to look more inward. And you see that in all kinds of ways. In connection with the sequester, the Pew Survey had just asked people, given a sequester, what areas specifically in government would you like to see cut? And they asked about 19 areas. Maybe not surprisingly, even people who wanted to see cuts, when you ask specifically, and 18 of those 19 areas they wanted to either see the sums held constant or increased. The only one where a majority did not want it held constant or increase was foreign aid, foreign assistance.

Likewise, I say that when I write about international issues, far away issues, then my audience plunges. I can pretty much write a Republican set column by hitting the F5 key on my keyboard and then when I do that you get lots of people saying, oh, great column, amazing, wonderful. And you've written in half an hour and on a deadline because you didn't have something else to do. Meanwhile, you go off and sneak into Syria or into the Nuba Mountains of Sudan and at great expense and a certain amount of risk and the columns, unfortunately, often just end up kind of disappearing without a ripple. And that's in general, I think, one reason why these issues tend to be covered so little.

Anderson Cooper went off to cover the first big Congo elections, huge expense, risk, live broadcasting in the early morning hours for Congo and his ratings went down. One of the things that left me kind of dispirited was that the Gates Foundation worked out an agreement with ABC News whereby the Gates Foundation would give \$1.5 million to ABC News, essentially -- almost as a bribe to cover important global issues, global health, global nutrition. And it was to cover their expenses and in some ways it worked really well. Great reporting came out about that, really important reporting. They won prizes.

Then after a year, ABC News decided not to renew it. Because even though they were being paid to cover global health, global nutrition, they thought that viewers were essentially uninterested. And that's a huge challenge, I think, for our industry. One level, it's very understandable. If any of us was executive producer of a show, you would know that you can send a crew a long way away at great expense and then you're ratings will go down. Or you can put a Democrat and a Republican in the studio together and have them yell at each other and the ratings will go up. And that is, I'm afraid, going to be our landscape ahead. And I think we've got to think really creatively about how we address that, how we can make stories more interesting, how we can use other hooks to try to present international news.

I think it will also mean that a certain amount of international reporting is going to come not from traditional news organizations, but from think tanks, from universities, non-governmental organizations, open foundation funded. I think the news landscape is going to be much more democratic in that response. And here at the University, one thing I would particularly encourage faculty or future faculty to think about is getting more engaged in those kinds of public debates.

One of the things that has frustrated me is there is so much knowledge about public policy issues on university campuses around the country. And often that wisdom isn't reflected in public policy debate and instead think tanks have a much, much greater profile. And I think part of that is we in the news media need to do a better job of getting really smart experts to weigh in. But I also think that part of that is that academia has, particularly in academic writing, has tended to marginalize itself by writing in ways that just are not going to sway the public. And I wish that academia would embrace social media more, because that is a way of reaching a broad platform. And it's really so important to get that kind of energy and thoughtfulness to participate in national debates on all these issues, including the foreign policy one.

I should also say that -- this sort of partly relates to my own evolution as a journalist. When I first became a columnist in 2001 I thought initially, oh, boy, I'm going to be

changing people's minds over issues twice a week. It really doesn't work out that way. What I found, at least, is that when I write about an issue that is already on the agenda, then people who start out agreeing with me think, oh, boy, that was good. And people who start out disagreeing with me think, boy, Kristof completely missed the boat today. And I truly believe that in a sense where our power is is not so much changing people's minds on issues that are on the agenda, but rather we're in the writing business. We shined a spotlight on something and that helps project it on the agenda.

The winning team from the *Chicago Tribune*, with their work on the flame retardants, that was a perfect example. It projected this issue on the national agenda and is bringing about far reaching change. And I hope that we in journalism will continue to recognize that that is our great power. It's in laying out an agenda and shining a spotlight rather than in necessarily just classic punditry. I was really frustrated when I was reporting from Darfur initially and, again, it just seemed that I'd go out there and visit these villages where there had been massacres and the column would kind of disappear without a trace. And at that time, I don't know if you remember, 2004, at least any of you who were living in New York then, may remember that there were a couple of red-tailed hawks in Central Park. One was Pale Male, do you remember this? And their apartment building, they were nesting in an apartment building there and the building kicked out the two hawks. And New Yorkers were all up in arms, were outraged about two homeless red-tailed hawks.

