H A R V A R D U N I V E R S I T Y

JOHN F. KENNEDY SCHOOL OF GOVERNMENT

JOAN SHORENSTEIN CENTER ON THE
PRESS, POLITICS AND PUBLIC POLICY

THE GOLDSMITH AWARDS

Wednesday
March 17, 2004

John F. Kennedy, Jr. Forum
Littauer Building
Kennedy School of Government
Cambridge, Massachusetts

BEFORE: ALEX JONES
Director
Joan Shorenstein Center on Press
Politics and Public Policy
Kennedy School of Government

ADVANCE SERVICES
Franklin, Massachusetts
(508) 520-2076

I N D E X

E V E N I N G S E S S I O N

(8:07 p.m.)

MR. NYE: Good evening, I'm Joe Nye, Dean of the Kennedy School, and it's my pleasure to welcome you to the 12th Annual Goldsmith Awards, which recognize excellence in political journalism. The Goldsmith Awards include a prize for investigative reporting, two book prizes and a career award for excellence in journalism. Over the last dozen years, the various Goldsmith Awards have been given to journalists whose work has not only piqued widespread public interest but has contributed to the wider public discourse and, in that sense, they reflect on the larger mission of the Kennedy School, which is bringing together practitioners and scholars to serve the public interest.

These awards are named for Berda Goldsmith, a woman who was passionately interested in the relationship between the press and politics in a democracy, and an avid newspaper reader and faithful follower of investigative reporting. She especially loved programs that were in the genre, and "60 Minutes", "Washington Week in Review" were among her

favorites. Her legacy is reflected in the Goldsmith Awards.

A number of people combined their efforts to establish these awards, including Bob Greenfield, President of the Goldsmith/Greenfield Foundation, who worked together with the Shorenstein Center on Press and Politics to create and to expand this program, and we are delighted to have the Greenfield family with us here tonight. We are also delighted to have with us Walter Shorenstein, whose foresight led to the establishment of the Center as a place that enhances our understanding of the interaction between press and politics and public policy.

So, Walter, thank you very much for your invaluable contributions.

And it's now my pleasure to introduce Alex Jones, who is the Director of the Shorenstein Center, who will take over from here. A distinguished journalist and a scholar, and he has been a prominent voice through National Public Radio, PBS and the *Times*, a recipient of the Pulitzer Prize and a wonderful Director of the Shorenstein Center.

So, Alex.

(Applause)

MR. JONES: Thank you very much, Joe. This is a very happy night for the Shorenstein Center, this year marks the 12th anniversary, as Joe said, of the Goldsmith Awards program, and each year, this night really is one of the high moments for the Shorenstein Center. If I may say also, and modestly, one of the high moments for American journalism.

You heard Joe's account of how the award was created, now let me tell you what really happened. Gary Orren, who is here, I think, is part of the Shorenstein Center, a professor at the Kennedy School, found himself making a speech at the Harvard Club in Sarasota, Florida and unbeknownst to him, sitting in the audience was Bob Greenfield. Bob Greenfield, a Philadelphia lawyer, a graduate of Harvard Law School and a man, I would say, of remarkable character. Bob had a client, Berda Goldsmith, who had told him of her intent to leave him her entire estate. Bob, remarkably, had decided not to accept that, he decided that that was not appropriate and he had been searching for a good way to use Berda's money for a purpose that Berda would have approved.

She was, as Joe said, passionately interested in both good government and in the news, she followed it ardently, and she was particularly inclined to being outraged at misconduct in people with public responsibility. Bob took the program from that speech that Gary Orren delivered and filed it in his Berda Goldsmith file and when Berda died about six months later, he called Gary Orren. What Bob said to Gary, according to Gary, and this is a direct quote, was in fact Bob called Gary, Gary didn't always return his calls but he got this pink slip and in fact, in this particular case, for whatever reasons, decided to call Bob back.

And when he got Bob on the phone, Gary distinctly remembers what Bob said, he said: "I may want to give you a lot of money".

(Laughter)

MR. JONES: When Gary heard this, he accepted. Actually he said do I have the right place for you, and told him about Marvin Kalb and the Shorenstein Center, and Marvin Kalb, the first Director of the Shorenstein Center and the man I am proud to have succeeded, negotiated with Bob about what would be

created, and what would be created from Berda's legacy was the Goldsmith Awards Program. By the way, Bob told me today that soon after he had spoke to Gary, he also had gotten in touch with the University of Florida. They sent a plane for him.

(Laughter)

MR. JONES: But the magic of Harvard had trumped the good weather, I'm glad to say.

I think that, you know, the way this all happened is something that is remarkable in the same way that the Greenfield family is remarkable, as a group, they are most remarkable and I'm very glad to say that some of them are here tonight. So, in additional, his wife, Louise, also Emily, Claudia, Joan, Lauren, Michael and William Greenfield, and Jill Greenfield-Feldman. It's a family affair, as you can see, and also Deborah Jacobs, the foundation's administrator.

For many years, Bob has been the family's representative on the judging committee that picks every year's finalists and winner. This year, his grandson, Michael, succeeded him in that post and Michael, where are you Michael? There you are,

Michael, I want to tell you how pleased we are to have the next generation in place. Without the Greenfield's continued support in good faith, this night would not be possible, and I ask you to join me in saluting Bob Greenfield and the Greenfield family.

(Applause)

MR. JONES: One of the pleasures of this night is to have the chance to also publicly thank the man principally responsible for the existence of the Joan Shorenstein Center on the Press, Politics and Public Policy, Walter Shorenstein. Walter is 89, he thinks he is 59, he has the drive of someone 39. That's absolutely true, it was that drive that led him to start, right after World War II, with about $1,000 in his pocket in San Francisco and turn it into a fortune in real estate.

But he also is a man with a keen and passionate engagement with the world, and that led him to endow the Shorenstein Center as a memorial to his daughter, Joan, who some of you in this room know or knew. Joan was a highly respected journalist for CBS, and she died far too young of breast cancer. I ask you to join me in a round of applause also in the thanks to Walter

Shorenstein.

(Applause)

MR. JONES: The first category of 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.

MR. PATTERSON: Alex, thank you.

I would like to add my thanks to Alex's to Walter and to Bob, who have contributed so much to the Shorenstein Center.

There are two Goldsmith book prizes given annually, one for the best trade book on press and politics and one for the best academic book. This year, we are giving three awards. The prize committee, vote after vote, was unable to break a tie between the two books that everyone agreed were the best in the academic category, and the wisest among us, Marion Just, said well let's give them both the prize, and so we have co-winners in the academic category.