And I couldn't figure out -- I thought, how is it that I can't muster the same level of indignation but hundreds of thousands of people being attacked and driven out of their homes and during mass rape and this kind of thing and that led me to the work of some people in social psychology, Paul Slovic in particular, about what makes us connect. And it's about individual stories. It's about saying that we are feeling differences are a change. And that likewise is in a sense why with *Half the Sky* we did all kinds of experiments. We, in the television documentary, we brought in actresses. And we were worried about some of this. Is this going to keep in issues that we really care about? Is one of our

actresses going to get arrested for shoplifting?

But at the end of the day it worked so well because it brought in people to pay attention to these issues who otherwise might not have. And Half the Sky game on Facebook is a new iteration. And it's an experiment. We, again, we worry a little bit that it's going to cheapen attention on issues that are truly life and death issues. And yet I think it's imperative that we figure out really aggressively how to get more people to pay attention to issues that are so important. And we'll let you know how that experiment unfolds.

The other challenge, the third challenge that I think we are going to face actually has to do with Jonathan Ladd's book that won. It has to do with this rising distrust for the news media, which I think is going to lead to more scrutiny. And I find all this really dispiriting. Alex mentioned some of the statistics. That at this point, I think so many of us enter journalism partly after the Woodward and Bernstein era and we thought that this is a field where you can really have a positive influence, a way to make a difference. And these days as many people in the public think that the press plays a harmful role in democracy as it plays a positive role.

Two-thirds of people say that news organizations regularly get their facts wrong. It's twice as many as in 1985. And as you know, there is much more polarization in the news media. So we have Fox News on the right, you have MSNBC on the -- Fox News on the right, MSNBC on the left. And I think that also creates a certain risk for the public, for all of us, that we self-select our news sources. Nick Negroponte at MIT years ago talked about the danger of people, through the internet, getting their news sources through what he called The Daily Me. And I think that is kind of the direction that we're going. We're all able increasingly to find out information sources that will confirm our biases instead of make us question them. And given human bias for trying to do that, I think that is a troubling issue for democracy as a whole.

And just more broadly I've just got to say that for all this distrust and, indeed, you know, I think maybe especially those of us in journalism see all kinds of mistakes we've

made, flaws, missed opportunities, things gone terribly wrong. But at its best this can still play such an important role in any society. And maybe because I'm often traveling in societies that don't have a free press, it strikes me in particular and I have such admiration for those journalists in other countries that don't have a free press and the risks they take. In Ethiopia a journalist, Eskinder Nega, is serving an 18 year prison term for having the courage to report honestly about his country.

And when I go and interview these countries I, on the one hand, thank my lucky stars that I'm a reporter here, but I'm just so full of admiration for all they do. I think that the U.S. sometimes tries to build democracy in other countries by holding elections, by paying for elections. I think we exaggerate the impact of the role of elections in a democracy and maybe discount the importance of other elements, including a free press. And for an awful lot less than the cost of an election one can support a journalist who in ways that will more than pay for itself in terms of reduced corruption in that country. I wish the U.S. would be more outspoken when some of these journalists in other countries are arrested and detained, particularly by our allies. We really do have some real voice.

One of the places where I kind of saw this was in Pakistan. I once sneaked into a village where a feudal lord of the area had -- really destroying the local people and killed several people. He had bought off the police and I sneaked in very nervously. I was interviewing people about it and then it's getting dark. I got back in my car, was trying to make a quiet exit. And to my great consternation, all the people around, all the villagers began to cheer. And I was trying to shush them up and I asked my interpreter and they were speaking Saraiki. I said, well, what are they saying. And he said, oh, they're saying long live journalists. And on the one hand, boy, I wish we could hear that a little more in this country. On the other hand, in places like that where journalism sometimes doesn't reach the open, you really do see what is missed and the power there.