One is Scott Althaus of the University of Illinois for his book, *Collective Preferences in Democratic Politics*. Stanford University's Paul

Sneiderman said that Scott's book is arguable the most important in the study of public opinion in the last decade, and it is an important book. As you all know, a lot of Americans have opinions that are not backed by information, and pollsters and scholars have lived comfortably in the belief that it was okay that they didn't, in that the assumption was that their issue preferences were distributed very much like those who are well informed about the issues.

Well Scott's book destroys that myth entirely, they are not distributed in that way, they are quite distributed in a different way and systematically biased. And this book, I think, is a warning to pollsters, to scholars, to journalists, that public opinion polls often are not quite what they seem.

Scott, it's a great book, please step forward for the award.

(Applause)

MR. ALTHAUS: Three quick words of thanks, first, to the Shorenstein Center and the Goldsmith Program here, for encouraging scholars and journalists alike to pursue hard work that tries to make governments more accountable to their citizens. And to

Cambridge University Press, who took a chance with me, a first time book author and after tonight, I think their chance has paid off. The popular audience for this one might range 12 to 13 people, I don't know.

(Laughter)

MR. ALTHAUS: But most especially, to my wife, Ellen, who can't be here tonight, who, over a period of ten years, as I was writing the book, gave daily gifts of time and effort to free me up to focus on this. Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. PATTERSON: Now the co-recipient of the Goldsmith prize for the best academic book is Paul Kellstedt for his *The Mass Media and the Dynamics of American Racial Attitudes*. The very same Paul Sneiderman at Stanford, who praised Scott's book, wrote the following about Kellstedt's book: "Given how much has been written about race in America, you might think there is little new and important left to say. Kellstedt's book may change your thinking, it changed mine. It makes an original, intellectually imaginative and essential contribution to understanding the unfolding politics of race."

In the book, Paul, who is on the Texas A&M faculty, shows that racial attitudes, over the last half century, have gone sometimes in the liberal direction, sometimes in the conservative direction, but usually staying in that direction for some period of time. What's interesting in this pattern is the media's role, it has contributed to these opinion swayings by playing up egalitarianism, layering in things of equality when the swing is in the liberal direction, and playing up individualism when the swing is in the conservative direction.

There is another impressive fact too that Paul documents, he shows that the press played a key role in the fusing of race and social welfare issues. In the 1950s and early 1960s, race and social welfare were largely separate issues in the public's mind. Beginning in the 1960s, they began to fuse, partly because reporters repeatedly tied them together in news stories and ever since then, opinions on race and social welfare have moved together in a liberal or a conservative direction.

Paul, this is an exceptional book, please come up to receive your Goldsmith book prize.

(Applause)

MR. KELLSTEDT: I too would like to thank Cambridge University Press for taking its chances on another first time author, like they did with Scott, and I hope they find the payoff to be as enriching as I have. I would also like to add, since I am a former Fellow at the Shorenstein Center, a personal thank you to Walter Shorenstein for being so generous in your support of the Center. Through your support, I was a Fellow in the Fall of 1999 and without that support and without the support of people like Tom Patterson, and Edie Holway and the rest of the staff at the Shorenstein Center, my book wouldn't have been possible and even if it had been possible, it wouldn't have been as satisfying to me as it was, so thank you very much for that.

And thank you also to the Goldsmith/Greenfield Foundation for continuing your support and encouragement of work like ours. I'm humbled by this award and would really like to encourage more scholarship in this area that doesn't make the press either a hero or a villain but inserts its role in sort of press/politics relations, sort of in its broadest

and deepest context, where we can really understand the influence that the press has on public opinion and vice versa, so thank you very much.

(Applause)

MR. PATTERSON: Thank you, Paul.

As I mentioned at the outset, we also give a Goldsmith book prize to the best book in the trade category, the type of book you are likely to pick up in a book store rather than read in a classroom. This year's Goldsmith prize in the trade category goes to Bill Katovsky and Timothy Carlson for their book, *Embedded: The Media at War in Iraq*. I have another Paul Sneiderman quote for this book, but I'll tell you, I wish I was smart enough to have thought about the idea underlying it.

As you all know, the news coverage of the Iraq war was shaped substantially by the embedded reporters who accompanied the American combat units on their way to Mosul, and Baghdad and Tikrit. For their book, Katovsky and Carlson collected all combat histories from more than 60 embedded reporters, and these histories are a fascinating tale of fear, fatigue, firefights, within the context of the constant pressure

to find the story and meet the deadline.

A lot has been written about embedded reporters and there certainly is a lot more to come, but none of it has the raw power of these oral histories collected soon after full scale combat ended in Iraq. It's a fascinating read and I recommend it. One of the authors, Bill Katovsky, was unable to come this evening, but we are delighted that his mother could join us. Lois Katovsky, could you stand so that we could acknowledge Bill's contribution?

(Applause)

MR. PATTERSON: Thank you.

Timothy Carlson is the other author of *Embedded*.

Timothy, please come up to receive the Goldsmith book prize.

(Applause)

MR. CARLSON: I want to thank the Shorenstein Center for their support for serious journalism and for their open mindedness. I suppose, of anyone in the last ten years who has been given an award, we would have to be the longest of longshots. Bill Katovsky is a political science major, from long ago, from the

University of Michigan, and got his Master's at UC Berkeley, but while there, I think one of the instructors told him to get out of the business.

And I was fortunate enough to attend Harvard University and be part of the *Harvard Crimson* amidst one of the best eras of student journalism ever. Some of my colleagues went on to become giants in the field, from Jim Fallows, Michael Kinsley, Frank Rich, and loved their work and loved being a small part of it back then. But thanks to another longshot, a small press, Lyons Press, in Guilford, Connecticut.

When Bill conceived of the idea and thought it was very important to really examine what's happening with both the new technology of satellite and instantaneous coverage, as well as the shift, after 30 years of kind of like a headache after Vietnam, of having kind of like a warfare between the US military and the press, we thought that we should find out, from the people on the front lines, what it meant. And I suppose, from being such outsiders, I actually write for a triathalon magazine and Bill founded about six or seven magazines, one of which was literary and one of which was the triathalon, we were very open minded.