I think that to deal with this distrust we're going to have to watch our backs much more broadly. But I think that sometimes there's a tendency to think of ethics in terms of codes. When more broadly they're essentially, I think, a way of seeing life, a way of

approaching life. I think the best ethical rule is what would this look like on a billboard. And I think it's very hard to come up with a specific code of conduct that is going to cover ethical lapses. I think we need to kind of broaden our sense of how that works.

One of the greatest challenges that I face in terms of an ethical conundrum and I'll leave you with this was again when Sheryl and I were in China. And we had covered Tiananmen. One of the young people who had helped us cover it was a student at Tsinghua University. And because he had helped us cover the crackdown there, he ended up in prison. He escaped from prison and then he returned to Beijing, secretly connected with us and asked for our help in fleeing the country. In general, one of the basic rules in *The New York Times* playbook is that you don't help escaped felons flee a country. And we couldn't even consult with our editors because, A, they would have to say you can't help him; but, B, our lines were tapped. And Sheryl and I just didn't know what to do. I mean, if we helped him we were at risk of being kicked out. The bureau could be closed.

On the other hand, if we didn't help him, he was a 19 year old kid who had already helped *New York Times* readers, had gone to jail for it. We figured if we didn't help him he would end up being imprisoned again for who knows how long. And I think one of the things I've done in my career that was most unprofessional was we did help him. And he did get out. And he's actually now in the U.S. Totally unprofessional, but something that in retrospect I think Sheryl and I are really proud of. So, with that, to help stimulate conversation, thank you very much for having me here. And I would love to take some questions.

(Applause)

MR. JONES: Nick has agreed to take some questions. There are microphones here, here, and up there and so forth. I would remind you of the rules. Identify yourself, make the question short and make sure it has a question mark at the end.

FROM THE FLOOR: Thank you very much for being here. What about the risks in terms of danger for when you know there may be potential repercussions, have you ever

felt personally any fear of those repercussions, for example, when you were reporting in Beijing or other places and can you recall any instances where it has forced you to compromise your work or to report any differently than you would otherwise have done?

MR. KRISTOF: Thanks for that question. The truth is that I spend much of my time abroad in total fear. And it constantly forces you to change your reporting, because there are all kinds of places you can't go. And it's not only your own safety you have to be concerned about, but the truth is typically you're traveling with an interpreter and a driver. And their lives are so much at greater risk than your own. I remember in Darfur once we were in a village that the Janjaweed militia was about to massacre. They were approaching it. Everybody, able bodied, was fleeing and we were interviewing those people who were left behind who were not able to leave. And my interpreter finally said at one point, look, they're going to be here very shortly. If they catch you, you have commercial value. They can ransom you. Me, they are just going to shoot me right away. And he was right and we left.

But there are all kinds of really important stories that get hugely under covered because it's hard to go and cover them. And you will put people at risk. And one of the lessons, I think, for dictators is that if you want to clamp down on atrocities that you commit, then unfortunately you can do that by creating real danger for journalists and those who assist them.

FROM THE FLOOR: Hi. My name is Melissa. I'm a second year here at the Kennedy School. First, I wanted to thank you for everything you have done to raise awareness for gender inequalities and women's empowerment. However, my question is a bit more about some of the criticisms that your work brings and more specifically some of your most vocal critics say that the way that you frame your articles tends to remove agency from the same women that you are seeking to empower by painting them as victims. And also sort of perpetuating this West should, you know, these women need to be helped by the West or saved by the West. And I was wondering if you had any sort of empathy for

these criticisms and if so how you might adjust your work accordingly going forward and, if not, what your response is.