And we wanted to find out what the *Al Jazeera* embedded reporter thought of the whole process, as well as the people from the *Washington Post* and *The New York Times*. People, such as Anna Bodkin, John Burns, a great number of other very brave, and talented and wonderful reporters, were the people that really made this book, and that they were so open, so profound and so sensitive, both gave us the universal human dimension of what it meant to cover a war, and what was going on in their minds and what they were trying to present to the people out there. And we also saw, in the details, of how this somewhat masterful stroke of propaganda, some would call it, or public policy, others would call it, played out. And I just want to thank everyone for this, we are totally excited and thrilled, thank you.

(Applause)

MR. JONES: Thank you, Tom.

It's now my pleasure to present the six finalists for the Goldsmith Prize for Investigative Reporting. This is one of my favorite duties as Director of the Shorenstein Center because it allows us here to recognize the kind of reporting that is

increasingly in short supply, and to my mind, the kind of reporting that is crucial to our democracy. The media have come in for a lot of criticism in recent years, it's nothing new, railing against the press is as old as the republic.

But what is changing for the worse, in this uncertain and unpredictable digital age, is the willingness of news organizations to spend the money that it takes to do the kind of reporting that we are honoring here tonight. Not only does it take courage, it's expensive, and it takes experienced reporters to do it, it takes a lot of their valuable time. The people who did these stories could very well have done a dozen or more less ones, lesser ones, and made themselves more productive to their employers, if you measure productivity in column inches of publishable copy.

My point is that, in honoring these journalists tonight, I want to make sure you keep in mind that we are also honoring the news organizations that sent them to do the job and paid their salaries while they took the time it takes to do this kind of work. The Goldsmith Prize is for a special kind of investigative

reporting in that it honors journalism which, like the Shorenstein Center, is focused on politics and public policy. In creating the prize, the Greenfields wanted it to be an award that had a profound effect on the public and on public institutions, if you will, on the common wheel.

This year, we had a record number of entries, I'm glad to say. To sift, and weigh and judge them, we had a distinguished panel of judges that I would like to recognize. This year's Goldsmith judges, in addition to Michael Greenfield, were Walter Robinson, who led the *Boston Globe's* Spotlight Team that won last year's Goldsmith Prize for reporting on sexual misconduct in the Catholic clergy, and then went on to win the Pulitzer Prize for Public Service.

Carol Bradley, a Niemann Fellow, and distinguished reporter and senior writer at the *Great Falls Tribune* in Great Falls, Montana. Ted Gup, the Shirley Wormser Professor of Journalism at Case Western Reserve University and also a Shorenstein Fellow. And Alex Sanders, former President of the College of Charleston, former Chief Judge of the South Carolina Court of Appeals, an Institute of Politics Fellow here

at the Kennedy School and perhaps most important, unsuccessful candidate for the Senate, who tried to succeed Strom Thurman, as a democrat, and almost won, which testifies to his political skills and also to his, shall I say, informed perspective on press coverage of politics. He will also be a Shorenstein Fellow in the fall, as we focus on the upcoming presidential election.

Each year, in January, the judges choose up to six finalists, which are announced publicly, they also choose an overall winner, which is not announced until tonight. I would like to call attention to the fact that, while three of the six finalists are among the nations largest and most recognized news organizations, three other finalists are from medium to small sized news organizations which did distinguished work focused on local and regional issues. This is very much in keeping with the aim of the award, which is intended both to recognize fine work and also to encourage this difficult and vital kind of reporting at news organizations of all sizes.

It's now my pleasure to honor the work of each of the finalists, to give them a chance to be

recognized individually before we announce the overall winner because as you will see, they have all done great work. I shall present the finalists in alphabetical order, based on the name of their news organization.

There are few icons of public service in this country that can match the Peace Corps, and deservedly so. When I was born, it was, you know, or I should say when it was born, it was born during the idealism of the Kennedy Administration.

The Peace Corps, at that time, came to embody the willingness of Americans, and especially young Americans, to do not just something for their country but for the world. It was well known that working as a Peace Corps volunteer was often difficult, dirty, frustrating, it was also accepted that going to remote and poverty wracked places could be dangerous. But it took the work of the *Dayton Daily News* in Dayton, Ohio to bring to light just how dangerous it was in some cases to be a Peace Corps volunteer, especially a female volunteer.

In an investigation that included interviewing more than 500 people, travel to ten countries, 75

Freedom of Information requests and ultimately, a lawsuit against the Peace Corps to force some open records, the *Dayton Daily News* team uncovered a disquieting reality, they called their report "Casualties of Peace". The investigation found that violence against volunteers is widespread and has increased dramatically since 1991, and the reporters found that particularly prevalent is violence against women volunteers, who make up a majority of all volunteers.

In some cases, the investigation found that women had been sent to isolated, dangerous places with little or no preparation at all or training in this aspect of their work. The overall portrait was painful to those who admire the Peace Corps, and some volunteers have challenged that picture of neglect, but the facts unearthed by the investigation have not been challenged, and the *Dayton Daily News'* work has prompted inquiries and reviews that almost certainly will make Peace Corps volunteers, if not safer, than far more aware of the risks that they run and how to deal with those risks.

Representing the *Dayton Daily News*

investigative team is Mei-Ling Hopgood.

Mei-Ling, please stand.

(Applause)

MR. JONES: Those of you who are fans of "The Sopranos" will not be totally shocked to learn that there is corruption in New Jersey.

(Laughter)

MR. JONES: In an odd way, we who don't live in New Jersey may find it far too easy to nod knowingly that of course every politician in New Jersey is a crook and government there works more like it does in Russia than in an exemplary, non-corrupt place like the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

(Laughter)

MR. JONES: In fact, corruption comes in many forms and so does investigative reporting. In New Jersey, there is one major city, Newark, whose newspaper dominates the state, most of the rest of New Jersey is made up of small towns, like Asbury Park on the Jersey shore. The Gannett Company owns a number of these newspapers in these small towns and the *Asbury Park Press* is the particular jewel in the crown of Gannett's New Jersey constellation. It was, before

Gannett bought it, a distinguished paper known for its feistiness and independence. The good news is that it remains so.

Under the leadership of the *Asbury Park Press*, the Gannett newspapers in New Jersey set out to explore a particularly pernicious form of official corruption that exists all over the nation, they went looking for state legislators who had turned their part time public service jobs, as legislators, into a multimillion dollar money machine for themselves, their families and their political backers. These legislators also write the state's laws, so they had made sure that their behavior was legal, albeit at the expense of taxpayers.

What did this joint task force find? That one third of the state's lawmakers hold multiple patronage jobs. For instance, the president of the Senate earned nearly $2 million in salaries, over the past decade, as an attorney serving various municipalities, this is a no-bid appointed job. This particular senator, who was truly shameless, approved $15 million in state funding for a township on the same day he became that same town's bond counsel. The corruption was republican and democrat, it included kick backs, no-bid contracts and

an array of bad practices.

Essentially, the investigation put on lurid display the power of money and the power of small newspapers acting together to make a difference. Not only did the series make the politicians furious, it also enraged the people of the state. Those papers we honor tonight are the *Asbury Park Press*, the *Courier Post*, the *Home News Tribune*, the *Courier News*, the *Daily Journal*, the *Daily Record* and the *Ocean County Observer*.

Representing them here are, from the *Asbury Park Press*, Skip Hadley, the Executive Editor, Paul Ambrosio, the Investigations Editor, and Jason Method and James Prado-Roberts, who are reporters. Would you please stand?

(Applause)

MR. JONES: Our third finalist is the *Los Angeles Times*, and their investigation was of a related sort of corruption that might be termed legal but odious. In the case of the *Los Angeles Times*, the target was the United States Senate, that most selective club and the elected body that was probably the most revered of all. Over a 12 month

investigation, the team of *Times* reporters highlighted the growing pattern of US Senators who are helpful to certain special interests and who, coincidentally, of course, have family members who earn hundreds of thousands of dollars as consultants or lobbyists for those same interest groups.

This is a cynical age but what the *Los Angeles Times* showed prompted broad disgust. Was the public shocked, shocked to learn that there was a link between interest groups and financial well being of certain lawmakers; no. But the *Los Angeles Times* series went well beyond showing what had been assumed, the articles connected the dots between compromising financial relationships that shadowed the decision making processes of the Senate. They illuminated that shadowy world of influence and lucrative friendship, a world made possible by their own lax ethics rules.

The *LA Times'* revelations prompted editorials in the *Washington Post* and the *New York Times*, something that is not an every day affair, I can assure you, that underscores that depth and quality that their work had. Will it change Washington? One thing is certain, it is exactly the kind of series that is the

only hope of changing Washington. The *LA Times* team is represented tonight by Chuck Neubauer and Richard Cooper, would you please stand?

(Applause)

MR. JONES: What makes a great investigative series great? The judges ask themselves that question each year, the answer has a certain amount of predictability, the reporting must be thorough, and accurate and fair, the subject must be worthy, the writing and the production value should be first class. But what about that intangible, the degree of difficulty? This is an aspect of judging that is inferred, almost intuitive. And what about what might be termed the surprise factor, the idea that the investigation is of a topic that you had not really considered before?

In terms of degree of difficulty and surprise, the joint series by the *New York Times*, "Frontline" and also the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, that they called "Dangerous Business: When Workers Die", that series, their joint effort, set a very high bar. Most of the people being written about made less than ten dollars an hour, they are not the people that normally

get that kind of attention from major news organizations, their jobs are nasty and dangerous and they usually can't get better ones.

When they are told by their bosses, these people, to do something that is obviously very dangerous and often patently illegal, they tend to do what they are told because they believe brightly, most likely, that if they don't, their job will be forfeited. And sometimes, they die, in the case of some employers, in alarming numbers, and with an absolutely horrific indifference from ownership of the business.

The *Times*/"Frontline" investigation set out to explore this kind of illegal negligence and what they found was something criminal, in every sense, they found a horrific pattern, and they found it by going to a Texas foundry, and a New Jersey foundry and a construction site north of Cincinnati, and a legion of other out of the way, unobserved businesses where terrible things were happening. For instance, they told the story of Patrick Walters, a 22 year old who was told by his boss to get into a deep and illegally unsecured trench at a construction site in Ohio. He

did as he was told and when the trench collapsed and buried him, he smothered to death in an avalanche of mud.

The motivation, time and again, for the risky behavior and the unsafe conditions, money. The mantra of reducing costs was putting people at grave risk, illegal risk and in many cases, mortal risk. To make the story even worse, the companies were rarely held accountable by the law, even when it was clearly illegal behavior that had caused the death. The impact of this series is yet to be fully realized, but it has deeply embarrassed OSHA and prompted what seems like to be reform.

Journalistically, the series was a hybrid of cooperative effort of the best kind, between papers, with a great newspaper, the "Frontline" program of PBS and the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. Representing the *New York Times* and "Frontline" tonight are David Barstow, Lowell Bergman and David Rummell, would you please stand?

(Applause)

MR. JONES: I would like to also invite to stand my colleague from the *New York Times*, who is in

charge of the *Times'* television project and had a definite hand in shaping this, and I'm very delighted he is here tonight, Mike Oreskes, please?

(Applause)

MR. JONES: Our fifth finalist is the team at the *Washington Post* that took on the nation's largest private environmental group, the Nature Conservancy. This is an organization that, to many, is a beacon of inspiring advocacy on behalf of us all. I suspect that many of you are like me, you get solicited by the Nature Conservancy each year, more than likely, you write them a check. What the team at the *Washington Post* found was that the Nature Conservancy also had become involved in what could only be described as practices that were very difficult to square with its mission and its image.

There were partnerships with major polluters, for instance. The Conservancy's board of advisory council included senior officials from corporations that had paid millions of dollars in environmental fines. What's worse, the Conservancy had engaged in deals with those corporate insiders and the companies, also worth millions. The *Post* found things that were

almost beyond belief, for instance, that highly endangered birds had died as the Conservancy drilled for oil under the specie's last breeding ground.

The *Post* had set out simply to do a profile of the Conservancy, which has over a million members and is one of the ten largest nonprofits in the country, what they turned up prompted alarming and further digging. Not surprisingly, the Conservancy mounted a counterattack, including a 16 page rebuttal that was sent to each member of Congress and full page ads in the *Post* and other publications. But the *Post* pressed ahead; the ultimate result, a declaration by the Conservancy of far reaching changes and sweeping alterations. My favorite: The Conservancy announced that it would no longer drill for oil.

(Laughter)

MR. JONES: I was told, over dinner, by one of the reporters, that they also had decided to abandon their strip mine.

(Laughter)

MR. JONES: The *Washington Post* investigative team was comprised of Joe Stephens and David B. Ottaway, and Joe Stephens is with us tonight and Joe's

editor is also with us tonight. Would you both please stand?