MR. KRISTOF: Sure. I think there is a real frustration with people who deeply care about a country, that I will go there and sometimes I will write about that country using some kind of American who happens to be in the area. And so for example in the case of Eastern Congo, I've written about it many times, the most lethal conflict since World War II, as you may know, rape capitol of the world. One of the stories that I did about it was through the kind of the lense or about the work of Lisa Shannon, who is a student here and I, in many ways, this is profoundly unfair. There's so many Congolese doing extraordinary work. But the reality is I want to be read. And if you only have -- I mean, already my readership for that column is dipping, I don't know, 50 percent. If you only have Congolese characters, unless you can -- sometimes you can find some truly amazing person or there will be a Congolese who will have that -- who will serve as that bridge, but otherwise if you don't have some kind of an American connection, then far more people are going to read it, are going to write to their member of Congress, are going to get engaged.

And essentially that's why I so often have those characters. It's the sense that that is the power to make a difference. Same reason to bring celebrities along on those videos. I have plenty of sympathy for those critics. I think it's perfectly valid. But I also think that if you want to have impact, then you have to be creative about how to figure out ways of telling that story.

FROM THE FLOOR: Hi, my name is Eliza. I'm a sophomore at the college. And as a member of the Forum Committee I would like to ask a question made to us through Twitter. How, if at all, do we encourage news consumers to diversify their media choices beyond polarized sources to eliminate media bias?

MR. KRISTOF: Boy, it's a great question and I wish I knew. I think it's just deeply embedded in us. That's how we -- I think we all want to reach for news sources that we think are reasonable, which means those that completely reflect our own biases. And I

think it's, I mean, it worked pretty well in old days when essentially the journalistic tradition was that AP, the wire services, needed to market themselves to both the Republican and Democratic newspapers in the 19th Century. So kind of new standard became being fairly neutral for business reasons. These days business reasons are such that there is a real market for a political point of view. And I think that once that is available and it is really hard to encourage people to turn to others, except by just encouraging them the same way you want to take a run or eat broccoli or brussels sprouts, you should -- I mean, that's how I view the *Wall Street Journal* editorial page, as kind of a hard work out or a brussels sprouts, that it's good for me.

(Laughter)

MR. KRISTOF: And I commend it to you in that regard.

FROM THE FLOOR: Hi. My name is Alex Remington. I'm a second year Master's in Public Policy student here. Thank you so much for coming. The public service or accountability journalism is often described as a public good. But it's a sort of unique public good that's largely provided by for profit corporations. As Jonathan Ladd's book documents, this notion of trusted media is something of historical anomaly. Obviously other public goods tends to be provided by regulated and often publicly supported utilities and agencies. Do you view the work that you do for a for profit company as being in danger? Do you think that reporters like you will continue to have a place in the for profit market?

MR. KRISTOF: I guess first I would say that in describing news organizations today I would be cautious about using the word for profit company.

(Laughter)

MR. KRISTOF: We actually have a lot in common these days with nonprofits. But I do think that a great deal of what journalism provides is indeed a classic public good. I think that there are going to be, I mean, I think there are going to be all kinds of creative ways that we figure out how to pay for this kind of journalism and for other solutions journalism, which also I think is really important, but that doesn't have a huge market.

And I think that foundation support, for example, may be an element of that. You have other examples of doing very interesting work along those lines, but I think that -- I don't see an inconsistency with a for profit company or an aspiring for profit company providing an important public good in that respect, if they can figure out how to pay for it.

FROM THE FLOOR: My name is Ben Voltur. I think by the wonderful examples tonight we see that the print media still is a really key driver of deep investigative journalism. You began your comments today about talking about new reforms of social media. Do you have hopes that these new reforms can actually support, sustain deep investigative journalism or do you think there's something really special about the traditional print form that really can't be replicated in new reforms?