(Applause)

MR. JONES: Local television is generally not considered the place where you find tough, thorough investigative reporting, unless it's the investigation of the latest sweeps week phenomenon, like the scandalous places people are body piercing themselves these days or the latest Elvis siting. WTVF-TV is based in Nashville, it's Elvis country, but their mission was a much more serious one. Phil Williams and his partner, Bryan Staples, set out to find out just what it meant to be a friend of the Governor of Tennessee, financially that is.

The result was a series of reports they called "Friends in High Places, Perks of Power", and their report was devastating. They told, in compelling and vivid form, how one of the governor's biggest supporters was given the state contract to run a job training center aimed at preparing people to reenter the work force, who had been laid off or lost their job. These people needed training, they needed training not only in job skills but also in the whole

procedure and mechanics of getting and keeping a job, it was a good idea, a worthy concept, but it turned out mainly to be a boondoggle.

The training was cursory at best and essentially, worthless, the company was little more than a Hollywood set, hastily constructed to look like something it wasn't. And the governor's friend, he was a man who had no apparent qualifications for being given this contract, except for the very important qualification of being a friend of the governor. WTVF found case after case of such shenanigans.

They took the probe further to examine the President of the University of Tennessee, he was also enmeshed in a web of abuse of his power and WTVF, among others, went after him with a resolute persistence that is something that television rarely exhibits.

The display of journalistic resolve, aggressive coverage and wholehearted commitment impressed the judges greatly and were in the highest tradition of the Goldsmith Prize.

Phil Williams and Bryan Staples, would you please stand?

(Applause)

MR. JONES: It's now my honor to name the 2004 winner of the Goldsmith Prize for Investigative Reporting. Before I do, let me, one more time, offer my sincere respect to all the finalists.

This year's winner, the *New York Times* and *Frontline* for "Dangerous Business: When Workers Die", David Barstow, Lowell Bergman, David Rumnell and Mike Oreskes, please come forward.

(Applause)

MR. JONES: Mike, please. David, please, David Fanning, from *Frontline*.

(Applause)

MR. JONES: Congratulations. Mike Oreskes and David Fanning, also, is of course the inventor of "Frontline" and its guiding spirit. Glad to have you, please.

MR. BERGMAN: Well, first of all, I would like to thank the Shorenstein Center, Walter Shorenstein, who is from San Francisco. I am, myself, from that area and it's nice that we are bringing a little culture to the East Coast.

(Laughter)

MR. BERGMAN: But primarily, because this is,

as you may know and noticed, it is a collaboration of television and print. They said it couldn't be done, that you could make television as good or better than print, and that print could really inform television. And this is also really about people, it's about David Fanning, who is standing up here, and Lou Wiley who, in television, have dedicated themselves to doing real quality. It's to Mike Oreskes, and Bill Keller and others at the *New York Times*, the departed Steve Engleberg, who went to Portland unfortunately.

People who had faith in this kind of project and most of all, to people, like David Barstow who, as a print reporter at the *New York Times*, I think, learned what it was like to be on camera for the first time. And to my colleague, Dave Rummell, both of whom, I think, will say something about what it is like to break in print reporters to television and vice versa, to make us, in television, become print reporters and understand that all of us are working together, thank you very much.

(Applause)

MR. RUMMELL: I just wanted to say that, for many years, I've always made a point of kind of

checking out who the winners were of the Goldsmith Award and who the finalists were, and actually going back and reading their stuff, and it was always a time for me to draw inspiration going forward into the year to come. And this year, of course I looked at all of the finalists and all of their work, and drew tremendous inspiration from them and felt envious of many of their stories. Nothing would please me more than if tomorrow morning, somewhere out there, some young journalists would look at our work and look at the other work of the finalists and draw some inspiration from that.

And the other thing I wanted to just say was that when you do stories like this, it's really great that you can sometimes be fortunate enough to meet a lot of new friends along the way in the people that you are sort of thrown together with and in this case, being kind of a skeptical print guy, I just wanted to say that I found some good, new friends in David Fanning and Lou Wiley, and I really enjoyed that partnership and thank you very much.

(Applause)

MR. ORESKES: I just wanted to second David,

having spent most of my career in network television, it's an honor to be able to do this kind of work with the *New York Times* and "Frontline", and congratulations to the rest of the finalists here, it's an honor to be among them, thank you.

(Applause)

MR. JONES: Again, congratulations.

(Applause)

MR. JONES: Every year, the Goldsmith/Greenfield Foundation and the Shorenstein Center honor a journalist of singular achievement with a career award. My colleague, Fred Schauer, the Frank Stanton Professor of the First Amendment at the Kennedy School and an affiliate of the Shorenstein Center will introduce this year's career winner and present the prize.

MR. SCHAUER: Thank you, Alex. On a night that we honor investigative journalism, it's appropriate to note that a key part of the reporter's task is to try to obtain information that official holders of that information do not wish to divulge. Yet, while this obstacle is one that all reporters must confront, reporters covering the courts must deal with government

reluctance to disclose information in a special way.

Not only do courts have secret documents and meetings, just like the executive branch; not only do courts do much of their work off the record and in the halls, just like legislatures; but courts, even when they are being public, disguise their reasoning and often even their outcomes in the formalities and the special language of the law, thereby erecting an additional barrier between them and public understanding of the increasingly vital role in democratic decision making the courts play.

For example, in a recent Supreme Court case called Ashcroft V. The American Civil Liberties Union, dealing with the Child On-line Protection Act, the result, the opinion of the court started in the following way: Justice Thomas announced the judgements of the court and delivered the opinion of the court with respect to parts one, two and four; an opinion with respect to part 3(a), 3(c) and 3(d), in which the Chief Justice and Justice Scalia joined; and an opinion with respect to part 3(b) in which the Chief Justice, Justice O'Conner and Justice Scalia joined. And there are, if we go back a few years, even more dramatic

examples of the same phenomenon.

Yet not only does a Supreme Court reporter have to convey such obscure examples to an interested public, the Supreme Court reporter must be an investigative journalist looking for the inner workings of such a notoriously secretive body and must have the ability to interpret the meaning of judicial outcomes, whose precedential precursors have rarely been news. Tonight we honor someone who has not only taken the art of Supreme Court reporting to a dramatically higher level but has also, as with her Mickeljohn Lecture at Brown University a few years ago, shown the singular ability, rare among journalists, almost as rare as it is among academics, to reflect critically and thoughtfully on the role that she, herself, plays and on the larger issue of courts as communicators and reporters of courts as communicators.

Chief Justice Hughes notoriously observed that the Constitution is what the Supreme Court says it is, but with Supreme Court opinions reaching unprecedented length, with the opinions of the justices ever more divided, with the Supreme Court now being asked to decide more than 8,000 cases a year, and with all of

this work being done partly under a veil of secrecy and partly under a veil of legalese, it has become increasingly the case that, although the Constitution may or may not be what the Supreme Court says it is, it is no less true that Supreme Court opinions are what Linda Greenhouse says they are.

(Laughter)

MR. SCHAUER: For 25 years of not only explaining but scrutinizing and interpreting an increasingly important Supreme Court, and of taking her reporting to unprecedented depth of analysis, we are honored to present to Linda Greenhouse of the *New York Times* and not irrelevantly, an alumna of whom Harvard can be most proud, the 2004 Goldsmith Career Award for Excellence in Journalism.

Linda.

(Applause)

MS. GREENHOUSE: Well, Fred, I thank you for putting me in the same category as investigative reporters, because that's really the last thing I've ever thought of myself as, as I thought I would be kind of a lousy one, so thank you for elevating me.

And I'm obviously honored to be here and I'm

touched in many ways. I knew Joan Shorenstein Barone, so I'm especially touched to be here. I never met Walter Shorenstein, of course I always heard of him, and it was a treat to meet him tonight and to hear his take on the passing scene.

And I am, as Fred mentioned, a product of the Harvard Government Department, which Dean Nye is a product of and his predecessor, Graham Allison, was the Teaching Fellow when I took Richard Neustadt's course on American Presidency so, anyway, there are many connections here. But I felt that I had very little light to shed on investigative reporting, as such, so I thought I would follow the old adage and talk about what I know so, as Fred mentioned, for the past 26 years, that has been covering the US Supreme Court.

And the court is, at times, a rather singular beat in which a reporter can feel quite isolated, sometimes blessedly so, from the ebb and flow of Washington journalism. But in other ways, I think the challenges that this beat posed are perhaps not so unique, and thinking about them can maybe shed some light on the challenges that all of us, not only reporters in Washington and not only those covering

institutions of government, face these days in a particularly tough and rapidly changing journalistic environment.

I said I would talk about what I know, so I'm going to start with a personal anecdote, it dates to the particularly unsettling time just following 9/11 when anthrax-laden mail of still mysterious origin had essentially shut down Capitol Hill, pretty much all of the Hill except for the court itself. On a Friday morning late in October, that fall, I was sitting in the Supreme Court press room, reading cases for the coming week and getting ready to keep a lunch date, word came from the press room staff that people were being asked to not leave the building.

Soon we were told that anthrax contamination had, not surprisingly, been found in the court's mailroom and the Capitol physician was coming to give a briefing at 2:00, at which time we would learn what the implications of this discovery were, both for people in the building and for the operations of the court, which was about to resume hearing cases. So I canceled my lunch date, I called my husband I called the office and I got ready to go to the briefing.

I joined the press room staff, as they closed their office doors in preparation for going upstairs to the West Conference Room where the briefing was going to be held. As I started to walk with them down the corridor to the staircase, I was amazed to be told that the briefing was only for court employees. My first thought was that they were kidding, this was, after all, quite plausibly a matter of life and death for all of us. At the very least, we shared a common interest that I would have thought transcended our job descriptions and our professional roles. But it was quite clear that they had their instructions and that they seriously intended to follow them.

Well I'm here and I'm coming, I said, but these staff people, several of whom I viewed as friends of many year's standing, were unyielding. It appeared to me that the bonds of civility that normally defined our relationship were about to snap. I'm not usually a confrontational person, well some of my editors here might disagree with that but I'm not, and I'm not a fan of swashbuckling confrontation style journalism, but I found myself becoming rather emphatic. I'll clean up my language a little bit here, but the court staff was

quite surprised to hear me say I'm breathing your (blank) air and I'm coming to your (blank) briefing. (Laughter)

MS. GREENHOUSE: And so I did. Leaving a handful of equally surprised colleagues down in the press room, I walked alone up the stairs and through the wooden gate that separates the public space of the great hall from the private space of the conference rooms. Another press office staffer was at the entrance to the West Conference Room, you can't come in, she said, looking embarrassed. I positioned myself in the doorway, leaving enough room for the employees to just squeeze by me. I'm not leaving, I said.

For some moments, we were at a standoff, many of the dozens of people who came through the door knew me and quickly sizing up the situation, walked by me with their faces averted. Eventually, the Chief Justice's administrative assistant came along, evidently having been briefed on this problem, you're welcome to come in, she said, but the briefing is off the record. And so I, along with everyone else in the crowded room, heard the official word on the anthrax problem, got the Capitol physician's health advice and

learned about the plans to evacuate and close the building that afternoon and to hold the upcoming arguments, for the first time, in a different federal courthouse. Then the Capitol physician, accompanied by court officials, went outside to the plaza and held a news conference, at which he and they said exactly the same things they had said inside.

Okay, why am I telling you all this? Because when I tried later to make sense of it, the events of that odd day seemed to me a useful metaphor for the relationship between the Supreme Court and the press, and by extension, between the press and the other institutions it covers. We are all breathing the same air, we do inhabit their buildings, we eat their food, we fly on their planes.

We sometimes understand them better than they seem to understand themselves and yet, of course, at the end of the day, despite all the trappings of familiarity, we are not part of their family and any passing illusion that we are is profoundly misleading, if not ultimately debilitating. We can probably never really understand one another's perspective, even in a shared crisis, we remain strangers.

This set of observations raises the question, what should our stance be toward the institutions we cover? I said, at the beginning, that there are ways in which the court beat is both different from and the same as other beats. One major difference, of course, is the relationship of reporters to the individuals who make up the institutions. Justices, at least the living ones, are not sources, nor do they spin, they don't hold press conferences, they don't leak, they don't send messages to one another via the press. They sign their names to what they do, which is more than one can say for many who hold elective office. And although the internal decision making process, as Fred mentioned, is not open to public view, they do own up to the final product and in that way, render themselves, I think, rather refreshingly, accountable.

This is all rather liberating for a reporter, there is no question of losing access because there is no access to speak of in the first place. But the fact that the justices themselves don't engage in spin control doesn't mean that reporters who cover the court don't have to contend with spin, it comes from outside, from those who try to shape the public perception of

issues as they reach the court and of decisions as they emerge from the court.