MR. KRISTOF: I think that's a really important question, one we don't really know the answer to. The *Huffington Post*, for example, has done very good work on veterans. I think there are some kinds of reporting that really do have an audience and that can be either loss leaders or can have broad support. There are other kinds of reporting that I think traditionally news organizations did because they regarded it as important. They regarded it as kind of a duty. And it didn't have an audience and probably never will. I think reporting on a lot of state capitols, for example, on city council meetings, providing real accountability on local and state government is something that is incredibly important to make democracy work. And I think that it's hard to see how you would get people passionately interested in that. Reporting on far away problems, ABC News, this thing I said about global health and global nutrition, I think that there is so much going on in that world that is so important. And yet, I think it's really hard to figure out how to cover that in a way that is going to build an audience and news organizations now care so much about their audiences as they're fighting for their lives. So I think some of these things are really going to be tough.

FROM THE FLOOR: Hi. My name is Sue Ling. I'm a first year at the Kennedy School. So as someone who has followed your column, blog and Facebook page for years now, I

would love to hear, given that unfortunately there is no shortage of social injustices and great challenges, what tugs at your moral conscience in choosing what to report on? And how do you decide the topics that seem to be a flashpoint for you that you write something on versus other things, like Darfur, where I know you've covered quite extensively?

MR. KRISTOF: I wish that I could offer you kind of a clearer formula, but really the truth is that very often it's not so much a rational choice, but just something that really just gets me, based on an initial reporting tip. The first time I went to Darfur I never would have imagined that I would end up going there, I think 11 or 12 times in all. But that first trip, seeing these villages where people had been massacred, where there had been mass rape, these orphans, little orphans, I mean, it's hard to put that out of your mind. Sex trafficking is another. I happened to do one story back in 1997 and I just could not -- I went into a Cambodian brothel and here are these two girls, 14 and 15, they were locked up in there. If they tried to escape the police would have handed them right back there. And it felt exactly like 19th Century slavery, except these two girls would be dead of AIDS in their 20's. I'm sure they are now dead, those two girls. But that makes me kind of want to go back.

I must say that I do look for stories that have kind of broader resonance, but that aren't eliminated, because if what I have is a spotlight, then there is no point in shining it on something that is fully lit up. It works the best if it's on something people are not paying adequate attention to. I did some reporting about AIDS in Southern Africa for example and that essentially had, I think, no impact because people already knew that it was a big issue. They had to be at work in 30 minutes and once they figured out that my column was about AIDS in Southern Africa they probably knew what my point of view was going to be and they moved on. Other issues, likewise, it's hard to think of a more important issue in nutrition than micro-nutrients, things like zinc and iodine and getting them to young people. On the other hand, that's one of the more boring things to write about. And so it's, you know, there is a trade-off.

I did one column about iodine supplementation and I was kind of teased that this is the most boring topic ever. But you can only do that once every five years or so. And so it's just kind of a sense of what I think I can -- what is important, not eliminated and what I can get away with boring my readers with on that. Thanks very much.

(Applause)

MR. JONES: Before we adjourn, I want to pay a special thanks to Alison Kommer, who is the person who does the lion's share of the organizing of this for the Shorenstein Center.

(Applause)

MR. JONES: And the entire Shorenstein Center staff. This is really something that we do as a staff together, as a team. And they are a superb team, they really are. Thank you very much. Tomorrow at 9:00 o'clock in Allison Dining Room at the top of the Taubman Building we will have an hour and a half colloquium about investigative reporting with representatives of all six of the finalists, who will talk about what they did and how they did it, the problems they ran into and so forth. It's actually a very fascinating thing if you are interested in investigative reporting at all. Let me say again my congratulations to all the finalists and the *Chicago Tribune* for its win. Again, Nick, thank you so much and thank you all for being here. We are adjourned.

(Whereupon, at 7:39 p.m., the meeting was adjourned.)

C E R T I F I C A T E

This is to certify that the preceding transcript is an accurate record based on the recordings of the proceedings taken before: Alex S. Jones

In the Matter of:

THE GOLDSMITH AWARDS IN POLITICAL JOURNALISM

Date: March 5, 2013

Place: Cambridge, Massachusetts

_ Date: _____

Allyson R. Farley

Advance Services

Advance Services
Franklin, Massachusetts
(508) 520-2076