The spin machines of both the legal establishment and of interest groups with a stake in Supreme Court cases has grown light years in energy and sophistication, since I've been covering the beat, many major and not so major cases have their own websites. Michael Nudow, the California atheist, who brought the Pledge of Allegiance case that will be argued next week, has a press agent who called me twice in the last couple of days. A huge and very sophisticated effort goes into shaping the public discourse that surrounds such issues as tuition vouchers, or call it school choice.

When the court upheld the Cleveland Voucher Program two years ago, Clint Bollock of the Institute for Justice was ready on the court plaza with a press release proclaiming that his victory was second only to Brown V. Board of Education in significance, as a Supreme Court ruling on the future of public education. This was so resonant an image and such brilliant public relations that, although, in my opinion, it was wide of the mark, it became, within hours, certainly

within days, the image that voucher supporters, their political allies and in my opinion, far too many editorials and even news columns reached for in discussing this decision.

The result of all of this has been a kind of convergence between covering the court and covering the more overtly political branches, where the spin comes from inside. The demands on the reporter are quite similar, to find one's own center of gravity amid the cacophony, to educate and arm the reader with the tools necessary to make an independent and informed judgement. This is truly difficult, whether the subject is the federal budget, the War in Iraq or whether states have immunity under the 11th Amendment from complying with the Americans with Disabilities Act.

It requires doing the homework necessary to achieve the self-confidence that, in turn, is necessary to cut through the fog and free the reporting of the need to rely on the he said/she said model that is the antithesis of useful journalism. For a reporter, knowledge is power, you have to know the issues, at least as well as the advocates do. Lack of knowledge

is vulnerability, you risk becoming a tool of those who understand the needs of journalism very well and who know how to exploit those needs.

Not that a story shouldn't let interested parties have their say, often, of course, a story wouldn't be complete without reaction, but I think weariness is the key to preventing reaction from becoming obfuscation, or worse, manipulation. I certainly don't advocate telling the reader what to think but I strongly believe that I have an obligation to give the reader a way to gain a foothold on a complex issue, a safe place to stand amid the rhetorical swirl of competing claims.

The worst or at least the least useful Supreme Court stories, it seems to me, are those that give paragraphs of reaction from a panoply of law professors without giving the reader a clue about which reactions are more credible, better grounded, more worthy of belief. Unprocessed he said/she said reaction or purported analysis of this kind is the raw material of journalism but is not a finished product. These experts, so-called experts or, in many cases, authentic experts are not the ones getting paid to write the

story, we are the ones who have an obligation to get beyond coyness, to level with our readers and fulfilling that obligation requires us to know what we are talking about.

I'll give just one example, the White House reaction to the Supreme Court's gay rights decision last June, which overturned, as you know, the Texas criminal sodomy law. Asked, at the daily briefing, for the Bush Administration's reaction, Ari Fleisher noted that the administration had not filed a brief in the case and said that, as the result of the court's ruling, "now this is a state matter". The truth, of course, was just the opposite, the court had just ruled that neither Texas nor any other state could make sodomy a crime.

So I decided that I had no obligation to let Ari Fleisher hijack my story. Rather, my obligation was quite the opposite, so I did quote him but I then added: "In fact the court took what had been a state-by-state matter and pronounced a binding national constitutional principle."

I'm not sure, but I think I detect a maturation process going on across the board now in political

journalism, as well as legal journalism, a moving away from simply transcribing the processed reaction and toward working through competing claims in order to empower readers to understand and judge for themselves. The colorful and clear-eyed analysis of claims in campaign advertising, which many newspapers are now running as regular features, is one example of this change for the better and I look forward to more, to reporting that elevates substance over form and keeps the reader's needs always foremost in mind.

I'll conclude with a return to my metaphor, we are all breathing the same air, those who report and those who we report on. Toxins, from whatever source, threaten us both, the best we can do is press on and keep in mind those who read and listen to us and depend on us to help them make some sense of a confusing and dangerous world.

Thanks so much for this award, I'm really delighted to be here.

(Applause)

MR. JONES: Linda has agreed to take a few questions. There are microphones here and there and if you would, line up at the microphone for a moment to

ask.

Let me, if I may, take the first question. Is it possible that when there is a new court or a new chief justice, that television cameras will be allowed into the Supreme Court?

MS. GREENHOUSE: If you take a very long view, I think it's probably inevitable but I'm not sure it's going to be in our lifetime. The court would only do this by consensus and I think any one justice saying no --. The way the various justices have explained this to me is that they think the court is working quite well right now and nobody wants to take the responsibility for changing anything that anybody might second guess them, in history, and say that was the moment when the court started losing it, losing its public credibility, losing its whatever. So I would not hold my breath for that.

MR. JONES: If you would, just identify yourself.

MS. MECKLER: Sure. Hi, I'm Laura Meckler, I'm a Niemann Fellow here.

My question is what is your response to the criticism that came out after Justice Blackman's files

were opened up that deliberations and information from people, who are currently on the court, should not be made public during their terms, for breaking some sort of, you know, the magic seal about how they do their work and such? Obviously, you wrote about a lot of that.

MS. GREENHOUSE: I mean obviously Justice Blackman was familiar with that line of criticism too and most justices do take care to keep their files closed. Chief Justice Berger's files are not going to be opened until 2026, when I think even I will have given up the beat by then.

(Laughter)

MS. GREENHOUSE: You know, I mean I think Justice Blackman felt, and I certainly agree, that there is a lot of historical interest in these materials and I can't imagine that it did the court any damage to have them opened. People would always like to keep their office secrets, but I think somebody would have been very hard pressed to go through the Blackman files and find something that was, you know, shockingly embarrassing about the court, or personal relations or anything, so I just think it was the usual

bureaucratic pandering that none of us, in our offices, would probably like to see our files open, but it didn't really change anything too much.

MR. SMITH: I'm Nick Smith, I'm a junior at the college.

And I was wondering what do you think about the duck hunting trip with Cheney and Scalia? And if Scalia refuses to recuse himself on the case with the energy dealings, do you think that the other eight justices will force him to, or should they force him to?

MS. GREENHOUSE: To answer your easiest question first, I'm sure they won't force him to. I cannot imagine the court getting itself in a position of judging their fellow justices, that's just not the ethos there. Should he recuse himself? You know, I take a bit of a minority, very un-PC view of this and say, if he doesn't want to recuse himself, don't recuse and let people judge him as they will. This is the guy who, after all, was one of the five votes that put Bush and Cheney in office and after that, I find it kind of hard to be shocked by much of anything.

(Laughter)

MS. GREENHOUSE: I hate to sound overly cynical or maybe overly credulous, but Scalia has shown us where he thinks the line should be drawn on recusal, and that is he has recused himself from the Pledge of Allegiance case that is going to be argued next week because he, rather temperately, expressed his opinion of the lower court decision that's under review there so, when he was asked to himself off the case, he very promptly did. He evidently believes that his personal friendships and personal relations shouldn't be seen as standing in the way of his ability to decide a case and others disagree. I mean many lower court judges that I've talked to say, you know, we would have to recuse, and why shouldn't he? I think it's debatable, and people will judge, so that's what it's all about.

MR. JONES: Well if I may follow up on that, do you think he will do himself damage or do you think he is indifferent to that? I mean do you think it would be, for instance, if his vote is critical in deciding the case in a particular way, would he be discredited in a way that would be of any consequence or interest to him at all?

MS. GREENHOUSE: Well I can't really judge

that, I mean just projecting myself into the mind of Scalia, a dubious proposition to be sure. One could argue that he thinks that there is also danger in blessing a regime under which a justice can't go anywhere and do anything without somebody raising a plausible recusal motion. And when this issue first started, I said to my liberal friends, if you could look me in the eye and say that you would be having just as much a party over this issue if, instead of Scalia and Cheney, it was Justice Ginsberg on a shopping trip with Lynn Cheney, then we might have something to discuss, but it seems to me a little opportunistic for the liberals to be making a bug fuss over this.

And sure enough, within a couple of weeks, somebody said well Justice Ginsberg spoke to a now legal defense fund group, and she should recuse from sex discrimination cases, and I said well okay, that's the wagers of sanctimony. Once you go down that road, I think it becomes institutionally disabling and as I say, I'm expressing a minority view and I get into arguments with people over this, but I would just rather let it all hang out there. And as your

question, just as people will judge Scalia for the better or the worse, that's none of my business, and he'll take his lumps and life will go on.

MR. JONES: Richard?

MR. SOBOL: I'm Richard Sobol.

I, among many people, have learned a tremendous amount from you and I just want to say, in terms of the two types of Goldsmith Awards for books that your piece in the *Sunday Times* about the process that you went through in doing the Blackman articles was really quite fascinating, to get caught up in the scholarship of the Library of Congress. Fred Schauer quoted Justice Hughes as saying the Constitution is what the Supreme Court says it is, and I'm curious how often, and if you could give an example, this would be interesting, you feel that a decision has been decided contrary to the Constitution?

There are a number of decisions that are going to be coming up now having to do with terrorism, Fourth Amendment decisions, very important sorts of questions. Kathleen Sullivan gave some lectures here talking about the Constitution during the time of terrorism and sort of the flexibility, can you think of a decision

where you thought the Court was just interpreting a different Constitution than the one that you are familiar with?

MS. GREENHOUSE: I'm thinking, it's a provocative question. Where I just thought they were flat out completely off the reservation?

MR. SOBOL: Or slightly off the reservation?

MS. GREENHOUSE: This may sound weird but I have developed, over my years, the sort of capacity to see arguments on both sides of this, and I would have to say no, I probably, there is probably not a case when I felt it was absolutely, again, rephrasing your question in a way that's sort of a cop out, but obviously I don't agree with everything they do, but that's sort of not the issue. By the time something comes up to the Court, it's usually there has been a conflict in the circuits and very smart judges have come out in opposite ways, that's why the Court takes the case.

So I can't think of a decision. We'll leave Bush against Gore aside, which is like a bad hair day, but--

(Laughter)

MS. GREENHOUSE: But I thought there was really no principled argument on the other side.

MR. JONES: Ravi?

MR. NAIDOO: My name is Ravi, I'm a Fellow at the Shorenstein Center.

The kind of story that the *Los Angeles Times* did on Justice Scalia's hunting trips, or the kind of story about the inner workings of the Court revealed by Justice Blackman's diaries and papers, how come the Court somehow, compared to the other branches of government who are less impervious to such kind of investigative reporting contemporaneously, not when the papers are available but during the working of the Court, do the reporters come across such information? And of course those stories seemed very rare, when they are happening.

MS. GREENHOUSE: Well, yes, the stories are rare because the sources of information are really not there. I mean don't forget the most recent case in Justice Blackman's files was ten years old, he retired ten years ago, he said the papers should be open five years after his death and he died five years ago. And the same thing with *The Bretheran*, a book which

revealed the inner workings of the Court and which a lot of the Blackman material validates very strongly. That book came out in 1979 and I think its most recent cases were at least five years old.

So to get contemporaneous information of that kind is essentially unheard of because people that are privy to the inner workings of the Court put a very high premium on guarding the confidentiality of those materials.

MR. JONES: Linda, by tradition, there is one more thing for you, aside from the plaque and such, and that is a chair. We give you a chair.

(Applause)

MR. JONES: We even have a plaque with your name on it on the back, and you can pretend that, this is your chair, we are going to ship it to you. Yeah, we are.

(Laughter)

MR. JONES: We are because we want you to think of us every time you sit in a Harvard chair. No, no, look at the back, look at the back.

MS. GREENHOUSE: I always wanted one of these.

(Laughter) (Applause)

MR. JONES: Before we end tonight, I want to say a special thanks to the staff of the Shorenstein Center and in particular, to Alison Kommer, who is sitting right over here, she is the one who really has done the labor of this.

(Applause)

MR. JONES: Alison, excellent job, but really the entire staff of the Shorenstein Center is required to put this all together and I want to thank all of you for that. Tomorrow at 9:00, in the Malkin Penthouse, the place where we had dinner, we are going to be having a seminar with the finalists on investigative reporting. We hope that many of you will be able to come, you are certainly most, most welcome, and we are adjourned. Thank you very much.

(Applause)

(Whereupon, at 9:22 p.m., the session was adjourned.)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7

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 JONES, Moderator

In the Matter of:

THE GOLDSMITH AWARDS

Date: March 17, 2004

Place: Cambridge, Massachusetts

_____ 04/05/03
Martin T. Farley Date
Advance Services

ADVANCE SERVICES

Franklin, Massachusetts

(508) 520-2076